AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

2. PROOF OF PUBLICATION

3. ACTION ITEMS

   A. TPO DIRECTOR SELECTION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
      The appointed selection committee has recommended two top candidates to
      be interviewed by the TPO Board. Michael Daniels, City of Ocala Planning and
      Kellie Smith, FDOT-District Five.

   B. TRANSIT SHELTER OPTIONS
      TPO Staff will present transit shelter options for consideration. Staff is
      recommending approval of a transit shelter design to proceed.

   C. SUNTRAN BUS ADVERTISING
      Follow-up information on bus wrap advertising options will be presented.
      Staff is recommending direction and approval of bus wrap options.

   D. BUS PASS REQUEST
      The Deliverance Outreach Ministries provides free healthcare, job search
      assistance, etc. to assist the underserved population in Marion County. Staff is
      recommending approval of bus passes for the short-term needs of these
      people.
E. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT
To ensure that the Transportation Improvement Program reflects the most current project information, it is periodically necessary to amend the document. Staff will present the Transportation Improvement Program amendments for review and approval.

F. OFF-SYSTEM FY 2022 PRIORITY PROJECTS - AMENDMENT
Marion County is requesting to add a sidewalk project to the Off-System Priority List. Staff is recommending ranking and approval of this request.

G. CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT
Mr. John Rudnianyn II has sent in an application to be on the Citizens Advisory Committee.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING (NPRM) CFMPOA LEGISLATIVE LETTER
The CFMPOA and other entities have sent letters of opposition to the US Senate and US DOT Secretary Foxx opposing reapportionment and changing the governance structure of MPOs across the nation.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

A. ANNUAL SUNTRAN BUDGET

6. COMMENTS BY FDOT

7. COMMENTS BY TPO STAFF

8. COMMENTS BY TPO 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.

Pursuant to Chapter 286.0105, Florida Statutes, if a person decides to appeal any decision made by the TPO with respect to any matter considered at this meeting or hearing, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, he or she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

The next regular meeting of the Ocala/Marion County Transportation Planning Organization will be held on October 25th, 2016.
MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 27, 2016

TO: TPO MEMBERS

FROM: JOHN VOGES, SR. TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

SUBJECT: TRANSIT SHELTER OPTIONS

TPO staff has identified and surveys have been completed for 34 bus stop locations for transit shelter installations. Engineered drawings are also being prepared for each location as well. The next step is for the TPO Board to decide on a preferred transit shelter design. Each shelter will be 5’ x 10’ and installed on a concrete pad.

It’s anticipated that 10 to 15 shelters will be installed initially with other locations added as funding allows.

On the following pages are various designs and associated costs for the shelters.

Staff is recommending approval of a transit shelter design to proceed.

If you have any questions, please contact our office at 629-8297.
Transit Shelter Options
Barreled Roof Shelter - $5,000
Transit Shelter Options

Barreled Roof Shelter - $6,500
Transit Shelter Options
Gable Roof Shelter - $5,000
Transit Shelter Options
Cantilever Shelter - $5,000
Transit Shelter Options
Acrylic Dome Shelter - $5,000
Transit Shelter Options

Hip Roof Shelter - $5,000
Transit Shelter Options
Single Slope Shelter - $5,500
MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 27, 2016

TO: TPO MEMBERS

FROM: JOHN VOGES, SR. TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

SUBJECT: SUNTRAN BUS ADVERTISING

At the August 23, 2016 TPO Board meeting, the TPO Board decided to extend the bus wrap contract with Bagen & Associates to continue to wrap five (5) buses until the end of October, 2017.

The City of Ocala had stopped the recycling bus wrap in July, 2015. The City of Ocala decided to continue wrapping a bus for Ocala Utilities. Also, Crime Stoppers indicated their desire to continue wrapping a bus. Those two (2) buses will be rewrapped in the near future.

This leaves three (3) buses unwrapped, one of which is kept unwrapped for special events, etc.

A non-profit health organization, Measure Up Marion, desires to wrap a bus to promote healthy lifestyles.

The remaining unwrapped bus(es), with the exception of one that is kept unwrapped, will be put out to bid utilizing the procurement’s reverse bidding process.

Since the beginning of this contract, the TPO has been contacted by ten (10) interested parties to wrap SunTran buses (shown on next page).

Staff is asking for approval of bus wrap options to proceed. If you have any questions, please contact our office at 629-8297.
Interested parties to wrap buses:

Sonny’s BBQ
Allen Law Firm
Sellers Funeral Home
Real Media Solutions
Bogin, Munns & Munns
Wenstrom Communications
Fakhoury Chiropractic
Ocala Realty World
One Stop Cooling and Heating
Southern Healthcare
Measure Up Marion is a name that comes from our county health ranking in Florida which, unfortunately, puts us at 42 out of 67 Florida counties. Measure Up Marion is here to change that ranking. We were ranked 41st, and then we dropped another place in only one year, even before Measure Up Marion came into being.

Measure Up Marion is here for one main purpose: to help make our county raise its ranking and to do it by helping our residents live happier, healthier lives where we live, work, worship, learn and play. Our goal is to improve our ranking – to measure up.

We are working hard to make changes by:
- increasing access to healthier foods in:
  - neighborhood stores
  - vending and concession choices
  - restaurants
  - improving access to, and affordability in, farmers’ markets by having them accept all forms of payment
  - helping children in after-school and summer recreation programs learn how to identify healthy food options
  - lowering exposure to second-hand smoke and increasing tobacco free and smoke free properties in:
    - multi-unit housing
    - restaurants, especially patios and entrances
    - parks and recreational areas
    - faith community campuses
  - increasing the number of people who can avoid, reduce or manage chronic diseases with the help of community and clinical help by:
    - building and strengthening a community health worker network in our outlying areas
    - providing and expanding worksite wellness to area businesses and agencies
    - creating multi-disciplinary teams in clinical settings
    - utilizing current technology for accessing and sharing health information through an electronic health information exchange

Those reasons are why we’re here. How we came to be here is another story.

Our partner organizations joined together and, through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s Partners in Community Health (PICH) award, we are able to lead an initiative in Marion County that helps improve the health of our community and prevent and reduce our rates of chronic disease.

We are proud that we are one of only four funded programs in Florida, and one of only 39 funded programs in the entire U.S.

Locally, Measure Up Marion is a partnership of Marion County community health advocates and organizations coordinated by Heart of Florida Health Center.
I’m choosing restaurants with healthier menu options

What’s Your Step?

MeasureUpMarion.com

Made possible with funding from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 27, 2016

TO: TPO MEMBERS

FROM: JOHN VOGES, SR. TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

SUBJECT: BUS PASS REQUEST

The Deliverance Outreach Ministries of Ocala offers free healthcare, job search assistance, and government assistance application services for the underserved population in Marion County. Mr. Tyrone Oliver, the director of this non-profit organization has requested bus passes to assist in getting people to doctor appointments and other appointments necessary to assist them and to get them to this place for much needed assistance. I’ve attached their letter as well as their flyer that detail the services that they provide.

Mr. Oliver is requesting fifty (50) daily passes to assist in this effort.

Staff is recommending approval of this request to help these people in our community with their short-term transportation needs.

If you have any questions, please contact our office at 629-8297.
Dear __________,

Deliverance Outreach Ministries of Ocala is a minority owned and operated non-profit organization that offers free healthcare services for the underserved population in Marion County, Florida. This particular area in Marion County is stricken by chronic disease and pockets of food deserts in underserved communities. With thousands of uninsured or underinsured residents seeking treatment with little relief, Deliverance Outreach Ministries serves as a beacon of hope to the local population. This organization provides physical, spiritual, mental and emotional care by offering medical, dental, physical therapy, and chiropractic and counseling services including mentorship on activities of daily living at no cost to the public. The organization also offers homeless services including free clothes and computer access for those without to pursue education, job searches, and applications for government assistance programs.

This mission came about when Pastor Oliver and his wife were ministering in Marion County and heard testimonials from that the locals were living in despair. Many of the local residents suffered from hypertension, high cholesterol, type II diabetes, and various cancers. Moreover, they were living in food deserts with no means of transportation or relying solely on public transportation. This in turn restricted access to health care and fresh produce, thus subjecting the residents to consume foods from fast food restaurants and corner stores. Quite noticeably, but perhaps unbeknownst to those living in these areas, these poor eating habits are the major cause for the chronic diseases that plague the low income population.

Those living in these low income communities expressed their anguish from the stressors of inner city living that directly affect their well-being. Unfortunately these income-based issues include healthcare, housing, transportation and healthy eating. Those they had spoken to explained that their health had declined due to making the difficult choice between paying rent, eating nutritious meals, and seeking medical treatment.

It is widely understood that choosing between food, clothes, shelter and health care should never be a life-altering thought. Knowing this, Pastor Oliver and his wife made it their mission to take care of God's people and sought to bridge the gap between hunger and healthcare for the homeless and less fortunate. The two developed a plan and place for people to receive care for free by commissioning the assistance of doctors and local volunteers to donate their time to the clinic.

After a year of executing this project, the clinic has seen over one hundred patients each month with the help of six providers and ten volunteers. Strategically and conveniently placed on the SunTran bus route, the organization is able to reach a multitude of people countywide, serving their healthcare needs. Now, as the organization has grown beyond its' physical capacity and more providers wish to volunteer their time and services at the clinic, Deliverance Outreach Ministries of Ocala is seeking to erect a building to house the services to those in need. With your help, this organization can continue to fulfill its faith and community-based mission, in the name of Jesus. Thank you for the opportunity to share our vision with you.

Respectfully,

Tyrone Oliver
Deliverance Outreach Ministries, Director

821 NE 36th Terrace Ocala, FL
Phone: (352) 261-0404
Fax: (352) 694-2814
Deliverance Outreach Ministries

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
821 NE 36th Terrace
Suite 10
Ocala, FL 34477

Free Clinic Services:

Medical  Dental  Physical Therapy  Chiropractic

Clinic Hours
MTWF: 9AM – 4PM
Closed: 12PM – 1PM
Thursday: 9AM – 12PM

Available Now

Food  Clothing  Christian Counseling  Florida Access Services

For more information please contact:
Pastor Tyrone Oliver
Phone: (352) 261-0404
Fax: (352) 694-2814
Tyroneoliver50@gmail.com

OUR MISSION IS TO HELP PEOPLE WITH THEIR NEEDS AND CONDUCT HUMANITARIAN OUTREACH

Please help our cause by donating by check to D.O.M. or at our website
www.deliveranceoutreachministriesofocala.org
September 22, 2016

TO: TPO Board Members
FROM: Kenneth Odom, Transportation Planner
RE: FY 2016/2017-2020/2021 TIP AMENDMENT

In order to ensure that the Ocala/Marion County TIP reflects the most current project information, it is necessary to periodically amend the document. 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 FDOT is requesting the TIP be amended to reflect the addition of one project.

- **439887-1**: Pedestrian Lighting Bundle (Four Intersections) Add $70K (PE) & 205K (CST)

Specific details regarding the addition of this project and the associated funding changes will be discussed at the September 27, 2016 meeting.

If you have any questions prior to the upcoming meeting, please contact our office at 629-8297.
September 22, 2016

TO: TPO Board Members

FROM: Kenneth Odom, Transportation Planner

RE: Off-System FY 2022 Priority Projects - Amendment

TPO staff have been asked to add a sidewalk construction project within the Marion Oaks community to the Off-System priority project list by the Marion County Engineering department. The project is intended to allow better pedestrian access to Horizon Academy and Sunrise Elementary schools. Unfortunately, a quorum was not present at either the TAC or CAC but attending members did recommend that this project be added to the list at the number seven (7) position. TPO staffing is requesting that the TPO Board review the Off-System priority list and recommend a different order or approve the recommended order.

If you have any questions regarding the rankings or a specific project please contact me in our office at (629-8297).
## 2022 Off-System Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Phase Estimate</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Osceola Linear Park</td>
<td>SE 3rd Street</td>
<td>NE 5th Street</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>Ocala</td>
<td>Linear Park</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>Full remodel of the corridor to include multi-modal facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SunTran Replacement Buses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SunTran</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
<td>Funded in FY 2019. Replacement of 7 transit buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SW 49th Avenue</td>
<td>SW 95th Street</td>
<td>Osceola Boulevard</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>$16,290,000</td>
<td>Funded in FY 2019. $9.0M local funds, $7.3 FDOT funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>East Pennsylvania Avenue (CR 484) Bicycle Improvements</td>
<td>Rainbow River Bridge</td>
<td>US 41</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>City of Dunnellon</td>
<td>Bike Path</td>
<td>DES</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Project to add bicycle path facilities and improved access to Blue Run Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Countywide ITS Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ocala &amp; MC</td>
<td>O/M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Annual allocation ($250K each agency) for ITS Ops &amp; Maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sunset Harbor Road</td>
<td>@ US 301/441</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Traffic Ops</td>
<td>DES</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Intersection operations improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sunrise/Horizon Schools</td>
<td>Marion Oaks Manor</td>
<td>Marion Golf Way</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>DES</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>Sidewalk construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPLICATION

1. Name: John "Steve" Rudnianyn II

2. Home Address: 1701 SE 28th Street

3. Business Address: 2441 NE 3rd Street Suite 201

4. Home Phone Number: (352) 804-0334 Business Phone Number: 352-629-6101

5. Occupation: Realtor / Investor


7. Are you a resident of Ocala/Marion County? Yes X No _______

   If so, how long? Number of years: 40_____

8. Are you a registered voter? Yes X No _______

9. Do you hold a public office? Yes _______ No X _______

10. At the present time, do you serve on a City/County Board, Commission, Authority, and/or Committee? Yes _______ No X _______

11. Are you familiar with the Transportation Planning Organization and its function? Yes X _______ No _______

12. Are you familiar with the current transportation issues/needs of Marion County? Yes X _______ No _______

13. Why are you interested in serving on this Board? I am interested in participating in transportation planning in Marion County.

14. I hereby confirm that I have read and understand this application and that all information furnished by me is true and accurate. I understand that to be considered for this committee, I must be a resident of Marion County and cannot be an elected official and/or a technical person involved in transportation planning in Ocala/Marion County.

   __________________________
   (Signature)                 9/5/2016
   __________________________
   (Date)

Please complete this form and return it to:
121 SE Watula Avenue • Ocala • Florida • 34471-2114
Resume:

Education:  Graduate of Forrest High School 1994
            Graduate Real Estate Institute  CFCC
            CFCC  AA degree 1996

Continuing Education:
            Real Estate License  1995
            CCIM candidate

Employment:
            International Property Services Corp.
            Associate Realtor since 1995

Professional Experience:
            Realtor
            Broker

Affiliations:
            Marion County Board of Realtors
            Served on Board of Directors
            Chairman: Education Committee
            Chairman: YPN
            Kiwanis
            Served on Board of Directors  3 years
            Member Leadership Ocala/Marion
            Leadership Ocala Class 2001
            Sunset Rotary President  2013-2014

Steve Rudnianyn was born and raised in Ocala, FL. He has been involved in the buying, selling and development of real estate in Marion County for the past 25 years. Enjoys hunting, fishing and boating.
MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 27, 2016

TO: TPO MEMBERS

FROM: JOHN VOGES, SR. TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

SUBJECT: NPRM LEGISLATIVE LETTER

The Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC), Central Florida MPO Alliance (CFMPOA), and other entities have sent letters to US DOT Secretary Foxx to oppose the Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) that would consolidate many MPOs and TPOs in the nation as well as in the State of Florida.

The Ocala/Marion TPO is in agreement with the MPOAC that this NPRM would adversely affect the local input into the transportation planning process for Marion County.

The Ocala/Marion TPO continues to coordinate regionally through the CFMPOA and sees this as the best mechanism for regional cooperation and coordination while maintaining close local coordination and cooperation with all entities in Marion County.

If you have any questions, please contact our office at 629-8297.
Docket Management Facility  
United States Department of Transportation  
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE  
Washington, DC 20590

RE:  Docket Number FHWA-2016-0016  
FHWA RIN 2125-AF68; FTA RIN 2132-AB28  
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM); Request for Comments  
Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform  
As published in the Federal Register, Monday, June 27, 2016

Dear Secretary Foxx,

On behalf of the 27 member Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) of the Florida MPO Advisory Council (MPOAC), I want to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan planning organization coordination and planning area reform rules. While we agree that MPO coordination and geography are important aspects of transportation planning decision making (as demonstrated by the extensive and formalized MPO coordination efforts found in Florida), we do not believe that the proposed rules will result in improved planning decisions or more efficient processes. Rather, we believe that the one-size-fits all approach of the proposed rules will make transportation planning less accessible to the general public by increasing MPOs’ size and scope. This would also mute the voice of locally elected officials in the metropolitan transportation planning process and undermine the original purpose for the creation of MPOs, which was to provide for local input in transportation decision making. We, therefore, stand strongly in opposition to the proposed metropolitan planning organization coordination and planning area reform rules and respectfully request that they be withdrawn without further action.

While we have a number of comments to the proposed rule (enumerated later in this letter), our primary concerns are the lack of a clearly defined, evidence-based “problem” with existing MPO coordination efforts and a cookie cutter “solution” which would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to enact in Florida without creating nonsensical metropolitan planning area (MPA) boundaries.

Numerous declarative statements are made in the proposed rule regarding the believed issues with existing MPO coordination efforts across the country and the supposed improvements the proposed rule will make. However, none of those perceived problems or proposed cures are supported by objective research findings. The problems of poor coordination between existing MPOs and the necessity to “right-size” planning geography has not been the subject of conference panels,
research papers, peer-to-peer exchanges or any of the typical mechanisms used by the federal agencies (the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)) to highlight and resolve issues they see in planning practice, giving the proposed rule an “out of the blue” quality. In fact, language relating to MPO coordination and geography remained unchanged in the final metropolitan transportation planning rules issued on May 27, 2016.

The proposed “solution” to this perceived lack of coordination is to force MPOs in the same urbanized areas (UZAs) to either merge or adopt a unified plan and program. In states like Florida, increases in population density have led the US Census Bureau to consolidate formerly separate UZAs over time. However, these UZA consolidations do not take into account transportation complexity, land use patterns, economic development patterns or other factors that make a UZA the appropriate area for conducting metropolitan transportation planning and programming. In fact, in many areas of Florida, now-consolidated UZAs stretch out for miles and link areas that have limited connections to each other in any meaningful planning metric (e.g. travel patterns, culture and identity, demographics, etc.). The fact that MPAs must also include areas expected to be part of the UZA based on 20-year growth projections further exacerbates this problem. The proposed rule doubles-down on this approach by strongly encouraging consolidation of MPAs for areas where UZAs are contiguous. In Florida, where UZAs are contiguous up and down both coasts and across the I-4 corridor, identifying appropriate boundaries between MPAs will be nearly impossible and result in MPO processes that will not in any way correspond to what the local populations consider to be their metropolitan area.

We have no doubt that MPO coordination across the country could be improved, particularly between MPOs in the same urbanized area. However, we strongly believe that any proposed rules should be based on objective research and that any potential solutions should be flexible enough to fit the local planning and regulatory context of each metropolitan area. We would support voluntary, incentive-based approaches to solving any identified problems.

The concept of voluntary coordination is something that Florida MPOs have been implementing for a number of years with great success at both the state and MPO level. FHWA even recognized the successes of MPO coordination in Florida through the Every Day Counts program (EDC-3 Innovations) in 2016. The South East Florida Transportation Council (SEFTC) was highlighted as a best practice for multi-MPO cooperation and collaboration for their ongoing and formalized planning efforts that include freight planning and coordinated identification of project priorities. In fact, 22 of Florida’s 27 MPOs (all those with a neighboring MPO) have entered into written agreements to coordinate with one or more nearby MPOs on a voluntary basis. Of those, 17 are members of formal MPO alliances that include three or more MPOs (see Table 1). Many transportation planning products have been generated, including but not limited to:

- Long-range transportation policy plans covering multiple MPO areas
- Shared goals and objectives
- Collaborative Shared project priority lists
- Congestion management processes covering multiple MPO areas
- Multi-county freight plans

Table 1. MPO Regional Coordinating Efforts in Florida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of MPO Alliance</th>
<th>Number of Member MPOs</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Year Formed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Alliances of MPOs (three or more MPOs working together)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida MPO Alliance</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>CFMPOA</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Florida Transportation Council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SEFTC</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Coast Transportation Council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TCTC</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central Florida MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FPO is a member of both the CFMPOA and the CCC

Additionally, all 27 Florida MPOs belong to the Florida MPO Advisory Council (MPOAC), which is a statewide forum for collaboration and statewide transportation policy development. The MPOAC meets quarterly and provides regular opportunities for the Florida DOT, FHWA and FTA to provide updates of national and statewide significance. This voluntary collaboration demonstrates that MPOs in Florida recognize the value of speaking with a collective voice on transportation issues at a statewide level. This has been demonstrated in a variety of ways including the development of financial guidelines for MPO plans and, in partnership with the Florida DOT, an estimate of unfunded statewide transportation needs in Florida’s urbanized areas. As a result, the funding allocated by the Florida legislature for transportation has been growing and exceeded $12.2 billion for the current state fiscal year (only 25% of that is federally funded).

Clearly, Florida already recognizes the value of partnerships and collaboration. We would like to see a process where MPOs are not forced to merge or forcibly coordinate, but rather are encouraged with incentives to develop partnerships that suit their unique metropolitan areas. We are open to several ideas and would suggest that any incentives offer additional funding beyond FHWA and FTA planning funds. We would be happy to assist USDOT and other states by sharing our experiences in Florida and assisting other areas in establishing voluntary cooperative planning agreements and structures.

Additional MPOAC comments to the proposed metropolitan planning organization coordination and planning area reform rules are stated below. Chief concerns include:

**Lack of Authority in Law**

As stated in the proposed rule, the interpretation of the terms Urbanized Area (UZA) and Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) has stood for many years. We cannot find a requirement in federal law stating that neighboring MPOs sharing a UZA need to produce joint documents (Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)) unless the definition is rewritten as proposed. In that case, we believe that the definition is being rewritten to achieve a goal that is beyond the original intent of Congress. We, therefore, contend it is an act of administrative overreach, and potentially not a legal action by USDOT. We ask USDOT to provide a legal opinion that demonstrates
Congressional intent in this area and provides authority for USDOT to undertake the actions proposed in this rulemaking.

**Loss of Coordination Between Transportation and Other Planning Processes**

One of the primary functions of MPOs, as is clearly illustrated in federal law through the planning factors, is to coordinate transportation planning with other forms of planning. MPA boundaries in our state are frequently drawn to correspond to the same geography as other planning processes, particularly land use planning. By forcing MPO planning and programming documents to be adopted for a larger geographic area than is currently the case in many areas of Florida, this proposal will dramatically complicate the ability to coordinate transportation planning with land use, economic development and other planning processes. Any rule on MPO coordination should maintain flexibility in the designation of MPA boundaries to allow MPOs to "right size" for this important planning coordination function.

**Complications of State Open Government Laws**

Florida has very strong and very specific open government laws that require the vast majority of transportation planning related discussions and decisions to be made during noticed meetings. These laws pertain not only to members of decision-making bodies such as MPO governing boards, but also to all MPO advisory committees (i.e. technical advisory committees, bicycle/pedestrian advisory committees, citizen/community advisory committees, freight advisory committees), most of which are comprised of local and state agency employees. As written, the proposed rule would greatly complicate coordinating decision-making processes across political boundaries in states with strong open government laws by requiring MPO planning processes to cover increasingly large areas. This would be particularly true for transit agencies that are currently covered by different MPOs, but would be covered by the same MPO under the proposed rule, dramatically limiting their ability to communicate with decision makers outside of publicly noticed meetings.

**Loss of Local Perspective**

The original motive behind the creation of MPOs was to incorporate the local perspective into transportation decisions that up until that time were made exclusively by state DOTs. This proposal will result in fewer, but much larger, MPO areas where the decision-making process will be further removed from communities and the people for whom MPOs were originally intended to provide engagement opportunities.

**Negative Impacts to Low-Income and Minority Communities**

MPOs are required to actively encourage the participation of transportation-disadvantaged populations and to continuously monitor and improve outreach techniques for that purpose. When larger MPOs hold meetings, they may try to either meet in a centralized location or move about the larger region. This would result in many citizens having to travel
further to engage in the transportation planning and programming process in person and will have a substantial impact on low-income and minority populations who may have limitations in terms of time, money, or mobility. We anticipate that the USDOT response will be that good public involvement will prevent this issue. We counter that participating in an MPO governing board meeting in person is more meaningful than any other form of participation. The additional travel that would result from this rule will create a barrier for low-income and minority populations to participate. We find it very concerning that USDOT would propose a rule that would potentially disengage individuals whom MPOs spend so much time and effort reaching.

Larger MPOs Will Not Necessarily Create Better Planning

As discussed earlier in these comments, we believe that the result of this proposed rule will be fewer and significantly larger MPOs that will not necessarily cover a geography that makes sense from a planning or programming perspective. This, in turn, will result in fewer creative solutions to address localized issues. Small MPOs provide customized transportation planning and solutions to their areas. As MPOs grow, they become less familiar with each individual sub-area of their region and less able to fully appreciate the impacts of their transportation decisions on local communities. MPOs were created to give a local voice to transportation planning. State DOTs are not always able to fully appreciate all of the individualized urban concerns due to the fact that they operate on a much larger scale and scope than individual MPOs. This NPRM, if implemented, will create MPOs that are larger than some states due to the contiguous nature of Florida’s UZAs. Florida already has five (5) MPOs with larger populations than the five (5) smallest states. This seems counter to the original purpose for creating MPOs.

Polycentric and Monocentric Regions: Not All UZAs are Alike

Each UZA or group of contiguous UZAs has a specific character and nature. Some areas grew from a singular, easily-identified, urban core outward (like an amoeba) and are generally monocentric regions. These monocentric regions grew organically from a core over long periods of time and the entire area generally shares a common identity. Other areas started as individual urbanized areas, each with their own identifiable urban core, which grew together (like interlocked fingers) and now comprise a single, census-defined UZA with multiple long-established urban cores. These are polycentric regions, which are quite different from monocentric regions in a variety of ways that are important to transportation planning and programming. For example, many polycentric areas in Florida have multiple commercial airports, multiple transit agencies, multiple expressway authorities, multiple seaports and multiple intermodal logistic centers. These polycentric areas do not share an identity and, though connected through a fluke of population density, continue to behave like a series of separate areas. As such, we do not believe that a one-size-fits-all approach to transportation planning is appropriate and propose that the federal agencies promulgate rules that allow for flexible and voluntary approaches to coordinated planning and programming. Such an approach would allow polycentric regions to address transportation issues of universal concern in a collaborative manner through
visioning efforts and general policy plans that guide and inform individual MPO planning and programming processes.

**The Term “Region” is Not Defined**

The word “region” is used repeatedly in the NPRM, but is not defined in the proposed rule or 23 CFR 450. “Region” may mean different things to different people.

**The Proposed Rule Gives Governors “Veto” Power over MPOs**

In a case where a governor will accept nothing other than merger of existing MPOs, the proposed rule would give the governor what amounts to veto power over the decision to allow MPOs to remain separate, creating a powerful weapon for that governor. The proposed rule states that most MPOs are not meeting the federal MPA boundary requirements and presumably would have to establish a new planning boundary or face receiving a corrective action during their next Transportation Management Area (TMA) certification review for not serving the entire MPA. The MPO could not re-establish its planning boundary to correct the deficiency identified in the certification review without approval from the governor. This rulemaking would give the governor the ability to compel MPO mergers by waiting out the process until a federal certification review. The affected MPOs would be forced to choose between being de-certified by FHWA/FTA for not serving the entire MPA or going along with a coerced merger if the governor decides that is what he/she wants. This proposed rule gives undue influence to the governor in these cases.

**Factual Statements Made in NPRM Need Verification**

As previously mentioned, a number of declarative statements are made in the proposed rule without explanation of how these statements are known to be factual. There are no citations of completed research, peer exchanges, or studies to establish the veracity of the statements, and the lack of proof leaves the reader unsure of what is actual fact. Examples include:

- A statement that economies of scale would be achieved by combining MPOs (page 41474).
- A statement that the proposed rule will correct problems that have occurred under the 2007 rule (what problems are we referring to?) (Page 41475).
- A declaration that planning has become inefficient in MPAs with multiple MPOs (page 41475).
- “However, it is the opinion of the Secretary of Transportation that there must be adequate cooperation between states and MPOs.” (Page 41476).
- USDOT states that multiple separate MPOs jointly developing unified planning products should not create a large burden and in some cases reduce overall planning costs (Page 41480).
- A declaration that the costs to the affected MPOs should be minimal (Page 41480).
**Appropriateness of Census Data and related Census Policies to set UZAs**

The proposed rule does not address how changing policies within the US Census Bureau could impact the structure and size of MPOs in the future. It is important to note that the US Census Bureau creates their data and UZA boundaries without regard to the needs and uses of the transportation community. Therefore, the results of census policies may have significant unintended impacts on transportation decision making. We note that the decennial census of 2010 did not merge any UZAs due to a policy decision that any named area identified in the 2000 census as a UZA would continue in 2010 to be an independently named UZA (please see the August 24, 2011 Federal Register, page 53041, middle column). This policy may not carry forward into future census efforts, which could cause Florida eventually to have one UZA along the entire Atlantic Coast (see Figure 1). The Atlantic Coast is a high growth area of our state, and the multiple existing MPOs will continue to have connected UZAs. It is conceivable that Florida could have one UZA that extends from Miami-Dade to Jacksonville, a distance of about 400 miles. We maintain that an MPO of this size would be nonsensical and unable to effectively or efficiently conduct a metropolitan planning process that represents local interests and engages local communities. Perhaps it is time to reconsider the census-defined urbanized area as the sole basis for MPO geography and for the necessity of an MPO process.

**Two (2) Years to Implement Is Not Enough Time**

The proposed rule requires that this change be implemented in two (2) years. The MPOAC does not believe that this time frame is reasonable given the multiple moving parts involved in this decision. In Florida, for example, not only would multiple MPOs and the State need agree to a course of action, but changes to state law would also be required, a process completely out of the control of the MPOs and governor. Additionally, this would require negotiating membership on a combined board, merging of staffs, and presumably in some cases may require state DOTs to alter their field office/district boundaries to better align with new MPO boundaries. All of this takes time and any changes would be best aligned with new census data when the 2020 census UZA boundaries are released.
Establishing One Performance Target per UZA

Establishing joint performance targets for MPOs within a common UZA ignores the fact that within a UZA there are often different priorities and characteristics among the multiple sub-areas and MPOs. In the case of a large UZA with multiple MPOs we could have an example where transit usage and the transit system is very different in one MPO than in the other MPOs. For example, the UZA that covers Southeast Florida includes four separate MPOs (Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, and Martin). Miami-Dade MPO has a well-developed transit system, with rail and bus rapid transit, whereas Martin County is much lower density and offers a smaller system with four fixed routes and paratransit services. Establishing a single performance target would be difficult because one target would not fairly represent all areas of the UZA. A low target may work well for a suburban area like Martin, but be well under the actual performance of an urban center, like Miami-Dade. Conversely, a target designed for an urban area would result in the suburban areas consistently failing to meet the target. We recommend that in the case of multiple MPOs, the UZA be allowed to set multiple targets that are specific to each MPO.
Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan planning organization coordination and planning area reform rules. We look forward to our continued work with the FHWA and FTA and our transportation partners at the state and local levels to plan and implement our nation's transportation system. Please feel free to call me at 850-414-4062 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Mayor Susan Haynie
MPOAC Chair

Carl Mikyska
Executive Director
List of FHWA Comment Requests in MPO Coordination and Planning Area Reform NPRM

II. Background

1. **Coordination Between States and MPOs, Page 41476.**
The purpose of the Planning program is to use public funds effectively and FHWA and FTA welcome ideas to improve our planning processes. As such, FHWA and FTA seek comment on how DOT can incorporate processes to further ensure that Federal funds are used efficiently by States and MPOs. How can the Statewide and Non metropolitan and Metropolitan Transportation Planning process provide stronger incentives to States and MPOs to manage transportation funding more effectively?

**MPOAC Response:** Project readiness and completing projects that have been started are key elements to insuring that all funds are used to their highest level of effectiveness. Obviously this also best serves the taxpayers who fund the transportation improvements we are discussing. Commonly, MPOs do the planning and State DOTs handle the NEPA process. Because the NEPA process is so difficult and time intensive, most MPOs do not have the expertise in-house to take on the effort with the limited funding MPOs have available. The passing of knowledge from the MPOs to the State DOTs will minimize the number of alternatives required to be reviewed in the NEPA process because they were already considered and eliminated in the planning process.

III. Section-by-Section Discussion

2. **Section 450.104—Definitions, Page 41476.**
The FHWA and FTA specifically ask for comments on whether the rule ought to expressly address how States and MPOs should determine MPA boundaries where two or more MPAs are contiguous or can be expected to be contiguous in the near future. For example, should the rule provide that such MPAs must merge? Alternatively, should the rule allow the States and MPOs to tailor the MPA boundaries and the 20-year urbanization forecast to take the proximity of other MPAs into account?

**MPOAC Response:** In Florida contiguous MPAs coordinate their planning efforts and have done so for a number of years with success. This current process works well in Florida and we ask that the current process whereby multiple MPOs within one UZA be allowed to work in coordination for visioning efforts and that each MPO produce their own Long Range Plan and TIP that reflects the land use policies and other policies of their membership and area. While this may not be working in other parts of the country, Florida finds that it does work well in our state. For areas where collaboration is not occurring, we ask that these areas be addressed specifically by the field offices of FHWA and FTA rather than through a nationwide rulemaking that affects everyone instead of addressing problems explicitly where they are occurring.
3. **Section 450.226—Phase-In of New Requirements, Page 41476 and Section 450.340—Phase-In of New Requirements, Page 41479.**
The FHWA and FTA seek comments on the appropriateness of the proposed 2-year phase-in period.

**MPOAC Response:** This is clearly not enough time to actually implement changes as proposed in this NPRM. Some states have legislatively incorporated MPO requirements into their laws. Implementing this NPRM would require legislative action by the state legislature and Governor. As we are sure USDOT can understand in trying to get federal transportation bills passed in a timely fashion, this can be an unpredictable process. USDOT has allowed States to place additional requirements on MPOs and this NPRM seems to ignore that latitude and control that USDOT has given to States. MPOs are responsible for, and subject to, the previous actions and decisions of others. In this case the previous decisions and actions of both USDOT and State Legislatures combined with this proposed action by USDOT would likely render the MPOs unable to comply with both State and Federal requirements. To not comply with each set of requirements could ultimately result in funding to the MPOs being restricted. Two years is not enough time and additionally, USDOT should not allow States to place additional requirements or restrictions on MPOs.

**Section 450.306—Scope of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process, Page 41477.** The FHWA and FTA request comments on the proposed language, and request ideas for alternatives that might better accomplish the goals embodied in the proposal.

**MPOAC Response:** As identified in this section of the NPRM, USDOT states that the goal is to select an appropriate performance target and avoid a situation where the MPOs within a single MPA select inconsistent or conflicting performance targets. We fear that by forcing the selection of a single performance target for a large region some sub-areas will be working with a performance target that is not appropriate or realistic. In a large area with a dense core area and less dense areas at the edge, the characteristics and nature of the transportation system are likely to be quite different. The question becomes which sub-area do you set a performance target for, a high target for the dense core or a lower target for the less dense areas? Either way, the target is not doing justice to one of these areas. We can see this being particularly true for transit targets. Having individual targets for each MPO, where multiple MPOs exist in a single UZAA, would be more appropriate in that each area can work on achieving something that is realistic and meaningful.

4. **Section 450.314—Metropolitan Planning Agreements, Page 41478.**
The FHWA and FTA seek comments on what, if any, exemptions ought to be contained in the rule from these requirements, and what criteria might be used for such an exemption.

**MPOAC Response:** It is the position of MPOAC and the 27 MPOs of Florida that the proposed rule should be withdrawn and therefore exemptions would not be needed. Suggesting exemptions seems as if MPOAC is signaling some form of approval to USDOT to proceed forward in the implementation of this rule. The existing process is working well in Florida and we again ask that if USDOT finds that collaboration is not working in some areas of the nation that these areas be addressed directly by the division offices of FHWA and FTA instead of creating a nationwide rule.
5. **Section 450.324—Development and Content of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, Page 41479.**

The FHWA and FTA seek comments on what, if any, exemptions ought to be contained in the rule from these requirements, and what criteria might be used for such an exemption. The FHWA and FTA also request comments on the question whether additional changes are needed in FHWA and FTA regulations on performance measures and target setting (e.g., 23 CFR part 490) to cross-reference this new planning provision on target-setting.

**MPOAC Response:** It is the position of MPOAC and the 27 MPOs of Florida that the proposed rule should be withdrawn and therefore exemptions would not be needed. Suggesting exemptions seems as if MPOAC is signaling some form of approval to USDOT to proceed forward in the implementation of this rule. The existing process is working well in Florida and we again ask that if USDOT finds that collaboration is not working in some areas of the nation that these areas be addressed directly by the division offices of FHWA and FTA instead of creating a nationwide rule.

Additionally, in the NPRM USDOT states that the goal is to select an appropriate performance target and avoid a situation where the MPOs within a single MPA select inconsistent or conflicting performance targets. We fear that by forcing the selection of a single performance target for a large region some sub-areas will be working with a performance target that is not appropriate or realistic. In a large area with a dense core area and less dense areas at the edge, the characteristics and nature of the transportation system are likely to be quite different. The question becomes which sub-area do you set a performance target for, a high target for the dense core or a lower target for the less dense areas? Either way, the target is not doing justice to one of these areas. We can see this being particularly true for transit targets. Having individual targets for each MPO would be more appropriate in that each area can work on achieving something that is realistic and meaningful.

6. **Section 450.326—Development and Content of the Transportation Improvement Program, Page 41479.**

The FHWA and FTA seek comments on what, if any, exemptions ought to be contained in the rule from these requirements, and what criteria might be used for such an exemption.

**MPOAC Response:** It is the position of MPOAC and the 27 MPOs of Florida that the proposed rule should be withdrawn and therefore exemptions would not be needed. Suggesting exemptions seems as if MPOAC is signaling some form of approval to USDOT to proceed forward in the implementation of this rule. The existing process is working well in Florida and we again ask that if USDOT finds that collaboration is not working in some areas of the nation that these areas be addressed directly by the division offices of FHWA and FTA instead of creating a nationwide rule.
IV. Regulatory Analyses and Notices

7. **Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review), Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review), and DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures, Page 41479-41480.**

The FHWA and FTA are seeking comments on what other options affected MPOs could exercise to reduce the overlap while meeting the statutory and regulatory requirements. The FHWA and FTA expect that such responses will reduce the number of MPOs ultimately affected by these coordination requirements.

**MPOAC Response:** We are strongly opposed to the proposed rule. We find the approach taken in the NPRM to be inappropriate and respectfully ask that the Proposed Rule be withdrawn. For a national policy we ask that FHWA and FTA incentivize MPO collaboration and coordination, not mandate it. We would be supportive of a program that rewards voluntary efforts of MPOs to collaborate and coordinate on both multi-MPO and statewide levels, while at the same time not create a default punishment or exclusion from benefits for those MPOs that already have a one UZA to one MPO ratio.

8. **Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review), Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review), and DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures, Page 41480.**

The FHWA and FTA seek comments and available data on the costs and benefits of the proposals of this rulemaking.

**MPOAC Response:** This is an excellent question and we would like to know the answer to this as well. It is our opinion that this should have been researched by FHWA and FTA prior to launching this effort and the answers provided in the NPRM. We are aware of a previous effort by FHWA to combine the duties and staffs of the Delaware and Maryland field offices. Looking at the FHWA website, we note that the two offices appear to be separate and question why a similar approach being mandated onto the MPOs would deliver any sort of benefit that was not realized by the FHWA effort. We ask that FHWA provide information pertaining to the realized cost savings from their merger of the two field offices and explain why it was not appropriate for FHWA to continue this merger but would be appropriate for MPOs to merge. If the answer is that operationally it was not working, we would ask why it will work operationally for MPOs when it did not for FHWA? The reasons for not merging two FHWA field offices would be the same reasons for not merging MPOs.

9. **Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review), Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review), and DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures, Page 41480.**

The FHWA and FTA seek comments and available data on the costs and benefits of the proposals of this rulemaking.

**MPOAC Response:** This is an excellent question and we would like to know the answer to this as well. It is our opinion that this should have been researched by FHWA and FTA prior to launching this effort and the answers provided in the NPRM. It is the understanding of Florida MPOAC that two MPOs in Connecticut voluntary merged and that effort took 4 years.
September 7, 2016

The Honorable Bill Nelson
United States Senate
716 Senate Hart Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Nelson:

The Central Florida MPO Alliance ("Alliance") is comprised of six metropolitan planning organizations in Central Florida representing 10 counties. The Alliance serves as a forum for coordinating regional transportation planning activities and advancing projects of regional significance.

At our recent Alliance meeting, there was a discussion about USDOT’s Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) regarding “Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform” (Docket Number FHWA-2016-0016) that was published in the Federal Register on June 27, 2016. Alliance members expressed their opposition to the proposed rules and it was felt that members of our Congressional delegation should be made aware of the position taken by the Alliance.

The proposed regulations, if implemented, would impact the governance structure and the nature of operations of metropolitan planning organizations. In addition, they would undermine some of the key principles that served as the basis for the federal legislation that created metropolitan planning organizations. In short, the proposed rules are felt to be unnecessary and counterproductive. Therefore, the Alliance is not in favor of the proposed rules.

The Florida MPO Advisory Council, which is comprised of the state’s 27 metropolitan planning organizations, is also opposed to the proposed rules. Enclosed for your information is a copy of the comments that were submitted for the record. You should also know that the Florida Department of Transportation, the National Association of Regional Councils, the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations, National Association of Development Organizations and numerous other state and national organizations have gone “on record” as opposing the proposed rules.

We are hopeful that USDOT officials will give careful consideration to the points that have been raised and withdraw the proposed rules without further action.

Sincerely,

Harold W. Barley
Executive Director
MetroPlan Orlando

Enclosure
Attached you will find the proposed SunTran budget for FY 16/17. The budget reflects the capital items and operational costs for the upcoming year. Overall, there are no significant cost changes from the previous year. We are anticipating a 12% decrease in ADA transportation costs ($510,000 to $442,000) due to lower rates adopted by Marion Senior Services. The overall budget for this year is just over $3.3 million and each jurisdiction’s portion is listed as part of the budget sheet. This represents a 3% decrease over last year’s budget.

Staff is requesting approval of the budget as presented. If you have any questions, please contact our office at 629-8297.
## SUNTRAN FY 2016/17 BUDGET

### Capital and Capitalized Maintenance/Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Ocala</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Purchases</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO Vehicle Replacement</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SunTran Service Vehicle Replacement</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Program</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capitalized Maintenance/Operation Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Improvements</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Maintenance</td>
<td>$363,447</td>
<td>$290,758</td>
<td>$36,345</td>
<td>$21,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SunTran facility maintenance</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SunTran Shop Equipment</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission Rebuilds</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Refrigerant Conversion</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans w/ Disabilities Act Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Transportation (Federal Eligible)</td>
<td>$242,362</td>
<td>$201,968</td>
<td>$20,197</td>
<td>$12,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Transportation (Non-Federal)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Development Plan</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>$8,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capital Sub-Total** $1,234,809 $869,126 $182,842 $109,705 $73,137

### Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Ocala</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McDonald Transit contract</td>
<td>$1,453,788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$225,960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Space:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Administration</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Maintenance</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Services</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboard Wifi</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecomm (internal allocation)</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone (external service)</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copier</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avail Maintenance</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Per Diem</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operations Sub-Total** $2,430,148

### Program Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Ocala</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fares</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$162,500</td>
<td>$81,250</td>
<td>$48,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Refund</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operations (less program income)** $2,075,148 $1,150,554 $462,297 $277,378 $184,919

### Total Operations & Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Ocala</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,309,957</td>
<td>$2,019,680</td>
<td>$645,139</td>
<td>$387,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of expense for each jurisdiction

1Capital equipment is 100% federal, Capitalized Operations include preventative maintenance, ADA and planning - match rate is 80% federal, 10% state, 6% Ocala, 4% Marion County

2Federal portion of ADA capped at 10% of annual 5307 allocation (FY 15 Allocation - $2,019,680)

3Operations match rate is 50% federal, 25% state, 15% Ocala, 10% Marion County
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Project No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Work Mix Description</th>
<th>Contractor Name</th>
<th>Original Amount</th>
<th>Original Contract</th>
<th>Work Begun</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Lane Closures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>338060-1</td>
<td>I-75 (SR 200) from US 27 to SR 107</td>
<td>ADD LAKES &amp; RECONSTRUCT</td>
<td>D.A.B. CONSTRUCTORS, INC.</td>
<td>$1,793,083.65</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>8/26/2015</td>
<td>in progress with design work. Work with utilities on relocation and drainage issues. Working in basin 2, 3, and 4 with drainage placement. Working on drainage basin issues with design work.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338060-3</td>
<td>I-75 (SR 200) from US 27 to SR 107</td>
<td>RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>D.A.B. CONSTRUCTORS, INC.</td>
<td>$488,688.00</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>01/08/14</td>
<td>Working and resurfacing in various locations. Started on July 29th.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372080-1</td>
<td>US 441 (SR 27) from NW 35th to CR 25A</td>
<td>RESURFACING</td>
<td>ANDERSON COLUMBIA CO., INC.</td>
<td>$8,434,536.00</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>11/29/2015</td>
<td>Contractor is working on milling and resurfacing and new shoulder placement and interchange at CR 25A reconstruction.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428080-2</td>
<td>SR 35 (Baseline Road) from SE 92nd to NE 25th Ave</td>
<td>RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>D.A.B. CONSTRUCTORS, INC.</td>
<td>$1,085,603.74</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>02/15/2016</td>
<td>Working on miscellaneous items to final.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429050-1</td>
<td>SR 40 Widening from CR 328 to SW 140th Avenue</td>
<td>RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>Masci General Contractors</td>
<td>$408,828.00</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>02/15/2016</td>
<td>Completed on 5/6/2016.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For additional information please go to www.cflroads.com**
The public meeting will be from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. on **November 1, 2016** at Marion County Growth Services Training Room (next to the Public Library), located at 2710 E. Silver Springs Boulevard, Ocala. The meeting will be an open house format. Project information will be available for review along with a project presentation that will run on a continuous loop.

If you have questions or would like more information about the project, please contact Heather Johnstone, P.E., FDOT Project Manager, by phone at 386-943-5540 or by email at heather.johnstone@dot.state.fl.us. You may also visit www.cflroads.com to review project information.

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons wishing to express their concerns relative to FDOT compliance with Title VI may do so by contacting Jennifer Smith, FDOT District Five Title VI Coordinator, by phone at 386-943-5367 or by email at jennifer.smith2@dot.state.fl.us.
NEW WEB ADDRESS: On Friday, October 7th (after 7:00 p.m.), FDOT’s web address will change from www.dot.state.fl.us to www.fdot.gov.
Good Afternoon,

I wanted to notify everyone of a change in staffing. Jamie Kersey has been selected as the Ocala/Marion County TPO Liaison.

Her contact information is:

Jamie Kersey
Jamie.kersey@dot.state.fl.us
386-943-5338

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Kellie