



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Ocala Citizens Service Center
201 SE 3rd Street, Ocala FL 34478

September 8, 2015

MINUTES

Members Present:

Eddie Esch, Vice-chairman
Sue Farnsworth
Gennie Garcia
Dave Herlihy
Masood Mirza
Kellie Smith
Kevin Smith
Lisa Walsh (*for Mike Daniels*)

Members Not Present:

Winston Schuler
Mickey Thomason

Others Present:

Greg Slay, TPO Director
John Voges, TPO Staff
Ken Odom, TPO Staff
Ann McGaffic, TPO Staff
Kayleen Hamilton, TPO Staff
Mike McCammon, FDOT
Wally Blain, Tindale-Oliver and Associates

Item 1. Call To Order And Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 10:03 AM by Vice-chairman Eddie Esch. Secretary Kayleen Hamilton called the roll. A quorum was present.

Item 2. Proof Of Publication

Secretary Kayleen Hamilton stated that the meeting had been published online on the TPO website and Facebook page and on the city of Ocala, Belleview, and Dunnellon websites.

Item 3a. Long Range Transportation Plan Presentation

Mr. Slay reported that the Long range Transportation Plan (LRTP) was scheduled for adoption in November. Staff would be asking the TPO to open a 60-day public comment period at its September meeting. Mr. Slay said that staff was not asking for action from the committee on the LRTP but would accept any comments the committee had.

Mr. Wally Blain from Tindale-Oliver and Associates stated that though there was no way to know for certain what the future would look like, there were tools that could be used as guides to build the community. Mr. Blain reviewed the vision statement for the LRTP. The plan goals were to provide multimodal choices, foster economic growth, improve safety and security, ensure cooperation among partners, create quality places, and preserve the existing transportation system. Mr. Blain said that the final plan would contain measurements to gauge progress.

The final needs assessment identified approximately \$1.4 billion in needed projects across highway, transit, and trail modes. Since the draft needs assessment had been presented in August, a new project – NW 44th Avenue from SR 200 to SR 40 – had been added.

Mr. Blain explained that in the cost feasible plan, local projects were grouped by jurisdiction and ordered by priority groups. Priority 1 listed funded projects, and Mr. Blain said that additional funding was figured in for intelligent transportation system improvements. The plan did not assume that gas tax revenues would be used for new project; those revenues were solely set aside for operation and maintenance of the transportation system. The cost feasible plan contained approximately \$566 million in projects. Cost feasible transit projects included bus shelter improvements, continuation of the existing routes and paratransit service, and improved frequency on four of the routes. Mr. Blain said that there was some flexibility with regards to the cost feasible trail projects; at present, there was \$29 million identified for trail priorities.

Mr. Blain reviewed results from polling questions that asked participants about funding projects and compared the trends with the structure of the cost feasible plan. The cost feasible plan allocated about 78% of its budget to highway improvements, 12% to transit, 5% to bicycle and pedestrian safety, and about 5% to intelligent transportation system/congestion management projects.

The cost feasible plan was scheduled for presentation to the TPO board at its September meeting, which would open a public comment period. Adoption was scheduled for November.

Mr. Smith mentioned a proposed tax referendum and asked how it would work into the LRTP. Mr. Blain said that it had been looked at as a possibility in the cost feasible plan; however, it did

not figure prominently as a potential revenue source. Mr. Slay added that since the tax was proposed to start in four years, if the referendum passed, projects could be accelerated. Mr. Herlihy asked about the rationale behind choosing projects to fund, and Mr. Slay said that it was roughly based on the TPO's annual priority projects list. Mr. Herlihy asked about the impact to the transportation network of not doing the unfunded projects, and Mr. Slay answered that the biggest issue was I-75. There were no unfunded local projects that caused concern for the network. Mr. Slay mentioned that the TPO preferred not to expand any roads to six lanes unless it was strongly tied to economic development. Mr. Slay said that there were several unfunded projects that staff would monitor for need.

Item 4. Comments by FDOT

Ms. Smith announced that there was a public hearing that evening for the NE 25th Avenue and NE 36th Avenue PD&E.

Item 5. Comments by TPO Staff

Mr. Slay reported that once the TPO board had approved the LRTP draft, the documents would be posted on the LRTP website. Mr. Slay commented that staff would like to get as much feedback on the plan as possible.

Item 6. Comments by TAC Members

There were no further staff comments.

Item 7. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Item 8. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned by Mr. Esch at 10:38 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Kayleen Hamilton, TPO Administrative Assistant