CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Ocala Citizens Service Center 201 SE 3rd Street, Ocala FL 34471
$2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor Training Room

## February 13, 2018

3:00 PM

## AGENDA

## 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

## 2. PROOF OF PUBLICATION

## 3. ACTION ITEMS

## A. SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND TARGETS <br> Staff will present and is requesting approval of the following five proposed safety targets and performance measures as required by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for all public roads: <br> 1. Number of fatalities; <br> 2. Rate of fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT); <br> 3. Number of serious injuries; <br> 4. Rate of serious injuries per 100 Million VMT; and <br> 5. Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries.

## Staff is requesting approval of the safety performance targets.

## 4. PRESENTATIONS

A. SR 35 AND NE 58 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ AVENUE TRAIL CROSSING REPORT

Staff will present the final report for the trail crossing study to connect the downtown trail to Silver Springs State Park and to connect the Indian Lake State Forest and Silver Springs State Forest.

## B. TRAILS PROJECT UPDATE

Staff will provide an update on the ongoing status of the regional trails projects.

## C. METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION ADVISORY COUNCIL (MPOAC) FREIGHT PRIORITIES

Staff will present the MPOAC freight-related priority project application to be submitted for inclusion to the statewide freight priority list with the intent to influence FDOT funding decisions in FDOT's 5 Year Work Program.

## 5. COMMENTS BY FDOT

## 6. COMMENTS BY TPO STAFF

## 7. COMMENTS BY CAC MEMBERS

## 8. PUBLIC COMMENT (Limited to 5 minutes)

## 9. 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 Technical Advisory Committee will be held on March 12, 2018.

February 9, 2018

## TO: TAC/CAC Members

## FROM: Michael Daniels, Director

SUBJECT: Safety Targets and Performance Measures

Nationally, state-specific, and locally, transportation plans exist to enhance safety for all users of the transportation system. A coordinated effort to connect all the safety plans has long been in effect in the transportation realm, but over the last two years, a system of Performance Management has led to a greater push for comprehensive and coordinated transportation and safety planning. Performance Measures for Safety have been developed by the FHWA, for which targets are being established cooperatively between the FDOT and MPO's within the State of Florida (as well as nationally). Through this coordinated effort, the goals of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), Highway Safety Plan (HSP), Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), and regionspecific safety and transportation plans can be shown to guide and support one another. In August of 2017, the FDOT adopted a target of "Zero" for the five (5) safety performance measures adopted by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for all public roads.

At the January $9^{\text {th }}$ TAC meeting, the committee recommended to adopt the FDOT target of " 0 " with an interim performance measure based on an average of the last four-five year rolling averages for each performance measure from 2009 to 2016. On January 31st, the TPO board was opposed to adopting a target of 0 and requested additional information to determine the correct performance measures for each category.

The Performance Measures, along with a brief description of each is provided in the following table:

Cooperative and comprehensive planning for our transportation needs
Marion County • City of Belleview • City of Dunnellon • City of Ocala

| Performance Measure | Description |
| ---: | :--- |
| Number of fatalities | The total number of persons suffering fatal injuries in a motor <br> vehicle crash during a calendar year. |
| Rate of fatalities per 100 Million <br> Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) | The ratio of total number of fatalities to the number of vehicle <br> miles traveled (VMT, in 100 Million VMT) in a calendar year. |
| Number of serious injuries | The total number of persons suffering at least one serious injury <br> in a motor vehicle crash during a calendar year. |
| Rate of serious injuries per 100 | The ratio of total number of serious injuries to the number of <br> Million VMT |
| Num (in 100 Million VMT) in a calendar year. |  |
| fatalities and non-motorized |  |
| serious injuries |  | | The combined total number of non-motorized fatalities and non- |
| :--- |
| motorized serious injuries involving a motor vehicle during a |
| calendar year. |


| FDOT Adopted Measures | Target | Interim Performance Measure |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of fatalities | 0 | 3,052 |
| Rate of fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle <br> Miles Traveled (VMT) | 0 | 1.65 |
| Number of serious injuries | 0 | 20,861 |
| Rate of serious injuries per 100 Million VMT | 0 | 11.06 |
| Number of non-motorized fatalities and non- <br> motorized serious injuries | 0 | 3,447 |

Upon adoption by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) of a target of "Zero" and the Interim Performance Measures, the TPO, along with all the other Metropolitan Planning Organizations in the State of Florida, were given 180 days to adopt their targets for the safety measures. The TPO must adopt its Performance Measures and Targets by February 27, 2018.

MPO's were granted the option of either adopting/supporting the State target, or establishing a specific number or rate for each performance measure. MPOs that choose to establish a rate for a target are required to report not only the estimate used for VMT to establish the target rate, but also the methodology used to arrive at the overall VMT estimate.

Additional information has been provided in the packet showing the number of traffic fatalities in the last five years and the fatalities by mode, as well as data regarding additional contributing causes to traffic fatalities such as drug and alcohol use, speeding and distracted driving. See table below:

Fatal and Incapacitating Crashes between 2012 and 2016

|  | Fatalities | Incapacitating |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total | 289 | 1276 |
| Alcohol Use | 71 | 102 |
| Drug Use | 63 | 80 |
| Exceeding Speed Limit | 90 | 207 |
| Distracted Driving | 35 | 114 |



## FATALITIES BY MODE (2016)



Cooperative and comprehensive planning for our transportation needs
Marion County • City of Belleview • City of Dunnellon • City of Ocala

Drug and Alcohol Related Crashes


## Recommended measures

- Develop long-term strategies to address traffic safety as part of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan, and
- Utilizing data that the TPO has collected as part of the annual traffic counts and trends manual and fatality and serious rate using FDOT's methodology as defined in the attached 2016 FHWA Performance Measures spreadsheet, staff has established the following 2018 performance measure targets:

| Safety Performance Measures | Performance <br> Measure Target |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of fatalities | 58 |
| Rate of fatalities per 100 Million VMT | 1.48 |
| Number of serious injuries | 255 |
| Rate of serious injuries per 100 Million VMT | 7.99 |
| Number of non-motorized fatalities and <br> non-motorized serious injuries | 42 |

If you have any questions regarding the ranking of this specific project please contact me in our office at (352) 629-8297.

## Safety Performance Targets

## Calendar Year 2018 Targets *

## Number of Fatalities

## Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.

Based on statistical forecasting, the five-year rolling average for total fatalities on Florida's roads is forecast to be between 2,716 and 3,052 in 2018. This forecast was made by combining FARS data with current state data from 2009 to 2016 to predict probable outcomes for 2017 and 2018. Florida's target for fatalities is zero in 2018. While the data forecast indicates Florida's five year rolling average for fatalities could continue to trend upward in 2017 and 2018, the FDOT State Safety Office expects the projects chosen for funding will mitigate the data forecast and ultimately reduce the number of traffic fatalities. An interim performance measure is required by our federal funding agencies to receive federal funding. We firmly believe that every life counts and although our target for fatalities is zero in 2018, Florida has forecast an interim performance measure of 3,052 to satisfy the federal requirement.

## Number of Serious Injuries

## Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.

Based on statistical forecasting, the five-year rolling average for total serious injuries on Florida's roads is forecast to be between 18,831 and 20,861 in 2018. This forecast was made by combining FARS data with current state data from 2009 to 2016 to predict probable outcomes for 2017 and 2018. Florida's target for serious injuries is zero in 2018. The data forecast indicates Florida's five year rolling average for serious injuries could continue to trend downward in 2017 and 2018. The FDOT State Safety Office expects the projects chosen for funding will enhance this downward trend in the number of serious injuries on Florida's roads. An interim performance measure is required by our federal funding agencies to receive federal funding. We firmly believe that every life counts and although our target for serious injuries is zero in 2018, Florida has forecast an interim performance measure of 20,861 to satisfy the federal requirement.

## Fatality Rate

## Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.

Based on statistical forecasting, the five-year rolling average for fatality rate per 100 million VMT on Florida's roads is forecast to be between 1.06 and 1.65 in 2018. This forecast was made by combining FARS data with current state data from 2009 to 2016 to predict probable outcomes for 2017 and 2018. Florida's target for fatality rate per 100 million VMT is zero in 2018. While the data forecast indicates Florida's five year rolling average for fatality rate per 100 million VMT could continue to trend upward in 2017 and 2018, the FDOT State Safety Office expects the projects chosen for

## 2017 Florida Highway Safety Improvement Program

funding will mitigate the data forecast and ultimately reduce the number of traffic fatalities. An interim performance measure is required by our federal funding agencies to receive federal funding. We firmly believe that every life counts and although our target for fatality rate per 100 million VMT is zero in 2018, Florida has forecast an interim performance measure of 1.65 to satisfy the federal requirement.

## Serious Injury Rate

## Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.

Based on statistical forecasting, the five-year rolling average for serious injury rate per 100 million VMT on Florida's roads is forecast to be between 7.57 and 11.06 in 2018. This forecast was made by combining FARS data with current state data from 2009 to 2016 to predict probable outcomes for 2017 and 2018. Florida's target for serious injury rate per 100 million VMT is zero in 2018. The data forecast indicates Florida's five year rolling average for serious injury rate per 100 million VMT could continue to trend downward in 2017 and 2018. The FDOT State Safety Office expects the projects chosen for funding will enhance this downward trend in the serious injury rate per 100 million VMT. An interim performance measure is required by our federal funding agencies to receive federal funding. We firmly believe that every life counts and although our target for serious injury rate per 100 million VMT is zero in 2018, Florida has forecast an interim performance measure of 11.06 to satisfy the federal requirement.

## Total Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries

## Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.

Based on statistical forecasting, the five-year rolling average for non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries on Florida's roads is forecast to be between 3,066 and 3,447 in 2018. This forecast was made by combining FARS data with current state data from 2009 to 2016 to predict probable outcomes for 2017 and 2018. Florida's target for non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries is zero in 2018. The data forecast indicates Florida's five year rolling average for non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries could continue to trend downward in 2017 and 2018. The FDOT State Safety Office expects the projects chosen for funding will enhance this downward trend in non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries. An interim performance measure is required by our federal funding agencies to receive federal funding. We firmly believe that every life counts and although our target for non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries is zero in 2018, Florida has forecast an interim performance measure of 3,447 to satisfy the federal requirement.

Enter additional comments here to clarify your response for this question or add supporting information.

2017 Florida Highway Safety Improvement Program
Florida shares the national traffic safety vision, "Toward Zero Deaths," and formally adopted our own version of the national vision, "Driving Down Fatalities," in 2012. FDOT and its traffic safety partners are committed to eliminating fatalities and reducing serious injuries with the understanding that the death of any person is unacceptable and based on that, zero deaths is our safety performance target. This target is consistent throughout our Strategic Highway Safety Plan, Highway Safety Improvement Program and Highway Safety Plan.

Florida's data forecasts have been established using an ARIMA Hybrid Regression Model $(0,1,1)(2,0,0)(12)$ with VMT. Nine independent variables were tested to assess correlations; only Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) and gas consumption have relatively high correlations with fatalities and serious injuries and of these two variables only VMT was useful in predicting future fatalities and serious injuries. The first three performance measures (number of fatalities, number of serious injuries, and fatality rate per 100M VMT) have been forecasted based on a five-year rolling average and the remaining performance measures will be forecasted annually. The forecasts for 2017 and 2018 are based on monthly data from 2005 through 2016 using statistical forecasting methodologies.
[Source: FDOT Highway Safety Plan]

| MPO/TPO |  |  | Average Annual Fatalities ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average Annual Serious Injuries ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average Annual Fatality Rates ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average Annual Serious Injury Rates ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average Annual Pedestrian and Bicyclist Fatalities and Serious Injuries5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2009-13 | 2010-14 |  | 2011-15 |  | 2012-16 |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 2009-13 \\ \hline \text { Average } \end{array}$ | 2010-14 |  | 2011-15 |  | 2012-16 |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2009-13 \\ \hline \text { Average } \end{array}$ | 2010-14 |  | $2011-15$ |  | 2012-16 |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline 2009-13 \\ \text { Average } \end{array}$ | 2010-14 |  | $2011-15$ |  | 2012-16 |  | $2009-13$ | 2010-14 |  | 2011-15 |  | 2012-1 |  |
|  |  |  | Average | \% ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Average | \% ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Average | \% $\Delta$ | Average |  | \% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Average | \% 4 Av | Average | \% $\Delta$ | Average |  | \% A Av | Average | \% 4 Av | Average | \% 4 | Average |  | \% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Average | \% $\Delta$ | Average | \% $\Delta$ | Average |  | \% $\Delta$ | Average | \% 4 | erage |  |
| Space | Coast TPO | Sinele couny |  | 63.8 | 66.2 | 3.8\% | 69.6 | 5.1\% | 74.8 | 7.5\% | 587.0 | 607.4 | 3.5\%/ | 601.4 | -1.0\% | 630.8 | 4.96 | 1.053 | 1.101 | 3.8\% | 1.159 | 5.1\% | 1.218 | 7.5\% | 9.666 | 10.99 | 4.5\% | 10.033 | ${ }^{-0.68}$ | 10.363 | 3.3\% | 79.8 | 82.2 | 3.0\% | 86.6 | $5.4 \%$ | 90.2 | 4.2\% |
| Charlot | te County-Punta Gorda MPO | Singe count | 22.8 | 21.0 | -7.9\% | 21.4 | 1.9\% | 22.6 | 5.6\% | 164.2 | 149.2 | -9.1\% | 134.6 | -9.8\% | 127.0 | 5.6\% | 1.048 | 0.965 | -7.9\% | 0.669 | 1.9\% | 0.998 | $5.6 \%$ | 7.555 | 6.864 | $9.1 \%$ | 6.127 | -10.7\% | 5.67 | 7.4 | 24.2 | 23.0 | 5.0\% | 21.4 | 7.0\% | 20.4 |  |
| Browar | d MPO | Singe count | 178.4 | 175.0 | 1.9\% | 183.0 | 4.6\% | 199.6 | 9.1\% | 2.080 .6 | 2.04 .0 | 3.7\% | 1,888.8 | 5.7\%/ | 1,776.0 | 6.08 | 1.099 | 1.074 | -1.9\% | 1.109 | 4.6\% | 1.205 | 9.1\% | 12.801 | 12.278 | -4.180 | 11.47 | 6.8\% | 10.97 | 5.7\% | 351.4 | 350.6 | 0.2\% | 341.4 | -2.6\% | 352.2 | .288 |
| Okaloo | sa-Walton TPO | utitile countes, not countwide | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gaines | ville MTPO | Singe Count, not countwide | See individual county below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual county below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual county below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual county below |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sei individual county below |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hernan | do/Citrus MPO | Mutiple countes | 50.6 | 47.0 | -7.1\% | 49.2 | 4.7\% | 49.8 | 1.2\% | ${ }^{488.4}$ | 428.8 | 4.4\% | 445.0 | 3.8\% | 461.2 | 3.68 | 1.527 | ${ }^{1.416}$ | 7.1\% | 1.471 | 4.7\% | ${ }^{1.464}$ | ${ }^{1.2}$ | 13.548 | 12.926 | -4.6\% | ${ }^{13.329}$ | 3.1\% | 13.560 | 1.79 | ${ }^{34,4}$ | 36.2 | 5.2\% | 41.0 | 13.3\% | 43.2 |  |
| Hillsbor | rough County MPO | Singe count | 157.6 | 16.0 | 2.2\% | 168.4 | 4.6\% | 183.8 | 9.1\% | 2,06.2 | 1,921.6 | 7.0\% | 1,752.0 | $8.88 \%$ | 1,618.0 | 7.6\% | 1.245 | 1.266 | 2.2\% | 1.308 | 4.6\%) | 1.400 | ${ }^{9.12}$ | 16.296 | 15.106 | -7.36 | ${ }^{13.550}$ | 9.6\% | 12.330 | -8.92 | 254.8 | 2496 | -2.0\% | 246.0 | 1.4\% | ${ }^{242.6}$ | 1.48 |
| Indian | River County MPO | Connt, not countemide | individual county below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual county below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual county below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual county below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual county below |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North F | Florida MPO | Mutitip Countes | 168.4 | 172.8 | $2.6 \%$ | 183.4 | 6.1\% | 20.4 | 9.8\% | 1,261.0 | 1,299.2 | 3.0\% | 1,341.4 | 3.2\% 1 | 1,371.0 | 2.28 | ${ }^{1.112}$ | 1.136 | $2.6 \%$ | 1.188 | 6.18 | 1.272 | 9.88 | ${ }^{8.329}$ | 8.547 | $2.6 \%$ | 8.717 | 2.0\% | 8.727 | 0.12 | 174.2 | 181.8 | 4.4\% | 191.8 | 5.5\% | ${ }^{196.2}$ | 2.3\% |
| Polk TP |  | Singe county | 90.4 | 94.2 | 4.2\% | 99.8 | 5.9\% | 10.6 | 8.8\% | 566.4 | 533.0 | -4.8\% | 499.6 | -7.3\% | 480.8 | -3.88 | 1.520 | 1.541 | 4.2\% | 1.579 | 5.9\% | 1.648 | 8.88 | 9.503 | 8.840 | -7.0\% | 7.959 | -10.0\% | 7.392 | -7.19 | 63.0 | 65.2 | 3.5\% | 63.6 | -2.5\% | 67.4 | 6.0\% |
| Lee COU | unty MPO | Singe count | 75.2 | 75.6 | 0.5\% | 81.0 | 7.196 | 87.0 | 7.4\% | 455.6 | 458.0 | 0.3\% | 460.4 | 0.5\% | 499.0 | 8.488 | 1.164 | 1.140 | 0.5\% | 1.187 | 7.1\% | 1.229 | ${ }^{7.48}$ | 7.067 | 6.921 | -2.1\% | 6.786 | -2.0\% | 7.101 | 4.68 | ${ }^{76.8}$ | 80.0 | 4.28 | 84.0 | 5.0\% | 91.0 | 8.3\% |
| Martin | MPO | Singe county | 26.2 | 23.6 | 9.9\% | 24.2 | 2.5\% | 25.4 | 5.0\% | 124.6 | 116.4 | -6.6\% | 107.0 | 8.1\% | 103.0 | ${ }^{3} .37$ | 1.273 | 1.162 | 9.9\% | 1.186 | 2.5\% | 1.246 | 5.0\% | 6.054 | 5.739 | -5.2\% | 5.269 | 8.2\% | 5.17 | ${ }^{2.9 \%}$ | 17.6 | 17.4 | 1.1\% | 16.2 | 6.9\% | 14.0 | 3.6\% |
| Miami- | Dade Urbanized Area MPO | Singec count | 242.8 | 24.6 | 1.6\% | 265.0 | 7.5\% | 273.8 | 3.3\% | 1,959.0 | 1,920.0 | 1.7\% | ${ }^{1,992.2}$ | 0.0\% | 1,894.4 | -4.9\% | 1.263 | 1.284 | 1.6\% | 1.378 | 7.5\% | 1.417 | 3.38, | 10.206 | 10.383 | 1.7\% | 10.386 | 0.0\% | 9.854 | 5.18 | 41.8 | 425.8 | 3.488 | 446.0 | 4.7\% | 436.0 | 2.2\% |
| Collier | County MPO | Singe count | 37.2 | 37.2 | 0.0\% | 38.8 | 4.3\% | 38.0 | -2.19\% | 184.0 | 174.0 | -5.4\% | 175.2 | 0.7\% | 177.2 | 1.1\% | 1.169 | 1.160 | 0.0\% | 1.183 | 4.3\% | 1.125 | 2.12 | 5.790 | 5.445 | -6.0\% | 5.388 | 1.0\% | 5.252 | 2.52\% | 37.2 | 38.6 | $3.8 \%$ | 37.6 | 2.6\% | 40.0 | 6.4\% |
| Ocala// | Marion County TPO | Singe count | 61.8 | 60.6 | -1.9\% | 60.0 | -1.0\% | 61.6 | 2.79 | 423.0 | 359.4 | -15.\% | 326.8 | 9.19\% | 327.8 | $0.3 \%$ | 1.537 | 1.507 | -1.9\% | 1.475 | (1.0\% | 1.478 | 2.78 | 10.501 | 8.952 | -14.8\% | 8069 | 9.9\% | 7.894 | ${ }^{-2.2 \%}$ | 41.8 | 39.0 | 6.7\% | 38.0 | -2.6\% | 41.2 | 8.4\% |
| METRO | PLAN Orlando | Mutipie countes | 208.8 | 210.6 | 0.9\% | 218.4 | 3.7\% | 226.0 | 3.5\% | 1,539.6 | 1.839.0 | 23.\% | 2,318.6 | 22.5\% | 2.640 .0 | 13.920 | 1.049 | 1.049 | 0.9\% | 1.073 | 3.7\% | 1.089 | 3.5\% | 7.748 | 9.401 | 21.3\% | 11.309 | 20.3\% | 12.27 | 11.78 | 261.2 | 30.0 | 14.9\% | 34.8 | 13.9\% | 375.8 | 9.9\% |
| Bay Coum | unty TPO | Singe count | 24.0 | 24.4 | 1.7\% | 27.2 | 11.5\% | 30.0 | 10.3\% | 257.4 | 250.4 | -2.7\% | 255.2 | 1.9\% | 234.6 | 8.1\% | 1.322 | 1.340 | 1.7\% | 1.476 | 11.5\% | 1.596 | 10.3\% | 14.172 | 13.761 | -2.9\% | 13.89 | 1.0\% | 12.55 | -9.6\% | 29.8 | 29.4 | -1.3\% | 34.4 | 17.0\% | 37.6 | 9.3\% |
| Pasco C | county MPO | Sinde count | 69.4 | 67.8 | -2.3\% | 66.8 | -1.5\% | 71.4 | 6.9\% | ${ }^{855.4}$ | 87.0 | 1.8\% | 933.0 | $7.1 \%$ | 1,032.6 | 10.7\% | 1.735 | 1.660 | -2.3\% | 1.592 | -1.5\% | 1.661 | 6.92 | ${ }^{21.416}$ | 21.279 | -0.6\% | 22.077 | 3.8\% | 23.95 | 8.3\% | 10.6 | 109.6 | 3.8\% | 1090 | 0.5\%) | 115.6 | 6.1\% |
| Florida- | -Alabama TPO | ties, not countwide | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pinellas | 5 County MPO | Sinele count | 99.0 | 101.4 | 2.4\% | 102.8 | 1.4\% | 105.8 | 2.96 | 1,270.0 | 1,217.8 | -4.1\% | 1,194.6 | ${ }^{-1.9 \%}$ | 1,175.2 | -1.68 | 1.229 | 1.272 | 2.4\% | 1.296 | 1.4\% | 1.310 | 2.98 | 15.74 | 15.58 | -3.1\% | 15.088 | 1.2\% | 14.59 | ${ }^{-3.12}$ | 212.4 | 213.8 | 0.7\% | 217.2 | 1.6\%) | 221.0 | 1.7\% |
| Sarasot | (Manatee MPO | Mitiple countes | 81.0 | 81.6 | 0.7\% | 87.4 | 7.1\% | 99.8 | 14.2\% | 770.8 | 777.8 | 0.9\% | 907.0 | 16.6\% | 1,131.2 | $24.7 \%$ | 1.103 | 1.104 | 0.7\% | 1.160 | 7.18 | 1.289 | 14.2\% | 10.42 | 10.97 | 0.0\% | 11.986 | 14.28 | 14.504 | 21.0\% | 127.8 | 134.2 | 5.0\% | 1428 | ${ }^{6.42}$ | 16.0 | 12.0\% |
| St Lucie | TPO | Singe county | 30.0 | 29.8 | 0.7\% | 31.0 | 4.0\% | 33.6 | 8.46 | ${ }^{187.4}$ | 174.0 | -7.2\% | 166.6 | -4.3\% | 165.0 | 1.0\% | 0.967 | 0.956 | $0.7 \%$ | 0.985 | 4.0\% | 1.064 | 8.48 | 6.027 | 5.562 | -7.7\% | 5.276 | 5.12 | 5.236 | ${ }_{0}^{0.88}$ | 26.6 | 28.4 | 6.8\% | 26.8 | -5.6\% | 24.0 | 0.4\% |
| Capital | Region TPA | Mutipie counties | 55.4 | 53.0 | -4.3\% | 51.4 | 3.0\% | 55.6 | 8.2\% | Seei individual countes below |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| River to | Sea TPO | Multiple conties, not countwide | See individual counties below |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palm B | each MPO | Singel couny | 131.4 | 127.0 | -3.3\% | 139.8 | 10.1\% |  |  | 1.047.0 | ${ }^{1.039 .8}$ | -0.76 | 1,026.2 |  |  |  | 1.066 | 1.022 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.493 | ${ }^{8.366}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 93.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lake-Su | umter MPO | Mutipil Countes | 62.0 | 61.2 | -1.3\% | 64.4 | 5.2\% | 66.4 | 3.1\% | 369.4 | 348.8 | 5.5\% | 30.4 | -2.4\% | 364.6 | 7.18 | 1.436 | 1.385 | ${ }^{-1.3 \%}$ | 1.410 | 5.2\% | 1.423 | 3.12 | 8.571 | 7.879 | -8.1\% | 7.425 | -5.8\% | 7.742 | 4.38 | 37.2 | ${ }^{39.6}$ | 6.5\% | ${ }^{38,8}$ | -2.0\% | 40.8 | 5.2\% |
| Heartla | nd Regional TPO | Mutitile countes | 57.6 | 55.8 | -3.1\% | 57.4 | 2.9\% | 60.8 | 5.96 | 331.2 | 310.4 | -6.3\% | 299.8 | -3.4\% | 342.0 | 14.12 | 2.053 | 1.996 | 3.19\% | 2.025 | 2.9\% | 2.105 | 5.92 | 11.785 | 11.089 | -5.9\% | 10.57 | 4.6 | 1.750 | 12.18 |  | 35.0 | 8.0\% | 33.2 | ${ }^{5.1}$ | 32.6 |  |
|  | County Name | MPO/TPO | Average Annual Fatalities ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average Annual Serious Injuries ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average Annual Fatality Rates ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average Annual Serious Injury Rates ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average Annual Pedestrian and Bicyclist Fatalities and Serious Injuries5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2009-13 | 2010-14 |  | $2011-15$ |  | 2012-16 |  | 2009-13 | 2010-14 |  | $2011-15$ |  | 2012-16 |  | 2009-13 | 2010-14 |  | $2011-15$ |  | 2012-16 |  | 2009.13 | 2010-14 |  | $2011-15$ |  | 2012-16 |  | 2009-13 | 2010-14 |  | 2011-15 |  | 2012-16 |  |
|  |  |  | Average | Average | \% $\Delta$ | Average | \% ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Average | \% 4 | Average | Average | \% ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Average | \% 4 | Average | \% 0 | Average | Average | \% $\Delta$ Av | Average | \% 4 A | Average | \% 4 |  | Average | \% 4 | Average | \% $\Delta$ | Average | \% ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Average | Average |  | Average | \% 4 | Average |  |
| 26 | Alachua | Gainesville MTPO | 30.6 | 30.6 | 0.0\% | 32.8 | 7.2\% | 36.6 | 11.6\% | 3028 | 275.8 | -8.9\% | 265.6 | -3.7\% | 264.0 | ${ }^{0.6 \%}$ | 1.080 | 1.073 | -0.6\% | 1.137 | 6.0\% | 1.242 | 9.2\% | 10.669 | 9.677 | -9.36 | 9.217 | ${ }^{-4.88}$ | 8.959 | 2.8\% | 37.6 | 38.2 | 1.6\% | 37.0 | -3.19\% | 37.8 | ${ }^{2.28}$ |
| ${ }^{48}$ | Escambia | Florida-Alabama TPO | 40.8 | 41.6 | 2.0\% | 44.2 | 6.3\% | 44.4 | 0.5\% | 472.2 | 377.8 | -20.0\% | 321.4 | -14.90\% | 281.6 | -12.48 | 1.206 | 1.228 | 1.8\% | 1.298 | 5.\% | 1.289 | -0.76 | ${ }^{13.954}$ | 11.152 | -20.1\% | 9.450 | 15.32 | 8.182 | -13.4\% | 6.0 | 60.2 | 8.8\% | 55.4 | $8.0 \%$ | 54.4 | 1.8\% |
| 58 | Santa Rosa | Florida-Alabama TPO | 23.8 | 22.2 | -6.7\% | 21.8 | -1.8\% | 20.0 | 8.3\% | 262.2 | 23.0 | -11.1\% | 218.0 | 6.4\% | 189.6 | -13.0\% | 1.189 | 1.105 | 7.1\% | 1.081 | -2.2\% | 0.978 | -9.5\% | 13.105 | 11.60 | -11.\% | 10.821 | 6.76 | 9.245 | -14.6\% | 16.4 | 15.2 | 7.3\% | 15.0 | ${ }^{1.3}{ }^{3}$ | 15.8 | 5.36 |
| 57 | Okaloosa | Okalosa-Walton TPO | 22.0 | 24.0 | $9.1 \%$ | 27.0 | 12.5\% | 26.6 | -1.5\% | 231.4 | 212.4 | $8.2 \%$ | 2024 | -4.7\% | 184.0 | -9.12 | 1.066 | 1.153 | 8.2\% | 1.284 | 11.4\% | 1.247 | -2.9\% | 11.232 | 10.227 | $8.9 \%$ | 9.681 | 5.3\% | 8.675 | -10.4\% | 28.6 | 29.0 | 1.46 | 30.8 | 6.22 | 28.6 | ${ }^{7.1 \%}$ |
| 60 | Walton | Okalosa-Walton TPO | 19.4 | 18.2 | 6.2\% | 14.2 | -22.0\% | 14.2 | 0.0\% | 143.4 | 138.2 | -3.6\% | 137.8 | -0.36 | 121.0 | -12.2\% | 1.684 | 1.561 | -7.3\% | 1.198 | -23.3\% | 1.160 | -3.28 | 12.43 | 11.849 | -4.7\% | 11.60 | -2.0\% | 9.954 | -14.39 | 8.6 | 9.0 | 4.7\% | 9.4 | 4.48 | 8.6 | 8.5\% |
| 73 | Flager | River to Sea TPO | 18.4 | 20.0 | $8.7 \%$ | 17.8 | 11.\% | 18.4 | 3.4\% | 176.2 | 160.0 | 9.2\% | 137.8 | -13.9\% | 119.4 | -13.4\% | 1.720 | 1.798 | 4.5\% | 1.542 | -14.2\% | 1.504 | ${ }^{2.5 \%}$ | 12.497 | 14.757 | -10.5\% | 12.239 | 17.18 | 10.274 | -16.19 | 13.6 | ${ }^{14.2}$ | $4.4 \%$ | 15.8 | ${ }^{11.3}$ | 15.6 | ${ }^{1.3 \%}$ |
| 79 | Volusia | River to Sea TPO | 94.4 | 93.0 | -1.5\% | 89.2 | -4.1\% | 99.4 | 8.1\% | 69.8 | 658.2 | 4.9\% | 630.2 | 4.3\% | 638.4 | 1.3\% | 1.716 | 1.697 | -1.1\% | 1.624 | -4.3\% | 1.715 | 5.68 | 12.57 | 12.019 | 4.48 | 11.485 | -4.4\% | 11.38 | 0.92 | 92.2 | 92.8 | 0.7\% | 89.0 | ${ }^{4.12}$ | ${ }^{88.8}$ | 0.28 |
| 8 | Indian River | Indian River County MPO | 20.0 | 19.8 | -1.0\% | 19.4 | -2.0\% | 20.6 | 6.28 | 117.2 | 119.0 | 1.5\% | 115.8 | -2.7\% | 127.2 | 9.88 | 1.333 | 1.312 | ${ }^{-1.6 \%}$ | 1.262 | -3.8\% | 1.322 | 4.8\% | ${ }^{7.817}$ | 7.885 | 0.9\% | 7.568 | -4.0\% | 8.194 | 8.38 | 14.2 | 14.6 | 2.8\% | 16.2 | 11.0\%) | 17.6 | 8.6\% |

 DATA sources. fatality and serious injury counts from Florida Dept. of Transportation (FDOT) State Safety Office's Crash Analysis Reporting (CAR) database as of November 8, 2017; traffic volumes as published by the FDOT office of Transportation Data and Analytics at http://www.ffot.gov//panning/statistics/mileage-rpts/

1. The average number of fatalities per year is the sum of the annual total fatalities for each year in the range divided by 5 , to one decimal place. Fatalities are individuals listed on a Florida Traffic Crash Report (FTCR) form with injury code " 5 " - fatal (within 30 days).
2. The average number of serious injuries per year is the sum of the annual total serious injuries for each year in the range divided by 5 , to one decimal place. Serious injuries are individuals listed on an FTCR form with injury code " "4" - incapacitating.


 5individuals listed on an FTCR form as Non-Motorist with a Non-Motorist Description code of "01" (pedestrian), " 02 " (other pedestrian (wheelchair, person in a building, skater, pedestrian conveyance, etc.), "03" (bicyclist) or "04" (other cyclist) and with injury code " 5 " - fatal ( within 30 days) or injury code "4" - incapacitataing.
int
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February 8, 2018

TO: TAC/CAC Committee Members

FROM: Kenneth Odom, Transportation Planner/Project Manager

SUBJECT: Trails Crossing Study

The TPO enlisted Kimley-Horn \& Associates to analyze trails crossings on SR 35 and NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue that will be a part of the Silver Springs to Downtown Trail and the Indian Lake State Trail. A FINAL report of the analysis was submitted to TPO staff on January 18, 2018 that documented the existing conditions and recommended treatments at both locations.

This document has been included for your review. TPO staff will offer a brief presentation to outline the purpose and recommended treatments for both crossings at the February $13^{\text {th }}$ meeting. Should you have any questions prior to the regularly scheduled meeting, please contact TPO staff at 352-629-8297.

## Kimley»Horn

## TRAIL CROSSING STUDY

To: Michael Daniels, Ocala/Marion County Transportation Planning Organization<br>From: Amber L. Gartner, P.E., Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.<br><br>Date: January 18, 2018<br>RE: $\quad$ SR 35 \& NE 58 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue Trail Crossing Studies -January 2018 Revision<br>Task Order KHA-2017-01<br>Kimley-Horn Project No. 040868020

The purpose of the study is to evaluate crossing treatment options at two future trail crossing/connection locations and provide recommendations for the appropriate treatment to include in any future design phases of the project. This study focuses on the following two trail crossings, per the request of the Ocala/Marion County Transportation Planning Organization (TPO):

- A trail crossing at State Road (SR) 35 to connect the downtown trail to the Silver Springs State Park
- A trail crossing at NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to connect the Indian Lake State Forest and Silver Springs State Forest

The existing conditions of the roadways subject to each trail crossing location were reviewed to identify the appropriate facility treatments. The roadway characteristics, posted speed limit, traffic volume, and crash history were evaluated in the review for the appropriate location and treatment. Guidance from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices were utilized in the determination of the recommended crossing treatment.

A conceptual layout of each recommended crossing location and treatment was prepared and discussed with stakeholders from Marion County Planning, Marion County Parks and Recreation, Florida Park Service, FDOT, and the TPO. This study has been updated to reflect the December 2017 notice from FHWA terminating their approval of the use of Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB) for mid-block pedestrian crossings. Input from the stakeholders was incorporated into the final recommendations within this study.
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## BACKGROUND

Marion County has several miles of planned paved trails to provide connectivity to local destinations, trailheads, and parks within Marion County as well as future connectivity to the regional trail system within North Central Florida. The Ocala/Marion County TPO’s 2035 Bicycle \& Pedestrian Master Plan depicts the network of trails planned in and around Ocala, including those for which these crossings are being evaluated (see Attachments $\mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{3}$ for maps from the Master Plan).

Consistent with the Master Plan, the SR 35 crossing at Silver Springs State Park would serve to connect the Downtown Ocala Connector on the west side of SR 35 to the Silver Springs Bikeway on the east side of SR 35. The crossing would also provide connection from the Downtown Ocala Connector to the Silver Springs State Park. The NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue crossing at the Indian Lake State Forest would serve to connect the Indian Lake Connector to the Indian Lake Campground and its associated trailheads.

The Ocala/Marion County TPO 2017/18 - 2021/22 Amended Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) identifies design funding for the Downtown Ocala (Connector) Trail, the Indian Lake Trail, and the Silver Springs Bikeway. Table 1 summarizes the limits, phases, and years of the funding (see Attachment 1 for relevant pages from the TIP).

Table 1: Ocala/Marion County TPO TIP Funding Summary

| Trail | Limits | Phase | Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Downtown Ocala Connector | Osceola Avenue to <br> Silver Springs State Park | Design | 2020 |
| Indian Lake Trail | Silver Springs State Park to <br> Indian Lake Park | Design | 2019 |
| Silver Springs Bikeway | SE 64th Avenue Road to <br> Silver Springs State Park |  <br> Construction | 2020 (Construction) |

The TPO has requested that this study be performed in advance of the design of the respective sections of trail to provide recommendations for the appropriate crossing location and treatment to be incorporated into the design phase of the trail projects.

Figure 1 and Figure 2 illustrate the location of the two trail crossings evaluated within this study.



## EVALUATION CRITERIA

The assessment of each potential trail crossing location included reviews of existing field conditions, existing traffic, speed data, crash history, trail plans, and pertinent FDOT design criteria for mid-block crossings.

The MUTCD and FDOT criteria for mid-block pedestrian crossings were utilized for evaluation and recommendation of the crossing location and treatment type.

Section 3.8 of the FDOT's Traffic Engineering Manual (TEM) addresses marked pedestrian crosswalks at midblock and uncontrolled approach locations and establishes definitions, criteria, and standards for installation and operation on the State Highway System.

Section 3.8.5(3)(c) of the TEM states that multi-use trail crossings are not subject to the minimum pedestrian crossing volumes that are otherwise required to warrant mid-block crossing treatments. This exemption is provided "in order to promote the use of multi-use paths and reduce the impacts roadway crossings can create for pedestrians and bicyclists." The same section of the TEM states that "care should be given to selecting the appropriate location and crossing treatment for multi-use trails."

The guidance within the TEM was utilized for the recommendations within this study.

## SR 35 CROSSING AT SILVER SPRINGS STATE PARK

The Downtown Ocala Connector is a $+/-6$ mile trail from downtown Ocala to the Silver Springs Conservation Area located north of NE $7^{\text {th }}$ Street and west of SR 35. The Silver Springs Bikeway Phase I is a $+/-4.5$ mile trail that will be partially within the Silver Springs State Park, located on the east side of SR 35, north of NE 7 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street. The SR 35 trail crossing would serve to connect the Downtown Ocala Connector through the Silver Springs Conservation Area on the west side of SR 35 to the Silver Springs Bikeway multi-use trail through the Silver Springs State Park on the east side of SR 35. This crossing would subsequently connect the Downtown Ocala Trail to the Heart of Florida Loop Trail System.

There is a current vehicular entrance to the Silver Springs State Park campground on the east side of SR 35 located approximately one-half mile north of the signalized intersection of SR 35 and NE $7^{\text {th }}$ Street. This was initially discussed as the preferred crossing location for the trail connection across SR 35.

## Existing Conditions

SR 35 is classified as an urban minor arterial within the vicinity of the proposed trail crossing and has a posted speed limit of 45 miles per hour ( mph ). SR 35 has two vehicular travel lanes in each direction, standard designated bike lanes in each direction, and a wide ( $>30$ feet) recessed grass median. At the entrance to the Silver Springs State Park, there is a full median opening with left-turn lanes in both directions and a right-turn lane in the northbound direction. The driveway from the park entrance is stop-controlled with free-flow traffic movements on SR 35.

SR 35 within the vicinity of the project has an AADT of 14,400 vehicles per day based on the FDOT 2016 Florida Traffic Online. The AM peak hour traffic volume is 882 vehicles per hour ( 500 NB, 382 SB ). The PM peak hour traffic volume is 1,331 vehicles per hour ( $574 \mathrm{NB}, 757 \mathrm{SB}$ ).

Speed data was collected by Marion County Transportation. The recorded $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed along SR 35 is 54 mph northbound and 53 mph southbound, both above the posted $45-\mathrm{mph}$ speed limit.

Sidewalks exist on both sides of SR 35, but no crossings are marked at the intersection. Both sides of SR 35 have curb and gutter drainage. Cross-slopes near the entrance to Silver River State Park were measured at an average of 2.1 percent. A normal crown configuration was observed (either side sloped toward its respective curb).

Potential utility conflicts (gas, water/sewer, and electrical) along SR 35 at the SR 35 crossing were discussed during the stakeholder meeting. Utility coordination will be needed to coordinate any impacts and/or relocations needed due to the mid-block crossing.

Photographs showing the existing roadway conditions on SR 35 are provided below.

## Historic Crash Data

Five years (2012-2016) of historic crash data were obtained from the Signal Four Analytics program within 500 feet of the proposed crossing location. Within the vicinity of the proposed crossing, there

## Kimley») Horn

was only one crash reported over the five-year period. The crash occurred under dark conditions as a result of a southbound vehicle swerving into a curb to avoid a deer crossing the roadway.


Photograph 1 - Looking north on SR 35 from the proposed crossing location


Photograph 2 - Looking south on SR 35 from the proposed crossing location

## Recommended Crossing Treatment

A Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon crossing treatment is recommended for the crossing on SR 35 due to the high traffic volumes on the roadway, high recorded vehicle speeds, and large crossing distance. The Hybrid Beacon will be mounted overhead for greater visibility and due to the multiple vehicle approach lanes. The Hybrid Beacon will be operated as specified in the MUTCD with a combination of steady yellow, steady red, and flashing red indications. The Hybrid Beacon will be pedestrian/bicyclist activated. The signal heads will remain dark until activated by a pedestrian/bicyclist.

Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons are not intended for use at intersections or driveways and are recommended to be placed at least 100 feet from driveways controlled by stop signs. Because of the northbound left-turn and northbound right-turn lanes provided at the park entrance, it is recommended
that the crossing be located approximately 800 feet south of the Silver Springs State Park entrance, outside of the influence area of the turn lanes. This location is more than a quarter-mile north of the signalized intersection of SR 35 with NE $7^{\text {th }}$ Street. Having the crosswalk at this location will reduce the crossing distance by providing a larger median area for refuge.

Sight distance was measured in the field at the proposed crossing location and was documented to be in excess of the 425 feet required for a $50-\mathrm{mph}$ design speed in FDOT's Plans Preparation Manual (PPM).

The TEM provides further guidance for Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons being used to cross more than 80 feet. In such cases, consideration should be given to a two-stage crossing, in which Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons serve pedestrians and bicyclists cross each direction of vehicular traffic independently, with a refuge area in the median. The crossing distance of approximately 100 feet at this location meets this criterion. Providing a two-stage crossing will reduce the vehicle delay associated with the crossing.

Ten-foot wide minimum Special Emphasis Crosswalk markings are required per FDOT's Design Standards, Index No. 17346, which is included as Attachment 4. Alternative crosswalk treatments, such as patterned/textured pavement, may be implemented to provide for additional emphasis and placemaking at the crossing. Red brick patterned/textured pavement crossing treatments have recently been constructed on SR 40 at the intersection with Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue in the City of Ocala. This crosswalk treatment is also being constructed with the Osceola Avenue multi-modal trail improvements in the City of Ocala. Use of a patterned/textured pavement crossing on SR 35 will require review and approval by FDOT.

Supplemental signage is also recommended, consistent with Index No. 17346. Overhead lighting is recommended for improved visibility of the pedestrians/bicyclists and to be consistent with FDOT Design Standards. Per discussion with Florida Park Service staff, lighting that reduces light emissions to the surrounding Parks and Recreation Areas is preferred.

Additional destination signage may be incorporated into the design of the crossing, in keeping with the branding for the trail system, to provide for enhanced visibility for the crossing and incorporate placemaking into the trail connection.

Utility coordination will be needed to coordinate any impacts and/or relocations needed due to the installation of the pedestrian activated hybrid beacon.

A conceptual layout of the proposed crossing location is provided in Figure 2.

## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

A planning-level Opinion of Probable Cost (OPC) was developed for the recommended Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon treatment on SR 35 at the Silver Springs State Park. The estimated construction costs were developed using historical cost information published by FDOT. Due to current conditions in the construction industry, a $25 \%$ contingency was added to account for the current escalation in construction costs. However, the OPC may still be below actual bids at the time of construction.

Based on the most recent cost information published by FDOT, the mid-block crossing with Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon at this location is estimated to cost approximately $\$ 285,000$. The OPC is provided as Attachment 6.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF TIITF OF STATE OF FLORIDA } \\
& 27348-000-00
\end{aligned}
$$
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## NE $58^{\text {TH }}$ AVENUE CROSSING AT INDIAN LAKE STATE FOREST

The NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue trail crossing at the Indian Lake State Forest would serve to connect the Indian Lake Connector Trail to the Indian Lake Campground and its associated trailheads. Three locations were evaluated for the trail crossing of NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, based on input from Marion County, the TPO, and the Kimley-Horn project team.

## Existing Conditions

NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue is classified as a rural minor collector in the area and has a posted speed limit of 55 mph . This segment of NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue is an undivided two-lane facility with no bike lanes, shoulders, or sidewalks. The traffic volume is 2,300 vehicles per day based on FDOT 2016 Florida Traffic Online.

Speed data was collected by Marion County Transportation. The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed recorded along NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue is 50 mph northbound and 54 mph southbound, both below the posted $55-\mathrm{mph}$ speed limit.

## Southern Location

The southern crossing location is $+/-1.75$ miles north of the signalized intersection of NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue at SR 326. There is a driveway on the east side of the roadway for a gravel parking lot to the Silver Springs Forest Conservation Area. The slope of the roadway was measured to be between 2 and 3 percent. Overhead utilities are present on the west side of the road and a buried gas line was marked on the east side of the roadway.

The driveway to the gravel lot is approximately 800 feet south of a westward curve in NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. Sight distance was measured in the field at the proposed crossing location and was documented to be in excess of that required for $55-\mathrm{mph}$ design speed in FDOT's Greenbook.


Photograph 3 - Looking south at the southern NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue crossing location, Silver Springs Forest Conservation Area driveway

## Central Location

The central location is $+/-0.4$ miles north of the southern location. There is a driveway on the east side of the roadway for access to a gravel parking lot to the Indian Lake State Forest Bear-N-Oak Trailhead. A buried gas line is marked on the east side of NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue.

This location is in the middle of an S-curve in NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. The curve to the north begins approximately 250 feet from the trailhead, and the curve to the south begins approximately 850 feet from the trailhead. The slope of the roadway was measured between 3.6 and 5.1 percent, sloping downward to the east. Sight distance was measured in the field at the proposed crossing location and was documented to be in excess of that required for $55-\mathrm{mph}$ design speed in FDOT's Greenbook.


Photograph 4 - Looking north from the central NE 58 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue crossing location, Indian Lake State Forest Bear-N-Oak Trailhead driveway

## Northern Location

The northern location is $+/-0.5$ miles north of the central location. There is a driveway on the east side of the roadway. Overhead utilities span NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue just north of the driveway and continue north along the west side of the roadway. A buried gas line is marked on the east side of NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue.

This location is in the middle of a westward curve in NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. The slope of the roadway was measured between 7.2 and 8.8 percent, sloping downward to the west. Sight distance was measured in the field at the proposed crossing location and was documented to be in excess of that required for $55-\mathrm{mph}$ design speed in FDOT's Greenbook.


Photograph 5 - Looking south at the north NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue crossing location, Indian Lake State Forest, northern driveway

## Historic Crash Data

Five years (2012-2016) of historic crash data were obtained from the Signal Four Analytics program within 500 feet of each proposed crossing location. Within the vicinity of the southern location, there was only one crash reported over the five-year period. The crash occurred under dark conditions as a result of a northbound vehicle striking a deer crossing the roadway. Within the vicinity of the central crossing location, there were four crashes reported from 2012 to 2016 . All four of the reported crashes were off road crashes. Two crashes occurred under dark conditions, and two crashes were reported as a result of a driver swerving to avoid a deer crossing the roadway. There were no crashes reported between 2012 and 2016 at the northern location.

## Recommended Crossing Location and Treatment

The recommended crossing location is the southern location. This is due to the proximity to superelevated curves and high roadway cross-slopes at the northern and central locations. The southern location has sufficient sight distance and has lower cross-slopes when compared to the northern and central locations. The crossing is recommended to be 100 feet north of the driveway at the Silver Springs Conservation Area trailhead to provide for improved sight distance and to meet design requirements for a mid-block crossing.

The recommended treatment for the crossing is post-mounted Flashing Yellow Warning Beacons on both sides of NE 58 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. This treatment is recommended due to the low traffic volumes on NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, high visibility of the location, and narrow crossing distance for bicyclists/pedestrians. Flashing Yellow Warning Beacons are considered an appropriate crossing treatment for uncontrolled approaches and tend to show high compliance rates at a lower cost than pedestrian signalization. Per the TEM, Flashing Yellow Warning Beacons must be pedestrian-actuated either by pushbutton or by passive detection devices. The Warning Beacons should be post mounted with a configuration of two vertically aligned warning beacons, operated in an alternating flash pattern.

As with all pedestrian crossing treatments, ten-foot wide minimum Special Emphasis Crosswalk markings should be used, as shown in FDOT's Design Standards, Index No. 17346. Supplemental signage is also recommended, consistent with Index No. 17346. Overhead lighting is recommended for improved visibility of the pedestrians/bicyclists and to be consistent with FDOT Design Standards. Per discussion with Florida Park Service staff, lighting that will reduce light emission to the surrounding Parks and Recreation Areas is preferred.

A conceptual layout of the proposed crossing location is provided in Figure 2.

## Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

A planning-level OPC was developed for the recommended treatment on NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. The estimated construction costs were developed using historical cost information published by FDOT. Due to current conditions in the construction industry, a $25 \%$ contingency was added to account for the current escalation in construction costs. However, the OPC may still be below actual bids at the time of construction.

Based on the most recent cost information published by FDOT, the mid-block crossing with Flashing Yellow Warning Beacons at this location is estimated to cost approximately $\$ 46,000$. The OPC is provided as Attachment 6.


## STAKEHOLDER INPUT

A stakeholder meeting was held on November $8^{\text {th }}, 2017$ to present the recommended trail crossing concepts and receive input. A project background and overview of the project was provided, followed by detailed discussion of each crossing location and recommended treatment.

The following stakeholders were present at the meeting:

- Ocala/Marion County TPO
- Marion County Parks and Recreation
- Marion County Planning
- Florida Department of Transportation

A separate stakeholder meeting was held with Florida Park Service staff on November 17, 2017.
Potential utility conflicts (gas, water/sewer, and electrical) along SR 35 at the SR 35 crossing were discussed during the meeting. Utility coordination will be needed to coordinate any impacts and/or relocations needed for the pedestrian activated hybrid beacon.

Alternative decorative treatment of the crosswalk on SR 35 was discussed. A high-emphasis crosswalk marking is the require treatment by FDOT design standards for a mid-block crossing location.

Potential lighting treatments of the trail crossings was discussed as a safety improvement for increased visibility of bicyclists/pedestrians crossing SR 35 and NE 58 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. Crosswalk illumination is required by FDOT standards for crosswalks at uncontrolled locations. The Florida Park Service expressed concerns about overhead lighting and potential impact to wildlife, as both locations are surrounded by State Lands. Input was provided that the crossings being installed for the trails under construction through the Cross Florida Greenway do not include overhead lighting, and that maybe overhead lighting should not be required at the NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue crossing as the traffic volumes are low and it is not a FDOT facility.

The stakeholders were in support of the proposed crossing locations and treatments. Meeting minutes are included in Attachment 5.

## SUMMARY

This memorandum summarizes the existing conditions and recommendations for two future trail crossings within Marion County; one on SR 35 to connect the Downtown Ocala Connector trail to the Silver Springs Bikeway trail, and one on NE 58 th Avenue to connect the Indian Lake Connector trail to the Indian Lake Campground. These two roadway crossings are essential in the connection of the extensive paved trail system planned throughout Marion County, sections of which have recently been constructed or are planned for construction within the next five years. The recommendations provided within this study will be used during the future design of the respective trail segments.

The trail crossing on SR 35 is recommended to have a pedestrian activated pedestrian hybrid beacon treatment due to the large crossing distance, high traffic volume, and high vehicle speeds. The trail crossing on NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue is recommended to have a pedestrian activated/sensor Flashing Yellow Warning Beacon treatment due to the low traffic volumes, high visibility, and short crossing distance.

The design and construction aspects of the recommended crossing treatments should comply with specifications and requirements in the FDOT Greenbook, FDOT PPM, FDOT Design Standards, MUTCD and all other pertinent jurisdictional standards. Permitting with FDOT will be required for the trail crossing on SR 35, as this roadway is owned and maintained by FDOT. Permitting with Marion County will be required for the crossing on NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, as this roadway is owned and maintained by Marion County.

At both proposed crossings, adequate lighting should be provided to improve visibility of pedestrians, bicyclists, and all other trail users. Care should be taken to direct lighting treatments at the crossings to minimize light intrusion on surrounding conservation and wildlife management areas.

Aesthetic features, such as patterned/textured pavement crosswalks and destination signage, may be incorporated into the design of the SR 35 crossing to provide enhanced visibility and placemaking for this major trail connection. Design within SR 35 right-of-way is subject to FDOT review and approval.

During subsequent phases of this project, coordination with utilities along and within the right-of-way of SR 35 and NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue will be required. As necessary, the specific locations of the recommended crossing treatments may be adjusted to avoid conflict with utilities, provided that sufficient sight distance is maintained and adequate distance remains between the crossings and adjacent intersections and driveways.

This letter and attachments summarize the crossing recommendations for the trail crossings on SR 35 and NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. We appreciate the opportunity to work with you on this project, and look forward to continued support for this project as it moves into the next phase.

Attachments: 1: Ocala/Marion County TIP Excerpt<br>2: Marion County Regional Trail Projects Map<br>3: Trails and Open Space - Silver Springs Regional Connectivity Map<br>4: FDOT Design Standards Index 17346<br>5: Stakeholder Meeting Minutes<br>6: Opinion of Probable Construction Cost
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## ATTACHMENTS

## ATTACHMENT 1: <br> Ocala / Marion County TIP Excerpt

Ocala/Marion County TPO
Regional Trail Priorities
FY 2016

| Priority | Project | From | To | Length <br> (mi) | Regional <br> Trail | Phase |  | Phase <br> Estimate | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pruitt Trail | Bridges Road | SR 200 | 9.5 | HOF | CST | \$ | 3,325,000 | CST FY 2021 (Delayed). need to contact Jim Couliard, deal seems to be done. Significant archaeological site (need to set up meeting) |
| 2 | Silver Springs Bikeway - Phase I | Baseline Paved Trail North Trailhead | Silver Springs State Park | 7.5 | HOF | DES | \$ | 225,000 | CST FY 2018. |
| 3 | Downtown Ocala Trail | Ocala City Hall | Silver Springs State Park | 6 | - | CST | \$ | 1,800,000 | DES FY 2020. |
| 4 | CR 484 - Pennsylvania Ave. Multi-Modal Improvements w/ Bridge Option | Blue Run Park | Mary Street | 0.8 | - | DES | \$ | 75,000 |  |
| 5 | Indian Lake Trail | Silver Springs State Park | Indian Lake Trailhead | 5 | - | DES | \$ | 155,000 | Design funded in FY 2019. |
| 6 | Silver Springs Bikeway Phase II | Baseline Paved Trail North Trailhead | CR 42 | 18.5 | HOF | DES | \$ | 555,000 |  |
| 7 | Belleview Greenway Trail | Lake Lillian Park | Cross Florida Greenway | 5.3 | - | DES | \$ | 159,000 | Feasibility study FY 2018. |
| 8 | Watula Trail | Tuscawilla Art Park | NE 8th St/SR 492 | 0.5 | - | CST |  | TBD | Design FY 2018 |
| 9 | Ocala National Forest Trail | Silver Springs State <br> Park | Wildcat Lake Boat Ramp <br> (1 mi. east of SR 19) | 27 | HOF | PD\&E | \$ | 750,000 | PD\&E FY 2020. |
| 10 | Silver Springs to Hawthorne Trail | Silver Springs State Park |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Approx. } \\ 30 \end{gathered}$ | - | PD\&E | \$ | 750,000 |  |
| Funded Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Land Bridge Gap | SR 200 | SW 49th Avenue | 8.25 | HOF | DES/CST | \$ | 3,300,000 | Bids received. 240-270 days |
|  | Santos West Gap | SW 49th Avenue | Santos Trail Head | 7.4 | HOF | DES/CST | \$ | 2,200,000 | Bids received. 240-270 days Baseline to Santos trail new funding source? |

CST - Construction
DEP - Department of Environmental Protection
DES - Design
HOF - Heart of Florida Loop
PD\&E - Project Development \& Environmental Study
ROW - Right-of-way

DOWNTOWN OCALA TO SILVER SPRINGS TRAIL


| Work Summary: |  | BIKE PATH |  | From: | OSCEOLA AVE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | To: | SILVER SPR | S STATE |  |
| Lead Agency: |  | City of Ocala |  | Length: | . 000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | LRTP \#: | GOAL 1: Ob <br> Page 2-8 | $\text { ve } 2-$ |  |
| Fund |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PE | TALL | 0 | 0 | 253,000 | 0 | 0 | 253,000 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 253,000 | 0 | 0 | 253,000 |

Prior Cost < 2017/18: 0
Future Cost > 2021/22:
0
Total Project Cost: 253,000
Project Description: Construct/designate an eight to twelve-foot multi-use path from Osceola Avenue to Silver Springs State Park.

SILVER SPRINGS BIKEWAY


4354861

| Work Summary: |  | BIKE PATH |  | From: | SE 64TH AVE RD |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | To: | SILVER SPR | S STATE | ARK |
| Lead Agency: |  | Marion County |  | Length: | . 000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | LRTP \#: | GOAL 1: Objective 2 - <br> Page 2-8 |  |  |
| Phase | Fund Source | 2017/18 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | Total |
| PE | TALT | 25,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25,000 |
| CST | TALT | 0 | 0 | 2,594,547 | 0 | 0 | 2,594,547 |
| CST | SL | 0 | 0 | 1,412,773 | 0 | 0 | 1,412,773 |
| CST | TALL | 0 | 0 | 472,724 | 0 | 0 | 472,724 |
| Total |  | 25,000 | 0 | 4,480,044 | 0 | 0 | 4,505,044 |

Prior Cost < 2017/18: 500,000
Future Cost > 2021/22:
Total Project Cost:
5,005,044
Construct a twelve-foot paved multi-use path from Silver Springs State Park to CR 42 along the Ocklawaha River, primarily along the existing levy system.


## Prior Cost < 2017/18: 0

Future Cost > 2021/22: 0
Total Project Cost: 155,000
Project Description: Construct approximately five miles of twelve-foot wide multi-use path from Silver Springs State Park north to Indian Lakes Park.
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## ATTACHMENT 2: Marion County Regional Trail Projects Map
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## ATTACHMENT 3:

## Trails and Open Space Silver Springs Regional Connectivity Map
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## ATTACHMENT 4: FDOT Design Standards Index 17346


2. For public sidewalk curb ramps, refer to Index No. 304.
3. For pavement marking and sign installation, refer to Indexes 11200 through 17356.
4. Crosswalk minimum widths: Intersection Crosswalk 6'. Midblock Crosswalk 10'
5. All crosswalk marking must be white.
6. Longitudinal markings in Special Emphasis Crosswalk must be 24" wide and spaced to avoid Plawe addititional longitculinal markings at the center of each lane (1/2W). The maximum spacing
allowed between longitudinal markings is $60^{\prime \prime}$.
When the Crosswalk is skewed to the lane lines, the longitudinal markings should be parallel
to the lane lines.
24" Longitudinal Bars in Special Emphasis Crosswalk must be preformed thermoplastic.
12" Transverse lines in the Special Emphasis Crosswalk may be standard thermoplastic or
preformed thermoplastic.


SPECIAL EMPHASIS CROSSWALK MARKING DETAIL

SPECIAL EMPHASIS AND STANDARD CROSSWALKS SIGNALIZED OR STOP SIGN CONTROLLED INTERSECTION


# Kimley»"Horn 

## ATTACHMENT 5: Stakeholder Meeting Minutes

## Kimley»Horn

# TPO Trail Crossing Study Stakeholders Meeting SR 35 \& NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue Trail Crossing Studies 

12:00 PM on Wednesday, November 8, 2017
Ocala/ Marion County TPO Office, Ocala, FL

| NAME | AGENCY | EMAIL ADDRESS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Amber Gartner | Kimley-Horn | amber.gartner@kimley-horn.com |
| Alex Memering | Kimley-Horn | alex.memering@kimley-horn.com |
| Mike Daniels | Ocala/Marion County TPO | mdaniels@ocalafl.org |
| Ken Odom | Ocala/Marion County TPO | kodom@ocalafl.org |
| Ronda Daniell | FDOT - Ocala Operations | ronda.daniell@dot.state.fl.us |
| Kevin Smith | Marion County | kevin.smith@marioncountyfl.org |
| Jim Couillard | MCBCC Parks \& Recreation | jim.couillard@marioncountyfl.org |

A meeting was held with stakeholders for the trail crossing study being performed for the Ocala/Marion County TPO for two future trail crossing locations. The meeting was held to discuss the proposed trail crossings on SR 35/Baseline Road near Silver Springs State Park and on NE 58 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue near Indian Lake State Forest and to receive stakeholder input. Highlights of the main discussion points of the meeting are summarized below.

## 1. Overview of the Project

a. Amber provided an overview of the purpose and scope of the study and an overview of the overall planned trail network in Marion County was provided.
b. The trail network was first identified in the TPO's 2035 Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan and will provide for miles of paved trail within Marion County and connecting to the Heart of Florida loop.
c. Portions of the overall trail network have been constructed, others are currently in the construction phase, and others are in the design, planning, or pre-planning phase.
d. The study will focus on the roadway crossing treatment for two specific trails; the connection of the Downtown Ocala Trail to the Silver Springs Bikeway across SR 35, and the connection of the Indian Lake Trail to the Indian Lake State Forest and Campground across NE 58 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue.
e. The study is being performed in advance of the design phase for the future trail connections to provide a recommendation for the appropriate crossing type and location.

## 2. SR 35/Baseline Road Trail Crossing

a. A summary of the existing conditions of SR 35 was provided.
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b. There are two travel lanes in each direction, with additional pavement for left-turn and right-turn lanes. There is a +/- 30 -foot grassed median. The posted speed limit is 45 mph.
c. The appropriate crossing location was reviewed based on the existing conditions and geometry of SR 35.
d. A conceptual layout of the recommended crossing location and treatment was reviewed.

- Located +/- 800 feet south of the Silver Springs State Park entrance. This location provides for more median refuge area, separation from the turn lanes at the Silver Springs State Park Entrance, and good visibility for bicyclists and motorists.
- A pedestrian activated hybrid beacon is the recommended crossing treatment due to the high traffic volumes on the roadway, the high recorded vehicle speeds, and the large crossing distance.
- A 2-stage crossing will be provided to allow for reduced vehicular delays for crossing pedestrians/bicyclists.
- The hybrid beacon will be mounted overhead.
- High emphasis crosswalk markings will be utilized.
- Advanced warning signage is recommended with flashing beacons. The flashing beacons will only be activated when the pedestrian hybrid beacon is activated.
- The beacon operations were discussed in detail.
- A green, yellow, red indication was discussed.
- The recommendation for this location is a hybrid beacon, which operates in a combination of steady yellow, flashing yellow, steady red, and flashing red indications. The signal is dark until activated by a pedestrian/bicyclist.
f. Utilities (gas, water/sewer, electrical) along SR 35/Baseline Road were discussed and utility coordination will be needed to coordinate any impacts and/or relocations needed for the pedestrian activated hybrid beacon.
g. Alternative decorative treatment of the crosswalk was discussed. A high-emphasis crosswalk marking is the required treatment by FDOT design standards for a mid-block crossing location.


## 3. NE 58 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue Trail Crossing

a. A summary of the existing conditions of NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue was provided.

- The posted speed limit on NE 58th Avenue is 55 mph .
- The roadway is a two-lane undivided facility with low traffic volumes.


## Kimley»Horn

- There are superelevated curves in the area of the proposed trail crossing.
b. Three locations were reviewed for a potential crossing location, based on input from Marion County and the TPO; 100 feet north of the Silver Springs Conservation Area trailhead, at the Indian Lake State Forest trailhead, and at the Indian Lake State Forest northern access driveway.
c. The recommended trail crossing location is 100 feet north of the Silver Springs Conservation Area trailhead based on good sight distance for pedestrians/bicyclists and motorists and that the roadway is a normal crown section in this area, as opposed to a superelevated roadway section at the other two potential crossing locations.
d. A conceptual layout of the recommended crossing location and treatment was reviewed.
- Located $+/-100$ feet north of the Silver Springs Conservation Area trailhead to provide sufficient distance from the driveway to meet design requirements and provide for improved sight distance.
- A rectangular rapid flashing beacon is the recommended treatment for this location based on the low traffic volumes, high visibility, and narrow crossing distance.
- The RRFB will be pedestrian/sensor activated.
- High emphasis crosswalk markings will be utilized.
- Advanced warning signage will be provided.
e. Potential lighting treatments of the trail crossing were discussed as a safety improvement for increased visibility of the bicyclists/pedestrians crossing NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. Lighting will be included as a recommendation of the study.


## 4. Conclusion

a. The stakeholders present at the meeting were generally in support of the crossing locations and treatments reviewed.

This summary serves to document the November $8^{\text {th }}$, 2017 stakeholder meeting for the SR 35 \& NE $58^{\text {th }}$ Avenue trail crossing study. If anyone wishes to modify or append to this account, please contact Amber Gartner either by phone at 352-438-3000 or by email at amber.gartner@kimley-horn.com.

Submitted by:


Amber Gartner, PE

## ATTACHMENT 6: Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

## OCALA/ MARIONCOUNTYTPO TRALLCROSSINGSSTUDY STATE ROAD 35 CROSSNG AT SLVER SPRINGSSTATE PARK PLANNING LEVE OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST

| Construction Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITEM \# | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FDOT PAYTEM } \\ \text { NUMBER } \end{gathered}$ | DESCRIPIION | UNIT | QUANIITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |  |
| 1 | - | M OBILIZATION | LS | 1 | \$ 20,000.00 | \$ | 20,000.00 |
| 2 | - | M AINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC | LS | 1 | \$ 20,000.00 | \$ | 20,000.00 |
| 3 | 0110-4-10 | REM OVAL OF EXISTING CONCRETE | SY | 40 | \$ 13.50 | \$ | 540.00 |
| 4 | 0522-2 | CONCRETE SIDEWALK, 6" | SY | 95 | \$ 65.00 | \$ | 6,175.00 |
| 5 | 0527-2 | DETECTABLE WARNINGS | SF | 80 | \$ 40.00 | \$ | 3,200.00 |
| 6 | 0630-2-11 | CONDUIT (OPEN TRENCH) | LF | 680 | \$ 7.50 | \$ | 5,100.00 |
| 7 | 0630-2-12 | CONDUIT (DIRECTIONAL BORE) | LF | 150 | \$ 20.00 | \$ | 3,000.00 |
| 8 | 0630-2-14 | CONDUIT (ABOVE GROUND) | LF | 20 | \$ 26.00 | \$ | 520.00 |
| 9 | 0632-7-1 | SIGNAL CABLE | PI | 1 | \$ 7,000.00 | \$ | 7,000.00 |
| 10 | 0635-2-11 | PULL \& SPLICE BOX (13"x24") | EA | 10 | \$ 600.00 | \$ | 6,000.00 |
| 11 | 0639-1-122 | ELECTRICAL POWER SERVICE (OVERHEAD) | EA | 1 | \$ 2,500.00 | \$ | 2,500.00 |
| 12 | 0639-2-1 | ELECTRICAL SERVICE WIRE | LF | 100 | \$ 7.00 | \$ | 700.00 |
| 13 | 0641-12-12 | PRECAST CONCRETE POLE, TYPE P-II SERVICE | EA | 1 | \$ 1,500.00 | \$ | 1,500.00 |
| 14 | 0646-1-12 | PEDESTRIAN DETECTECTOR POST | EA | 2 | \$ 1,400.00 | \$ | 2,800.00 |
| 15 | 0649-21-10 | STEEL M AST ARM ASSEM BLY, 60' | EA | 2 | \$ 42,000.00 | \$ | 84,000.00 |
| 16 | 0653-1-11 | PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL, LED COUNTDOWN | AS | 4 | \$ 680.00 | \$ | 2,720.00 |
| 17 | 0654-3-10 | PEDESTRIAN HYBRID BEACON | AS | 4 | \$ 1,200.00 | \$ | 4,800.00 |
| 18 | 0665-1-12 | PEDESTRIAN DETECTOR | EA | 4 | \$ 1,750.00 | \$ | 7,000.00 |
| 19 | 0670-5-110 | TRAFFIC CONTROLLER ASSEM BLY | EA | 1 | \$ 28,000.00 | \$ | 28,000.00 |
| 20 | 0700-1-11 | SINGLE POST SIGN | AS | 6 | \$ 350.00 | \$ | 2,100.00 |
| 21 | 0700-12-21 | SIGN BEACON, AC | AS | 2 | \$ 4,000.00 | \$ | 8,000.00 |
| 22 | 0706-3 | RETRO-RELECTIVE PAVEM ENT M ARKERS | EA | 10 | \$ 7.00 | \$ | 70.00 |
| 23 | 0711-14-123 | THERM OPLASTIC, PREFORM, WHITE, SOLID, 12" | LF | 160 | \$ 10.00 | \$ | 1,600.00 |
| 24 | 0711-14-125 | THERM OPLASTIC, PREFORM, WHITE, SOLID, 24" | LF | 190 | \$ 20.00 | \$ | 3,800.00 |
| 25 | 0711-16-101 | THERM OPLASTIC, 6" WHITE | GM | 0.04 | \$ 4,700.00 | \$ | 178.03 |
| 26 | 0715-5-11 | LUM INAIRE \& BRACKET ARM | EA | 2 | \$ 2,750.00 | \$ | 5,500.00 |
|  |  |  | SUBIOTAL= |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 226,803 |
| Total Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CONTINGENCY (25\%) = |  |  | \$ | 56,700 |
|  |  |  | GRANDTOTAL = |  |  | \$ | 285,000 |
| Disclaimer: The Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Engineer at this time and represent only the Engineer's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Due to current conditions in the construction industry, this Opinion of Probable Construction Cost is based on the most recent data published by FDOT. The Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## OCALA/ MARIONCOUNTYTPOTRALCROSSNGSSTUDY NE 58IHAVENUE CROSSNG AT INDIAN LAKE STATE FOREST PLANNING LEVE OPINION OF PROBABLECONSTRUCTION COST

| Construction Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TEM \# | FDOT PAYITEM NUMBER | DESCRIPIION | UNT | QUANIITY | UNIT PRICE |  | OUNT |
| 1 | -- | M OBILIZATION | LS | 1 | \$ 5,000.00 | \$ | 5,000.00 |
| 2 | -- | M AINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC | LS | 1 | \$ 5,000.00 | \$ | 5,000.00 |
| 3 | 0630-2-11 | CONDUIT (OPEN TRENCH) | LF | 150 | \$ 7.50 | \$ | 1,125.00 |
| 4 | 0630-2-14 | CONDUIT (ABOVE GROUND) | LF | 20 | \$ 26.00 | \$ | 520.00 |
| 5 | 0635-2-11 | PULL \& SPLICE BOX (13"x24") | EA | 2 | \$ 600.00 | \$ | 1,200.00 |
| 6 | 0639-1-122 | ELECTRICAL POWER SERVICE (OVERHEAD) | EA | 1 | \$ 2,500.00 | \$ | 2,500.00 |
| 7 | 0639-2-1 | ELECTRICAL SERVICE WIRE | LF | 150 | \$ 7.00 | \$ | 1,050.00 |
| 8 | 0641-12-12 | PRESTRESSED CONCRETE POLE, TYPE P-II SERVICE | EA | 1 | \$ 1,500.00 | \$ | 1,500.00 |
| 9 | 0665-1-12 | PEDESTRIAN DETECTOR | EA | 2 | \$ 1,750.00 | \$ | 3,500.00 |
| 10 | 0700-1-11 | SINGLE POST SIGN | AS | 4 | \$ 350.00 | \$ | 1,400.00 |
| 11 | 0700-12-22 | FLASHING YELLOW WARNING BEACONS, SOLAR | AS | 2 | \$ 6,000.00 | \$ | 12,000.00 |
| 12 | 0711-14123 | SPECIAL EM PHASIS CROSSWALK M ARKING, 12" | LF | 50 | \$ 10.00 | \$ | 500.00 |
| 13 | 0711-14125 | SPECIAL EM PHASIS CROSSWALK M ARKING, 24" | LF | 50 | \$ 20.00 | \$ | 1,000.00 |
| 14 | 0715-4-11 | LIGHT POLE, 30' | EA | 1 | \$ 4,500.00 | \$ | 4,500.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBIOTAL= |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 40,795 |
| Total Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CONINGENCY (25\%) = |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 6,100 |
| GRANDTOTAL= |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 46,000 |
| Disclaimer: The Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Engineer at this time and represent only the Engineer's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Due to current conditions in the construction industry, this Opinion of Probable Construction Cost is based on the most recent data published by FDOT. The Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

February 8, 2018

## TO: TAC/CAC Committee Members

FROM: Kenneth Odom, Transportation Planner/Project Manager
SUBJECT: Greenway Trails Update

The Santos and Land Bridge Trail sections on the Marjorie Harris-Carr Cross Florida Greenway are nearing completion. These two sections comprise a total of nineteen miles of the approximately twenty-seven miles that are planned from the Santos trailhead to the Bridges Road Trailhead west of the City of Dunnellon.

TPO staff will be presenting an update on the trails construction and basic information regarding each segment. Official opening of these two segments will take place on February $27^{\text {th }}$ at the Santos trailhead, time to be announced.

Should you have any questions prior to the regularly scheduled meeting, please contact TPO staff at 352-629-8297.




## MEMORANDUM

February 9, 2018

## TO: TAC/CAC MEMBERS

FROM: MIKE DANIELS, DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: Freight Priority Project Submittal Application

The Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC) Freight Committee developed a Freight Priority Projects list to be included for consideration for FDOT's annual work program.

The purpose of the list is to prioritize high priority projects Statewide and that the MPOAC, as the association representing all MPOs in Florida, has the opportunity to promote and endorse these priorities on behalf of its members for consideration by the FDOT.
The overview of the process is provided below:

- Each MPO can submit up to 3 freight roadway projects annually for inclusion in the freight priority list; projects must fall on state facilities;
- Projects must have completed the PD\&E process and be ready for design and/or construction funding;
- A screening checklist must be completed for each project; this information will illustrate the project is a freight priority;
- List of freight priorities will undergo MPOAC approval process annually (Freight Committee, Staff Directors Committee, Governing Board)
- Approved list will be transmitted to FDOT Freight Logistics and Passenger Operation (FLP) Office.
- Intent is to influence funding decisions relating to the new $5^{\text {th }}$ year of FDOT's work program as well any changes to years 1 thru 4.

The project checklist and additional information regarding the MPOAC Freight Priorities as presented to the MPOAC Governing Board has been provided in your packet.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call our office at 629-8297.

## Establishing Freight Project Priorities as Input to FDOT's Work Program

Presented to<br>MPOAC Staff Directors' Committee<br>and<br>MPOAC Governing Board

Presented by
Michael Williamson, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
Todd Braver, White House Group, Inc.

## Agenda

- Review purpose and need
- Describe methodology
- Demonstrate methodology
- Request approval to present to Governing Board


## Review Purpose and Need

What is the Purpose?

- To ensure MPOs have an opportunity to identify high priority freight projects on an annual basis, and that the MPOAC, as the association representing all MPOs in Florida, has the opportunity to promote and endorse these priorities on behalf of its members, for consideration by the FDOT



## Review Purpose and Need How Did We Get Here?

- FMTP Policy and Investment Elements completed in 2013 and 2014
- MPOAC Freight Advisory Committee formed in 2013
- How Should MPOs Engage in Setting Freight Priorities, October 29, 2015
- Continuing the Discussion, July 18, 2016
- MPOAC's Opportunity to Enhance the Definition of Florida's Freight Priorities, October 2016
- MPOAC Freight Committee Workshop, April 6, 2017
- MPOAC Freight Committee Discussion and Approval, July 19, 2017
- FAST Act signed December 2015
- Florida Freight Advisory Committee Inaugural Meeting, April 21, 2017



## Review Purpose and Need

Why is the Setting of Priorities Important?

- Florida's MPOs must have every advantage possible to compete for available funding
- State freight priorities address the most strategic freight needs
- MPOs drive project development and priorities within established planning boundaries
- Each MPO should include freight considerations in project prioritization methodologies
- Unified input by MPOs and the MPOAC to FDOT on freight priorities will help ensure local and regional freight needs are addressed in funding decisions



## Describe Methodology <br> Overview of Process

- Each MPO can submit up to 3 freight roadway projects annually for inclusion in the freight priority list; projects must fall on state facilities
- Projects must have completed the PD\&E process and be ready for design and/or construction funding
- A screening check list must be completed for each project; this information will illustrate the project is a freight priority
- List of freight priorities will undergo MPOAC approval process annually (Freight Committee, Staff Directors' Committee, Governing Board)
- Approved list will be transmitted to FDOT FLP Office with cc to each District Freight Coordinator; MPOAC leadership will work with FDOT leadership to ensure this list of freight priorities is considered
- Intent is to influence funding decisions relating to the new $5^{\text {th }}$ year of FDOT's work program as well as any changes to years 1 thru 4


## Describe Methodology <br> Project Check List
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## Instructions and Support to be Provided

## MPOAC Freight Priority Screening Instructi

Each MPO can submit up to 3 freight projects annually (located within the inclusion in the statewide MPO freight priority list. For 2018, the focus will state facilities.

A screening check list must be completed for each project. This informatio freight priority and is ready for advancement. Projects must have progress must have regional support. Screening questions focus on project readines benefits, and funding need. As an annual process, the intent is to influence new 5th year of FDOT's work program as well as any changes to years 1 thr

The MPOAC Freight Committee will review and approve the aggregated list be presented to MPOAC Executive Committee for endorsement/approval. be transmitted to FDOT FLP Office with cc to each District Freight Coordina with FDOT leadership to ensure this list of freight priorities is considered a allocation process.

## Florida Transportation Plan - Goals

1. Safety and security for residents, visitors, and businesses
2. Agile, resilient, and quality infrastructure
3. Efficient and reliable mobility for people and freight
4. More transportation choices for people and freight
5. Transportation solutions that support Florida's global economic co
6. Transportation solutions that support quality places to live, learn,
7. Transportation solutions that support Florida's environment and cc

| MPO Name: | Enter MPO Name |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project Number: | An MPO can submit up to three projects; the project number value should be 1, 2, or 3 . |
| Year | Enter current year (year of submittal) |
| Facility Name: | Enter roadway/facility name (e.g., state route) |
| Extent of Project: | Enter a description in to/from fields that establishes project limits (e.g., milepost) |
| Project Description: | Provide short description of project (e.g., add two lanes) |
| Describe freight usage of the facility (volumes, connections, etc.): | Provide short description of freight usage (e.g., AADTT, Truck Percent, connector status) |
| Has the project completed the PD\&E process (ready to move directly to design/construction)? | [yes/no] If no, this project is not eligible for the project priority list. |
| Does the project have regional support? If so, please provide documentation. | [yes/no] If yes, provide description documenting support. The existence of significant opposition should be considered before submitting a project as a priority. |
| Is the project identified as a freight priority by the MPO and its partners (i.e. seaport, airport, railroad)? If yes, how was this priority determined? | [yes/no] If yes, provide short description of how the priority was determined and by which entity. |
| Is the project included in an adopted plan (freight plan, LRTP, TIP, CIP, master plan)? If yes, which one(s)? | [yes/no] If yes, identify the plan(s) documenting the project. |
| Is the project on a priority freight network (e.g., NHFN, CUFC, CRFC, SIS, regional freight network)? Please describe. | [yes/no] If yes, identify the network(s) that contains the project facility. |
| Does the project support one or more FTP goals? If so, which ones? | [yes/no] If yes, identify the goals addressed by the project. |
| Does the project improve economic competitiveness? If yes, please describe. | [yes/no] If yes, describe the impacts of the improvement. |
| Does the project add capacity or improve operations? If yes, please describe. | [yes/no] If yes, describe the impacts of the improvement. |
| Is the project a critical next step in a series of linked projects? If yes, please describe. | [yes/no] If yes, describe the larger project or group of projects this improvement will support. |
| Please provide the year(s) of your funding request. | Provide the year for which funding is being requested. |

## Illustrative List Based on Project Submittals

| MPO Name: | Facility Name: | Extent of Project (From) | Extent of Project <br> (To) | Project Description: | Funding Year Request |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bay County TPO | US 231 | US 98 | US 20 | 6-laning of US 231 | FY 22/23 |
| Bay County TPO | Gulf to Bay Highway | US 98 | Bay/Gulf County Line | New four lane road | FY 22/23 |
| Broward MPO | SR 9/ I-95 | Interchange @ Broward Blvd/SR 84 |  | Interchange improvement | FY 2023 |
| Broward MPO | Sawgrass Expressway/ <br> SR 869 | SR 7 | Powerline Rd | Widens the Sawgrass Expressway from six to ten travel lanes. | FY 2022 |
| Florida - Alabama TPO | SR 95 (US 29) Interchange | I-10 and US 29 interchange |  | I-10 /US 29 interchange Major Improvement Phase 2 | FY 22/23 |
| Florida - Alabama TPO | SR 8 (I-10) | SR 10 (90A) Nine Mile Rd | W of SR 95 (US 29) | Widen I-10 to 6 lanes | FY 22/23 |
| MetroPlan Orlando | US 17/92 | Polk / Osceola County Line | West of Poinciana Blvd | Wide from 2 to 4 lanes and intersection improements | FY 2021/2022 for PE \& FY 2023/2024 for CST |
| MetroPlan Orlando | SR 535 | Interstate 4 | US 192 | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes with operational improvements | FY 2021/2022 for PE \& FY 2023/2024 for CST |
| MetroPlan Orlando | SR 15 / 600 US 17/92 | Norfolk Ave | Monroe Street | Median and safety improvements \& extend road | FY 2019/2020 for CST |
| Miami-Dade TPO | SR 826/PALMETTO EXPWY | NW 154 STREET | NW 17 AVENUE | Add Special Use Lane (7.143 miles) | 2021 |
| Miami-Dade TPO | GOLDEN GLADES INTERCHANGE |  |  | Intermodal Hub Capacity | 2023 |
| Miami-Dade TPO | GOLDEN GLADES INTERCHANGE | MP OX |  | Interchange Improvements (FDOT Turnpike Enterprise) | 2021 |
| Okaloosa-Walton TPO | US 98 | Mack Bayou Blvd | 30 A West | Widen US 98 to six lanes | FY 22/23 |
| Okaloosa-Walton TPO | US 331 | US 90 | Alabama State Line | Widen US 331 to 4 lanes | FY 22/23 |
| Palm Beach MPO | SR 80 Bypass | US 27/SR 80 | US 441/SR 715 | Construct a new two lane facility to support an inland logistics center in the Glades Region of Palm Beach County | 2025 |

## Describe Methodology <br> Planned Schedule

- MPOs will submit projects by mid March
- Projects will be reviewed by MPOAC Freight Committee; any requests for clarifications or additional information will be distributed

- Projects will be approved for inclusion on the list at MPOAC Freight Committee Meeting in April
- List of projects will be presented to both the Staff Directors' Committee and the Governing Board for approval in June
- Approved list transmitted to FDOT in July for consideration in development of work program


## Next Steps

- MPOAC Staff Directors' Committee Approval
- Do you approve this program?
- Governing Board Approval
- Do you approve this program?
- Discuss next steps for 2018 roll out with MPOAC Freight Committee

| Financial Project No. | Description | Work Mix Description | Contractor Name | Original Amount | $\begin{gathered} \text { Original } \\ \text { Contract Days } \end{gathered}$ | Work Begin | Estimated Completion | Status | Lane Closures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 238693-1 | SR 35 (Baseline Road) from SE 92nd Loop to SR 464 | ADD LANES \& RECONSTRUCT | D.A.B. CONSTRUCTORS, INC. | \$17,605,644.00 | 850 | 8/28/2015 | 11/11/2018 | Working in all basins with embankment, subgrade, base, sidewalk, gravity wall and asphalt. | Monday, February 5th, 2018 to Wednesday, February 28th, 2018 <br> A traffic shift will be in effect starting Thursday night, Feb. 8. The new traffic pattern begins near the Church @ The Springs, approximately one-half mile south of SE Maricamp Road, and ends at Dogwood Trail Pass. Signage is already posted. Please slow down and be alert while driving through the construction zone. |
| 435057-1 | Lighting Project at CR 484, CR 318 and SR 326 | Lighting | United Signs and Signals | \$3,075,596.26 | 290 | 11/14/2017 | 9/8/2018 | Working at CR 318 and SR 326 with Drilled Shafts and Counduit | No lane closures anticipated. |
| 434408 | SR 40 Brooks Road | Mill and Resurface | DAB | \$413,888.88 | 90 | 12/9/2017 | 2/9/2018 | Started work on 12/11/2017 with MOT and Erosion Control. Paving will start on 1/8/2018 | No lane closures anticipated. |
| 436371 | US 441 North | Pavement | ACKA | \$142,000.00 | 60 | 10/25/2017 | 12/19/2017 | Completed. |  |
| 437828-1 | Landscaping at I 75 at 20th and 43 | Landscaping | Gainesville Landscape Contractors | \$438,500.00 | 800 | 7/27/2017 | 10/18/2019 | Contract in plant establishment time frame now. | N/A |
| 437818-1 | Landscape at CR318 | Landscaping | Frankie Valdez Co Inc. | \$407,700.00 | 820 | 10/31/2016 | 2/11/2019 | Contract in plant establishment time frame now. | N/A |
| 435466-1 | Landscaping at I 75 at SR 200 and US 27 | Landscaping | Gainesville Landscape Contractors | \$594,750.00 | 870 | 08/21/15 | 01/19/18 | Contract in plant establishment time frame now. | N/A |
| TRAFFIC OPERATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Financial Project No. | Description |  | Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | US 27/ CR 464B Directional median opening |  | To be sent to design. Access management team will schedule public hearing and 180 day waiting period. Public Hearing on March 8, 2018, location is TBD. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | SR 464 at SE 53rd Ave/Rotary Sportplex |  | Median opening construction and turn lane extension. Design complete. Work Order to be submitted for construction. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | US 27 @ CR 326 |  | Supplemental warning beacons on signal ahead signs. Design complete. NTP with Work Order \#1 submiteed, construction to begin in 90 days. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | SR 40 @ SR 492 |  | Add right turn signal heads, restripe right turn lane. Waiting on design work order to be sent out. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Contact Information:
mie Kersey, TPO
66-943-5338
amie.kersev@dot.state.fl.us

Mike McCammon, Ocala Operations Engine
(352) 620-3001

Michael.McCammon@dot.state.fl.us

For additional information on these projects as well as future projects, please go to www.cflroads.com

## FDOT



PROJECT
U.S. 27 at

County Road (C.R.) 464B Safety Improvements Median Modification Marion County

LOCATION Fellowship Baptist Church 10500 U.S. 27 Ocala, FL 34482 Thursday March 8, 2018 5:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.

The Florida Department of Transportation will conduct a public hearing for the proposed safety improvements on U.S. 27 at the intersection of C.R. 464B. The project addresses operational and safety concerns in the area by converting the full median opening to a bi-directional median opening. Northbound and southbound left turns from U.S. 27 will still be permitted, but the C.R. 464B intersection with U.S. 27 will be converted to right turn only. This modification reduces traffic conflict points at the intersection, improving safety.
This public hearing is being conducted to give interested persons an opportunity to express their views concerning the location, conceptual design, and social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed improvements. Draft project documents and other information will be available for public review from February 15 through March 19, 2018 at the Marion County Public Library Headquarters, 2720 E. Silver Springs Blvd., Ocala, FL 34470.

Participants may provide verbal comments directly to a court reporter before and after the formal presentation. Persons wishing to submit statements, in place of or in addition to oral statements, may do so at the hearing or by sending them to: Dave Mixon, Florida Department of Transportation, District Five Roadway Design, 719 S. Woodland Boulevard, M.S. No. 562, DeLand, FL 32720 or Dave.Mixon@dot.state.fl.us.
All statements postmarked on or before March 19, 2018 will become part of the public hearing record.
Persons with disabilities who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Kelly Hiden, Public Involvement Coordinator by phone at 407-508-0839, or via email at Kelly@valerin-group.com at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting. If you are hearing or speech impaired, please contact us by using the Florida Relay Service, 1-800-955-8771 (TDD) or 1-800-955-8770 (Voice).

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 at Jennifer.Smith2@dot.state.fl.us.

