



Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting

Meeting Held via Cisco WebEx

10:30 AM

MINUTES

Members Present:

Steven Neal
Dave Herlihy
Vickie Wyche
Kenneth Odom
Nancy Smith
Mickey Thomason
Eric Smith
Elton Holland

Members Not Present:

Bruce Phillips
Lonnie Smith
Loretta Shaffer

Others Present:

Rob Balmes, TPO
Elizabeth Mitchell, TPO
Derrick Harris, TPO
Shakayla Irby, TPO
Anton Schauerte, TPO
Steven Schnell, HDR
Anna Taylor, FDOT
Judy Pizzo, FDOT
Karen Snyder, FDOT
Taylor Laurent, HDR
Ralph Bove, Volkert, Inc
Anthony Nosse, FDOT

Item 1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Elton Holland started the meeting started at 10:30am. Secretary Shakayla Irby called the roll there was a quorum present.

Item 2. Proof of Publication

Secretary Shakayla Irby stated that the meeting had been published online on the TPO website, the City of Ocala, Belleview, Marion County and Dunnellon websites on May 5th, 2020. The meeting had also been published to the Star Banner news calendar, and the TPOs Facebook and Twitter pages.

Item 3a. Florida Transportation Plan 2020 Update

Ms. Judy Pizzo with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) presented and said that the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) was the single overarching statewide plan guiding Florida's transportation future. It was a plan for all of Florida providing direction to FDOT and all organizations that were involved in planning and managing Florida's transportation system, including statewide, regional, and local partners.

The FTP provided policy guidance and established the policy framework for allocating the state and federal transportation funds which flowed through FDOT's 5-year Work Program.

The FTP was important because it not only set a long-range vision for the future but it guided transportation decision making. It considered how to:

- Attain the goal of zero fatalities on Florida's transportation system.
- Provide a more efficient and mobile transportation system.
- Meet the needs of a growing and changing population.
- Make the economy more competitive.
- Enhance the quality of life and environment of Florida's communities.
- Increase opportunities for access to transit and other modes of transportation.
- Address emerging issues such as the rapid changes in technology.

The FTP was updated every five years. The 2020 update was being led by a diverse steering committee with over 30 members from the public, private, and civic sectors. The Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council was among the organizations represented on the steering committee.

The FTP update was focused on four cross-cutting topics:

1. Technology
2. Resilience
3. State/ Interregional
4. Regional/ Local

FDOT's presentation covered the purpose of the FTP and why it mattered and shared ways to provide input on the FTP update. There would be a focus on the cross-cutting topics and obtaining responses to online polling questions.

The committee was presented with a slideshow presentation and the information was also included in the committee meeting packet. The committee was also given the opportunity to answer questions via a web-based app provided by the FDOT.

Item 3b. I-75 PD&E Study

Steven Schnell with HDR presented the I-75 PD&E Study and said that FDOT was conducting two PD&E studies to evaluate transportation improvements and upgrades to I-75 in Sumter, Marion and Alachua Counties.

Both studies would take place simultaneously. The outcomes for both studies may result in different recommendations to address transportation corridor issues for each specific area. The two PD&E study segments included:

- Southern Segment: Florida Turnpike (SR 91) to SR 200
- Northern Segment: SR 200 to CR 234

The study overview consisted of three elements:

1. Engineering
2. Environmental
3. Public Involvement

The corridor and interchange improvements to increase the capacity of I-75 within the study areas were to accommodate area growth, freight activity, traffic and safety, and hurricane evacuation.

The next steps in the schedule would be data collection, developing alternatives, evaluating alternatives, and by 2023 preparing all final reports.

Item 3c. FY 2020-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Anton Schauerte, TPO Transportation Planner presented the FY 2020-2025 TIP and said The TPO was in the process of updating the TIP for FY 2020/2021-2024/2025.

Mr. Schauerte provided an overview of the proposed changes from the current TIP to the draft 20/21-24/25 TIP. The purpose of the changes were to simplify the language and improve the overall readability of the document in order to improve the accessibility of the information to a wider audience and to garner more public feedback.

Major changes from the current TIP to the draft 20/21-24/25 TIP included:

- The rewriting, reorganizing, and consolidating of text throughout most sections
- Re-categorizing the way projects were classified

- Creation of county-wide project map and improve readability of individual project maps
- Inclusion of interactive online map to accompany TIP document
- Removal of Transportation Performance Measures Consensus Planning Document (per request of the Federal Highway Administration and to be adopted separately by TPO Board)

Item 3d. 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

Derrick Harris, TPO Assistant Director presented the 2045 LRTP and said that the TPO was working on an update to the LRTP. The TPO board passed the Goals and Objectives for the LRTP in February, along with the associated weights to those Goals and Objectives. TPO staff coordinated the Goals and Objectives and their weights with our LRTP consultant. The final document had been published.

Also, the TPO was anticipating having a great deal of public outreach where staff would go out to various locations in the community and discuss any transportation needs the public had. However, with the global pandemic staff decided that it would not be wise to have public meetings.

Therefore, staff planned on setting up virtual meetings and an interactive map. The tools would replace what would have been in person public meetings. The virtual meetings would include short presentations, documents, and an overall explanation on how to submit comments and transportation needs to staff directly. The interactive map would be a visual representation of the needs that have been demonstrated in other local plans, including the current LRTP. It was hoped to have the meetings take place around the last week or two in May.

TPO staff had developed a DRAFT needs plan with a corresponding interactive map that was included in the committees packet.

Item 4a. List of Priority Projects (LOPP)

Mr. Harris presented the LOPP and said that at the May 2019 TPO Board Meeting, staff received direction regarding how to formally proceed with ranking of LOPP. It was determined that staff should use a ranking system that was developed by TPO staff.

The ranking criteria developed was grouped into the following six categories:

1. **Multimodal:** The ranking criteria looked at whether a project incorporated different modes of transportation into the project or was it multimodal. Therefore, if a project incorporated bike lanes, sidewalks, transit options, or offered a new alternative, such as a trail, it received one point for being multimodal.
2. **Performance Measure:** Based on the latest federal transportation legislation, the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act was signed into law on December 4, 2015, which required MPO/TPOs to measure the performance of projects. This was done by measuring projects on safety, system performance, pavement/bridge condition, and transit asset management. Therefore, the LOPP gave weight to any project that met one of the performance measures, and an

additional point if the project met two. Note: most projects could only obtain one point for a performance measure, as most performance measures required a project to either be on or demonstrate how it would improve the performance of a corridor on the National Highway System (NHS). Therefore, most projects that obtained two points in the category were a part of the NHS.

3. Project Development: The ranking criteria looked at where the projects were in their development.

For example, if a project was in the Project Development & Environmental (PD&E) stage it would receive one point, and it received an additional point for each stage the project was in up until construction, which would be four points. Note: projects could only qualify for one of the phases, with one to four points possible.

4. Funding Availability: FDOT had mentioned on several occasions, funding is limited. Therefore, if a project had a lower cost associated with it, and/or a lower cost needed for completion, the project could receive one additional point.

5. Local Revenue/Funding Source: An additional category that staff thought was pertinent to the ranking system was local revenue. Therefore, if a project had local revenue being added to the project it received an additional point.

6. Local Partnership: The ranking criteria considers whether a project had a formal partnership between two agencies. For example, a project could be a Local Agency Program (LAP) project, or a project that FDOT managed or helped manage for another jurisdiction. In the case, the project would receive an additional point.

The ranking criteria developed by TPO staff was based on several discussions with FDOT, various staff from local municipalities, and internal discussions. These discussions helped create a ranking criteria that was narrowed down based on the adopted 2040 LRTP and Objectives. The Goals from the 2040 LRTP which was focused on were Multimodal Choices (Goal #1), Economic Development and Growth (Goal #2), Safety and Security (Goal #3), Cooperation (Goal #4), and System Preservation (Goal #6).

Mr. Odom gave the following comments:

- #9 change from 4 points construction to 2 points design (Santos to Baseline Trail)
- #16 change from 3 points ROW to 2 points design (Pruitt Trail from Trailhead to Bridges road)
- #17 delete due to being already under construction (NE 36th Avenue bridge)

Ms. Smith asked why there were projects that were already funded still on the list.

Mr. Harris said it depends on where the project is in terms of funding because all projects are not completely funded.

Mr. Odom made a motion to approve the LOPP with the corrections that were sited. Ms. Smith seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Item 4b. TIP Amendment (Walk-on Item)

Mr. Harris said the TIP Amendment was part of the CARES act and was a relief package for the Corona Virus and would add additional funding of \$2,668,689.00 to Marion Transit for operational purposes.

Ms. Smith approved the TIP Amendment. Mr. Thompson seconded, a roll-call vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.

Item 5a. Consent Agenda

Mr. Odom made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Thompson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Item 6. Comments by FDOT

Ms. Wyche said that she would have the construction report at a later time due to a shortage of staff in the office. LAP applications needed to submit through the LAP app.

Item 7. Comments by TPO Staff

Mr. Balmes said that there had been discussion at Federal, State, and Local/ Regional levels regarding potential federal stimulus dollars for transportation and a request was made for 50 billion dollars to replace lost funds during the pandemic.

Carl Mikyska had been in contact and said to put together a list of projects that might be thought to be delayed or cancelled as a result of the pandemic that had received federal funding and Carl would put together a letter to lobby Congress and also take to Tallahassee with multiple projects across the state that were of concern.

Item 8. Comments by TAC Members

There were no comments.

Item 9. Public Comment

There were no comments.

Item 10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Holland at 11:52am.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Shakayla Irby, TPO Administrative Assistant