



**OCALA/MARION COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

Marion County • City of Belleview • City of Dunnellon • City of Ocala

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Monthly Meeting
September 8, 2009
3:00 pm**

**Ocala Electric Utilities Customer Service Center
201 SE 3rd Street, Ocala FL 34478**

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
- 2. PROOF OF PUBLICATION**
- 3. ACTION ITEMS**
 - A. 2009/2010-2013/2014 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) AMENDMENTS**
- 4. DISCUSSION ITEMS**
 - A. 2008 TRAFFIC COUNTS AND TRENDS DATA**
 - B. REVIEW OF 2035 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION ISSUES/STRINGS & RIBBONS SESSION**
- 5. CONSENT AGENDA**
 - A. MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 10, APRIL 14 AND JUNE 9, 2009**
- 6. COMMENTS BY FDOT**
- 7. COMMENTS BY TPO STAFF**

8. SUGGESTIONS BY CAC MEMBERS

9. PUBLIC COMMENT (Limited to 5 minutes)

10. ADJOURNMENT

If reasonable accommodations are needed for you to participate in this meeting, please call the TPO Office at (352)629-8297 forty-eight (48) hours in advance, so arrangements can be made.

*The next regular meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee will be held on
October 13, 2009*



**OCALA/MARION COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

Marion County • City of Belleview • City of Dunnellon • City of Ocala

MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 3, 2009

TO: TAC/CAC MEMBERS

FROM: KENNETH ODOM, TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

**SUBJECT: 2009/2010-2013/2014 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM (TIP) AMMENDMENTS**

In order to ensure that the Ocala/Marion County TIP reflects the most current information, it is necessary to make periodic amendments. Amendments to the TIP are typically required:

- To add or delete a project;
- To change the state or federal funding allocation of a project;
- To change the year of anticipated funding of a project phase;
- To change the scope of work of a project;
- To change the source of federal or state funds.

The attached table offers a brief explanation of the amendments that were required to ensure the accuracy of the current version of the TIP. Please review the table for discussion at the September 8, 2009 meeting.

If you have any questions prior to the September 8, 2009 meeting, please contact our office at 629-8297.

2009/2010-2013/2014 OCALA/MARION TPO
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMMENDMENTS

TIP PAGE #	FM #	SEGMENT	FROM	TO	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FUNDING CHANGE
1-2	2383958	US 441	Sumter CL	CR 42	Widen to 4-Lanes	PD&E Added: \$881,010
1-4	2386771	SR 35	S of CR 464	SR 40	Widen to 4-Lanes	FSF1 Funding Added: \$49,051,059
1-5	2387191	SR 40	CR 328	SW 80th Ave	Widen to 4-Lanes	All funding deferred one year
1-8	4112563	US 301	Sumter CL	529' S of CR 42	Widen to 4-Lanes	Ammended ROW Funding: \$5,472,748
1-9	4152561	Sharpe's Ferry Bridge			Bridge Replacement	Ammended PD&E Funding: \$153,748
1-12	4187401	CSX Railroad	Anthony		Siding	Project not included in initial data import
3-2	4130194	Traffic Signalization	Various Locations		Traffic Signalization	Project not included in initial data import
4-3	4139931	Bellevue Sidewalks: Phase I	Front Rd	Bellevue Park	Sidewalk Construction	Project not included in initial data import
4-4	4154021	CR 40 Sidewalk (Dunnellon)	500' W of Kennesaw Rd	McKinney Rd	Sidewalk Construction	PE Added: \$35,000
4-7	4222847	Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Website			Website Development	Project not included in initial data import



OCALA/MARION COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Marion County • City of Belleview • City of Dunnellon • City of Ocala

September 2, 2009

TO: TAC/CAC Members
FROM: Kenneth Odom, Transportation Planner
RE: 2008 Traffic Counts & Trends Report

The 2008 Traffic Counts & Trends Report will be presented for your review and discussion at the September 8, 2009 committee meeting. If you recall, this document was expanded last year from a traffic counts book to also illustrate current and developing trends and conditions in various areas such as accident information, population, employment and law-enforcement activities including the number of vehicles registered in Marion County.

This document has not been included in your packet because a separate stand-alone report will be issued to each member at the upcoming meeting.

If you would like to review the 2008 Traffic Counts & Trends Report prior to the September 8, 2009 meeting, the document is available to download at <http://www.ocalamariontpo.org/>

Cooperative and comprehensive planning for our transportation needs
HIGHWAY • TRANSIT • BICYCLE • PEDESTRIAN

121 S.E. Watula Avenue • P.O. Box 1270 • Ocala, Florida 34478-1270
Telephone: (352) 629-8297 • Fax: (352) 368-5994 • www.ocalamariontpo.org



OCALA/MARION COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Marion County • City of Belleview • City of Dunnellon • City of Ocala

September 2, 2009

TO: TAC/CAC Members

FROM: Kenneth Odom, Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan: Strings & Ribbons Exercise

Public Involvement is a continuous and significant part of the planning process for any of our transportation planning projects. The difficulty is in getting good public involvement, in terms of number of people attending the meetings and their active participation at these meetings. Typically, a public meeting is advertised and anyone wishing to provide input is encouraged to attend. Attendance at these meetings is sporadic at best, varying depending on the topics and issues being discussed, and often attendees leave these meetings not knowing if they have adequately communicated their opinion on the topics. Based on the success that we experienced with the Strings & Ribbons exercise during the 2025 LRTP public involvement process, we have decided to revisit it as one of the primary public involvement tools during the 2035 LRTP process.

The public involvement element of the 2035 LRTP will begin with TPO staff bringing the Strings & Ribbons exercise to the TAC and the CAC. This program is an interactive exercise that allows all participants the opportunity to be a transportation planner by selecting projects and allocating funding to those projects. Each group, within each committee, will have \$300 million S&R dollars to allocate for the projects that they select. This is the projected amount of money that is estimated to be available over the next 25 years for capital transportation projects within Marion County. At the end of this exercise each group in each committee will have developed a map showing all of the future improvements that they would like to see in place by the year 2035.

If you have any questions regarding the 2035 LRTP or the Strings & Ribbons exercise please contact me at 352-629-8297.

Cooperative and comprehensive planning for our transportation needs
HIGHWAY • TRANSIT • BICYCLE • PEDESTRIAN

121 S.E. Watula Avenue • P.O. Box 1270 • Ocala, Florida 34478-1270
Telephone: (352) 629-8297 • Fax: (352) 368-5994 • www.ocalamariontpo.org



**OCALA/MARION COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

Marion County • City of Belleview • City of Dunnellon • City of Ocala

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Ocala Electric Utilities Customer Service Center
201 SE 3rd Street, Ocala FL 34478**

March 10, 2009

Minutes

Members Present:

Ed Kelly, Chairman
Mike Sizemore, Vice-chairman
Mariam Cook
Penny Fleeger
Joe London
Richard McGinley
John Rudnianyn
Paul Segal
Robert Sulzer

Members Not Present:

Freddie MacKenzie
Suzanne Mangram
Carolyn Torrey

Others Present:

Greg Slay, TPO Staff
Ken Odom, TPO Staff
John Voges, TPO Staff
Kayleen Hamilton, TPO Staff
Vicki Mitchell, FDOT
Justin Ryan, Marion County Planning
Bill Kinser, Marion County Planning
Darlene Weesner

Approved –

Item 1. Call To Order And Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 PM by Chairman Ed Kelly. Secretary Kayleen Hamilton called the roll. A quorum was present.

Item 2. Proof Of Publication

Secretary Kayleen Hamilton stated that the meeting had been published in the March 3, 2009, edition of the Ocala Star Banner.

Item 3a. US 41 (SR 45) Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Update

Ms. Mitchell introduced Ms. Amy Sirmans, FDOT project manager for US 41, and Mr. Dan Kristoff and Ms. Tanya Kristoff of Reynolds, Smith and Hill.

Mr. Kristoff provided handouts of the US 41 alternatives. The project consisted of a section of roadway from approximately four and one-half miles north of the Dunnellon city limits to the proposed realignment of the intersection of US 41 and SR 40. The purpose of the project was twofold – to study the widening of US 41 and to reduce time from PD&E to final design by incorporating information from the ETDM.

Mr. Kristoff reviewed existing conditions on the two-lane rural road. Traffic volumes were projected to fall to unacceptable levels of service by 2035 if a no-build alternative was followed. Issues the project was attempting to address included historical and natural resources; protect specials; the proximity to Rainbow Springs; and residential, business and community center impacts. Consideration was also being given to the vertical geometry of the roadway, the local topography, intersection safety, storm water treatment and access management.

Mr. Kristoff went over the typical sections being considered for the roadway and their impact on the surrounding area. All typical sections met Class V median restrictions. The existing profile of the road was substandard in some places, and Mr. Kristoff advised that the frequency of median openings and signalized intersections were being examined. Mr. Kristoff stated that because of the substantial impact on the surrounding areas, a rural typical alternative had been taken out of consideration. Mr. Kristoff also reviewed potential alignments of the road, including holding the right-of-way line to the east or to the west or centering the road. Mr. Kristoff reported that the project was interested in minimizing the impact to key facilities, residences and particularly Rainbow Springs State Park.

A public alternatives presentation was planned for April 23 at St. John the Baptist Catholic Church in Dunnellon. Comments on the alternatives were being accepted. Environmental documents were being completed, and a public hearing was being planned for the fall of 2009.

Approved –

A previous public hearing on the project had attracted around one hundred attendees. Major concerns expressed at that public hearing had included noise, speed and safety, and the desire for more traffic signals. A meeting had also been conducted at the Chatmire neighborhood, and residents had expressed a desire for better mobilization out of the neighborhood. A public survey had also been conducted.

Mr. Sulzer asked about the pros and cons of suburban versus urban designs. Mr. Kristoff replied that the suburban section had shoulders and swales as opposed to a curb and had a higher operating speed.

Mr. Kelly asked about relocation of the SR 40 intersection, and Mr. Kristoff advised that the US 41 project was matching the new intersection design.

Mr. Sizemore asked about design speed, and Mr. Kristoff explained that the design speed was generally five to ten miles per hour higher than the posted speed limit. Mr. Sizemore asked about bicycle paths, and Mr. Kristoff answered that bicycle lanes would be on the shoulder of a suburban section. Mr. Sizemore noted that there had been a recent spate of cyclists hit by cars and wondered about a barrier.

Mr. Sizemore commented on access to the spring, and Mr. Kristoff noted that sidewalks had been included in all typical sections. Mr. Kristoff stated that they wanted to know if residents were interested in having sidewalks or multiuse paths in the area. Discussion ensued regarding the construction of a sidewalk versus a multiuse path.

Mr. Rudnianyn asked about the SR 40 intersection, and Mr. Kristoff advised that the public meeting would demonstrate how the US 41 project would proceed with and without the SR 40 realignment. The US 41 project was a higher priority.

Item 3b. Federal Economic Stimulus Update

Mr. Voges presented the updated list of federal stimulus projects. There were three projects from the original list that did not meet criteria of the bill and were replaced with two new projects. The first eight projects on the list had been submitted and were anticipated to be funded. Ms. Mitchell reported that District Five anticipated around nine to eleven million dollars in funded projects for Marion County. Mr. Voges advised that staff was making sure that the other projects met federal requirements in case there was a second round of funding.

Mr. Kelly asked about Sharpes Ferry Bridge, and Ms. Mitchell advised that the project had been included in case there was enough funding available for a design-build. It was unclear whether the bridge project fit the stimulus criteria. The project was low on the list because County Incentive Grant Program funds were being pursued. Ms. Mitchell advised that the project was included on the list to fund a design/build. The project had gone through PD&E.

Approved –

Mr. Kelly asked if the designer would handle construction, and Ms. Mitchell replied that if the project was approved as a design/build, they would. FDOT was currently negotiating with the consultant who had done the PD&E. Ms. Mitchell commented that there was no special category for bridges in the stimulus bill. The Department was proceeding with the bridge design, and if funds became available, it would be constructed as a design/build. Mr. Kelly asked about cost of a design/build, and Ms. Mitchell stated that it seemed to be lower.

Mr. Sizemore asked about funding to rebuild deficient bridges. Ms. Mitchell replied that there were criteria for deficiency, and Sharpes Ferry Bridge was far down the list.

Ms. Mitchell explained that Sharpes Ferry Bridge was not high on the economic stimulus list because of its high cost. One large project would not be as much of an economic stimulus as several smaller projects.

Mr. Voges reported that the TPO board had raised the Fort King reconfiguration to priority number four. Baseline Road (SR 35) was the second priority on the FDOT project list. Enhancement funds were being sought for sidewalk projects on Broadway Street and in Marion Oaks.

Item 3c. Marion County Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Kelly noted that the meeting time had been improperly advertised by the Marion County Planning Department. Discussion ensued regarding the meeting time. Mr. Kelly stated that the comprehensive plan update would remain as a part of the regular CAC meeting and would be scheduled to begin at 4 p.m.

Mr. Sizemore asked for direction regarding expectations for comments and suggestions, and Mr. Massey stated that at the current meeting, staff was looking for comments on the transportation maps that needed to be update.

Mr. Kelly commented that the general public should be able to read and understand the comprehensive plan. Mr. Kelly stated that the Level of Service (LOS) chart on page 2-1 was problematic.

Mr. Kelly suggested that the schedule of long-range and short-range goals produced by County Engineering would be a helpful addition to the transportation element of the comprehensive plan. Mr. Massey explained that the transportation element of the comprehensive plan was meant to address only LOS projects. Some Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) projects that did not maintain LOS standards were listed in other elements of the comprehensive plan such as the capital improvement element. Mr. Massey explained that the transportation element set the LOS standard for each road and included goals, objectives and policies for those standards.

Mr. Odom stated that the comprehensive plan could not contain year-to-year projects like the TIP because the comprehensive plan was not updated on an annual basis. The

Approved –

TIP was governed by the comprehensive plan, which set minimum standards, and was updated biannually. Mr. Voges added that the comprehensive plan set up LOS goals and the TIP identified projects to maintain those goals. The comprehensive plan was not, therefore, project specific.

Mr. Massey advised that the county Planning Department was seeking input from the committee to update the transportation element and charts, to assess the element's effectiveness and provide comments on changes. Discussion ensued regarding inclusion of functional classifications in the transportation element. Mr. Massey explained that county staff was seeking input from a citizen perspective as opposed to a transportation professional perspective. Mr. Massey stated that the comprehensive plan could differ from TPO plans and the TPO would not be involved in the update. Mr. Massey clarified that the committee could recommend that functional classification information be included in the element, but county staff did not want the inclusion of TPO plans to be assumed as automatic.

There was discussion regarding LOS definitions, and Mr. Odom agreed to provide information for the next meeting. Mr. Kelly requested the information be provided to the committee a week in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Odom clarified that the comprehensive plan was concerned with county roads. Mr. Massey stated that an initial assessment of each policy would be provided in chart form. A staff assessment would also be performed.

Mr. Sizemore asked about including a policy on commercial traffic in the comprehensive plan, and Mr. Massey stated that that was the type of input county staff was seeking. Mr. Sizemore mentioned work done by MyRegion.org and suggested including regional impacts. Mr. Sizemore also suggested including a policy on alternate forms of transportation.

Ms. Darlene Weesner stated that she had studied geological and environmental information and that traffic counts did not provide any unification regarding impact to the transportation system. Ms. Weesner commented that schools should not be in high traffic areas.

Mr. Sizemore commented that discussions regarding how to address stressed and over-capacity roadways often led to disputes within the community. Mr. Sizemore suggested exploring boulevards and traffic calming measures.

Ms. Weesner cited comments by Mr. Dan Burden of High Springs, Florida, saying that bigger roads created more traffic. Ms. Weesner said that traffic patterns needed to be identified and alternative options provided.

Mr. Massey agreed that an emphasis on alternate transportation was important and that the purpose of the comprehensive plan update was to talk about these needed changes to the goals, objectives and policies that addressed those issues.

Approved –

Mr. Sizemore asked about tying the comprehensive plan to visioning, and Mr. Massey replied that it would be done. Mr. Rudnianyn stated that there needed to be discussions regarding how fast traffic was wanted to move. Returning to Mr. Sizemore's idea of boulevards, Mr. Rudnianyn suggested that roads such as SE/SW 31st Street would be more appealing to citizens if they were better landscaped.

Item 4. Consent Agenda

Mr. Sizemore made a motion to accept the consent agenda as presented. Mr. Sulzer seconded, and the motion passed by unanimous consent.

Item 5. Comments By FDOT

Ms. Mitchell advised that the project status report was being included in the meeting packet to allow the committee time to review it ahead of the meeting. Ms. Mitchell drew the committee's attention to the website address included on the project report. This website contained detailed information on the projects for Marion County.

Ms. Mitchell reported that resurfacing on US 301 from the Sumter County line to US 441 was complete. A new project, resurfacing on I-75 from SR 200 to north of US 27, had been added.

Mr. Sulzer asked about the east-bound left turn lane on SR 200 at I-75, and Ms. Mitchell replied that she would check.

Ms. Mitchell stated that the stimulus projects had been submitted to the FDOT Central Office. Expected funding was based on population, and Ms. Mitchell said that the list submitted had been set up for the maximum allowable. The submitted list consisted of the first eight projects the TPO had requested, and a separate submission had been made for enhancement projects. Ms. Mitchell expected contract negotiations to take place within the next thirty days.

Ms. Sirmans stated that District 5 would hold a convention for contractors and other industry persons to inform them about the stimulus requirements and process. Ms. Mitchell noted that FDOT wanted the TPO to have its stimulus priorities in its TIP.

Ms. Weesner asked about SR 35, and Ms. Mitchell advised that it was the number two priority on the state project list. Mr. Odom added that this was for the section from SR 464 to SR 40. Bids on the project had come in lower than anticipated, and discussion ensued regarding use of remaining funding allocations. Mr. Voges explained that with state stimulus funds, leftover funds would remain in the state but not necessarily in the local area to which they were first assigned.

Approved –

Item 6. Comments By TPO Staff

Mr. Odom stated that staff was completing work on the interactive TIP.

Item 7. Suggestions By CAC Members

Mr. Kelly reported that a longer island was needed at the CVS on CR 464 at Midway Road in Silver Springs Shores. Mr. Odom stated that staff would check the location.

Item 8. Public Comment (Limited To 5 Minutes)

There was no public comment.

Item 9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Kelly at 5:05 PM.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Kayleen Hamilton, TPO Administrative Assistant



**OCALA/MARION COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

Marion County • City of Belleview • City of Dunnellon • City of Ocala

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Ocala Electric Utilities Customer Service Center
201 SE 3rd Street, Ocala FL 34478**

April 14, 2009

Minutes

Members Present:

Ed Kelly, Chairman
Mike Sizemore, Vice-chairman
Mariam Cook
Joe London
John Rudnianyn
Robert Sulzer

Members Not Present:

Penny Fleeger
Freddie MacKenzie
Suzanne Mangram
Richard McGinley
Paul Segal
Carolyn Torrey

Others Present:

Greg Slay, TPO Director
John Voges, TPO Staff
Ken Odom, TPO Staff
Kayleen Hamilton, TPO Staff
Shakayla Pullings, TPO Staff
Jimmy Massey, Marion County Planning
Justin Ryan, Marion County Planning
Vicki Mitchell, FDOT

Others Present (cont):

John Zielinski, FDOT
Jessica Grafton, HDR

Item 1. Call To Order And Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 PM by Chairman Ed Kelly. Secretary Kayleen Hamilton called the roll. A quorum was not present.

Item 2. Proof Of Publication

Secretary Kayleen Hamilton stated that the meeting had been published in the April 7, 2009, edition of the Ocala Star Banner.

Item 3a. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment to Include Stimulus Projects

Mr. Slay drew the committee's attention to the revised project list in the meeting packet. Projects on roads that were no in the federal aid system had been removed and had been replaced. Staff was seeking approval of the revised list to amend the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Mr. Sizemore asked about resurfacing on Fort King Street and Mr. Slay replied that the project involved resurfacing and some road improvements. Mr. Slay commented that the city of Ocala and Marion County were ready to go out to bid.

Action was not taken on the TIP amendment due to a lack of quorum.

Item 3b. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

Item was deferred due to a lack of quorum.

Item 4a. Interactive Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Update

Mr. Odom provided a presentation of the web-based interactive TIP. The interactive TIP included an interactive map and visual search features. The site was constructed to allow searches to include or exclude various layers of information. Staff was requesting feedback from the committee regarding the interactive TIP.

Mr. Odom demonstrated the map and reports features, which could filter information by various options such as funding type. There was also a complete project report that

Approved –

included projects, funding and an index. Mr. Odom stated that an executive summary would also be available.

Mr. Sizemore asked about coding of funding sources such as impact fees and bonds. Mr. Slay answered that a code would need to be created for bonds. Projects would display funding sources such as local, state and federal.

Mr. Sizemore asked about showing maps by commission districts to find projects by impact fee zones. Mr. Odom stated that reports could be constructed as desired.

Staff requested that the committee look over the interactive TIP online and submit any comments, questions and suggestions.

Item 4b. 2010 Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Plan Update

Ms. Mitchell introduced Mr. John Zielinski, the FDOT District V Strategic Intermodal Systems coordinator. Mr. Zielinski explained that the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) covered major transportation facilities. FDOT was providing an overview of the process and schedule for the SIS plan update and wanted to provide the opportunity for local input.

Ms. Jessica Grafton of HDR presented an overview of the SIS plan update. Ms. Grafton provided handouts that included a SIS plan update informational pamphlet, a draft project schedule and a brochure of Florida SIS facilities. Ms. Grafton explained that the SIS was a state-wide system of high-priority transportation facilities, including hubs, corridors and connectors. Hubs were facilities for multimodal types of transportation. Corridors were facilities such as highways that supported regional transportation and the economy. Connectors connected SIS facilities. The SIS was divided into two categories: regular SIS and emerging SIS. Emerging SIS facilities were lower level facilities located in growing areas that were expected to meet SIS criteria within three years.

The SIS plan was required to be updated every five years. The plan had to include a map of facilities, a needs assessment with back-up documentation, a project prioritization process for FDOT district coordination with local and state entities, a cost feasible plan, and impacts on military installations. FDOT was also required to coordinate with federal, regional and local partners such as local MPOs and MyRegion.org.

The purpose of the update was to bring goals, objectives, criteria and policies up-to-date. The update was planned for completion and signing by January 2010, and Ms. Grafton reported that a designations report would be published with the needs and cost feasible plan. Ms. Grafton stated that a district-wide workshop was scheduled in the summer and a draft review was planned for fall. A leadership committee of approximately thirty members had been assembled to guide the process and make

Approved –

recommendations. Meetings of the leadership committee were open to the public. There was also a SIS website with further information.

Ms. Grafton explained that a focus of the update was to assist with air and environmental goals. The biggest challenge was funding. Of identified needs, there was currently funding for approximately ten percent.

Recommendations for policies were expected at the May leadership meeting. Ms. Grafton reiterated that there would be a district workshop during the summer and a draft plan available for review in fall. Additional information could be acquired at the SIS website, www.sisupdate.org.

Mr. Kelly asked about I-75 and SR 40, and Mr. Zielinski replied that those facilities met SIS criteria. Mr. Kelly asked about hubs in Marion County, and Mr. Zielinski advised that there were no hubs. Mr. Zielinski added that other roads in Marion County that were on the SIS included CR 326 and US 301.

Mr. Zielinski stated that a presentation on the SIS plan update was planned for the next TPO board meeting. The committee was invited to review the update information and submit comments to FDOT.

Item 4c. Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS)

The Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS) update was postponed due to information availability.

Item 4d. Marion County Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Massey explained that county staff was present at the committee meeting to receive any comments that members of the committee or attending public might have. County staff had provided an initial assessment for review and comments on the transportation element including policies and maps.

Mr. Kelly expressed approval of the recommendations made and suggested adjusting SunTran bus routes to serve the Silver Springs Shores industrial parks. Mr. Kelly stated that this change would not affect the bus run timings. Mr. Kelly also suggested extending a northwest route out to the K-Mart distribution center so that employees could take the bus to work. Mr. Slay commented that staff was looking into establishing a feeder route to the distribution center. Mr. Slay stated that TPO staff could look into adjusting the SunTran route, and Mr. Massey said county staff would make a note to include it as part of the future service/circulation map.

Mr. Rudniansky commented that the comprehensive plans should include the I-75 overpass on SW 42nd Street. Discussion ensued regarding SE/SW 31st/42nd Street. Mr. Slay suggested including the SW 42nd Street overpass on the future traffic lanes map.

Approved –

Mr. London asked about SW 44th Avenue from SW 20th Street south. Mr. London stated that a one-mile segment would be finished in the next month. Mr. Slay replied that it would not be added until it connected with SR 200.

Mr. Rudnianyn mentioned that SW 49th Avenue was being extended north to SR 200 through a public/private partnership. This road would eventually connect from CR 326 to CR 484. Discussion ensued regarding lack of a connection on SW 49th Avenue at SW 66th Street. Mr. Massey stated that SW 66th Street was a scenic road and access was restricted. Mr. Slay added that the concept was to keep traffic off SW 66th Street. Mr. Rudnianyn suggested that it would make sense from a traffic standpoint to have a connection, but Mr. Slay responded that no connection would keep traffic on SW 49th Avenue flowing without having to stop at SW 66th Street. Ms. Cook objected to encouraging traffic on SW 66th Street and other scenic roads.

Mr. Sulzer asked about the interrelation between the TPO and the county. Mr. Slay answered that the Long Range Transportation Plan was part of the comprehensive plan to fulfill requirements that capacity projects be consistent between agencies. Mr. Slay explained that the TPO implemented level-of-service for roadways and the county determined in the comprehensive plan how to maintain that level-of-service. The LRTP looked out past the planning horizon for the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Sizemore provided written comments regarding language to include in the comprehensive plan.

There was discussion regarding extending SW 49th Avenue south into Marion Oaks. Mr. Slay commented that there was development in the area, extending a road from Marion Oaks south to SR 44 in Sumter County could be considered.

Mr. Massey explained that the county had to keep eye on maintaining established level-of-service requirements while limited to five-year planning documents. Mr. Massey stated that county staff was trying to get a comprehensive plan that allowed a ten year capital scale. Everything in the five year plan needed to be financially feasible. There was discussion regarding the timing of projects.

Mr. Rudnianyn commented that limited access roads would eventually be needed. Mr. Slay responded that it was difficult to convert an existing road into a limited access facility.

There was discussion regarding wording for policy on eminent domain.

Mr. Massey mentioned that legal research was in process regarding adding a future corridors map into the comprehensive plan. This map would identify corridors to protect for future project.

Mr. Rudnianyn commented that consideration needed to be given to extending SW 95th Street west of SW 80th Avenue to SW 180th Avenue Road as an alternative to CR 484 and SR 40.

Approved –

Mr. Massey thanked the committee for its input. Mr. Massey said that county staff would notify the committee when a final draft of the comprehensive plan was completed.

Item 4e. Freight Movement Study

Mr. Slay reported that staff had prepared an outline for studying freight movement from heavy truck and freight rail traffic. The study was expected to include a working group of government and private company stakeholders and to consider existing conditions and locations, level-of-service deficiencies and potential locations for freight access. Some potential locations included US 27 at I-75, the Silver Springs Shores industrial park and the Baseline Road industrial park. The final step in the study would be identifying improvements for deficiencies. Mr. Slay stated that additional rail access would be considered. Staff was in talks with the Economic Development Council to identify how often companies came to Marion County looking for rail access.

Mr. Sizemore explained that freight rail movement was now a multimodal industry. Mr. Sizemore suggested looking for positive products of having rail traffic in Marion County, such as local shipping companies that could benefit from moving freight from a rail depot to final destinations.

Mr. Kelly asked how soon the working group would begin, and Mr. Slay replied that direction was needed from the TPO board. The working group would be used to develop a scope for the freight movement study. Mr. Slay added that staff was looking into options for funding the study.

There was discussion regarding the central Florida commuter rail project and its impact on Marion County. Mr. Sizemore mentioned that if the commuter rail bill passed, there would be a five-year window to more train traffic through Marion County. Mr. Slay added that staff was having discussions with county and city staff regarding opportunities to prepare.

Mr. Rudnianyn suggested that the best opportunity for an intermodal location was close to I-75. Mr. Rudnianyn stated that interstate connection was important to companies.

Mr. Sizemore commented that discussion was needed regarding high speed rail and moving rail out of urbanized areas. Mr. Slay mentioned that the 2025 LRTP had identified the Silver Springs rail line as a potential light rail corridor. Mr. Slay advised that Senate Bill 121 required FDOT to work with communities affected by rail to identify viable alternatives.

Item 5. Comments By FDOT

Ms. Mitchell provided handouts of pushbutton projects in Marion County and the project status report.

Approved –

Ms. Mitchell reported that there was a meeting at St. John the Baptist Catholic Church in Dunnellon on April 23 at 5 p.m. regarding the US 41 PD&E study. A list of projects for stimulus funding, including enhancement projects, had been submitted and was awaiting legislature approval.

Ms. Mitchell noted that SR 200 at I-75 had been added to the push button project list. The project was designed and expected to go to construction by the end of summer. County Incentive Grant Program funds were expected for construction of Sharpes Ferry Bridge in 2012. SR 35 was the number two project on the state list for stimulus funding and was planned as a design/build project. Mr. Rudniansyn commented that SR 35 was designed, and Mr. Slay explained that the plans needed to be updated.

Ms. Mitchell reported that a revenue estimating conference had been held and a \$2B state-wide reduction in funding was expected over the five-year work program. Ms. Mitchell stated that determinations had not yet been made regarding what projects would be deferred. The two Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) projects – the SW 42nd Street overpass and SE 92nd Loop – had been deferred out of the work program.

Mr. Slay asked about the construction estimate on SR 40, and Ms. Mitchell replied that it was around \$28M. Mr. Sizemore asked about a final total on the SR 464 railroad overpass, and Mr. Slay replied that it was approximately \$35-37M. Ms. Mitchell reported that the railroad overpass was completing early.

Item 6. Comments By TPO Staff

Mr. Slay introduced Shakayla Pullings, the TPO's new part-time staff assistant.

Item 7. Comments by CAC Members

There were no further comments from CAC members.

Item 8. Public Comment (Limited To 5 Minutes)

There was no public comment.

Item 9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Kelly at 5:02 PM.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Kayleen Hamilton, TPO Administrative Assistant



**OCALA/MARION COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

Marion County • City of Belleview • City of Dunnellon • City of Ocala

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Ocala Electric Utilities Customer Service Center
201 SE 3rd Street, Ocala FL 34478**

June 9, 2009

Minutes

Members Present:

Ed Kelly, Chairman
Mariam Cook
Penny Fleeger
Richard McGinley
Suzanne Mangram
Robert Sulzer

Members Not Present:

Mike Sizemore, Vice-chairman
Joe London
Freddie MacKenzie
John Rudnianyyn
Paul Segal
Carolyn Torrey

Others Present:

Greg Slay, TPO Director
John Voges, TPO Staff
Ken Odom, TPO Staff
Kayleen Hamilton, TPO Staff
Shakayla Pullings, TPO Staff
Jimmy Massey, Marion County Planning
Justin Ryan, Marion County Planning
Vicki Mitchell, FDOT

Others Present (cont):

John Zielinski, FDOT
Jessica Grafton, HDR

Item 1. Call To Order And Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 PM by Chairman Ed Kelly. Secretary Kayleen Hamilton called the roll. A quorum was present.

Item 2. Proof Of Publication

Secretary Kayleen Hamilton stated that the meeting had been published in the June 2, 2009, edition of the Ocala Star Banner.

Item 3a. FY 2010/2011-2014/2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

At Mr. Kelly's inquiry, Mr. Odom advised that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) had approved the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as presented. Mr. Odom drew the committee's attention to the major projects listed in the cover memo in the packet. Sharpes Ferry Bridge had been moved in a year with construction planned for 2012. Ms. Mitchell reported that a design kick-off was planned within the next thirty days. Mr. Odom advised that FDOT was working with the Office of Greenways and Trails to connect the bridge into the trail system from SR 40 to Marshall Swamp. The current design concept called for use of the existing center span of the old bridge as a pier.

Mr. Odom reported that \$5.65M had been removed from right-of-way funding on SR 40 West. There was still funding for construction, and Mr. Odom commented that staff needed to research why there would be construction funds without right-of-way. Ms. Fleeger asked about real estate estimates, and Mr. Odom replied that the cost was not anticipated to drop significantly.

Four million dollars had been removed from SE 92nd Loop, and the project was deferred out past 2015. US 441 from SR 42 to the county line had received funding for P&E for widening in 2013.

Mr. Odom reported that fewer projects were represented in the TIP versus the previous year due to small projects completing. Mr. Odom stated that the decrease in the number of projects did not necessarily mean a decrease in funding.

Mr. Odom drew the committee's attention to the new TIP format. A summary of projects by funding category had been added, and Mr. Slay mentioned that the local funding

source did not include monies that went to local projects that were not included in the TIP. Discussion ensued regarding recent reductions in funding levels.

Mr. Odom advised that the TIP included federal, state, local, transit, aviation and bicycle/pedestrian sections. Mr. Odom stated that staff was looking at consolidating the transit and aviation projects into a more condensed form. There was also a project index with items listed by project number.

Mr. Kelly asked about SR 35, and Mr. Slay advised that stimulus funds had been awarded to advance the project. The project was scheduled to be let in October.

Ms. Cook asked about the I-75 interchange at SW 95th Street, and Mr. Slay replied that the only funding on the project was for the interchange justification report and design paid through local impact fees. Mr. Slay explained that the interchange was currently envisioned as a full interchange with four points of access and no connections east of the interstate. Ms. Cook expressed objection to the interchange. Mr. Slay pointed out that the interchange was not included in the TIP for approval.

A consensus of members showed that all present approved of the TIP as presented.

Item 3b. FY 2015 Priority Projects

Mr. Voges reported that the TAC had recommended that priority project seven be moved up to second and all other projects be adjusted accordingly. Mr. Odom explained that a traffic study had been completed on SR 464 about ten years previously. The study had recommended access management improvements such as medians. The project was relatively low cost to complete.

Mr. Odom reviewed the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) and upcoming projects on the first page. Changes to the priority projects list included P&E on Sharpes Ferry Bridge being moved in. Right-of-way on SR 40 West had been deferred, and Mr. Odom reminded the committee that staff would be looking for clarification on the project's funding. Funding for P&E on SR 40 West had been added, and right-of-way funding had been added for US 301 from the end of current four-laning just south of US 441 to the county line.

Mr. Kelly asked about the I-75 interchange at SW 95th Street. Mr. Odom answered that Marion County was paying for the interchange justification report. There were no state or federal funds allocated. Mr. Sulzer commented that it should be a full interchange, and Mr. Slay explained that it would be a full interchange with four full access points. Ms. Fleeger asked about an environmental study, and Mr. Slay replied that once the interchange justification report was completed, an environmental study would be done. Mr. Sulzer asked about eastern connections, and Mr. Slay replied that no consideration was being given to them at that time. Mr. Slay conceded that the issue would likely come up at some point. Ms. Cook explained that the probability of eastern connections was the reason she objected to the project.

Approved –

Ms. Cook stated that she would like to see the interchange removed from the priority project list. Mr. Slay commented that the project had been included on the list because it was eligible for federal and state funding. Mr. McGinley asked if anything going over I-75 would be eligible for federal funding since it touched federal land. Mr. Slay answered that crossing an interstate did not necessarily make a project eligible and federal funding on local roads was rare.

A consensus of the priority project list as amended by the TAC showed that of those present, five were in favor and Ms. Cook was opposed.

Item 4. Consent Agenda

Mr. Sulzer noted a correction that a quorum was not present at the April meeting. On the second paragraph on page five, Mr. Sulzer noted that SW 66th Avenue should be SW 66th Street. There was also a typographical error in the spelling of “Marion” in paragraph five.

Action was deferred due to lack of quorum.

Item 5. Comments By FDOT

Ms. Mitchell reported that the Central Florida Roads website was adding a page for projects in design.

Ms. Mangram commented that the contractor had done a good job on the CR 484 project. Discussion ensued regarding project construction schedules and early completion bonuses.

Item 6. Comments By TPO Staff

Mr. Slay reported that bids had been received for the SE 31st Street project from SE 19th Avenue to Maricamp Road. The bids had been rejected because of the discrepancy between the high and low bids and the project was being rebid. This was expected to delay the project. There was also an issue with the high/low bid difference on CR 200A.

Mr. Slay advised the committee that staff had advertised for new CAC members.

Item 7. Comments by CAC Members

Mr. Sulzer asked about the senate concurrency bill SB 360. Mr. Slay advised that the TPO did not deal with concurrency on a day-to-day basis though the bill could potentially impact projects. Mr. Slay stated that it was not yet clear what the impact of

Approved –

the bill would be. If applied properly, Mr. Slay commented that it could protect rural areas.

Ms. Cook mentioned that the City had previously produced ideas such as adjusted business hours and transit that eliminated the need for concurrency. Mr. Slay explained that part of those travel demand management (TDM) plans had centered around an industrial park on SW 17th Street. The corridor developed more retain instead. Mr. Slay stated that TDM worked best in dense industrial areas.

Mr. Slay advised that SB 360 turned Ocala into a transportation concurrency exception area. Mr. McGinley asked if the bill transferred any responsibilities from the Department of Community Affairs onto the local government, and Mr. Slay answered that he was not yet familiar enough with the bill to know. Ms. Cook asked about population requirements for an area to be designated urban, and Mr. Slay answered that was one thousand per square mile. An urbanized area was different from an urban service boundary. Urban service boundaries were agreed upon between the City and the County for provision of services within a certain amount of time.

Mr. Slay reported that the primary enforcement seatbelt law had passed. The law was slated to go into affect on July first to qualify the state for federal funding.

A request for proposal had been issued for deploying cameras for red light running.

Item 8. Public Comment (Limited To 5 Minutes)

There was no public comment.

Item 9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Kelly at 4:22 PM.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Kayleen Hamilton, TPO Administrative Assistant