



APPENDICES

OCALA MARION 2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

OCALA MARION
TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING
ORGANIZATION

NOVEMBER 2020



APPENDIX A – FEDERAL/STATE REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST

APPENDIX B – GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

APPENDIX C – LRTP PUBIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

APPENDIX D – METROQUEST SURVEY SUMMARY

APPENDIX E – GOALS AND OBJECTIVES TECH MEMORANDUM

APPENDIX F – SYSTEM PERFORMANCE REPORT

APPENDIX G – PLAN SYNTHESIS TECH MEMORANDUM

APPENDIX H – FINANCIAL RESOURCES TECH MEMORANDUM

APPENDIX I – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY

APPENDIX J – MCORES PROJECT

APPENDIX K - TECHNICAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS



APPENDIX A

FEDERAL/STATE REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST

FDOT LRTP Review Checklist

SECTION A- FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS		WHERE AND HOW ADDRESSED
23 C.F.R. Part 450 – Planning Assistance and Standards		
A-1	<p>Does the plan cover a 20-year horizon from the date of adoption?</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(a)</p>	<p>Yes, the plan covers the period between 2021 and 2045, covering 25 years</p>
A-2	<p>Does the plan address the planning factors described in 23 C.F.R. 450.306(b)?</p> <p>Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Risk and Resiliency</p> <p>Does the plan improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation?</p> <p>Travel and Tourism</p> <p>Does that plan enhance travel and tourism?</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(a)</p>	<p>Chapter 2, Appendix E</p> <p>Chapter 5, Appendix K</p>
A-3	<p>Does the plan include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that provide for the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(b)</p>	<p>Chapter 5</p>
A-4	<p>Was the requirement to update the plan at least every five years met?</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(c)</p>	<p>Yes, the 2040 LRTP was adopted on November 24, 2015 and the 2045 plan was adopted on November 24, 2020</p>

SECTION A- FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS	WHERE AND HOW ADDRESSED
<p>A-5 Did the MPO coordinate the development of the metropolitan transportation plan with the process for developing transportation control measures (TCMs) in a State Implementation Plan (SIP)?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(d)</p>	<p>Not applicable, as Ocala Marion urbanized area is in attainment status.</p>
<p>A-6 Was the plan updated based on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity?</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(e)</p>	<p>Chapters 1 and 5</p>
<p>A-7 Does the plan include the current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the plan?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(1)</p>	<p>Chapters 1 and 5</p>
<p>A-8 Does the plan include existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, public transportation facilities, intercity bus facilities, multimodal and intermodal facilities, nonmotorized transportation facilities, and intermodal connectors that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(2)</p>	<p>Chapters 1 and 5</p>
<p>A-9 Does the plan include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with §450.306(d)?</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(3)</p>	<p>Appendix F</p>

SECTION A- FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS	WHERE AND HOW ADDRESSED
<p>A-10</p> <p>Does the plan include a system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets described in §450.306(d), including progress achieved by the metropolitan planning organization in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data?</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(4)(i)</p>	<p>Appendix F</p>

SECTION A- FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS	WHERE AND HOW ADDRESSED
<p>Did the MPO integrate in the metropolitan transportation planning process, directly or by reference, the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in other State transportation plans and transportation processes, as well as any plans developed under 49 U.S.C. chapter 53 by providers of public transportation, required as part of a performance-based program including:</p> <p>(i) The State asset management plan for the NHS, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the Transit Asset Management Plan, as discussed in 49 U.S.C. 5326;</p> <p>(ii) Applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP, as specified in 23 U.S.C. 148;</p> <p>(iii) The Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan in 49 U.S.C. 5329(d);</p> <p>A-11 (iv) Other safety and security planning and review processes, plans, and programs, as appropriate;</p> <p>(v) The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program performance plan in 23 U.S.C. 149(l), as applicable;</p> <p>(vi) Appropriate (metropolitan) portions of the State Freight Plan (MAP-21 section 1118);</p> <p>(vii) The congestion management process, as defined in 23 CFR 450.322, if applicable; and</p> <p>(viii) Other State transportation plans and transportation processes required as part of a performance-based program.</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.306 (d)(4)</p>	<p>Appendices E and G</p>
<p>A-12 Does the plan include operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(5)</p>	<p>Chapters 5 and 7</p>

SECTION A- FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS	WHERE AND HOW ADDRESSED
<p>A-13 Does the plan include consideration of the results of the congestion management process in TMAs, including the identification of SOV projects that result from a congestion management process in TMAs that are nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(6)</p>	<p>Not applicable, as Ocala Marion TPO is not a TMA. The TPO is embarking on a CMP update in January 2021</p>
<p>A-14 Does the plan include assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure, provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs, and reduce the vulnerability of the existing transportation infrastructure to natural disasters?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(7)</p>	<p>Chapters 5 and 7</p>
<p>A-15 Does the plan include transportation and transit enhancement activities, including consideration of the role that intercity buses may play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption in a cost-effective manner and strategies and investments that preserve and enhance intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated, and including transportation alternatives, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a), and associated transit improvements, as described in 49 U.S.C. 5302(a)?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(8)</p>	<p>Chapter 5</p>
<p>A-16 Does the plan describe all proposed improvements in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates?</p> <p>Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(9)</p>	<p>Chapters 5 and 7</p>

SECTION A- FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS	WHERE AND HOW ADDRESSED
<p>A-17 Does the plan include a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the metropolitan transportation plan?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(10)</p>	<p>Chapters 4 and 5</p>
<p>A-18 Does the plan include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented?</p> <p>Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)</p>	<p>Chapter 6, Appendix H</p>
<p>A-19 Does the plan include system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways and public transportation?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(i)</p>	<p>Chapters 6 and 7, Appendix H</p>
<p>A-20 Did the MPO, public transportation operator(s), and State cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, as required under §450.314(a)?</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(ii)</p>	<p>Chapter 6, Appendix H</p>
<p>A-21 Does the financial plan include recommendations on additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the plan, and, in the case of new funding sources, identify strategies for ensuring their availability?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(iii)</p>	<p>Appendix H</p>
<p>A-22 Does the plan's revenue and cost estimates use inflation rates that reflect year of expenditure dollars, based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s)?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(iv)</p>	<p>Chapters 6 and 7, Appendix H</p>

SECTION A- FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS		WHERE AND HOW ADDRESSED
A-23	<p>Does the financial plan address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of TCMs in the applicable SIP?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(vi)</p>	Not applicable, as Florida is in attainment status
A-24	<p>Does the plan include pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 U.S.C.17(g)?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(12)</p>	Chapters 5 and 7
A-25	<p>Does the plan integrate the priorities, goals, countermeasures, strategies, or projects for the metropolitan planning area contained in the HSIP, including the SHSP, the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan, or an Interim Agency Safety Plan?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(h)</p>	Chapter 2, Appendix E
A-26	<p>Does the plan identify the current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the plan?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(g)(1)</p>	Chapter 5, Appendix K
A-27	<p>Did the MPO provide individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cashout program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under §450.316(a)?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(j)</p>	Chapter 3

SECTION A- FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS	WHERE AND HOW ADDRESSED
<p>Did the MPO publish or otherwise make readily available the metropolitan transportation plan for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web?</p> <p>A-28 Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(k), 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(1)(iv)</p>	<p>Yes, the draft plan was published at least 30 days prior to adoption</p>
<p>Did the MPO provide adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan?</p> <p>A-29 Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R 450.316(a)(1)(i)</p>	<p>Yes, multiple newspaper advertisements (print and web) were made, flyers were distributed at venues for at least one week prior to workshops, and social media was used extensively to advertise public involvement opportunities. Appendix I</p>
<p>In developing the plan, did the MPO seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems such as low-income and minority households?</p> <p>A-30 Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R 450.316(a)(1)(vii)</p>	<p>Chapter 3</p>
<p>Has the MPO demonstrated explicit consideration of and response to public input received during development of the plan? If significant written and oral comments were received on the draft plan, is a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of the comments part of the final plan?</p> <p>A-31 Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(1)(vi) & 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(2)</p>	<p>Chapter 3, Appendix I</p>

SECTION A- FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS	WHERE AND HOW ADDRESSED
<p>A-32 Did the MPO provide an additional opportunity for public comment if the final plan differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment and raises new material issues which interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R 450.316(a)(1)(viii)</p>	TBD
<p>A-33 Did the MPO consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPO planning area that are affected by transportation, or coordinate its planning process (to the maximum extent practicable) with such planning activities?</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.316(b)</p>	Chapter 3
<p>A-34 If the MPO planning area includes Indian Tribal lands, did the MPO appropriately involve the Indian Tribal government(s) in the development of the plan?</p> <p>23 C.F.R 450.316(c)</p>	Not applicable, there are no tribal lands in Marion County
<p>A-35 If the MPO planning area includes Federal public lands, did the MPO appropriately involve Federal land management agencies in the development of the plan?</p> <p>23 C.F.R 450.316(d)</p>	Chapters 3 and 4
<p>A-36 In urbanized areas that are served by more than one MPO, is there written agreement among the MPOs, the State, and public transportation operator(s) describing how the metropolitan transportation planning processes will be coordinated to assure the development of consistent plans across the planning area boundaries, particularly in cases in which a proposed transportation investment extends across those boundaries?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.314(e)</p>	Chapter 3

SECTION B- STATE REQUIREMENTS		WHERE AND HOW ADDRESSED
Florida Statutes: Title XXVI – Public Transportation, Chapter 339, Section 175		
B-1	<p>Are the prevailing principles in s. 334.046(1), F.S. – preserving the existing transportation infrastructure, enhancing Florida's economic competitiveness, and improving travel choices to ensure mobility – reflected in the plan?</p> <p>ss.339.175(1), (5) and (7), F.S.</p>	Chapters 2 and 5, Appendix E
B-2	<p>Does the plan give emphasis to facilities that serve important national, state, and regional transportation functions, including SIS and TRIP facilities?</p> <p>ss.339.175(1) and (7)(a), F.S.</p>	Chapters 5 and 7
B-3	<p>Is the plan consistent, to the maximum extent feasible, with future land use elements and the goals, objectives, and policies of the approved comprehensive plans for local governments in the MPO's metropolitan planning area?</p> <p>ss.339.175(5) and (7), F.S.</p>	Chapter 2, Appendices E and G
B-4	<p>Did the MPO consider strategies that integrate transportation and land use planning to provide for sustainable development and reduce greenhouse gas emissions?</p> <p>ss.339.175(1) and (7) F.S.</p>	Chapter 5
B-5	<p>Were the goals and objectives identified in the Florida Transportation Plan considered?</p> <p>s.339.175(7)(a), F.S.</p>	Chapter 2, Appendix E
B-6	<p>Does the plan assess capital investment and other measures necessary to 1) ensure the preservation of the existing metropolitan transportation system, including requirements for the operation, resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of major roadways and requirements for the operation, maintenance, modernization, and rehabilitation of public transportation facilities; and</p> <p>2) make the most efficient use of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the mobility of people and goods?</p> <p>s.339.175(7)(c), F.S.</p>	Chapter 5

SECTION B- STATE REQUIREMENTS		WHERE AND HOW ADDRESSED
B-7	Does the plan indicate, as appropriate, proposed transportation enhancement activities, including, but not limited to, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, scenic easements, landscaping, historic preservation, mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff, and control of outdoor advertising? s.339.175(7)(d), F.S.	Chapter 5
B-8	Was the plan approved on a recorded roll call vote or hand-counted vote of the majority of the membership present? s.339.175(13) F.S.	TBD

SECTION C- PROACTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS		WHERE AND HOW ADDRESSED
C-1	Does the plan attempt to improve the resilience and reliability of the transportation system or mitigate the impacts of stormwater on surface transportation? 23 C.F.R 450.306(b)(9)	Chapters 2 and 5
C-2	Does the plan proactively identify climate adaptation strategies including—but not limited to—assessing specific areas of vulnerability, identifying strategies to reduce emissions by promoting alternative modes of transportation, or devising specific climate adaptation policies to reduce vulnerability?	Chapters 2 and 5
C-3	Do the plan consider the transportation system's accessibility, mobility, and availability to better serve an aging population?	Chapter 4
C-4	Does the plan consider strategies to promote inter-regional connectivity to accommodate both current and future mobility needs?	Chapter 3
C-5	Is the MPO considering the short- and long-term effects of population growth and or shifts on the transportation network?	Chapter 4

APPENDIX B

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

ACES	Automated, Connected, Electric, and Shared Use vehicles
ADS	Advanced Driving Systems
AV	Automated Vehicle
BEBR	Bureau of Economic and Business Research
BMAP	Basin Management Action Plan
BMP	Best Management Practice
BOD	Biological Oxygen Demand
CAC	Ocala Marion Citizens Advisory Committee
CDB	Corridor Demand Balancing
CFP	Cost Feasible Plan
CFRPM	Central Florida Regional Planning Model
CR	County Road
CV	Connected Vehicle
DRASTIC	Depth Recharge Aquifer Soil Topography Impact Conductivity
EJ	Environmental Justice
EPDO	Equivalent Property Damage Only
ESOZ	Environmentally Sensitive Overlay Zone
EST	Environmental Screening Tool
ETDM	Efficient Transportation Decision Making
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FAC	Freight Activity Center
FAST Act	Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FDOT	Florida Department of Transportation
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Administration
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FRAME	Florida Regional Advanced Mobility Elements
FTP	Florida Transportation Plan
FWC	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
G&O	Goals and Objectives
GIS	Geographical Information System
HSP	Florida Highway Safety Plan
IT	Information Technology
ITS	Intelligent Transportation System
LOPP	List of Project Priorities
LRTP	Long Range Transportation Plan
MaaS	Mobility as a Service
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
NWI	National Wetland Inventory
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
OFS	Outstanding Florida Springs
PIP	Public Involvement Plan

SHSP	Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan
SIS	Strategic Intermodal System
SIS	Florida Strategic Intermodal System
SPOZ	Springs Protection Overlay Zone
SR	State Road
SWFMD	Southwest Florida Water Management District
SWIM	Surface Water Improvement and Management
TA	Transportation Alternatives (various forms including TALT, TALU, TALL)
TAC	Ocala Marion Technical Advisory Committee
TAZ	Transportation Analysis Zone
TDLCB	Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board
TDP	Transit Development Plan
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TMA	Transportation Management Area
TMC	Traffic Management Center
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Loads
TNC	Transportation Network Company
TPO	Transportation Planning Organization
TRIP	Transportation Regional Incentives Program
UAM	Urban Aerial Mobility
USEPA	United States Department of Environmental Protection
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
V/C	Volume to Capacity Ratio
V2X	Vehicle to Everything
VHT	Vehicle Hours Traveled
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
WEC	World Equestrian Center

APPENDIX C

LRTP PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

OCTOBER
2019

CONTENTS

KEY ISSUES 4

PUBLIC OUTREACH METHODS 4

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES	5
MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS	5
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS	5
PUBLIC WORKSHOP MATERIALS AND NOTIFICATION	7
TPO BOARD AND COMMITTEES	7
STEERING COMMITTEE	7
STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS	7

PUBLIC OUTREACH AND SOCIAL MEDIA 8

2045 LRTP PROJECT WEBSITE	8
SOCIAL MEDIA & ONLINE ADVERTISING	8

POP-UP EVENTS	8
OUTREACH TO UNDER-REPRESENTED POPULATIONS	8

VISUALIZATION	9
PUBLIC MEETING MATERIALS	9

DOCUMENTATION 9

SCHEDULE 10

INTRODUCTION

This Public Involvement Plan outlines the public outreach activities for the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for the Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization (TPO). The TPO planning area covers the entirety of Marion County, which is comprised of 3 cities, 2 towns, two airports, and includes a portion of the Ocala National Forest. The 2040 LRTP Cost Feasible Plan, which was adopted in 2015, must be updated and adopted no later than November 24, 2020.

To comply with the updates of federal legislation in the FAST Act (2015) and MAP-21 (2012), the 2045 LRTP Public Involvement Plan (PIP) will provide summary documentation of the tools utilized, the input received, the overall results, and measures of effectiveness of LRTP public involvement activities.

GENERAL PURPOSE

Public participation is an integral component of transportation planning, as transportation affects all residents, visitors and businesses in the County in one form or another. The intent of the LRTP public outreach process is to gain the critical insights of the users of the transportation system and to communicate with them regarding the likely growth that is going to occur in the County over the next 25 years and how well equipped our infrastructure is to accommodate that growth. The ongoing dialogue between the public and the technicians that formulate, analyze and present the plan itself must be a two-way communication. The diverse viewpoints from the user perspective can help steer the decision-making process. The financial, technical, and procedural opportunities and challenges communicated by the technicians in turn molds the ideas and needs of the users in a way that is affordable and implementable. The LRTP PIP will follow the goals, policies, and objectives from the TPO's general Public Involvement Plan. Public outreach in the update of the Ocala Marion LRTP will focus on the following areas:

1 Inform the public on existing conditions, future trends, and major issues facing the County and challenges and opportunities to address those issues as the County transitions into the future.

2 Engage the public in a goals, objectives, and performance measures development process that is consistent with national guidance, including:

- / Reconfirm/Update the 2040 LRTP goals and vision.
- / Develop measures (evaluation criteria) and weights for the goals and objectives.

3 Coordinate with residents and businesses to define the desired functionality of major corridors in Marion County and identify the appropriate improvement strategies for those corridors.

4 Equitably engage the public in defining project needs and priorities, with specific emphasis on providing opportunities to engage the traditionally underserved populations.

5 Document the public outreach process in a technical memorandum providing a summary of the tools utilized, the input received, and measures of effectiveness of the outreach activities.

KEY ISSUES

The following key issues set the context for public outreach that will be used in developing the 2045 LRTP:

Track measures of effectiveness that gauge the effectiveness of the public outreach process.

Coordinate with Marion County, the cities of Ocala, Dunnellon, and Belleview, FDOT, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection DEP to address comprehensive plan updates, economic development, and local infrastructure plans that influence various modes of transportation in the County.

Coordinate continuously with state and regional planning efforts.

Solicit input from the public, agency stakeholders, TPO committees, and the TPO Board throughout the course of the project.

Meet Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) planning requirements (FAST Act and MAP-21).

Utilize innovative outreach techniques that increase participation and specifically enable people in disadvantaged communities to be part of the planning process.

Utilize visualization techniques to disseminate technical information to the general public in a way that is easily understandable and engaging.

PUBLIC OUTREACH METHODS

The public outreach schedule includes both milestone workshops to obtain input at integral points in the plan update process and continuous

public involvement through pop-up events and electronic tools. A range of methods will be used to communicate with residents, other stakeholders, and specifically with underserved populations, including development and distribution of printed materials that incorporate visualization techniques; electronic mail correspondence; social media presence and boosting to target under-represented groups; in person and virtual public workshops and pop-up events; and web-based survey applications. Table 1 displays the primary, secondary, and indirect audiences for the various public outreach efforts that will be undertaken as part of the 2045 LRTP update.

TABLE 1 PUBLIC OUTREACH ACTIVITIES AND INTENDED AUDIENCE

	Public/Business Stakeholders	Agency Stakeholders	Elected Officials
Metroquest Survey	1	1	1
In Person Public Workshops	1	2	2
Virtual Public Workshop	1	2	2
Pop-Up Events	1	3	3
Website	1	2	2
Social Media	1	2	2
Stakeholder Meetings	1	1	3
Steering Committee Meetings	3	1	3
TPO Committees Meetings	2	1	2
TPO Board Meetings	2	2	1

1 - Primary Audience

2 - Secondary Audience

3 - Indirect Audience

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance based planning is a federal requirement, as stipulated in MAP-21 and the Fast Act. Performance is measured in many different ways and contexts, including the projected performance of infrastructure improvements; system performance before and after improvements; and process performance. The latter context is very much related to how well the planning process reaches and involves the region's stakeholders, including the general public, business community, government agencies, and elected officials. The objectives, actions, and measures in Table 2 will be used to gauge the public involvement process on a continual basis and feedback generated by these measures will be used to improve the process over the course of the plan update.

TABLE 2 TPO PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND TARGETS

Activity	Objective	Action	Measure	Target
Public Workshops	Encourage participation by all Marion County citizens in the planning process.	Hold meetings in various locations and times to maximize the population with access to the meetings. Hold virtual public workshops in lieu of in person workshops, as necessary. Encourage completion of Metroquest survey and comment cards	Average workshop attendance	30
			Number of Metroquest surveys completed at workshops	30
			Number of comment cards received at workshops	30
Pop-up Events	Maximize the number of people reached at pop-up events.	Attend the maximum number of events feasible and reach the maximum number of people at each event.	Pop-up events attended	10
			Average number of visitors to LRTP "table" at pop-up events	30
			Number of Metroquest surveys completed at pop-up events	30
Website, Metroquest	Maximize website visitors & Metroquest survey responses	Keep website current with latest schedule, documents, and social media posts.	Number of comment cards received at pop-up events	30
			Number of website hits.	300
Social Media	Maximize number of social media followers	Post regularly on a range of transportation topics, including current news and plan update events and happenings.	Number of responses to Metroquest survey.	300
			Number of social media followers	500
Public Involvement Effectiveness	Maximize accessibility of public involvement opportunities to Marion County residents and stakeholders	Hold meetings during non-business hours & at locations accessible to the maximum number of people. Hold at least half of the meetings in Environmental Justice areas. Prepare materials in a way that is easy to understand for laypeople	Number of people who learned about workshops from social media	300
			Average scores for meeting accessibility	4.5
			Average scores for meeting content clarity/usefulness	4.5

MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

Throughout the course of the 2045 LRTP update, a series of two different public workshops will be held in five different areas of Marion County for a total of ten (10) public workshops. Table 3 displays the public workshop schedule for the project:

TABLE 3 PUBLIC WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

Workshop	Winter 2019	Spring/ Summer 2019	Fall 2019	Winter 2020	Spring/ Summer 2020	Fall 2020
Goals and Objectives		X				
Needs Plan Development					X	
Cost Feasible Plan Public Hearing						X
Pop-up Events				X	X	

/ DRAFT COST FEASIBLE PLAN PUBLIC HEARING - A public hearing will be held to solicit input from the public on the draft Cost Feasible Plan. Participants will be given the opportunity to comment on projects before the LRTP is adopted by the TPO Board.

FIGURE 1 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AREAS



PUBLIC WORKSHOP MATERIALS AND NOTIFICATION

For each series of public workshops, the following materials will be prepared:

- / Poster boards with project information, which may include:
 - Flowchart displaying the LRTP process;
 - Overall project schedule with public involvement touchpoints highlighted; and
 - Phase specific information for the Goals and Objectives and Needs Plan.
- / Remote control and/or mobile phone app to collect public input with the capability to present results back to workshop participants in real time.
- / Summary notes of workshops, including results of the public involvement performance questionnaire, will be provided to the TPO no later than two weeks after the workshop.
- / Project summary/overview handout.

To promote the workshops to the public, a combination of outreach will occur via the following.

POSTCARDS	COMMUNITY CALENDAR	ADVERTISEMENT IN	SOCIAL MEDIA EVENT
FLIERS	POSTINGS ON LOCAL	LOCAL NEWSPAPER	POSTINGS AND
HANDOUTS	MEDIA/NEWS OUTLETS		BOOSTING

The TPO will coordinate e-mails advertising the public workshops sent to elected and appointed officials, the Steering Committee, and other identified interested parties associated with the project. The TPO will also handle the public relations/news releases when the meetings are to be held.

TPO BOARD AND COMMITTEES

The Project Team will present at four (3) separate regularly scheduled TPO Board meetings and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)/Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings throughout the course of the project. TPO staff will present to the Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board (TDLCB). These project update presentations will take place during the following phases:

- / GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES
- / NEEDS ASSESSMENT
- / COST FEASIBLE PLAN DEVELOPMENT ADOPTION

Meeting materials will be provided in the agenda packages for the two groups to allow for adequate review prior to the meeting date.

STEERING COMMITTEE

The project Steering Committee will function as an advisory committee throughout the 2045 LRTP update process and will include representatives of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and local government agencies. The Project Team will identify appropriate members of the Steering Committee. Members of the Steering Committee are anticipated to represent local, state, and federal agencies and municipalities in Marion County. The Committee may also include environmental agency representatives. The Steering Committee will hold five meetings and will engage in the review of products at key decision points during the 2045 LRTP development process.

STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

In addition to the Steering Committee meetings, individual meetings will be held with other stakeholders identified by the Project Team. These could be individual meetings with members of the Steering Committee or other stakeholders identified throughout the course of the project, including the Marion County Tourist Development department and Ocala / Marion County Chamber & Economic Partnership.

PUBLIC OUTREACH AND SOCIAL MEDIA

2045 LRTP PROJECT WEBSITE

The 2045 LRTP project website will function as a major medium of communication with the public to distribute information as widely as possible and solicit public feedback on the LRTP update. The website will be a stand-alone website that will be linked to the TPO's website. The domain name for the LRTP project website will be www.ocalamarion2045.com. Final work products, copies of presentations, public survey questions and results, and other relevant data will be posted to the website on a regular basis. A schedule of 2045 LRTP meetings and associated agendas will also be maintained through the website. Additionally, the website will allow for submission of public comments through an online comment form that will remain active during the 2045 LRTP development process. This will serve as another avenue for soliciting public comments. The LRTP website will link to a MetroQuest site that will be used to collect public input, including goal weighting, needs, project evaluation, and other miscellaneous input consistent with input solicited in the public meetings.

SOCIAL MEDIA & ONLINE ADVERTISING

The Project Team will use both organic social media postings and online advertising to drive project awareness and participation in the 2045 LRTP update. Social media postings will be crafted for distribution on active TPO accounts, with a primary focus on Facebook. Calls-to-action will coincide with the appropriate project phase and will include approved graphics for visual continuity.

The online advertising approach will focus on survey participation during each of the project phases. Audience targeting parameters will focus on residents within Marion County, with emphasis on the traditionally underserved and residents under the age of 50, both typically underrepresented groups in long range planning public involvement. Ad sets will run as a 3 to 4 week blitz approach to provide a high frequency of exposure and maximize return on investment.

POP-UP EVENTS

In addition to the public workshops, TPO staff will attend local public events and set up a booth from which they can distribute informational materials, including general materials about the TPO and its purpose and function, and the LRTP, encourage completion of the Metroquest survey, and generally inform participants about the LRTP update and opportunities to stay involved. The public involvement evaluation questionnaire will also be distributed at pop-up events and participants will be encouraged to complete and submit it to TPO staff.

A full list of pop-up events attended will be documented as they occur. Strategy for development of this list takes into account the desire to interact with a wide variety and cross-section of residents. This detailed breakdown will include event details, key point of contact, number of attendees, and costs to participate (if applicable).

As the plan update progresses, the LRTP pop-up at scheduled events will offer and collect input on the contemporaneous phase of the process.

OUTREACH TO UNDER-REPRESENTED POPULATIONS

To reach traditionally under represented communities in Marion County, the TPO will target specific community events to provide project information and obtain feedback. The Project Team will help prepare materials for these events and TPO staff will coordinate and attend the events. These activities will be closely coordinated with the TPO staff. The Project Team will also utilize social media boosting to specifically target the following under-represented populations:

- / LOWER INCOME;
- / MINORITY POPULATIONS;
- / PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES; and
- / UNDER 50 YEARS OLD POPULATIONS.

The Project Team is able to communicate directly to these populations through a combination of layered targeting. These include household income, zip code mapping, job titles, age, education status, and behavior/interests online. As an example, a person with a disability may participate in a Facebook support group in that interest area. This is one example that allows the Project Team to refine the targeting so populations are seeing and receiving information about the 2045 LRTP update.

VISUALIZATION

Visualization techniques include the use of graphical content designed to disseminate technical information in a way that is both accessible and engaging, thus encouraging participation and input into the planning process. Techniques that will be used in the 2045 LRTP include maps, graphs, conceptual corridor graphics, hands-on exercises, diagrams, photos, and videos. Effective visualization techniques can facilitate understanding, clarify concepts and ideas, and can be used to build consensus for proposed investment strategies. The following sections outline the visualization techniques to be used during the 2045 LRTP update.

PUBLIC MEETING MATERIALS

Poster boards will be prepared for each series of public workshops to display the appropriate data and information at the respective stage in the plan update process. Content included on the poster boards may include flowcharts, a schedule graphic, visual representations of the plan Goals and Objectives, corridor graphics, and investment strategies. Handouts will also be prepared and distributed at the public meetings with summaries of the information being presented at the respective meeting. Meeting evaluation forms will be distributed at all meetings in an effort to obtain feedback and continually improve the public engagement process. Table 4 includes a draft evaluation form to be distributed at all public engagement events.

TABLE 4 PUBLIC MEETING EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I have increased my understanding of the purpose of the LRTP	1	2	3	4	5
I have increased my understanding of the LRTP update process	1	2	3	4	5
My transportation question(s) were answered adequately	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation was helpful and informative	1	2	3	4	5
The visual aids were beneficial (handouts, display boards)	1	2	3	4	5
Staff were friendly and professional	1	2	3	4	5
The location of the meeting was appropriate and accessible	1	2	3	4	5
The time of the meeting was appropriate and accessible	1	2	3	4	5


DOCUMENTATION

Documentation of the 2045 LRTP public outreach process will be completed continuously as the LRTP update unfolds. An agenda, sign-in sheet, submitted comment forms, survey results, photographs of meetings, and summary notes from each public outreach activity will be maintained and made available on the project website for public access at any time. A final technical Public Involvement memorandum will be prepared at the completion of the project to document public input into the process, how it was disseminated and incorporated into the plan and the materials developed for public distribution throughout the planning process. It will summarize the major activities, and document all public comments received in person, on line, via email and social media. The memorandum will also include a summary of the public involvement evaluation results, obtained through participants' submission of evaluation forms on line or at workshops. The appendix to the memorandum will include all original evaluation forms.

SCHEDULE

The Project Team will establish and maintain a regular communication with the TPO staff, agency stakeholders, TPO committees (TAC/CAC/Steering Committee), TPO Board, and the public at large throughout the LRTP update process. Materials presented and input solicited at public and stakeholder meetings will also be shared digitally through a LRTP specific website, social media, and a MetroQuest website. Figure 2 displays the schedule for the 2045 LRTP.

FIGURE 2 2045 LRTP UPDATE SCHEDULE



Workshop



Public Hearing



APPENDIX D

METROQUEST SURVEY SUMMARY

2045 Long Range Transportation Plan

METROQUEST SURVEY USER SURVEY SUMMARY

APRIL 2020

CONTENTS

2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN	1
METROQUEST SURVEY USER SURVEY SUMMARY	1
I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. MARKETING EFFORTS SUMMARY	4
III. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	5
Goals and Objectives – Key Findings	5
IV. EXISTING CONDITION RATINGS	6
Existing Condition Rating – Key Findings	10
V. IMPROVEMENT PRIORITY RANKING EXERCISE	11
Priority Ranking Exercise – Key Findings	11
VI. STAY INVOLVED (DEMOGRAPHICS)	12
Demographics – Key Findings	15
VII. SURVEY COMMENTS	15
APPENDIX A - METROQUEST SURVEY SCREENS	17
APPENDIX B - METROQUEST COMMENTS	21

I. INTRODUCTION

The following provides an overview of the process and results of the Ocala Marion 2045 LRTP survey. The survey was conducted using MetroQuest, an online interactive survey software developed to maximize public participation, solicit informed input, and create actionable results while conveying information to increase project awareness. The survey was available online from June 19th, 2019 through September 4th, 2019 and had 607 site visits, 257 participants, and 313 comments, and 5,439 data points¹ received.

¹ A Data Point is any input given in any MetroQuest "screen" (i.e. one rating, one ranking, one comment; these are all considered as each their own separate data point).



Figure 1. MetroQuest Participation Timeline




Figure 1 illustrates participation levels over the course of the survey. Five MetroQuest "screens" were used as part of the survey including "Welcome, Goals & Objectives, Existing Conditions, Priorities, and Stay Involved." **Appendix A** includes the MetroQuest screens and **Appendix B** includes all the comments entered into one or more of the screens by participants.

As shown in **Figure 1**, public participation levels spiked four times, in late June, mid July, late July, and early August. All four spikes coincided with social media advertising and TPO and Marion County email blasts advertising the meetings, indicating the effectiveness of digital media as an outreach tool. The following sections detail the social media marketing efforts, the specific questions asked in the survey, and the public responses.


II. MARKETING EFFORTS SUMMARY

A total of 12 advertisements were procured on social media over the course of the survey period. The total number of impressions, defined as number of times a piece of content was shown to a Facebook user, garnered via the promotional advertisements was just under 28,300. The average number of impressions by advertisement was

more than 2,350. While not all people who were reached by the social media posts completed, or even viewed the survey instrument, this strategy certainly resulted in increases in survey responses.

A project website was also used to advertise the survey, with a link to the survey on the project home page at **www.ocalamarion2045.com**. In addition to the digital outreach, paper surveys were distributed at a series of six public workshops held in August 2019.

Figure 2: 2045 LRTP Website



III. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Participants were asked which of the draft goals and objectives are most important to them. The goals were arranged in a random order and participants were asked to rank them in order of importance. Objectives under each respective goal were listed when participants clicked on any given goal, to clarify the meaning of the different goals. The purpose of this part of the survey is to gain input from participants as a factor that can be used by the LRTP Steering Committee, and ultimately the TPO Board, to weight the LRTP goals for application in the needs assessment and cost feasible plan development. **Figure 3** illustrates the results of the Goals and Objectives ranking question.

Goals and Objectives – Key Findings

The Goal ranking results in the survey yielded a fairly modest distinction between the various goals in terms of average rank across all responses. The results depicted in **Figure 3** are charted by average rank. If a goal was consistently ranked the most important goal, the average rank would be 1.00. The lower the average rank, then, the higher the importance of the goal, on average. The highest ranked goal, based on this analysis, is the Quality & Natural Places goal, with an average rank of 1.65. Second highest is the Optimize Existing System Goal. The next three goals in order of importance differ in rank by an average of 0.02, effectively making them more or less equal in importance, according to the survey results. These include Economic Development, Travel Choices, and Safety & Security. The sixth and final goal is the Community Needs goal, ranked lowest with an average rank of 2.23.

Figure 3: Goals and Objectives Average Rank




IV. EXISTING CONDITION RATINGS

Participants were asked to rate the existing driving, walking, bicycling, and transit conditions on a scale of 1 to 5 (with “1” being the worst and “5” being the best).

Questions were developed for driving, walking, bicycling, and transit conditions based on the unique needs and characteristics of each transportation mode; however, questions regarding general travel, infrastructure, connectivity, and safety were asked for all modes. **Figure 4** through **Figure 8** illustrate the results of the Existing Condition Rating.

Figure 4: Driving Conditions



General Driving Travel: Ease of commuting to and from work or school or traveling for personal errands.


Roadway Infrastructure: Traffic signal timing and coordination, roadway conditions such as potholes, grooved pavement.

Roadway Landscaping: Trees, shrubbery, and other green features along roadways.

Roadway Safety: Your feeling of personal safety when driving (dangerous roadways, intersections, crashes, etc.)

Roadway Visibility: Sight distance visibility, clarity of roadway signage.

Figure 5: Walking Conditions




General Walking Travel: Ease of walking to and from work or school; or traveling for personal errands.

Walking Connectivity: Continuous sidewalks or other walking facilities without gaps in the network.

Walking Infrastructure: The presence and physical condition of sidewalks, crosswalks, shared-use paths, and trails.

Walking Safety: Your feeling of personal safety when walking (dangerous roadways, intersection crossings, etc.)

Figure 6: Bicycling Conditions




Bicycle Connectivity: Continuous bike lanes or other bicycle facilities without gaps in the network.

Bicycle Infrastructure: The presence and physical condition of bike lanes, bike parking, shared-use paths, and trails.

Bicycle Safety: Your feeling of personal safety when biking (dangerous roadways, intersections crossings, etc.)

General Biking Travel: Ease of bicycling to and from work or school; or traveling for personal errands.

Figure 7: Transit Conditions



General Transit Travel: Ease of taking transit to and from work or school; or traveling for personal errands.

Transit Safety: Your feeling of personal safety when waiting or riding public transit.

Transit Service: Routes that go directly where you need, without having to transfer. The amount of time it takes to get to your destination by bus.

Transit Stops: Transit shelters, signs, locations, conditions, and proximity to destinations.

Existing Condition Rating – Key Findings

The following section provides a summary of the key findings as part of the *Existing Condition Rating* section of the survey.² As described previously, the following findings are representative of the people who completed the survey and do not represent the entire population of Marion County.


- The top average scores for the existing condition rating exercise included General Driving Travel (3.5), Roadway Visibility (3.5), Roadway Landscaping (3.2), and Roadway Safety (3.2).

- The bottom average scores for the existing condition rating exercise included Transit Service (2.1), Bicycle Safety (2.2), Transit Stops (2.2), Bicycle Connectivity (2.2), General Biking Travel (2.3), and General Transit Travel (2.3).

As illustrated in **Figure 8**, and described above, existing condition averages related to motorized vehicle travel rated highest whereas conditions for transit and bicycles rated the lowest.

² Existing Condition Ratings were based on a scale of 1-5 (with “1” being the worst and “5” being the best).

Figure 8: All Modes (Average)



V. IMPROVEMENT PRIORITY RANKING EXERCISE

Participants were asked to rank the importance of a range of transportation improvement types to meet Marion County’s future transportation system needs. Each participant ranked their top 5 priorities in order of 1 through 5 with “1” being the most important and “5” being the least important (of the top 5). The following represent the improvement types that were ranked and **Figure 9** illustrates the results of the ranking exercise.


- Freight Movement** - Focus more investment on major roadways used for freight movement
- Local Roadways** - Focus more investment on local roadways including bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Improve Bike and Pedestrian** - Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities by expanding infrastructure and closing gaps within the existing network
- New Bus Routes** - Add new bus routes to roadways and areas that are currently underserved
- New Roadways** - Expand existing roadways or add new roadways

- Existing Roadways** - Improve roadways with operational strategies like signal timing, real time travel information, limiting left turns, etc.
- Trails** - Improve and expand the existing trail network in Marion County
- Improve Existing Transit** - Add more service to existing transit routes such as increasing the number of buses per hour

Priority Ranking Exercise – Key Findings

The results depicted in **Figure 9** are charted by average rank. If an improvement type was consistently ranked the most important goal, the average rank would be 1.00. The lower the average rank, then, the higher the importance of the improvement type, on average. As illustrated above, the majority of people ranked Existing Roadways and New Roadways as the most important improvement types for meeting the future transportation system needs of Marion County. Improvements related to Freight Movement, Trails, and New Bus Routes ranked lowest and Improvements to Existing Transit and Bike and Pedestrian facilities were ranked in the middle.

Figure 9: Improvement Priority Ranking Average




VI. STAY INVOLVED (DEMOGRAPHICS)

Participants were asked to provide contact information as well as demographic information to help gain a broader understanding of which

audiences were being reached, as well as which audiences could be better served through additional public outreach. **Figure 10** and **Figure 11** illustrate the results of the Stay Involved (Demographic) survey. Over 35 different home ZIP codes were recorded; **Figure 10** illustrates participation for all home ZIP codes represented by more than one respondent.

Figure 10: Home ZIP Code




34471	Ocala, FL
34481	Ocala, FL
34432	Dunnellon, FL
34482	Ocala, FL

34470	Ocala, FL
34476	Ocala, FL
34480	Ocala, FL

34474	Ocala, FL
34473	Ocala, FL
34491	Summerfield, FL

Over 25 different work or school ZIP codes were recorded; **Figure 11** illustrates participation for all work or school ZIP codes represented by more than one respondent.

Figure 11: Work or School ZIP Code



34471	Ocala, FL
34470	Ocala, FL
34481	Ocala, FL
34432	Dunnellon, FL

34482	Ocala, FL
34474	Ocala, FL
34476	Ocala, FL
34480	Ocala, FL

34491	Summerfield, FL
34473	Ocala, FL
34472	Ocala, FL
34420	Bellevue, FL

Figures 12 and 13 break down respondents by age and race, with a comparison to the age and race breakdown for Marion County in the 2010 US Census.

Figure 12: Age





Figure 13: Race/Ethnicity



Demographics – Key Findings

The geographical breakdown of survey respondents, in terms of where they live, is fairly well dispersed, with 35 of 38 zip codes in Marion County represented by two or more survey respondents. For place of work or school, 25 of 38 zip codes in the County are represented.

The age breakdown of survey respondents closely mimics the Marion County population, with the exception of two cohorts. The 51 to 65 year old cohort is over-represented in the survey by about fifteen percentage points, while the 18 or younger cohort is under-represented by about eighteen percentage points. This age imbalance is fairly commonplace in transportation planning studies, but efforts have been made since the survey to reach out more to younger populations through additional social media and school outreach channels.

The race breakdown of survey respondents, simply categorized as White Caucasian vs Non-white, even more closely resembles the 2010 population in Marion County, with a slight over-representation of Non-white residents.

VII. SURVEY COMMENTS

In addition to pre-scripted questions in the Metroquest survey, respondents were given the opportunity to provide comments at every step of the survey process. More than 320 comments were provided, ranging from general comments about the existing condition of the Marion County transportation system to very specific comments about safety, mobility, and operating issues at the segment and intersection levels. Several summaries of the comments are provided in **Figures 14** and **15** below, categorized in different ways. **Figure 14** depicts a categorical summary of the comments, including general and facility-specific comments, with the largest share of the comments related to pedestrian/bicycle issues (25%), followed by roadway operational issues (21%), followed by public transit issues (18%). **Figure 15** summarizes by facility, including only facility-specific comments. The most commented facilities include SR 40 (19%), SR 200 (18%), US 41 (16%) and I-75 (13%). Finally, **Figure 16** narrows the categorical summary of comments to those that are facility-specific, indicating that as they pertain to specific facilities, the most commented issues are roadway operations (39%), pedestrian/bicycle (19%), and safety (16%). **Appendix B** lists all 327 comments submitted by respondents, organized by type.

Figure 14: Comments by Type




Figure 15: Comments by Facility





Figure 16: Facility Specific Comments by Type



APPENDIX A - METROQUEST SURVEY SCREENS

WELCOME

2

3

4

5

1

2

3

4

5

Welcome

We Need Your Input!

The Ocala/Marion County Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is currently developing the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (The Plan). The goal of this Plan is to create a transportation system to serve the needs of Marion County's residents and visitors

As part of our public outreach efforts, the Ocala/Marion TPO is seeking input through this survey to help guide Marion County's long term transportation needs

[Help](#) [Privacy](#) [About MetroQuest](#)



[Begin](#)

TPO
Ocala-Marion County

WELCOME

2

3

4

5

1

2

3

4

5

Goals and Objectives

[What to do](#) [Next Task](#)

Order your top 2 items above this line

- Community Needs
- Safety & Security
- Optimize Existing System
- Economic Development
- Quality & Natural Places
- Travel Choices

Tell us what goals and objectives are most important to you. Click on the Goal to view the associated objectives.

Please rank up to 5 items.

Please drag 2 of the items above the line in your preferred order.

[Suggest another](#)

[Help](#) [Privacy](#) [About MetroQuest](#)

Goals and Objectives
What to do

Tell us what goals and objectives are most important to you. Click on the Goal to view the associated objectives.

Please rank up to 5 items.

Please drag 2 of the items above the line in your preferred order.

[Done](#) [More](#)

1

2

3

4

5

WELCOME

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

PRIORITIES

STAY INVOLVED

Existing Condition Rating

What to do

Next Task

Driving Conditions

Walking Conditions

Bicycling Conditions

Transit Conditions

For each of the **EXISTING** driving conditions, please provide your opinion of its rating from 1 to 5 stars.

General Driving Travel

Ease of commuting to and from work or school or traveling for personal errands

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Roadway Infrastructure

Traffic signal timing and coordination, roadway conditions such as potholes, grooved pavement

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Roadway Landscaping

Trees, shrubbery, and other green features along roadways

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Roadway Visibility

Sight distance visibility, clarity of roadway signage

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Roadway Safety

Your feeling of personal safety when driving (dangerous roadways, intersections, crashes, etc.)

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Next Category

Help

Privacy

About MetroQuest

1

2

3

4

5

WELCOME

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

PRIORITIES

STAY INVOLVED

Existing Condition Rating

What to do

Next Task

Driving Conditions

Walking Conditions

Bicycling Conditions

Transit Conditions

For each of the **EXISTING** walking conditions in Marion County, please provide your opinion of its rating from 1 to 5 stars

General Walking Travel

Ease of walking to and from work or school; or traveling for personal errands

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Walking Infrastructure

The presence and physical condition of sidewalks, crosswalks, shared-use paths, and trails

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Walking Connectivity

Continuous sidewalks or other walking facilities without gaps in the network

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Walking Safety

Your feeling of personal safety when walking (dangerous roadways, intersection crossings, etc.)

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Next Category

Help

Privacy

About MetroQuest

WELCOME

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

PRIORITIES

STAY INVOLVED

3

Existing Condition Rating

What to do

Next Task

4

5

Driving Conditions

Walking Conditions

Bicycling Conditions

Transit Conditions

For each of the EXISTING bicycling conditions in Marion County, please provide your opinion of its rating from 1 to 5 stars

General Biking Travel

Ease of bicycling to and from work or school; or traveling for personal errands

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Bicycle Infrastructure

The presence and physical condition of bike lanes, bike parking, shared-use paths, and trails

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Bicycle Connectivity

Continuous bike lanes or other bicycle facilities without gaps in the network

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Bicycle Safety

Your feeling of personal safety when biking (dangerous roadways, intersection crossings, etc.)

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Next Category

[Help](#)
[Privacy](#)
[About MetroQuest](#)

WELCOME

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

PRIORITIES

STAY INVOLVED

3

Existing Condition Rating

What to do

Next Task

4

5

Driving Conditions

Walking Conditions

Bicycling Conditions

Transit Conditions

For each of the EXISTING transit conditions in Marion County, please provide your opinion of its rating from 1 to 5 stars

General Transit Travel

Ease of taking transit to and from work or school; or traveling for personal errands

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Transit Stops

Transit shelters, signs, locations, conditions, and proximity to destinations

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Transit Service

Routes that go directly where you need, without having to transfer. The amount of time it takes to get to your destination by bus

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Transit Safety

Your feeling of personal safety when waiting or riding public transit

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Comment

Next Task

[Help](#)
[Privacy](#)
[About MetroQuest](#)

1

2

3

4

5

WELCOME

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

PRIORITIES

STAY INVOLVED

?

What to do

Next Task

Transportation Priorities

Order your top 5 items above this line

Freight Movement

Improve Bike & Pedestrian

Improve Existing Transit

New Bus Routes

Trails

Local Roadways

New Roadways

Existing Roadways

Suggest another

Please rank the importance of the following improvements for meeting Ocala/Marion County's FUTURE transportation system and economic development needs.

Please drag 5 of the items above the line in your preferred order.

Transportation Priorities

What to do

Please rank the importance of the following improvements for meeting Ocala/Marion County's FUTURE transportation system and economic development needs.

Please drag 5 of the items above the line in your preferred order.

Done

More

Help

Privacy

About MetroQuest

1

2

3

4

5

WELCOME

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

PRIORITIES

STAY INVOLVED

?

What to do

Stay Involved

Final Questions (Optional)

Home ZIP Code

Type...

Work or School ZIP Code

Type...

Race/Ethnicity

Select...

Age

Select...

How did you hear about the survey?

Type...

Email

Type...

Submit Final Questions

Skip

Thank you!

Please provide your contact information if you would like to stay up-to-date on the Plan and future public engagement activities. Visit the project website to learn more: <https://www.ocalamarion2045.com/>

Stay Involved

What to do

→ Thank you for your input so far! It has been recorded.

→ Please answer a few optional questions. This helps us understand your input better.

→ Your private information will be kept private.

→ Use the sharing tools (on the right) to spread the word!

Start

Help

Privacy

About MetroQuest

20 | OCALA MARION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

APPENDIX B - METROQUEST COMMENTS

PED/BIKE

Urban Design- what does the sense of place for the pedestrian (the person spending money) feel like Transit options, BRT/ trackless trams for long distance to connect Ocala, the Shores, Belleview, the Villages, and toward Sunrail. Regional connections. And those little carts that look like mini buses. allow them to be circulators in our urban areas

Our small community does not need or want a new super highway that will destroy our rural way of life. More bike paths along school roads would be nice.

Very dangerous for bike commutes.

Few more crosswalks would stimulate walking with residential areas in town reducing sprawl.

On the major arterial roads, the highspeed limits and lack of mid-block crosswalks makes it feel dangerous to be a pedestrian.

Walking is very dangerous. No protection at all. No sidewalks, bike paths, street lights or neighborhood roads without potholes.

Design roads for the speed intended, use complete streets, build bike/ped infrastructure. Statistics show that if the protected and landscaped bike/ped infrastructure is there then people will use it. Here, no one walks because they are like Frankenstein's monster, they want to live. Wide Right Of Ways and stroads built like freeways, along with no trees and a history of huge setbacks has made this place ugly and dangerous by design.

There are some places where the sidewalk just ends.

There are some places where the sidewalk ends and some where there is no sidewalk at all.

Many sidewalks are uneven and not trimmed overhead. Also there aren't enough sidewalks in general

Love the Rails to Trails at Santos! Just needs a bathroom at the SR 200 end!

Walk from bestbuy to bed bath and beyond. You'll have to cross a total of at least 12 lanes of traffic, traffic is doing 45-55mph through there, the right of way is wide and the buildings are so far from the street. If you don't die of heat stroke or being run over then you deserve a medal from the Mayor. And a medal of navigation for making it through the seas of parking just to get to the pedestrian death zone. Ocala and it's love for the car.

I live on the NE section of MC near Silver Springs. There are no neighborhood sidewalks or bike paths.

I live and work downtown and the sidewalks are awful and end in random places.

Fill sidewalk gaps more often. Why rip out a segment but leave another segment, especially when the part ripped out is the high and dry place people could stand on when waiting for a bus - now they have to stand in the mud and puddles of water.

Fill in more sidewalk gaps, especially along critical roads - and finish off them as well - extend 1/2 down the road then stop - forcing people into the road?

Nice network of "ribbon" walkways at Heathbrook Hills and Fore Ranch, but not a good connector. Also, would be nice to incorporate park with rest stop/bathrooms south of Racetrac gas station, for walkers.

Nothing in my area to encourage walking.

Almost anywhere you drive in this county you can see sidewalk gaps or simply sidewalk ending or no sidewalk at all and you see a goat trail along the side of the road. that trail is from people trying to walk so much that the grass died. Just look at the maps of our sidewalks, for the sidewalks actually recorded....

There are some places where the sidewalk just ends and leaves you walking on the side of a busy road.

You're establishing California style bike lanes but the drivers here need to be educated and tested on how to treat bike lanes. They are not passing lanes and most space was taken from right turn lanes and I see a lot of infractions and safety issues because people don't understand.

Cycling here has to be similar to cycling in the world of mad max. No infrastructure, no network, no trees, few bike lanes, Cyclists have to stay to the side at intersections.

Drivers in Ocala have little respect for cyclists. no bike lanes make cycling extra dangerous

I am threatened every time I try to ride in the lanes.

There is a generational lack of understanding of bike lanes, their use, the rules, and safety of all drivers of bikes, cars, and trucks. Bikers need to understand that for a time, they need to be hyper vigilant about their surroundings and others around them.

I would love to be able to bike to work, but people treat the new bike lines on Baseline Rd like turn lanes and I don't want to die.

Bike lanes are similar to those in California but seem narrower (ie: NE 14th Street and NE 8th Ave.) Also, since the city borrowed the right lane on NE 8th Avenue as a bike lane and changed busy street from 2 lanes to 1, it's sometimes difficult to turn left (South) from NE 9th Street onto 8th. Because of the entertainment complex at Tusawilla's entrance being there, I think a traffic signal is warranted. Also, since reducing NE 8th Avenue to a single lane, many more commercial vehicles, including 18 wheelers, are using my street, NE 10th Avenue as a bypass and exceed the 30mph residential speed limit. I would like a speed bump installed as a deterrent. Drivers used to NE 8th Avenue being 2 lanes don't observe the bike lane and still use it for passing and right hand turns. Otherwise, good job!

Many roads still lack bike lanes or some sort of bike boulevard designation.
Show us a map of bicycle connectivity. When you cannot provide one then your question is answered. I'd give these 0 stars but that isn't an option.
Bonnie Heath, 42nd St, 8th Ave are all excellent for bike traffic. SR 40, US 441, and SR 200 ARE NOT. These roads all need bicycle lanes.
Bike facilities are lacking for sure. Fill in the gaps, and connect the existing routes at least.
What bike lanes, etc. They only seem to be on the state's roads - nowhere else - and those are risky with the higher speeds better separate/mark - don't reduce the speeds.
I'm seeing more of these (bike lanes) proliferate but it's not enough. People here are not kind to people on bicycles. They do not like to share the road and are often unaware that bicycles follow all of the same traffic rules.
Santos Trail rocks...but needs to be finished or have a bathroom installed at the SR 200 end.
While Santos has a great option, it's only 15 miles. That leaves many of us out.
Every transit stop should have a safe sidewalk towards it and a crosswalk nearby.
I would like to bike commute but a lack of lanes stops me.
Need more multipurpose trails so that people can bike to grocery store, bank, exercise etc. less car use.
Living in Rainbow Spring I use the walking trail. Have to drive to stores
No shade, and oddly placed crosswalks don't help people who want/need to walk.
There are no sidewalks in my area- and because we are the "poor part of town" one would have to trudge through trash to get anywhere. I do not walk.
No sidewalks
I don't live in Citra. The only stores close to me that I could walk to are along US 301 and it does not have pedestrian accommodations and the people speed on the side streets so I wouldn't walk anywhere.
Not enough sidewalks or wide enough shoulders to walk or bike. The High School road in Dunnellon should have a wide shoulder for students and teachers who bike or walk to school.
Depending on where you live, walking to work or school is most likely not possible. In other areas there needs to be improvement of sidewalk availability and maintaining sidewalks.
Newer roads are better but the older roads are severely lacking. Sidewalks at hammett bowen need to be installed as kids are walking in grass or on the roadway to get to the cross walks
Florida and the few sidewalks we have are not lined with trees or shade. Combine that with the wide lanes and extra wide Right of Way. No way is walking comfortable or easy here.
We need better sidewalks/ bike lanes
Not enough sidewalks!
Lack of sidewalks for walking, biking, and Segway.
There are no walking paths in my neighborhood
Needs improvement - shade for routes would be good too.
On us 41 the new road in 2024 should have bike lane instead of sidewalks as in the plan people do not walk to Walmart
If it isn't safe to walk then it isn't safe to bike. Only a small % of cyclists will ride in the unprotected bike lanes. It's not safe out there on the extra wide roads built for freight or whatever the intent was, and that is where you actually find a bike lane. Not too many of them here. No trees so the ride is even more sweaty than it needs to be.(Cyclists- people going to a real place, work/school/shopping. not those in spandex and training for exercise or events).
Need more bike lanes
Need better bike lanes
My comments on biking are the same as walkingnot to be done unless you risk life and limb.
Lanes could be built off busy roads and reducing sprawl would make it easier to bicycle or walk to work or shopping.
(Bicycle facilities) need huge improvement
The only path I know of is Santos. I'd love to see a path on 40 and down 19. Connecting Alexander to Juniper (and other) springs would be awesome.
Depends on where you live (bicycle infrastructure). Newer areas seem to have pretty good conditions but older areas well not too good

I notice far more bike zones in the roadways. Now we need advertising because older people who may not understand biking as a mode of travel do not know how to respect the space you've created. They drive in it, they drive through it, they kill people. Time to advertise in "older people magazines" and TV (I am 67 so I am not being disrespectful, I am pointing out a generational problem that you need to overcome that requires resources)

We lack bike lanes and I will be quite hesitant to ride a bicycle to work, even though it is very easy for me to do so. Again it is related to how people choose to drive with carelessness and a lack of respect.

Where cyclist or walkers come close to the road or the trails are built on the right of ways, there should be a barrier from the cars. How about solar pathways that will light at night or dusk.

If it were more convenient for people to bike and walk we would have a healthier community.

We need a true network for protected bike infrastructure. the few bike lanes we have are unsafe and no novice or even somewhat capable rider is going to try their luck on them.

TRANSIT

Public transit

I would like to see more buses or trains.

We need to optimize our mass transit from buses to trains. Private auto travel will be reduced in the future and mass transit will be the mode

Most of our transit stops are out in full sun and weather elements. For those who rely on public transportation, they are exposed and the first thing I think of our our young children and senior citizens

I don't see a lot of (bus) shelters.

NON-EXISTENT (transit) how there ISN'T a bus system going up and down 200 is beyond me

There should be covered stops here. You want people to ride transit to real places like work or school, they need protection from the elements if they're going to get caught standing out there

Transit conditions look horrid with blazing sun in summer and few areas for seating if waiting for busses. Needs encouragement with more communication to residents.

(Transit) not sufficient

Don't see many (bus) shelters

Transit conditions look horrid with blazing sun in summer and few areas for seating if waiting for busses.

I gave it (transit infrastructure) one star - but it doesn't even deserve that. No covers, no benches or places to lean, and you have to stand in mud/puddles, etc. (especially after the sidewalk is removed and never replaced).

Marion County doesn't have general transit in my area. Why not?

Marion County doesn't have general transit in my area.

Again, I couldn't give "0" stars. A stop is right where I live and right where I work - they are 1 mile apart (no shade up hill walk on major highway) - but to go the one mile, I have to go all the way downtown and back to get there.

Bring passenger trains to Ocala. It would help the economy, especially downtown&events.

I don't live where transit is available

Not for me (transit). Sorry, we could not calculate transit directions from "Home ...

Otow provides transit as well as Marion transit. what about a rail system thru Ocala

Need improvement (transit)

The bus service is extremely limited here.

We need real bus stops in Ocala!

Really don't know (transit). Suntran has never been a reasonable option for me.

Haven't used transit. Would love to have a user-friendly transit/trolley linking Churchill Square Shopping Center with Downtown and Tuscaawilla Park

No transit in my area!

Marion County doesn't have general transit in my area.

When you're within city limits it is probably a lot easier (transit). However outside of the city limits, challenging.

Some people can take it (transit). Maybe the flex routes will be nicer when that is up and running but they aren't advertising it to the residents. I live in a "future flex route area" and haven't heard it. Though I believe I'd be on the blue route flex and that would make my 6 minute drive to work probably closer to an hour transit ride. That first and last mile seems to be a killer in the transit here. For those that have transit options. Still aren't seeing any west of 75

We don't have metro or trains
No transit that I know of in Dunnellon.
Ease is NOT the term (transit). When a one-way trip takes an hour because you have to go downtown first - is NOT efficient.
Marion County doesn't have general transit in my area.
There is almost no public transportation, at least in Dunnellon and other smaller cities. This needs improvement.
Service should really aim for 7 days a week with a bus every 15 minutes on peak and every half an hour off-peak. Lack of connections to intercity transportation is another challenge.
Ease? if walking over a mile to the nearest bus stop constitutes "ease"
I am retired so I answer this from the perspective of an older retired individual. My over 55 community provides a fair system to get around and outside the community for personal needs. I do not see a lot of elder service vans that you see in many other larger cities... and it could be that my community fulfills that need through its own transit system.
There should be a priority to work with the FDOT, CSX and Amtrak to get passenger rail service back on the S-line serving Ocala.
Rail transportation with connections to other cities.
Provide connections to Rail (Amtrak, SunRail, Brightline/Virgin TrainsUSA)
If buses are typically less than half full, perhaps more smaller,user friendly buses, particularly in areas where there is a lot of on/off traffic.
Increasing the schedule so the buses run on Sunday
Consider alternative transit patterns other than a hub/spoke only arrangement.
Higher frequency transit would be nice.
Deplorable (transit)
Add park and Rest Stop/Rest Rooms south of Racetrac on 200 close to Market Street. Nice walks for Heathbrook Hills and Fore Ranch could converge here.
SW Ocala could use bus transportation
Change the bus services so that it can run on sundays as well
There is no service on the SW quad of Ocala!
Improve use of rail system for movement of passengers and freight. Rail and use right-away with freeways and existing track.
AVIATION
Airport
Upgrade airport for human travel on commercial airlines.
Airport
Get us a major airport.
The Ocala airport needs to be expanded so commercial airlines can land.
Upgraded Airport for human travel by commercial carriers.
Passenger airport
We need an airport in Ocala. Too far to Orlando, Sanford or Tampa and traveling from Gainesville is ridiculous. Need major hub airport here.
The Ocala airport should allow commercial airlines, if it needs to be expanded then that should be reviewed, Orlando, Tampa and Gainesville take quite a while to reach.
Airline service
Does this objective (Travel Choices) include intercity travel choices? Ocala in the last 40 years has lost both rail and commercial air service.
Need commercial plane service at Ocala.
My experience is only with car, ride share, and plane. Ride Share into the airport is affordable and although there is a change of vehicles from Ocala to Orlando, it is reasonable. I wish Ocala would expand the airport to include some of the smaller commuter airlines that can barely keep up with jet Blue and Southwest. If you expanded the airport so carriers like Spirit Air and Frontier could take off, land, and develop their own hubs, you would get a ton of business. These airlines purchase a lot of the older, smaller models that could be doable in the space you have. You should look at the statistics of how many "unaccompanied minors" fly in and out of Orlando daily. The multiply that by 1.5 and you could get a rough idea of how many people would come just to visit their aging grandparents who are driving to and from Orlando to pick them up and bring them back.

ENVIRONMENT

Sustain the Quality of our Aquifer.

Quality of our Aquifer to not be interrupted

Save our Rural NW County to breed horses & cattle

Complete cross Florida bike trail on greenways

Leave us alone. We don't want any more growth. The more development we get, the more ugly and expensive it is to live here.

Stop all this development

Minimize transient traffic crossing through the area. Many developments and major roads focus only on the immediate vicinity, and the impact on increased traffic to the peripheral roads are neglected, and unfunded. The increased traffic is a burden to the area, and the costs remain unfunded. Developers are subsidized, and environmental deterioration is made worse.

Because of the robust economy, unfortunately, our rural environment is quickly changing as landowners sell to become retired millionaire and developers go from 30-60 courses a year to 30 or more a month. There should be incentives for landowner's and farmers to continue to maintain and utilize (and contribute) the land, or as a county, we should think about acquiring a percentage for green space. Otherwise we will look like Orlando Central and before you know it we will have a theme park just outside of "old town" downtown Ocala. (can you see it?)

One of the main attractions of Marion County is it's natural beauty, which can be preserved by improving the existing systems.

The environment is my number one priority. If we do not protect the water, air, and land we are not protecting ourselves.

Residents' voices should be heard first, realizing the importance of drinking water, and the damage caused by new roads and growth.

I moved here from Pinellas to enjoy nature and horse country wide open spaces and farmland with retirement.

The community needs to maintain " horse capital of the world" it is beautiful!

Protecting the natural and farm environment should be the primary long-term goal. Development that impinges on these areas is not desirable and will adversely affect the quality of life in Marion County. At the same time, improvements to transportation in the areas of mass transit options and making existing roads and highways more efficient will help the underserved residents as well as visitors and locals without "breaking the bank" through tax hikes or tax breaks to developers.

We need to keep in mind always our natural resources and waterways like Rainbow Springs and the Rainbow River.

Complete 4 lanes of SR 40 and US 41 with underpasses for wildlife transit.

Stop already with all this development. It makes things worse. The more we grow, the uglier our county gets. And the more expensive and unpleasant for those living here.

More traffic is unsafe, particularly where freeways do not exist, and are not wanted. Maintaining farmland is essential, and sprawling growth unconnected to a central sewerage system is unsafe for water.

Highway 40 from rt326 to 60th street needs something in the median strip road as made ugly from the past tree lined road

Could be much better. They recently removed beautiful old oaks to widen a road. (unnecessary btw) and could have left them standing in the median.

I don't see much landscaping. Unless you count the beautiful live oaks.

Obviously power lines shouldn't be in danger, but native and existing plants should be encouraged to grow along roadsides.

Please do something about all the trash! You could save thousands of dollars with all the free labor that we have sitting in the jail and prison. I'm sure some of those folks would love to work to get some gain time.

Street trees would be nice. -pedestrians might actually walk if it wasn't 100 degrees and no shade. The roads are designed like freeways, wide lanes and no trees or landscaping. sign my say 35 but the road says 65 and unwalkable.

Don't plant if you are not going to spend the money to maintain it. Then it becomes a waste of money. It made me so mad when there were beds installed on either side of Pine south of the train trestle. Lots of times they looked terrible because of weeds, etc.

I would say one of the most beautiful things about Ocala/Marion County is our scenery. The embellishments along the roadways in different areas... Very nice and makes traveling pleasant. I realize within city limits... Deep in the city, can't be difficult. However, I've been to other cities in which placement of businesses have zero rhyme or reason...Our community has done very well! I am sure we can always look for places to beautify as we should never settle for less

Would love to find a way to do wildlife underpasses along 40.

And where necessary animal wildlife crossings

Keep bicycles away from autos. I have experience with bicyclists taking chances as well as auto drivers negligence.

Ease of travel and quality environment will bring more economic development with lower costs to citizens and secure a safe, reliable, friendly community.

There is a constant fight between green space and routes heaving your sidewalk up in pieces. Not sure how you balance those out.

OTHER

Do not overpopulate existing communities

Get rid of the threat of eminent domain

Get rid of the threat of eminent domain & keep transit people out of our NW County

Stop crazy street and bike lane changes.

I don't bike for now - I don't have a death wish.

Don't ride

Bike lanes not the best way to spend limited funds

Live in rural nw and have no problem traveling to Ocala

Rush hour congestion but most of the time if no accidents, no problem

Crazy street changes....stop already!

Hwy 484 from Ocala to Dunnellon across the Rainbow river conjection needs to be addressed when school is in session. the light at Williams street and Pennsylvania backs up from downtown across the rainbow river bridge.

For me, n/a. No stores etc for several miles and I'm quite ok with that.

No comment. I live out in the country

I live in the country, no walking

I work about 20 miles from where I live. Wouldn't bike.

It is my impression that cyclists are largely catered to in this area.

Don't use (transit) so don't know.

Don't ride bus

It would take some cars off the road.

I know nothing about public transit in Marion County.

Waiting looks isolated from buildings/ safety, but I do not use public transit at this time.

Traffic at BT school during morning commute is ridiculous

Marion is a rural county and one would hope will remain so, which makes walking somewhat irrelevant. In some towns, walking is downright dangerous. Downtown Ocala is nicely laid out and walkable, but would benefit from more city parking areas (garages).

Don't use (transit) so don't know.

Don't use (transit) do cannot comment.

Can't comment as I don't use buses etc.

Have not used the transit in Marion recently

Have not used Marion County Transit recently

Presently don't use transit.

I don't use buses etc

Don't use (transit) so don't know.

Don't use (transit) so don't know.

It's the best of times and the worst of times. We are now a society that must watch around us. All the time. No matter where we are. We must be aware of our surroundings.

Our commute times have doubled.

The transportation needs of the future cannot be developed by maintaining or trying to upgrade current antiquated systems. We should look to our niche market and ensure that we have the transportation options that continue to attract money to be spent in our county through business ownership or trade.

Should be contained. Too many central urban areas can be used with existing roads. Developers should not be subsidized.

Don't forget about those of us on the Lake border...we pay taxes too and would love to see stuff down our way.

Tax dollars should be spent on infrastructure not landscaping.

I Commute 35 miles each way to work. Piece of cake most days. Even the Villages isn't that bad except not all visitors can figure out 'rotors' aka circle jerks.

Transportation services on Sunday

Living in the outskirts of Marion County we have no transportation. I would hope this would be considered, as a trial first and if all goes well a new system to provide transportation for those on the outer perimeter of Marion County.

Suntran

Don't do it. The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and expecting different results. We know by studying organization that we cannot change the paradigm by placating a percentage of people who want what's familiar and comfortable for them. Bite the bullet and go wild. You might not see another economic climate like this to help leverage expensive changes for decades so take full advantage of it while you can. Don't do death by committee...(wink wink)

Expanded future development, even within zoning, exceeds funding for road systems, and each new business or subdivision increases pressure on the barely adequate status quo.

I'm a safe and cautious driver. I use local roads so have no need for toll roads.

Omg - naming of roadways in Marion is ridiculous. Why does each road have so many names - 441, 301, Pine Ave for example. And why is everything Street Road??? And get GPS mapping updated and correct in neighborhoods and communities

Depends on where you live. Some bike lane IMHO interfere with traffic

As an equestrian, I've noticed that we are not acknowledged as recreational users in a serious way, as the cyclists are even though it's been proven over and over that we are every bit as much or more of an economic impact in this area. We have lost so many peaceful trails in Ocala that got paved to become road cyclist and skateboard playgrounds. It's quite disappointing.

Don't use (transit) so don't know.

Don't use (transit) so don't know.

I do not use public transportation so I'm giving a neutral rating because I do not know how well we do here in this specific factor.

Don't use (transit) so don't know.

You've got to make sure you are serving your residential needs first. After all it's your tax base.

Clean up all the blight.

Want to see more horse trails open d up to Driving carriages .. not just horseback

Would like to see some acknowledgement that equestrians have right of way on the roads too. Ocala is known as a HORSE town, not a BIKE town. There are plenty of BIKE towns in FL. We don't need more roads or bike trails. We need more beautiful settings and quiet country living, and less emphasis on rezoning so that the TPO can get their hands on more money.

The disparity is massive

Route 200 is quickly becoming difficult to traverse during peak hours for workers/commuters.

Other Modes of Transportation

Need to consider the aging population, they will need more options to doctors and facilities.

Landscaping is good. But don't plant the big trees in the center - put small ones in the center with big ones on the side - that way they shade sidewalks and if they fall or drop a limb at times, it won't automatically block some of the lanes.

ROAD OPS/SYSTEM PRESERVATION

Stop crazy street and bike lane changes. Stop with the 4-way stops, you are driving the driving public crazy

We really need to improve the existing roads I-75 and US 19 before creating urban sprawl in north central Florida

Access management is key. Stop giving everyone a driveway on the strip commercial highways. it's ridiculous

I75 needs to be improved and more FHP patrols

We do not need new highways, we need improvements to existing roads in the Dunnellon area like HWY 41,484 and 40 West. we do not need new highways.

Optimize what we have, do not increase traffic by removing automobile lanes.

Improving the existing roads and infrastructure would help with the flow of traffic and congestion. In Dunnellon, there is a section of Rt 20 near Rt 41 where the train overpass is too narrow and causes flooding. There should be a shoulder along the road instead of a curb.

Potholes everywhere, inclines to get off the highway (you have to use a highway to get to any commercial in this town because strip commercial is the only way here) you scrape your car trying to get in and out. of all the driveways.

There are roads with turn arrows that should allow yielding when the arrow is not green. That would help improve flow in places where traffic must wait through an entire cycle.

36th Ave around the railroad is bad, as well as the intersection at the Indian Cultural center

Traffic lights on 200 need to be synched better.

Please work on signal timing. Some lights only let a couple of cars go through before they change. I have actually sat through three red lights at 27th ave and 40. There are many others throughout the county that are the same way.

The pot hole issue is awful and need re-paving instead of just worthless patching.

It seems we could have a coordinated effort with all out traffic signals not just downtown Ocala.

Signal timing... and please address the length of the yellow lights along 60th between 27 and 200, horse trailers cannot stop in time.

Many county roads are in need of resurfacing.

Traffic signal timing illogical and unrealistic.

Many of our county's residents are pulling horse trailers, and in some instances the light system doesn't allow for adequate stopping or getting through the light.

Road change at Hwy 27 & NW 160 is bad. Having to turn left from CR 316 instead of 160 is dangerous. Can't see traffic coming.

Stop relying on the public to notify you of issues, there are enough city employees traveling the streets to recognize and report most issues if they would?

A light is needed at Rainbow Lakes Estates Blvd & SR41 ... also close the closest exit at the BP before someone gets killed. Major problem.

There is too much pressure to build toll roads and not enough money spent on present road repair or improvement.

Many roads in Dunnellon are in poor condition. There should be large shoulders along the roads so people would feel safer biking/ walking to commute or exercise.

Instead of dumping hot top in hole it should be squared and rolled which is being done in Northern cities

Signal timing is off - you aren't "doing the speed limit" from light to light - you have get up to speed, so you have to do 10mph over the speed limit to get to the next light in time to get through - otherwise you get stopped at every light.

Suggest pressure washing and/or painting concrete components of I-75 bridging and adjacent roads and upgrading landscaping at connectors.

441 from Belleview to Ocala could use some additional landscaping for being a major artery.

You can't maintain roads and sidewalks what makes you think you can maintain greenery?

SR 200 through Ocala looks terrible.

Extra wide lanes, no street trees, barely any sidewalks, few bike/pedestrian facilities, no on street parking. Combine that racetrack feel of highway on every road with terrible access management, strip commercial, and terrible drivers. oh, it's not safe out there. Design roads for the speed intended, fix the access management, provide protected multi-modal paths with landscaping, and use trees. Also, do we need HUGE right of ways? Let's work on making them more compact so the area is walkable.

Green left turn arrow lights at all intersections.

Standing water after/during hard rains a problem on

Question allowing left hand turns from and to Hwy SR200, and number of accesses from businesses along SR200. Suggest not allowing or minimizing left turns, except at intersections, and providing more connecting drives, back routing.

Many signs are faded and many damaged from hurricane Irma & not repaired. Some missing all together (breakwater & tiger lakes blvd)

Some overgrowth of trees hiding signage, and problems with fences obstructing oncoming traffic.

Need street lights in southeast Marion County. Especially along 200 south of 75

Most of time feel this excellent, except in residential areas - especially the only exit from Shadow Woods on 38th St. The bushes need to be cut WAY BACK so you can see.

You can see the signs, long straightaway drag strips lined with commercial and the tacky signs in the area.

Tree/shrub maintenance to keep signs visible needs work! And the nice new shiny pavements just turn into mirrors when they get wet so you can't see any stripping or where the lanes are.

As our residents age, we need better maintenance of lines etc.

Street lights are insufficient around intersections - more lights in each direction to better light it - but they don't have to be major high power lights - light the immediate space/location, not the entire neighborhood

Traffic lights not synced so you get stopped always. And everyone gets a commercial driveway 10 ft from the last driveway. stop and go and stop and go and stop and go. that's Ocala driving. Fix the traffic lights and access management and traveling would be easy here. there are only 350,000 people here. very low population but stop and go stop and go. Take the right lane on 200 and make it acceleration and deceleration lane plus transit only. that will help that crap highway. 6 lanes of congestion because of bad design

SW Marion county to downtown needs more alternate roads. Designers need to observe how traffic backs up during rush hours and put in appropriate turn lanes and adjust timing on signals

Some Tulane secondary roads are very congested during the most busiest points of the day (lunch hour, morning traffic, and evening traffic some two lanes secondary roads are very congested during the most busiest periods of the day (lunch hour, morning traffic, and evening traffic). Further, traffic lights... The timing on some of the traffic lights in relation to congestion needs to be improved significantly. I do not know if these lights are out dated and maybe that is the need to improve efficiency... A serious look at doing something with the timing of traffic lights may be an easy and economical solution.

Roads and many intersections are 20+ years old or behind needs

Access Management and Traffic Light Sync/timing. Long lights make for terrible pedestrian climate.

You look the road in fl. highland road there lake when rain and safe for kids walk pave road for school bus.

Until existing county roadways can be made safe and maintain why continue to build new roads that take \$\$ away from maintenance of existing roads.

This tollroad nonsense, I follow the money. It's being driven by the wrong people. Improve the roads we have. Leave the rural areas alone, that is unless you want to turn into California sprawl. Saw that happen firsthand

Please address existing roads and bridges in and around Dunnellon specifically HWYS 484, 41, 40.

Why spend billions acquiring right of ways and thru adverse possession when the existing infra structure could be improved for millions and NO TOLLS!!!

Absolutely improve existing roadways, new roads are 100% NOT needed

17th St intersection with Pine Ave is terrible at rush hour. People coming out of Dunkin Donuts and Burger King should not be able to turn left...way too dangerous!

Too much sprawl increases cost of infrastructure and road repair as well as safety and emergency services.

SAFETY

Improve safety by installing left hand turn arrows. Improve traffic flow by widening roads for more automobile lanes.

I think the biggest issue with traffic crashes truly belong to help people choose to drive. If we were all respectful to each other, I think we would see a tremendous difference. Maybe this is where there needs to be more education for young drivers. And a greater presence of law-enforcement. But I know that in itself is a huge budgetary challenge! Not every teenager goes through driver's education or that fantastic program given by the Sheriff's Department. Again, I think there needs to be a greater emphasis on education and law-enforcement.

I say this with tongue in cheek considering my age but, old people drive scary... you MUST be on the defense.

Too many drivers weaving in and out of traffic lanes at high speeds

Many drive too fast for conditions, not enough LEOs to go around, how about red light cameras and other speed control. Like Europe, your car going fast, the car get the ticket and it MUST BE PAID no matter who was driving. This should make the lawyers happy LOL

Aggressive driving, tailgaters and speed are the name of the game in Marion Cty. Even our police drive way too fast when not on emergency runs. I've witnessed police driving far too aggressively. Set the example please.

Need more officers on 301/441

Too little control of speeders, road rage, red-light runners. I-75 is a nightmare and needs immediate (not 2045) change. Trucks in right lane only would help. FHP monitoring would help.

Avoid I75 and 200. People drive too fast and wild.

Not worried about road conditions but worried about detracted drivers

Turning from southbound 60th to eastbound 200 TOO MANY northbound drivers ignore the "no right turn" signage and light!

The US441 and US301 interchange North of Ocala needs a study done. There has been various accidents there over the years.

301/441 is a zoo need mores patrols

I travel Rt 40 and 484 often. I feel that many people drive way too fast on these roads and pass when it is not safe. I am always on guard for a car heading toward me in my lane!

People drive crazy here. stop to turn right from left turn lane. stop to turn left from right lane. Speed to get to their appointment. Not give right of way to fire trucks.

There are some areas due to the road layout or where are structures are in place that it can be difficult to see clearly. I know outside of city limits there are areas where it might be strawberry and other things that make it difficult to see clearly. Safety issue.

Alternate solution for panhandlers instead of their working intersections would increase feeling of safety.

When walking on trails I feel safe...but not on the roads.

Goes with excess speeding should say texting as well, no matter what be on guard.

Walking can be dangerous, to your health and it goes along with cars speeding

Warm weather and ease of travel will be aided by more shade producing trees along transportation corridors to slow traffic as well as for safety

200 is speedway

Safety while walking in terms of lighting depends on the area where you are walking or things I like to do, like running. Sometimes the lighting is really not that great and I do not feel safe.

Very dangerous for bike commutes.

On the major arterial roads, the highspeed limits and lack of mid-block crosswalks makes it feel dangerous to be a pedestrian.

Walking is very dangerous. No protection at all. No sidewalks, bike paths, street lights or neighborhood roads without potholes.

Design roads for the speed intended, use complete streets, build bike/ped infrastructure. Statistics show that if the protected and landscaped bike/ped infrastructure is there then people will use it. Here, no one walks because they are like Frankenstein's monster, they want to live. Wide Right Of Ways and stroads built like freeways, along with no trees and a history of huge setbacks has made this place ugly and dangerous by design.

There are places where there are no sidewalks and there definitely should be. SR 200, SW 27th Ave/475a, S. Pine, 17th St/ Maricamp/464. There are also places where the design of the crosswalk is actually hazardous. The intersection of 200 and SW 27th Ave: rather than the crosswalks meeting at a 90 degree angle the crosswalk to cross 200 is actually around the corner on the other side of the pole. People who are turning right onto wb 200 cannot see the people waiting to cross 200.

Walk from bestbuy to bed bath and beyond. You'll have to cross a total of at least 12 lanes of traffic, traffic is doing 45-55mph through there, the right of way is wide and the buildings are so far from the street. If you don't die of heat stroke or being run over then you deserve a medal from the Mayor. And a medal of navigation for making it through the seas of parking just to get to the pedestrian death zone. Ocala and it's love for the car.

You're establishing California style bike lanes but the drivers here need to be educated and tested on how to treat bike lanes. They are not passing lanes and most space was taken from right turn lanes and I see a lot of infractions and safety issues because people don't understand.

Drivers in Ocala have little respect for cyclists. no bike lanes make cycling extra dangerous

I am threatened every time I try to ride in the lanes.

There is a generational lack of understanding of bike lanes, their use, the rules, and safety of all drivers of bikes, cars, and trucks. Bikers need to understand that for a time, they need to be hyper vigilant about their surroundings and others around them.

I would love to be able to bike to work, but people treat the new bike lines on Baseline Rd like turn lanes and I don't want to die.

We lack bike lanes and I will be quite hesitant to ride a bicycle to work, even though it is very easy for me to do so. Again it is related to how people choose to drive with carelessness and a lack of respect.

My comments on biking are the same as walkingnot to be done unless you risk life and limb.

If it isn't safe to walk then it isn't safe to bike. Only a small % of cyclists will ride in the unprotected bike lanes. It's not safe out there on the extra wide roads built for freight or whatever the intent was, and that is where you actually find a bike lane. Not too many of them here. No trees so the ride is even more sweaty than it needs to be.(Cyclists- people going to a real place, work/school/shopping. not those in spandex and training for exercise or events).

FREIGHT

Restricting freight movement on Suncoast would preserve it as a scenic highway instead of creating another grimy transportation chute like I-75 is becoming.

Restricting freight movement on Suncoast would preserve it as a scenic highway instead of creating another grimy transportation chute like I-75 is becoming. Anything to improve movement of trucks and autos on I-75 would be appreciated and save lives.

I would put both freight movement and new roadways as last if I could. Marion County is rural, and that is why people move here. If I wanted to live in a big city I would move to Orlando.

This is tricky because we need the commerce and that means larger trucks on the road all day and night... I know they are supposed to travel in the far right lane, but they don't so maybe more restriction around lane driving.

Need extension of Suncoast Parkway to Ga. line and beyond for emergency egress during hurricanes. Florida needs three ways out.

ROAD CAPACITY

Widen Hwy 41

SR 40 to 41 as well as SR41 should be 4 lanes.

Add another lane, but do it quickly, get big crews in, no long construction builds

More emphasis should be placed on rail. It is not to evacuate during a hurricane, and residents should shelter in place in county facilities. Florida should use contra flow for evacuations consistent with existing examples in neighboring states.

Complete 4 lanes of SR 40 and US 41 with underpasses for wildlife transit.

SECURITY

Suggest adding, "particularly during emergencies, such as hurricanes."


Before we even consider travel and visitors, etc. we need to ensure that our residents of Marion County can navigate it for work opportunities, general commerce, medical treatment, etc. Remember the old Maine saying "if you can't get there from here..." then you are not going anywhere. This includes creative use of Uber, busses, train transportation, ride share, and telecommuting options.

TECH/INNOVATION

Well really this is a priority on a much larger scale than just transportation but this is a good opportunity to talk about innovative things like automated cars and how they will work on an 8 lane roadway etc.

TOURISM

Let's face it. We all need a level of tourism to bring dollars into our County to help keep our tax base reasonable considering the average age range within our county... That being said, we need to make sure people will come and stay in the County even though many attractions like theme parks etc. or more than an hour or two away. So high speed affordable train and ride share systems can attract people who want to relax from the hustle in downtown Orlando or Tampa but can still get there for a day or two. At the same time, we have to promote a level of tourism/ tourist attraction that says to folks (and their wallets) "hey stay here and do these wonderful things while relaxing in a beautiful country like environment and we will get you to Disney for a few days somewhere in between".



APPENDIX E

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

2045 Long Range Transportation Plan

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

APRIL 2020

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. 2045 VISION	3
III. STATE GOALS AND REQUIREMENTS	4
Florida Statewide Plans	4
IV. FEDERAL PLANNING REQUIREMENTS	6
Performance Measures	7
Goal Metrics and Weights	8
Public Involvement Measures of Effectiveness	9
V. OCALA MARION TPO 2045 LRTP GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND EVALUATION CRITERIA	10

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the first steps in the preparation of any plan is to establish a vision and/or goals and objectives that serve to guide the planning process. The late great Yogi Berra once said “If you don’t know where you are going, you’ll end up someplace else”. The most effective way to plan for anything is to first establish what it is the plan needs to address, whether it is population growth or worsening safety, etc. This is the purpose of outlining plan Goals and Objectives, which establish the “mission” of the plan and are subsequently used to guide the process.

The 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for the Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) includes Vision and Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria formulated to guide the Plan update process. The 2045 Vision reflects a desired future for Marion County that embraces the values of safety, accessibility, convenience, environmental protection, and system preservation. The Goals and Objectives represent the desired outcomes of the planning process, in a much more tangible way than the Vision, and actionable steps or targets for those outcomes, respectively.

Current federal legislation dictating the long-range planning requirements for TPOs, the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act signed into law in December 2015, includes a requirement to practice performance-based planning (PBP), which is a data-driven process that involves goal setting, target setting, and performance monitoring to track progress toward the targets. A review of the Planning Factors and National Goals as set forth by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is a necessary preliminary step in the establishment of LRTP Goals and Objectives. The relationship of the LRTP Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria to the PBP requirements established by FHWA is also important. In addition, the Plan’s Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria used to prioritize investments must align with performance monitoring requirements.

Finally, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has established planning factors and goals, as laid out in the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP). Consistency with Statewide goals and requirements is critically important, as the LRTP represents a coordinated effort with FDOT, as well as local planning partners.

The following sections describe the Federal and State goals and planning factors, as well as a detailed description of the Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria developed to guide the Ocala Marion 2045 LRTP. **Appendix A** through **C** of this report also include a comparison of the LRTP Goals and Objectives to the National Goals, Florida Transportation Goals and Objectives, and the Florida Highway Safety Plan Program Areas and Strategies.

II. 2045 VISION

The 2045 LRTP Vision encapsulates the goals and objectives, singling out key elements that represent overarching guiding principles. There are nuances within each of the explicit Vision elements that are more fully fleshed out in the Goals and Objectives. 2045 Vision:



**DEVELOP A SAFE,
CONVENIENT AND
ACCESSIBLE MULTIMODAL
TRANSPORTATION
SYSTEM THAT SUPPORTS
A VIBRANT ECONOMY,
PRESERVES EXISTING
ASSETS AND
PROTECTS THE
NATURAL
ENVIRONMENT.**

The elements of safety, convenience, and accessibility encapsulate multi-modality, including pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and automobile; support for a vibrant economy addresses growth, economic development and freight movement; protecting the natural environment refers to the unique landscape of Marion County, including its national forest, parks and trails, and natural springs; and preserving existing assets addresses a “fix it first” mentality that implicitly acknowledges the importance of cost efficient operational solutions in lieu of major capital investments.

III. STATE GOALS AND REQUIREMENTS

Chapter 339.155 in the Florida Statutes requires that FDOT develop a Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan that mimics the federal legislation pertaining to MPO/TPOs. This Statewide LRTP requires a minimum 20-year planning horizon, regular plan updates every 5 years, and coordination/reconciliation with local LRTPs. The FDOT Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Program Management Handbook requires that MPOs and TPOs consider the goals and objectives in the FTP in metropolitan long-range plans. Section 175(6)(b) of the statute also requires that metropolitan plans also consider the following in the identification of improvement strategies, consistent with Planning Factors established in federal statute:

1. Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
2. Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
3. Increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and for freight;
4. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve quality of life;
5. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
6. Promote efficient system management and operation; and
7. Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

Florida Statewide Plans

The FTP is a Statewide plan developed by FDOT to fulfill Chapter 339.155. The FTP includes three separate documents. The first is the Vision Element, which examines growth and development trends and establishes a desired direction for a longer-term period of 50 years. The second piece of the FTP is the Policy Element, which is essentially a strategic plan that establishes goals and objectives and sets a policy framework for the State and for regional and local partners. The final document is the

Implementation Element, which is action oriented in terms of the short- and long-term investments and, as such, is a more fluid plan that is updated on a more regular basis. The goals of the FTP, as outlined in the Policy Element, address the core elements of both the State and Federal legislation guiding transportation planning. The FTP goals include:

- Safety and Security for Residents, Visitors, and Businesses
- Agile, Resilient, and Quality Infrastructure
- Efficient and Reliable Mobility for People and Freight
- More Transportation Choices for People and Freight
- Transportation Solutions that Support Florida's Global Economic Competitiveness
- Transportation Solutions that Support Quality Places to Live, Learn, Work, and Play
- Transportation Solutions that Support Florida's Environment and Conserve Energy

Other Statewide plans reviewed for consistency and effectively adopted by reference include the Florida Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP), updated in 2019; the Florida 2017 Highway Safety Plan (HSP); Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), updated in 2016; the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Policy Plan, updated in 2016; and the Freight Mobility and Trade Plan, updated in 2019. Objectives and strategies in those respective plans are listed in the following section. **Appendices B and C** includes a fuller description of Florida Transportation Plan and the Florida Highway Safety Plan goals.



SIS PLAN OBJECTIVES

Interregional Connectivity

- Ensure the efficiency and reliability of multimodal transportation connectivity between Florida's economic regions and between Florida and other states and nations.

Intermodal Connectivity

- Ensure the efficiency and reliability of multimodal transportation connectivity between Florida's economic regions and between Florida and other states and nations.

Economic Development

- Provide transportation systems to support Florida as a global hub for trade, tourism, talent, innovation, business, and investment

HSP PROGRAM AREAS

- Aging Road Users
- Community Traffic Safety
- Comprehensive Traffic Enforcement & Education
- Distracted Driving
- Florida Law Enforcement Liaison
- Impaired Driving
- Motorcycle Safety
- Occupant Protection & Child Passenger Safety
- Paid Media
- Pedestrian Bicycle and Safety
- Public Traffic Safety Professionals Training
- Speed/Aggressive Driving
- Teen Driver Safety
- Traffic Records

SHSP STRATEGIES

Engineering

- Identify, develop and deploy engineering solutions that encourage safe driving behavior and reduce roadway fatalities and serious injuries
- Incorporate policies and practices into roadway design, construction, operation, and maintenance that make Florida's transportation system safer for all users
- Ensure infrastructure design allows for safe and efficient access for first responders

Enforcement

- Increase targeted enforcement activities in high-crash locations and at relevant times
- Increase enforcement of high-risk driving behaviors
- Coordinate with prosecutors and the courts to improve prosecution and adjudication of traffic safety-related cases

Education

- Educate all road users on sharing the road
- Develop and implement communication strategies for all road users and improve public awareness of highway safety.
- Increase training and educational opportunities for first responders and other traffic safety partners focused on reducing roadway-related fatalities and serious injuries.
- Increase motorists' understanding of engineering solutions and best practices, and vehicle technologies that can reduce the number and injury severity of crashes

FMTP GOALS

- Increasing the flow of domestic and international trade through the state's seaports and airports, including specific policies and investments that will recapture cargo currently shipped through seaports and airports located outside the state.
- Increasing the development of Intermodal Logistics Centers (ILCs) in the state, including specific strategies, policies, and investments that capitalize on the empty backhaul trucking and rail market in the state.
- Increasing the development of manufacturing industries in the state, including specific policies and investments in transportation facilities that will promote the successful development and expansion of manufacturing facilities.
- Increasing the implementation of compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), and propane energy policies that reduce transportation costs for businesses and residents located in the state.

TAMP OBJECTIVES

- Ensure the safety and security of transportation customers.
- Minimize damage to infrastructure from vehicles.
- Achieve and maintain a state of good repair for transportation assets.
- Reduce the vulnerability and increase the resilience of critical infrastructure to the impacts of extreme weather and events.

IV. FEDERAL PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

One of the key provisions of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), signed into law by President Obama in 2015, is the requirement that states and TPOs improve project decision making through a performance-based planning process. The FHWA's rule implementing the FAST Act includes seven goals to guide that process and the establishment of targets and measurement of progress toward those targets in 23 U.S.C. 150(b). FHWA also included a set of ten planning factors in the final rule, including two new planning factors since passage of the FAST Act. A comparison of the National Planning Factors to the Ocala Marion 2045 Goals and Objectives is included in **Appendix A**.

NATIONAL GOALS

- **Safety** - To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.
- **Infrastructure Condition** - To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.
- **Congestion Reduction** - To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System.
- **System Reliability** - To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system.
- **Freight Movement and Economic Vitality** - To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.
- **Environmental Sustainability** - To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.
- **Reduced Project Delivery Delays** - To reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices.



NATIONAL PLANNING FACTORS

- Support the **economic vitality** of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
- Increase the **safety** of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- Increase the **security** of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- Increase the **accessibility and mobility** of people and freight;
- Protect and enhance the **environment**, promote energy conservation, improve the **quality of life**, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns;
- Enhance the **integration and connectivity** of the transportation system across and between modes for people and freight;
- Promote **efficient system management and operations**;
- Emphasize the **preservation** of the existing transportation system;
- **NEW**: Improve the **resiliency and reliability** of the transportation system, and reduce or mitigate storm water impacts of surface transportation; and
- **NEW**: Enhance travel and **tourism**.

Performance Measures

The 2045 LRTP cycle is the first time TPOs are required to set performance targets based on consistent federal performance measures and monitor progress towards those measures. The requirement involves a successive process beginning with the establishment of National Goals by Congress, followed by USDOT establishing performance measures, culminating in states, TPOs, and public transit agencies setting targets and monitoring progress toward them. The target setting process is also successive, with states setting targets first, followed by metropolitan target setting within 180 days of state targets being set. There are three performance measure programs for which targets have been set by FDOT and TPOs, including:

- **Safety Measures (PM1)** – including traffic fatalities and serious injuries, pedestrian/bicycle fatalities and serious injuries; and transit incidents.
- **Pavement and Bridge Condition Measures (PM2)** – including roadway, bridge, and transit capital asset condition and how well they are maintained.
- **System Performance Measures (PM3)** – including highway congestion, travel reliability, freight movement reliability, and mobile source emissions.


The Ocala Marion TPO Board has adopted its own targets for the PM1 and adopted PM 2/3 measures consistent with FDOT targets at their February 2018, 2019, 2020 and October 2018, February 2020 TPO Governing Board meetings, respectively.

The target setting and monitoring process, as mandated by the FAST Act, is an important part of performance-based planning, but it must also be complemented by a performance-oriented assessment and evaluation process in the prioritization of investments. There are two parts to evaluating performance from a planning standpoint. The first is to identify currently or historically under-performing facilities and the second is to forecast performance using the travel demand model and other tools to estimate the impacts of growing demand on the system.

Goal Metrics and Weights

The LRTP Objectives all have quantitative metrics associated with them, as outlined in **Table 1**, that are used to evaluate improvements for prioritization purposes, and to assess the system as a whole to identify additional needed improvements. The connection between the Goal Metrics and the Performance Measures used to set targets and monitor progress toward them is crucial to the effectiveness of planning based on specific goals and objectives.

An added nuance that aligns the quantitative evaluation process more closely to community needs and desires is the assignment of weights to the Goals. The weights reflect the relative importance of each individual goal, relative to the others. So, for instance, if the safety goal is the most important goal, it should be weighted more heavily than the other goals. Each goal's weight is included in Table 1 below, consistent with the TPO Board's assignment of weights to the goals. The weights are used in the evaluation of improvements used to prioritize them and develop the cost feasible plan. The goal weighting process is described in **Appendix D**.



Public Involvement Measures of Effectiveness





A FHWA requirement related to the public involvement process in LRTP includes monitoring of the effectiveness of the public involvement program. As described in detail in the 2045 LRTP Public Involvement Plan, goals, targets, and measures were developed to monitor the LRTP

public involvement program. These measures of effectiveness will be employed throughout the plan update process in an effort to continuously improve the program through the feedback generated by the measures. Every interaction with members of the public during the plan update process will include the opportunity to complete a comment card, which is displayed in **Figure 1** below. The Public Involvement Plan contains a more comprehensive description of the metrics and goals.

Figure 1. Public Involvement Questionnaire

OCALA MARION 2045

RACING TOWARD A CONNECTED FUTURE



Thank you for attending our meeting or visiting our booth today! We appreciate and value your participation in this process and we are focused on providing quality information that is accessible to all who participate. We also are committed to making our interactions with the communities of Marion County accessible, in terms of where, when and how we hold these meetings. Please take a few moments to complete this survey to help us to continuously improve this process. Thank you!

For all questions, 1 is not good, 5 is great.

1. How would you rate the **TIME OF DAY** chosen to hold this meeting?

1

2

3

4

5

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

2. How would you rate the **LOCATION** chosen to hold this meeting?

1

2

3

4

5

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

3. How would you rate the clarity and usefulness of the **CONTENT** presented at this meeting?

1

2

3

4

5

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

4. How would you rate the **STYLE AND PRESENTATION** of materials presented at this meeting?

1

2

3

4

5

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

5. How would you rate the **ELECTRONIC MEDIA** developed for the project (Website, Metroquest, Facebook)?

1

2

3

4

5

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

Please tell us how you learned about the meeting you attended and any comments you have on the process or transportation issues in Marion County.

2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN - GOALS AND OBJECTIVES TECH MEMO | 9

V. OCALA MARION TPO 2045 LRTP GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 1. 2045 LRTP Goals, Weights, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria

GOALS	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVES	EVALUATION CRITERIA
Goal 1: Promote travel choices that are multimodal and accessible	13%	1.1 Increase transit ridership by providing more frequent and convenient service.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does project include public transit frequency improvement? Does project fill sidewalk gap, bike lane gap, or develop a trail? Does project fill sidewalk gap, bike lane gap, trail, or include transit in EJ area?
		1.2 Increase bicycle and pedestrian travel by providing sidewalks, bike lanes, and multi-use trails throughout the county.	
		1.3 Provide safe and reasonable access to transportation services and facilities for use by the transportation disadvantaged (TD) population.	
		1.4 Provide desirable and user-friendly transportation options for all user groups regardless of socioeconomic status or physical ability.	
Goal 2: Provide efficient transportation that promotes economic development	18%	2.1 Improve access to and from areas identified for employment development and growth.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is project is on a facility that traverses an employment growth area? Is project on a facility that accesses a freight intensive area? Is project on a congested facility?
		2.2 Foster greater economic competitiveness through enhanced, efficient movement of freight.	
		2.3 Address mobility needs and reduce the roadway congestion impacts of economic growth.	
Goal 3: Focus on improving safety and security of the transportation system	19%	3.1 Provide safe access to and from schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is project on a facility in the vicinity of a school (1/2 mile)? Is project on a facility designated as an evacuation route? Is project on a facility with a history of fatal and/or severe crashes (last 5 yrs)?
		3.2 Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and freight within the region and to other areas.	
		3.3 Improve security by enhancing the evacuation route network for natural events and protecting access to military asset.	
		3.4 Reduce the number of fatal and severe injury crashes for all users	



GOALS	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVES	EVALUATION CRITERIA
Goal 4: Ensure the transportation system meets the needs of the community	13%	4.1 Provide opportunities to engage citizens, particularly traditionally underserved populations, and other public and private groups and organizations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is project in one or more local plans? • Does project traverse EJ area?
		4.2 Support community education and involvement in transportation planning.	
		4.3 Coordinate with local government to consider local land use plans when identifying future transportation projects.	
		4.4 Collaborate with various agencies including FDOT, Marion County School District, Marion County and its municipalities, SunTran, and providers of freight and rail travel to create strategies for developing a multimodal transportation system.	
		4.5 Improve the safety of the transportation system for all user groups regardless of socioeconomic status or physical ability.	
Goal 5: Protect natural resources and create quality places	13%	5.1 Limit impacts to existing natural resources, such as parks, preserves, and protected lands.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does facility encroach on natural resource areas? • Does project improve facilities that traverse flood prone areas? • Does project improve a facility that provides access to a tourist destination?
		5.2 Avoid or minimize negative impacts of projects and disruption to residential neighborhoods.	
		5.3 Improve the resiliency of the transportation system through mitigation and adaptation strategies to deal with catastrophic events.	
		5.4 Enhance access to tourist destinations, such as trails, parks and downtowns.	
Goal 6: Optimize and preserve existing infrastructure	24%	6.1 Improve the performance of the transportation system through intersection modifications, access management strategies, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) applications, and other emerging technologies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does project include operational or ITS improvement? • Is project on facility due or overdue for resurfacing/ maintenance? • Does project includes operational or ITS imp. on high crash corridors?
		6.2 Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system and establish priorities to ensure optimal use.	
		6.3 Maintain the transportation network by identifying and prioritizing infrastructure preservation and rehabilitation projects such as asset management and signal system upgrades.	
		6.4 Plan for the future of Automated, Connected, Electric and Shared (ACES) vehicles and other emerging technologies into the transportation network	
		6.5 Improve the reliability of the transportation system through operational and incident management strategies.	

Appendix A: Ocala Marion TPO LRTP Goals vs National Goals

NATIONAL PLANNING FACTORS

OCALA MARION GOALS	OCALA MARION OBJECTIVES	ECONOMIC VITALITY	SAFETY	SECURITY	ACCESSIBILITY & MOBILITY	ENVIRONMENT & QUALITY OF LIFE	INTEGRATION & CONNECTIVITY	EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT & OPERATION	SYSTEM PRESERVATION	RESILIENCY & RELIABILITY	TRAVEL & TOURISM
Goal 1: Promote travel choices that are multimodal and accessible	1.1 Increase transit ridership by providing more frequent and convenient service.				1	2	1			1	2
	1.2 Increase bicycle and pedestrian travel by providing sidewalks, bike lanes, and multi-use trails throughout the county.		2		1	1	1				2
	1.3 Provide safe and reasonable access to transportation services and facilities for use by the transportation disadvantaged (TD) population.		2		1	2	2				
	1.4 Provide desirable and user-friendly transportation options for all user groups regardless of socioeconomic status or physical ability.				1	2	2				
Goal 2: Provide efficient transportation that promotes economic development	2.1 Improve access to and from areas identified for employment development and growth.	1			1		2				2
	2.2 Foster greater economic competitiveness through enhanced, efficient movement of freight.	1			1			2			
	2.3 Address mobility needs and reduce the roadway congestion impacts of economic growth.	1			1			2			1
Goal 3: Focus on improving safety and security of the transportation system	3.1 Provide safe access to and from schools.		1		1		2				
	3.2 Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and freight within the region and to other areas.	1			1		1	2			
	3.3 Improve security by enhancing the evacuation route network for natural events and protecting access to military asset.							2			
	3.4 Reduce the number of fatal and severe injury crashes for all users		1								

1 = Directly addresses National Planning Factor
2 = Indirectly addresses National Planning Factor

NATIONAL PLANNING FACTORS

OCALA MARION GOALS	OCALA MARION OBJECTIVES	ECONOMIC VITALITY	SAFETY	SECURITY	ACCESSIBILITY & MOBILITY	ENVIRONMENT & QUALITY OF LIFE	INTEGRATION & CONNECTIVITY	EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT & OPERATION	SYSTEM PRESERVATION	RESILIENCY & RELIABILITY	TRAVEL & TOURISM
Goal 4: Ensure the transportation system meets the needs of the community	4.1 Provide opportunities to engage citizens, particularly traditionally underserved populations, and other public and private groups and organizations.				2	2					
	4.2 Support community education and involvement in transportation planning.				2	2					
	4.3 Coordinate with local government to consider local land use plans when identifying future transportation projects.				2	2					
	4.4 Collaborate with various agencies including FDOT, Marion County School District, Marion County and its municipalities, SunTran, and providers of freight and rail travel to create strategies for developing a multimodal transportation system.	1			1		1	2		2	
	4.5 Improve the safety of the transportation system for all user groups regardless of socioeconomic status or physical ability.		1		2	2					
Goal 5: Protect natural resources and create quality places	5.1 Limit impacts to existing natural resources, such as parks, preserves, and protected lands.					1				1	2
	5.2 Avoid or minimize negative impacts of projects and disruption to residential neighborhoods.					1					
	5.3 Improve the resiliency of the transportation system through mitigation and adaptation strategies to deal with catastrophic events.					2				1	2
	5.4 Enhance access to tourist destinations, such as trails, parks and downtowns.	2			1	2	2				1

NATIONAL PLANNING FACTORS

OCALA MARION GOALS	OCALA MARION OBJECTIVES	ECONOMIC VITALITY	SAFETY	SECURITY	ACCESSIBILITY & MOBILITY	ENVIRONMENT & QUALITY OF LIFE	INTEGRATION & CONNECTIVITY	EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT & OPERATION	SYSTEM PRESERVATION	RESILIENCY & RELIABILITY	TRAVEL & TOURISM
Goal 6: Optimize and preserve existing infrastructure	6.1 Improve the performance of the transportation system through intersection modifications, access management strategies, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) applications, and other emerging technologies.				1			1	1	1	
	6.2 Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system and establish priorities to ensure optimal use.				1			1	1	2	
	6.3 Maintain the transportation network by identifying and prioritizing infrastructure preservation and rehabilitation projects such as asset management and signal system upgrades.				1			1	1	2	
	6.4 Plan for the future of Automated, Connected, Electric and Shared (ACES) vehicles and other emerging technologies into the transportation network	2	2		2			2			
	6.5 Improve the reliability of the transportation system through operational and incident management strategies.				1			1		1	

1 = Directly addresses National Planning Factor
2 = Indirectly addresses National Planning Factor

Appendix B: Florida Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Safety and Security for Residents, Visitors, and Businesses

- **Objective 1:** Prevent transportation-related fatalities and injuries
- **Objective 2:** Reduce the number of crashes on the transportation system
- **Objective 3:** Prevent and mitigate transportation-related security risks
- **Objective 4:** Provide transportation infrastructure and services to help prepare for, respond to, and recover from emergencies

Goal 2: Agile, Resilient, and Quality Infrastructure

- **Objective 1:** Meet or exceed industry, state, national, or international standards for infrastructure quality, condition, and performance for all modes of transportation
- **Objective 2:** Optimize the functionality and efficiency of existing infrastructure and right-of-way
- **Objective 3:** Adapt transportation infrastructure and technologies to meet changing customer needs
- **Objective 4:** Increase the resiliency of infrastructure to risks, including extreme weather and other environmental conditions

Goal 3: Efficient and Reliable Mobility for People and Freight

- **Objective 1:** Reduce delays related to bottlenecks, gaps, and crashes and other incidents for all modes of Florida's transportation system
- **Objective 2:** Increase the reliability of all modes of Florida's transportation system
- **Objective 3:** Increase customer satisfaction with Florida's transportation system and regulatory processes for residents, visitors, and businesses
- **Objective 4:** Increase the efficiency of the supply chain for freight moving to, from, and through Florida
- **Objective 5:** Increase the efficiency and flexibility of transportation related regulatory processes

Goal 4: More Transportation Choices for People and Freight

- **Objective 1:** Increase the use of new mobility options and technologies such as shared, automated, and connected vehicles

- **Objective 2:** Increase the share of person trips using public transportation and other alternatives to single occupancy motor vehicles
- **Objective 3:** Increase the number of quality options for visitor travel to, from, and within Florida
- **Objective 4:** Increase the number of quality options for moving freight to, from, and within Florida
- **Objective 5:** Increase the efficiency and convenience of connecting between multiple modes of transportation

Goal 5: Transportation Solutions that Support Florida's Global Economic Competitiveness

- **Objective 1:** Provide transportation infrastructure and services to support job growth in transportation-dependent industries and clusters
- **Objective 2:** Increase transportation connectivity between Florida's economic centers and regions
- **Objective 3:** Increase transportation connectivity between Florida and global and national trading partners and visitor origin markets
- **Objective 4:** Increase the number of skilled workers in Florida's transportation-related industries

Goal 6: Transportation Solutions that Support Quality Places to Live, Learn, Work, and Play

- **Objective 1:** Plan and develop transportation systems that reflect regional and community values, visions, and needs
- **Objective 2:** Increase customer satisfaction with Florida's transportation system
- **Objective 3:** Provide convenient, efficient accessibility to the transportation system for Florida's residents and visitors
- **Objective 4:** Provide transportation solutions that contribute to improved public health

Goal 7: Transportation Solutions that Support Florida's Environment and Conserve Energy

- **Objective 1:** Plan and develop transportation systems and facilities in a manner that protects, and where feasible, restores the function and character of the natural environment and avoids or minimizes adverse environmental impacts
- **Objective 2:** Decrease transportation-related air quality pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions
- **Objective 3:** Increase the energy efficiency of transportation
- **Objective 4:** Increase the diversity of transportation-related energy sources, with emphasis on cleaner and more efficient fuel

Appendix C: Florida Highway Safety Plan Program Areas and Strategies

AGING ROAD USERS PROGRAM STRATEGIES

- Manage and evaluate aging road user safety, access, and mobility activities to maximize the effectiveness of programs and resources
- Provide the best available data to assist with decisions that improve aging road user safety, access, and mobility
- Provide information and resources regarding aging road user safety, access, and mobility
- Inform public officials about the importance and need to support national, State, regional, and local policy and program initiatives which promote and sustain aging road user safety, access, and mobility
- Promote and encourage practices that support and enhance aging in place (i.e., improve the environment to better accommodate the safety, access, and mobility of aging road users)
- Enhance aging road user safety and mobility through assessment, remediation, and rehabilitation
- Promote safe driving and mobility for aging road users through licensing and enforcement
- Promote the safe mobility of aging vulnerable road users (pedestrians, transit riders, bicyclists, and other non-motorized vehicles)
- Promote the value of prevention strategies and early recognition of at-risk drivers to aging road users and stakeholders
- Bridge the gap between driving retirement and mobility independence (i.e., alternative transportation mobility options, public transportation, and dementia friendly transportation)

COMMUNITY TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAM

- Increase public awareness and highway traffic safety programs
- Expand the network of concerned individuals to build recognition and awareness about traffic safety
- Support initiatives that enhance traffic laws and regulations related to safe driving

COMPREHENSIVE TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT AND EDUCATION PROGRAM

- Increase public awareness of highway traffic safety programs
- Expand the network of concerned stakeholders to build recognition and awareness of traffic safety
- Support initiatives that enhance traffic safety laws and regulations related to safe driving
- Support and promote effective law enforcement efforts related to safe driving

DISTRACTED DRIVING PROGRAM

- Increase public awareness and outreach programs on distracted driving
- Encourage companies, state agencies, and local governments to adopt and enforce policies to reduce distracted driving in company and government vehicles
- Support legislative initiatives that enhance distracted driving-related traffic laws and regulations
- Support Graduated Driver's License (GDL) restrictions to reduce distracted driving behaviors in teen drivers
- Increase law enforcement officer understanding of Florida traffic crash reporting and distracted driving data collection
- Educate law enforcement, judges, and magistrates on the existing laws that can be applied to distracted driving
- Deploy high-visibility enforcement mobilizations on distracted driving subject to appropriate/future legislation

FLORIDA LAW ENFORCEMENT LIAISON PROGRAM

- No specific strategies

IMPAIRED DRIVING PROGRAM

- Improve DUI enforcement
- Improve prosecution and adjudication of impaired driving cases
- Improve the DUI administrative suspension process
- Improve prevention, public education, and training
- Improve the treatment system (i.e., DUI programs, treatment providers, and health care providers)
- Improve data collection and analysis

MOTORCYCLE SAFETY PROGRAM

- Collect and analyze data on motorcycle crashes, injuries, and fatalities to provide local and state agencies with the best available data to make appropriate and timely decisions that improve motorcycle safety in Florida
- Manage motorcycle safety activities in Florida as part of a comprehensive plan that includes centralized program planning, implementation, coordination, and evaluation to maximize the effectiveness of programs and reduce duplication of effort
- Promote personal protective gear and its value in reducing motorcyclist injury levels and increasing rider conspicuity
- Ensure persons operating a motorcycle on public roadways hold an endorsement specifically authorizing motorcycle operation
- Promote adequate rider training and preparation to new and experienced motorcycle riders by qualified instructors at State-approved training centers
- Reduce the number of alcohol, drug, and speed-related motorcycle crashes in Florida
- Support legislative initiatives that promote motorcycle safety-related traffic laws and regulations
- Ensure State and local motorcycle safety programs include law enforcement and emergency services components

- Incorporate motorcycle-friendly policies and practices into roadway design, traffic control, construction, operation, and maintenance
- Increase the visibility of motorcyclists by emphasizing rider conspicuity and motorist awareness of motorcycles
- Develop and implement communications strategies that target high-risk populations and improve public awareness of motorcycle crash problems and programs

OCCUPANT PROTECTION AND CHILD PASSENGER SAFETY PROGRAM

- Support the Occupant Protection Resource Center which provides stakeholders with occupant protection public information and education materials, information regarding child passenger safety inspection stations, and child passenger safety technician and instructor training
- Promote safety belt and child restraint use to high-risk groups through the Florida Occupant Protection Task Force
- Support the national Click It or Ticket mobilization through overtime enforcement efforts targeting safety belt and child restraint use during day and nighttime hours

PAID MEDIA PROGRAM

- Increase public awareness of highway traffic safety programs and enforcement
- Expand the network of concerned individuals to build recognition and awareness

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE SAFETY PROGRAM

- Increase awareness and understanding of safety issues related to vulnerable road users
- Increase compliance with traffic laws and regulations related to pedestrian and bicycle safety through education and enforcement
- Develop and use a systemic approach to identify locations and behaviors prone to pedestrian and bicycle crashes and implement multidisciplinary countermeasures
- Promote, plan, and implement built environments (urban, suburban, and rural) which encourage safe bicycling and walking
- Support national, state, and local legislative initiatives and policies that promote bicycle and pedestrian safety

PUBLIC TRAFFIC SAFETY PROFESSIONALS TRAINING

- Increase traffic safety professionals' awareness of highway safety issues
- Improve traffic enforcement and detection skills
- Improve crash investigation and prosecution skills
- Improve detection, prosecution, and adjudication of impaired driving cases
- Increase understanding of the importance of accurate data collection and analysis

SPEED/AGGRESSIVE DRIVING PROGRAM

- Support and promote effective law enforcement efforts to reduce aggressive driving
- Support and promote effective law enforcement efforts to reduce speed-related crashes
- Increase training and education on the problems of speed/aggressive driving
- Identify and support initiatives that reduce instances of speeding and aggressive driving

TEEN DRIVER SAFETY PROGRAM

- Expand the network of concerned individuals to build recognition and awareness as it relates to teen driver safety and support for the Florida Teen Safe Driving Coalition
- Create a safe driving culture for teen drivers through outreach and education
- Support initiatives that enhance safe teen driving-related traffic laws and regulations related to safe teen driving

TRAFFIC RECORDS PROGRAM

- Develop and maintain complete, accurate, uniform, and timely traffic records data
- Provide the ability to link traffic records data together
- Facilitate access to traffic records data
- Promote the use of traffic records data







Appendix D: Goal Weighting Worksheet

The worksheet used to weight the goals was completed by the LRTP Steering Committee and Citizens and Technical advisory committees and

the results were provided to the TPO Board for their consideration in assigning final weights. It consists of a very simple pairwise comparison process in which one of two goals is picked as more important than the other in every possible combination of goals. The results of this process are then summarized and converted to percentage values, which become the goal weights.

OCALA MARION 2045

RACING TOWARD
A CONNECTED FUTURE



Goal Weighting Exercise Instructions

1. Complete the matrix choosing more important goal of all 2-goal comparisons

2. Add number of times a goal was more important

3. Divide each goal "score" by 15 (number of combinations)

4. Results represent relative weight of each goal

B. Economic Development

C. Safety & Security

D. Community Needs

E. Quality & Natural Places

F. Optimize Existing System

						A. Travel Choices
						B. Economic Development
						C. Safety & Security
						D. Community Needs
						E. Quality & Natural Places

#

A

B

C

D

E

F

Report number of times each goal is more important

%

A

B

C

D

E

F

Divide number above by 15 for each relative goal weight

2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN – GOALS AND OBJECTIVES TECH MEMO | 19

APPENDIX F

SYSTEM PERFORMANCE REPORT

2045 Long Range Transportation Plan

SYSTEM PERFORMANCE REPORT

SEPTEMBER 2020



CONTENTS

1 - BACKGROUND	3
2 - HIGHWAY SAFETY MEASURES (PM1)	4
3 - PAVEMENT AND BRIDGE CONDITION MEASURES (PM2)	7
4 - SYSTEM PERFORMANCE, FREIGHT, AND CONGESTION MITIGATION & AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM MEASURES (PM3)	10
5 - TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT MEASURES	13
6 - TRANSIT SAFETY PERFORMANCE	17

1 - BACKGROUND

Pursuant to the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) Act enacted in 2012 and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) enacted in 2015, state departments of transportation (DOT) and MPOs must apply a transportation performance management approach in carrying out their federally required transportation planning and programming activities. The process requires the establishment and use of a coordinated, performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support national goals for the federal-aid highway and public transportation programs.

On May 27, 2016, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued the Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning; Metropolitan Transportation Planning Final Rule (The Planning Rule).¹ This rule details how state DOTs and MPOs must implement new MAP-21 and FAST Act transportation planning requirements, including the transportation performance management provisions.

In accordance with the Planning Rule, the Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) must include a description of the performance measures and targets that apply to the TPO planning area and a System Performance Report as an element of its LRTP. The System Performance Report evaluates the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to required performance targets, and reports on progress achieved in meeting the targets in comparison

with baseline data and previous reports.

There are several milestones related to the required content of the System Performance Report:

- In any LRTP adopted on or after May 27, 2018, the System Performance Report must reflect Highway Safety (PM1) measures;
- In any LRTP adopted on or after October 1, 2018, the System Performance Report must reflect Transit Asset Management measures;
- In any LRTP adopted on or after May 20, 2019, the System Performance Report must reflect Pavement and Bridge Condition (PM2) and System Performance (PM3) measures; and
- In any LRTP adopted on or after July 20, 2021, the System Performance Report must reflect Transit Safety measures.

The Ocala Marion TPO **2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan** was adopted on November 24, 2020. Per the Planning Rule, the System Performance Report for the TPO is included for the required Highway Safety (PM1), Bridge and Pavement (PM2), System Performance (PM3), and Transit Asset Management.

¹ The Final Rule modified the Code of Federal Regulations at 23 CFR Part 450 and 49 CFR Part 613.

2 - HIGHWAY SAFETY MEASURES (PM1)

Effective April 14, 2016, the FHWA established five highway safety performance measures² to carry out the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). These performance measures are:

1. Number of fatalities;
2. Rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT);
3. Number of serious injuries;
4. Rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT; and
5. Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries.

FDOT publishes statewide safety performance targets in the HSIP Annual Report that it transmits to FHWA each year. Current safety targets address calendar year 2020. For the 2020 HSIP annual report, FDOT established statewide at "0" for each performance measure to reflect Florida's vision of zero deaths.

The Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization adopted/approved safety performance targets on February 25, 2020 via Resolution 20-03.

2 23 CFR Part 490, Subpart B

Table 3.1. Highway Safety (PM1) Targets

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	OCALA MARION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION BASELINE PERFORMANCE (FIVE-YEAR ROLLING AVERAGE 2015-2019)	CALENDAR YEAR 2020 OCALA MARION PLANNING AREA PERFORMANCE TARGETS
Number of Fatalities	81	88
Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million VMT	1.80	1.86
Number of Serious Injuries	407	433
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million VMT	9.06	9.19
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries	51	55

Baseline Safety Conditions

After FDOT set its Safety Performance Measures targets in 2020, the Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization established 2019 Baseline Safety Performance Measures. To evaluate baseline Safety Performance Measures, the most recent five-year rolling average (2015-2019) of crash data and VMT were utilized. Table 3-2 presents the Baseline Safety Performance Measures for Florida and Ocala Marion TPO. For Florida, 2014-2018 is considered as the baseline performance since this is the latest available statewide data.

Trends Analysis

The Ocala Marion TPO used fatality and serious injury data provided by FDOT in its calculation to determine 2020 Safety targets. Specifically, the number of fatalities, serious injuries and non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries for every year from 2011 to 2019 were recorded. Table 3-3 shows the changes in Safety Performance Measures for the TPO from 2015 through 2019. The measures shown in Table 3-3 were calculated by following the same methodology as that used to calculate the baseline conditions.

The 2020 targets for the Number of Fatalities, Serious Injuries and Non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries were determined by applying the annual percent change of the five 5-year rolling averages to the most recent rolling average (2015-2019). The Fatality Rate was calculated by dividing the 2020 target for Number of Fatalities by the projected Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) for 2020. The same calculation was performed to determine the Serious Injury Rate.

Table 3.2. Baseline Safety Performance Measures

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	FLORIDA (2014-2018)	OCALA MARION TPO (2015-2019)
Number of Fatalities	2,972	81
Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million VMT	1.4	1.8
Number of Serious Injuries	20,738	407
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million VMT	9.8	9.1
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries	3,339	51

Table 3.3. Trends of Ocala Marion Safety Performance Measures 2015-2019

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	2011-2015	2012-2016	2013-2017	2014-2018	2015-2019
Number of Fatalities	60.0	62	66.0	74	81
Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million VMT	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.8
Number of Serious Injuries	327.0	328	321.0	370	407
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million VMT	8.0	7.9	7.5	8.4	9.1
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries	38.0	41	43.0	46	51
VMT (100 MVMT)	40.6	41.6	42.7	43.9	44.9

Coordination with Statewide Safety Plans and Processes

The Ocala Marion TPO recognizes the importance of linking goals, objectives, and investment priorities to established performance objectives, and that this link is critical to the achievement of national transportation goals and statewide and regional performance targets. As such, the Ocala Marion TPO 2045 LRTP reflects the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets as they are available and described in other state and public transportation plans and processes; specifically the Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), the Florida Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), and the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP).

- The 2016 Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) is the statewide plan focusing on how to accomplish the vision of eliminating fatalities and reducing serious injuries on all public roads. The SHSP was developed in coordination with Florida's 27 metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) through Florida's Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC). The SHSP guides FDOT, MPOs, and other safety partners in addressing safety and defines a framework for implementation activities to be carried out throughout the state.
- The FDOT HSIP process provides for a continuous and systematic process that identifies and reviews traffic safety issues around the state to identify locations with potential for improvement. The goal of the HSIP process is to reduce the number of crashes, injuries, and fatalities by eliminating certain predominant types of crashes through the implementation of engineering solutions.
- Transportation projects are identified and prioritized with the MPOs and non-metropolitan local governments. Data are analyzed for each potential project, using traffic safety data and traffic demand modeling, among other data. The FDOT Project Development and Environment Manual requires the consideration of safety when preparing a proposed project's purpose and need, and defines several factors related to safety, including crash modification factor and safety performance factor, as part of the analysis of alternatives. MPOs and local governments consider safety data analysis when determining project priorities.

LRTP Safety Priorities

The Ocala Marion TPO 2045 LRTP increases the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users as required. The LRTP aligns with the Florida SHSP and the FDOT HSIP with specific strategies to improve safety performance focused on prioritized safety projects, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety enhancements, and traffic operation improvements to address our goal to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

The LRTP identifies safety needs within the metropolitan planning area and provides funding for targeted safety improvements. Goal Three in the LRTP is to Focus on Improving the Safety and Security of the Transportation System, with the following objectives, related to safety:

- Goal 3, Objective 3.1: Provide safe access to and from schools.
- Goal 3, Objective 3.4: Reduce the number of fatal and severe injury crashes for all users.

The Ocala Marion TPO has developed a project selection process that includes three safety measures of effectiveness related to the above-stated objectives to evaluate and prioritize projects for inclusion in the LRTP cost feasible plan. The measures include:

- Annual severity-weighted crash frequency
- Five year crash history involving bicyclists and pedestrians
- Number of schools within 0.5 miles of transportation facility

The first two measures are intended to identify those facilities that have a history of crashes, weighted by severity, measured by number of fatalities, serious injuries, and property damage and facilities with a history of crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrian. The third measure is intended to prioritize any facility near schools as those facilities for which safety of particular and critical importance.

The Ocala Marion TPO's 2045 LRTP will provide information from the FDOT HSIP annual reports to track the progress made toward the statewide safety performance targets. The MPO will document the progress on any safety performance targets established by the MPO for its planning area.

3 - PAVEMENT AND BRIDGE CONDITION MEASURES (PM2)

Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Measures and Targets Overview

In January 2017, USDOT published the Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Measures Final Rule, which is also referred to as the PM2 rule. This rule establishes the following six performance measures:

1. Percent of Interstate pavements in good condition;
2. Percent of Interstate pavements in poor condition;
3. Percent of non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) pavements in good condition;
4. Percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in poor condition;
5. Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) classified as in good condition; and
6. Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) classified as in poor condition.

The four pavement condition measures represent the percentage of lane-miles on the Interstate and non-Interstate NHS that are in good condition or poor condition. The PM2 rule defines NHS pavement types as asphalt, jointed concrete, or continuous concrete. Five metrics are used to assess pavement condition:

- International Roughness Index (IRI) - an indicator of roughness; applicable to asphalt, jointed concrete, and continuous concrete pavements;
- Cracking percent - percentage of the pavement surface exhibiting cracking; applicable to asphalt, jointed concrete, and continuous concrete pavements;
- Rutting - extent of surface depressions; applicable to asphalt pavements only;
- Faulting - vertical misalignment of pavement joints; applicable to jointed concrete pavements only; and
- Present Serviceability Rating (PSR) – a quality rating applicable only to NHS roads with posted

speed limits of less than 40 miles per hour (e.g., toll plazas, border crossings). States may choose to collect and report PSR for applicable segments as an alternative to the other four metrics.

For each pavement metric, a threshold is used to establish good, fair, or poor condition. Using these metrics and thresholds, pavement condition is assessed for each 0.1 mile section of the through travel lanes of mainline highways on the Interstate or the non-Interstate NHS. Asphalt pavement is assessed using the IRI, cracking, and rutting metrics, while jointed concrete is assessed using IRI, cracking, and faulting. For these two pavement types, a pavement section is rated good if the rating for all three metrics are good, and poor if the ratings for two or more metrics are poor.

Continuous concrete pavement is assessed using the IRI and cracking metrics. For this pavement type, a pavement section is rated good if both metrics are rated good, and poor if both metrics are rated poor.

If a state collects and reports PSR for any applicable segments, those segments are rated according to the PSR scale. For all three pavement types, sections that are not good or poor are rated fair.

The good/poor measures are expressed as a percentage and are determined by summing the total lane-miles of good or poor highway segments and dividing by the total lane-miles of all highway segments on the applicable system. Pavement in good condition suggests that no major investment is needed and should be considered for preservation treatment. Pavement in poor condition suggests major reconstruction investment is needed due to either ride quality or a structural deficiency.

The bridge condition measures refer to the percentage of bridges by deck area on the NHS that are in good condition or poor condition. The measures assess the condition of four bridge components: deck, superstructure, substructure, and culverts. Each component has a metric rating threshold to establish good, fair, or poor condition. Each bridge on the NHS is evaluated using these ratings. If the lowest rating of the four metrics is greater than or equal to seven, the structure is classified as good. If the lowest rating is less than or equal to four, the structure is classified as poor. If the lowest rating is five or six, it is classified as fair.

The bridge measures are expressed as the percent of NHS bridges in good or poor condition. The percent is determined by summing the total deck area of good or poor NHS bridges and dividing by

the total deck area of the bridges carrying the NHS. Deck area is computed using structure length and either deck width or approach roadway width.

A bridge in good condition suggests that no major investment is needed. A bridge in poor condition is safe to drive on; however, it is nearing a point where substantial reconstruction or replacement is needed.

Federal rules require state DOTs and MPOs to coordinate when setting pavement and bridge condition performance targets and monitor progress towards achieving the targets. States must establish:

- Four-year statewide targets for the percent of Interstate pavements in good and poor condition;
- Two-year and four-year targets for the percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in good and poor condition; and
- Two-year and four-year targets for the percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) in good and poor condition.

MPOs must establish four-year targets for all six measures. MPOs can either agree to program projects that will support the statewide targets or establish their own quantifiable targets for the MPO's planning area.

The two-year and four-year targets represent pavement and bridge condition at the end of calendar years 2019 and 2021, respectively.

Pavement and Bridge Condition Baseline Performance and Established Targets

This System Performance Report discusses the condition and performance of the transportation system for each applicable target as well as the progress achieved by the MPO in meeting targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports. Because the federal performance measures are new, performance of the system for each measure has only recently been collected and targets have only recently been established. Accordingly, this first Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization LRTP System Performance Report highlights performance for the baseline period, which is 2017. FDOT will

continue to monitor and report performance on a biennial basis. Future System Performance Reports will discuss progress towards meeting the targets since this initial baseline report.

Table 4.1 presents baseline performance for each PM2 measure for the State and for the Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization area as well as the two-year and four-year targets established by FDOT for the State.

FDOT established the statewide PM2 targets on May 18, 2018. In determining its approach to establishing performance targets for the federal pavement and bridge condition performance measures, FDOT considered many factors. FDOT is mandated by Florida Statute 334.046 to preserve the state's pavement and bridges to specific standards. To adhere to the statutory guidelines, FDOT prioritizes funding allocations to ensure the current transportation system is adequately preserved and maintained before funding is allocated for capacity improvements. These statutory guidelines envelope the statewide federal targets that have been established for pavements and bridges.

In addition, MAP-21 requires FDOT to develop a Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) for all NHS pavements and bridges within the state. The TAMP must include investment strategies leading to a program of projects that would make progress toward achievement of the state DOT targets for asset condition and performance of the NHS. FDOT's TAMP was updated to reflect MAP-21 requirements in 2018 and the final TAMP was approved on June 28, 2019.

Further, the federal pavement condition measures require a new methodology that is a departure from the methods currently used by FDOT and uses different ratings and pavement segment lengths. For bridge condition, the performance is measured in deck area under the federal measure, while the FDOT programs its bridge repair or replacement work on a bridge by bridge basis. As such, the federal measures are not directly comparable to the methods that are most familiar to FDOT.

In consideration of these differences, as well as the unfamiliarity associated with the new required processes, FDOT took a conservative approach when setting its initial pavement and bridge condition targets.

The Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization agreed

Table 4.1. Pavement and Bridge Condition (PM2) Performance and Targets

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	STATEWIDE (2017 BASELINE)	STATEWIDE 2019 ACTUAL	OCALA MARION TPO 2019 ACTUAL*	STATEWIDE 2-YEAR TARGET (2019)	STATEWIDE 4-YEAR TARGET (2021)
Percent of Interstate pavements in good condition	66.0%	68.5%	66.4%	n/a	≥60%
Percent of Interstate pavements in poor condition	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	n/a	<5%
Percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in good condition	76.4%	41.0%	37.8%	≥40%	≥40%
Percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in poor condition	3.6%	0.2%	0.0%	<5%	<5%
Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) in good condition	67.7%	74.19%	59.1%	≥50%	≥50%
Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) in poor condition	1.2%	0.40%	0%	0%<10%	<10%
*For bridge condition, 2018 Actual data is represented, as 2019 data is unavailable					

to support FDOT's pavement and bridge condition performance targets on October 23, 2018. By adopting FDOT's targets, the Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization agrees to plan and program projects that help FDOT achieve these targets.

The Ocala Marion TPO recognizes the importance of linking goals, objectives, and investment priorities to established performance objectives, and that this link is critical to the achievement of national transportation goals and statewide and regional performance targets. As such, the TPO's 2045 LRTP reflects the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets as they are described in other state and public transportation plans and processes, including the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) and the Florida Transportation Asset Management Plan.

- The FTP is the single overarching statewide plan guiding Florida's transportation future. It defines the state's long-range transportation vision, goals, and objectives and establishes the policy framework for the expenditure of state and federal funds flowing through FDOT's work program. One of the seven goals defined in the FTP is Agile, Resilient, and Quality Infrastructure.

- The Florida Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) explains the processes and policies affecting pavement and bridge condition and performance in the state. It presents a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving these assets effectively throughout their life cycle.

The Ocala Marion TPO 2045 LRTP seeks to address system preservation, identifies infrastructure needs within the metropolitan planning area, and provides funding for targeted improvements. Goal Six in the LRTP is to Optimize and Preserve Existing Infrastructure, which includes the following objectives:

- Goal 6, Objective 6.2: Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system and

establish priorities to ensure optimal use.

- Goal 6, Objective 6.3: Maintain the transportation network by identifying and prioritizing infrastructure preservation and rehabilitation projects such as asset management and signal system upgrades.

4 - SYSTEM PERFORMANCE, FREIGHT, AND CONGESTION MITIGATION & AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

MEASURES (PM3)

System Performance/ Freight/CMAQ Performance Measures and Targets Overview

In January 2017, USDOT published the System Performance/Freight/CMAQ Performance Measures Final Rule to establish measures to assess passenger and freight performance on the Interstate and non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS), and traffic congestion and on-road mobile source emissions in areas that do not meet federal National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The rule, which is referred to as the PM3 rule, requires MPOs to set targets for the following six performance measures:

National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)

1. Percent of person-miles on the Interstate system that are reliable, also referred to as Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR);
2. Percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable (LOTTR);

National Highway Freight Program (NHFP)

3. Truck Travel Time Reliability index (TTTR);

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)

4. Annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per

capita (PHED);

5. Percent of non-single occupant vehicle travel (Non-SOV); and
6. Cumulative 2-year and 4-year reduction of on-road mobile source emissions (NOx, VOC, CO, PM10, and PM2.5) for CMAQ funded projects.

In Florida, only the two LOTTR performance measures and the TTTR performance measure apply. Because all areas in Florida meet current NAAQS, the last three measures listed measures above pertaining to the CMAQ Program do not currently apply in Florida.

LOTTR is defined as the ratio of longer travel times (80th percentile) to a normal travel time (50th percentile) over all applicable roads during four time periods (AM peak, Mid-day, PM peak, and weekends) that cover the hours of 6 a.m. to 8 p.m. each day. The LOTTR ratio is calculated for each roadway segment, essentially comparing the segment with itself. Segments with LOTTR ≥ 1.50 during any of the above time periods are considered unreliable. The two LOTTR measures are expressed as the percent of person-miles traveled on the Interstate or non-Interstate NHS system that are reliable. Person-miles consider the number of people traveling in buses, cars, and trucks over these roadway segments. To obtain person miles traveled, the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for each segment are multiplied by the average vehicle occupancy for each type of vehicle on the roadway. To calculate the percent of person miles traveled that are reliable, the sum of the number of reliable person miles traveled is divide by the sum of total person miles traveled.

TTTR is defined as the ratio of longer truck travel times (95th percentile) to a normal travel time (50th percentile) over the Interstate during five time periods (AM peak, Mid-day, PM peak, weekend, and overnight) that cover all hours of the day. TTTR is quantified by taking a weighted average of the maximum TTTR from the five time periods for each Interstate segment. The maximum TTTR is weighted by segment length, then the sum of the weighted values is divided by the total Interstate length to calculate the Travel Time Reliability Index.

The data used to calculate these PM3 measures are provided by FHWA via the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS). This dataset contains travel times, segment lengths, and Annual Average Daily Travel (AADT) for Interstate and non-Interstate NHS roads.

The PM3 rule requires state DOTs and MPOs to coordinate when establishing performance targets for these measures and to monitor progress towards achieving the targets. FDOT must establish:

- Two-year and four-year statewide targets for percent of person-miles on the Interstate system that are reliable;
- Four-year targets for the percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable³; and
- Two-year and four-year targets for truck travel time reliability

MPOs must establish four-year performance targets for all three measures within 180 days of FDOT establishing statewide targets. MPOs establish targets by either agreeing to program projects that will support the statewide targets or setting quantifiable targets for the MPO's planning area.

The two-year and four-year targets represent system performance at the end of calendar years 2019 and 2021, respectively.

PM3 Baseline Performance and Established Targets

The System Performance Report discusses the condition and performance of the transportation system for each applicable PM3 target as well as the progress achieved by the MPO in meeting targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports. Because the federal performance measures are new, performance of the system for each measure has only recently been collected and targets have only recently been established. Accordingly, this Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization LRTP System Performance Report highlights performance for the baseline period, which is 2017. FDOT will continue to monitor and report performance on a biennial basis. Future System Performance 3 Beginning with the second performance period covering January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2025, two-year targets will be required in addition to four-year targets for the percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable measure.

Table 5.1. System Performance and Freight (PM3) - Performance and Targets

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	STATEWIDE (2017 BASELINE)	STATEWIDE 2019 ACTUAL	OCALA MARION TPO 2019 ACTUAL	STATEWIDE 2-YEAR TARGET (2019)	STATEWIDE 4-YEAR TARGET (2021)
Percent of person-miles on the Interstate system that are reliable	82.2%	83.0%	100%	≥75.0%	≥70.0%
Percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable	84.0%	87%	96%	n/a	≥50.0%
Truck travel time reliability index (TTTR)	1.43	1.45	1.42	≤1.75	≤2.00

Reports will discuss progress towards meeting the targets since this initial baseline report.

Table 5.1 presents baseline performance for each PM3 measure for the state and for the MPO planning area as well as the two-year and four-year targets established by FDOT for the state.

FDOT established the statewide PM3 targets on May 18, 2018. In setting the statewide targets, FDOT reviewed external and internal factors that may affect reliability, conducted a trend analysis for the performance measures, and developed a sensitivity analysis indicating the level of risk for road segments to become unreliable within the time period for setting targets. One key conclusion from this effort is that there is a lack of availability of extended historical data with which to analyze past trends and a degree of uncertainty about future reliability performance. Accordingly, FDOT took a conservative

approach when setting its initial PM3 targets.

The Ocala Marion TPO agreed to support FDOT's PM3 targets on October 23, 2018. By adopting FDOT's targets, the Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization agrees to plan and program projects that help FDOT achieve these targets.

The Ocala Marion TPO recognizes the importance of linking goals, objectives, and investment priorities to established performance objectives, and that this link is critical to the achievement of national transportation goals and statewide and regional performance targets. As such, the Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization 2045 LRTP reflects the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets as they are described in other state and public transportation plans and processes, including the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) and the Florida Freight Mobility and Trade Plan.

- The FTP is the single overarching statewide plan guiding Florida's transportation future. It defines the state's long-range transportation vision, goals, and objectives and establishes the policy framework for the expenditure of state and federal funds flowing through FDOT's work program. One of the seven goals of the FTP is Efficient and Reliable Mobility for People and

Freight.

- The Florida Freight Mobility and Trade Plan presents a comprehensive overview of the conditions of the freight system in the state, identifies key challenges and goals, provides project needs, and identifies funding sources. Truck reliability is specifically called forth in this plan, both as a need as well as a goal.

The Ocala Marion TPO 2045 LRTP seeks to address system reliability and congestion mitigation through various means, including capacity expansion and operational improvements. The Ocala Marion TPO 2045 LRTP seeks to address system preservation, identifies infrastructure needs within the metropolitan planning area, and provides funding for targeted improvements. Goal Two in the LRTP is to Provide Efficient Transportation that Promotes Economic Development and Goal Six is to Optimize and Preserve Existing Infrastructure. The following objectives under those two goals, related to reliability and congestion, include:

- Goal 2, Objective 2.2: Foster greater economic competitiveness through enhanced, efficient movement of freight.
- Goal 2, Objective 2.3: Address mobility needs and reduce the roadway congestion impacts of economic growth.
- Goal 6, Objective 6.1: Improve the performance of the transportation system through intersection modifications, access management strategies, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) applications, and other emerging technologies.
- Goal 6, Objective 6.4: Plan for the future of Automated, Connected, Electric, and Shared (ACES) vehicles and other emerging technologies into the transportation network.
- Goal 6, Objective 6.5: Improve the reliability of the transportation system through operational and incident management strategies.

The Ocala Marion TPO has developed a project selection process that includes three reliability and mobility measures of effectiveness related to the above-stated objectives to evaluate and

prioritize projects for inclusion in the LRTP cost feasible plan. The measures include:

- Facility congestion level (projected 2045 PM peak period volume-to-capacity ratio under LOS C conditions in no-build network scenario)
- Facilities identified for ITS and emergency vehicle signal pre-emption in the 2018 ITS Strategic Plan

5 - TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT MEASURES

Transit Asset Performance

On July 26, 2016, FTA published the final Transit Asset Management (TAM) rule. This rule applies to all recipients and subrecipients of Federal transit funding that own, operate, or manage public transportation capital assets. The rule

Table 6.1. FTA TAM Performance Measures

ASSET CATEGORY	PERFORMANCE MEASURE AND ASSET CLASS
1. Equipment	Percentage of non-revenue, support-service and maintenance vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark
2. Rolling Stock	Percentage of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have either met or exceeded their useful life benchmark
3. Infrastructure	Percentage of track segments with performance restrictions
4. Facilities	Percentage of facilities within an asset class rated below condition 3 on the TERM scale

defines the term “state of good repair,” requires that public transportation providers develop and implement TAM plans, and establishes state of good repair standards and performance measures for four asset categories: equipment, rolling stock, infrastructure, and facilities. The rule became effective on October 1, 2018.

Table 6.1 below identifies performance measures outlined in the final rule for transit asset management.

For equipment and rolling stock classes, useful life benchmark (ULB) is defined as the expected lifecycle of a capital asset, or the acceptable period of use in service, for a particular transit provider’s operating environment. ULB considers a provider’s unique operating environment such as geography and service frequency.

Public transportation agencies are required to establish and report transit asset management targets annually for the following fiscal year. Each public transit provider or its sponsors must share its targets, TAM, and asset condition information with each MPO in which the transit provider’s projects and services are programmed in the MPO’s TIP.

MPOs are required to establish initial transit asset management targets within 180 days of the date that public transportation providers establish initial targets. However, MPOs are not required to establish transit asset management targets annually each time the transit provider establishes

targets. Instead, subsequent MPO targets must be established when the MPO updates the LRTP.

When establishing transit asset management targets, the MPO can either agree to program projects that will support the transit provider targets or establish its own separate regional transit asset management targets for the MPO planning area. In cases where two or more providers operate in an MPO planning area and establish different targets for a given measure, the MPO has the option of coordinating with the providers to establish a single target for the MPO planning area, or establishing a set of targets for the MPO planning area that reflects the differing transit provider targets.

To the maximum extent practicable, transit providers, states, and MPOs must coordinate with each other in the selection of performance targets.

The TAM rule defines two tiers of public transportation providers based on size parameters. Tier I providers are those that operate rail service or more than 100 vehicles in all fixed route modes, or more than 100 vehicles in one non-fixed route mode. Tier II providers are those that are a subrecipient of FTA 5311 funds, or an American Indian Tribe, or have 100 or less vehicles across all fixed route modes, or have 100 vehicles or less in one non-fixed route mode. A Tier I provider must establish its own transit asset management targets, as well as report performance and other data to FTA. A Tier II provider has the option to establish its own targets or to participate in a group plan with other Tier II

Table 6.2. Florida Group TAM Plan Participants

DISTRICT	PARTICIPATING TRANSIT PROVIDERS	
1	Good Wheels, Inc ¹ Central Florida Regional Planning Council	DeSoto County Transportation
2	Suwannee Valley Transit Big Bend Transit ² Baker County Transit Nassau County Transit	Ride Solution Levy County Transit Suwannee River Economic Council
3	Tri-County Community Council Big Bend Transit ² Gulf County ARC	Calhoun Transit Liberty County Transit JTRANS Wakulla Transit
4	No participating providers	
5	Sumter Transit Marion Transit	
6	Key West Transit	
7	No participating providers	

1 no longer in service
2 provider service area covers portions of Districts 1 and 2

providers whereby targets are established by a plan sponsor, typically a state DOT, for the entire group. A total of 19 transit providers participated in the FDOT Group TAM Plan and continue to coordinate with FDOT on establishing and reporting group targets to FTA through the National Transit Database (NTD) (Table 6.2). These are FDOT's Section 5311 Rural Program subrecipients. The Group TAM Plan was adopted in October 2018 and covers fiscal years 2018-2019 through 2021-2022. Updated targets were submitted to NTD in 2019.

The MPO has the following Tier I and Tier II providers operating in the region:

The Ocala Marion TPO planning area is served by two (2) transit service providers: SunTran and Marion Transit. SunTran is considered a Tier I

provider and, as such, must develop a TAM Plan. Marion Transit is considered a Tier II provider and thus is included in a group TAM plan developed by the FDOT Public Transit Office in Tallahassee.

On November 24, 2020, the Ocala Marion TPO agreed to support SunTran's transit asset management targets, thus agreeing to plan and program projects in the TIP that once implemented, are anticipated to make progress toward achieving the transit provider targets.

SunTran established the transit asset targets

Table 6.3. FTA TAM Targets for SunTran

ASSET CATEGORY PERFORMANCE MEASURE	ASSET CLASS	FY 2019 ASSET CONDITION	FY 2023 TARGET
Rolling Stock			
Age - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their ULB	Articulated Bus	NA	NA
	Bus	69%	0%
	Cutaways	0%	100%
	Van	NA	NA
	Etc.	NA	NA
Equipment			
Age - % of non-revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their ULB	Non Revenue/Service Automobile	80%	20%
	Trucks and other Rubber Tire Vehicles	NA	NA
	Maintenance Equipment	NA	NA
	Etc.	NA	NA
Infrastructure			
% of track segments with performance restrictions	Guideway Elements	NA	NA
	Power & Signal Elements	NA	NA
	Track elements	NA	NA
Facilities			
Condition - % of facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale	Administration	NA	NA
	Maintenance	0%	0%
	Parking Structures	NA	NA
	Passenger Facilities	NA	NA
	Shelter	NA	NA
	Storage	NA	NA
	Etc.	NA	NA

identified in Table 6.3 in July, 2019:

The transit asset management targets are based on the condition of existing transit assets and planned investments in equipment, rolling stock, infrastructure, and facilities. The targets reflect the most recent data available on the number, age, and condition of transit assets, and expectations and capital investment plans for improving these assets. The table summarizes both existing conditions for the most recent year available, and the targets.

Marion Transit is part of the Group TAM Plan for Fiscal Years 2018/2019-2022/2023 developed by FDOT for Tier II providers in Florida and coordinates with FDOT on reporting of group targets to NTD.

The FY 2019 asset conditions and 2020 targets for the Tier II providers are shown in Table 6.4.

The statewide group TAM targets are based on the condition of existing transit assets and planned investments in equipment, rolling stock, infrastructure, and facilities over the next year. The

Table 6.4. FDOT Group Plan Transit Asset Management Targets for Tier II Providers

ASSET CATEGORY PERFORMANCE MEASURE	ASSET CLASS	FY 2019 ASSET CONDITION	FY 2023 TARGET
Revenue Vehicles			
Age - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)	Automobile	27.3%	≤27%
	Bus	9.1%	≤9%
	Cutaway Bus	15.6%	≤15%
	School Bus	25%	≤25%
	Mini-Van	13.8%	≤13%
	SUV	10.0%	≤10%
	Van	30.1%	≤30%
Equipment			
Age - % of equipment or non-revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)	Non Revenue Automobile	20%	≤20%
	Trucks and other Rubber Tire Vehicles	4%	≤4%
Facilities			
Condition - % of facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale	Passenger/Parking Facilities	0%	≤0%
	Administration/ Maintenance Facilities	0%	≤0%

targets reflect the most recent data available on the number, age, and condition of transit assets, and expectations and capital investment plans for improving these assets during the next fiscal year.

As required by FTA, FDOT will update this TAM Plan at least once every four years. FDOT will update the statewide performance targets for the participating agencies on an annual basis and will notify the participating transit agencies and the MPOs in which they operate when the targets are updated.

These targets for the MPO planning area reflect the targets established by SunTran through its Transit Asset Management Plans, as well as the statewide targets established by FDOT for those providers participating in the Group Transit Asset Management Plan, which includes the following provider(s) in the MPO planning area:

TAM Performance

The Ocala Marion TPO recognizes the importance of linking goals, objectives, and investment priorities to stated performance objectives, and that establishing this link is critical to the achievement of national transportation goals and statewide and regional performance targets. As such, the LRTP directly reflects the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets as they are described in other public transportation plans and processes, including the SunTran Transit Development Plan, and the current Ocala Marion 2040 LRTP.

The Ocala Marion TPO 2045 LRTP seeks to address system preservation, identifies infrastructure needs within the metropolitan planning area, and provides funding for targeted improvements. Goal Six in the LRTP is to Optimize and Preserve Existing Infrastructure, which includes the following objectives:

- Goal 6, Objective 6.2: Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system and establish priorities to ensure optimal use.
- Goal 6, Objective 6.3: Maintain the transportation network by identifying and prioritizing

infrastructure preservation and rehabilitation projects such as asset management and signal system upgrades.

The 2045 LRTP was coordinated closely with SunTran, reflecting the priority operational and maintenance costs reflected in the Transit Development Plan to replace fixed route and paratransit vehicles and continuously improve bus stops and maintain facilities to maintain a state of good repair.

6 - TRANSIT SAFETY PERFORMANCE

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) published a final Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) rule and related performance measures as authorized by Section 20021 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP- 21). The PTASP rule requires operators of public transportation systems that receive federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 to develop and implement a PTASP based on a safety management systems approach. Development and implementation of PTASPs is anticipated to help ensure that public transportation systems are safe nationwide.

The rule applies to all operators of public transportation that are a recipient or sub-recipient of FTA Urbanized Area Formula Grant Program funds under 49 U.S.C. Section 5307, or that operate a rail transit system that is subject to FTA's State Safety Oversight Program. The rule does not apply to certain modes of transit service that are subject to the safety jurisdiction of another Federal agency, including passenger ferry operations that are regulated by the United States Coast Guard, and commuter rail operations that are regulated by the Federal Railroad Administration.

Transit Safety Performance Measures

The transit agency sets targets in the PTASP based on the safety performance measures established in the National Public Transportation Safety Plan (NPTSP). The required transit safety performance measures are:

1. Total number of reportable fatalities.

2. Rate of reportable fatalities per total vehicle revenue miles by mode.
3. Total number of reportable injuries.
4. Rate of reportable injuries per total vehicle revenue miles by mode.
5. Total number of reportable safety events.
6. Rate of reportable events per total vehicle revenue miles by mode.
7. System reliability - Mean distance between major mechanical failures by mode.

Each provider of public transportation that is subject to the rule must certify it has a PTASP, including transit safety targets for the above measures, in place no later than July 20, 2020. However, on April 22, 2020, FTA issued a Notice of Enforcement Discretion that extends the PTASP deadline to December 31, 2020 due to the extraordinary operational challenges presented by the COVID-19 public health emergency.

Once the public transportation provider establishes targets, it must make the targets available to MPOs to aid in the planning process. MPOs have 180 days after receipt of the PTASP targets to establish transit safety targets for the MPO planning area. In addition, the Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization must reflect those targets in any LRTP and TIP updated on or after July 20, 2021.

In Florida, each Section 5307 and 5311 transit provider must develop a System Safety Program Plan (SSPP) under Chapter 14-90, Florida Administrative Code. FDOT technical guidance recommends that Florida's transit agencies revise their existing SSPPs to be compliant with the new FTA PTASP requirements.

Transit Provider Coordination with States and MPOs

Key considerations for MPOs and transit agencies:

- Transit operators are required to review, update, and certify their PTASP annually.
- A transit agency must make its safety performance targets available to states and MPOs to aid in the planning process, along with its safety plans.
- To the maximum extent practicable, a transit agency must coordinate with states and MPOs in the selection of state and MPO safety performance targets.
- MPOs are required to establish initial transit safety targets within 180 days of the date that public transportation providers establish initial targets. MPOs are not required to establish transit safety targets annually each time the transit provider establishes targets. Instead, subsequent MPO targets must be established when the MPO updates the TIP or LRTP. When establishing transit safety targets, the MPO can either agree to program projects that will support the transit provider targets or establish its own regional transit targets for the MPO planning area. In cases where two or more providers operate in an MPO planning area and establish different targets for a given measure, the MPO has the option of coordinating with the providers to establish a single target for the MPO planning area, or establishing a set of targets for the MPO planning area that reflects the differing transit provider targets.
- MPOs and states must reference those targets in their long-range transportation plans. States and MPOs must each describe the anticipated effect of their respective transportation improvement programs toward achieving their targets.

Over the course of 2020-2021, the Ocala Marion TPO will coordinate with public transportation providers in the planning area on the development and establishment of transit safety targets. LRTP amendments or updates after July 20, 2021 will include the required details about transit safety performance data and targets.

APPENDIX G

PLAN SYNTHESIS TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

2045 Long Range Transportation Plan

PLAN SYNTHESIS TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

APRIL 2020

CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW	3
Plans Reviewed	3
II. MARION COUNTY AND MUNICIPALITIES	4
III. PLANNING REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS	5
Development & Growth	5
Infill & Redevelopment	5
Population and Employment Growth	7
Noteworthy Projects	9
New Development	10
Multimodal Facilities	10
Public Transportation	10
Noteworthy Projects	10
Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Projects	11
Noteworthy Projects	12
Roadways - Expansion, extension, & creation	22
Congestion Management/LOS Standards	22
New Roads	23
Roadway Expansion	24
ITS and Corridor Management	29
Intermodal & Freight	32
Airport	32
Rail	32
Freight Roadways	34
Safety & Security	34
Safety/Crash reduction	34
Evacuation Routes	34
IV. THEMATIC SYNTHESIS - SUMMARY OF PRIORITIES & ALIGNMENT WITH NATIONAL PLANNING FACTORS	34

I. OVERVIEW

The Ocala Marion Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) must address transportation infrastructure needs for a minimum of 20 years into the future. The costs of planned projects must be balanced against a forecast of available revenue and must also consider projected population and employment growth over the 20-year period, estimating the impacts of growth on transportation infrastructure. The LRTP typically includes projects to add roadway capacity to existing roads, new roads, transit services, bicycle lanes, and sidewalks and trails to support a growing community. In addition to mobility for future residents, visitors, and businesses in Marion County, the plan must also consider safety, security, connectivity, cost efficiency, and other performance categories as stipulated by the ten Federal Planning Factors in the FAST Act, administered by FHWA.

The ten planning factors that TPOs are required to consider when developing LRTPs include:

1. Support the **economic vitality** of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
2. Increase the **safety** of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users.
3. Increase the **security** of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users.
4. Increase the **accessibility and mobility** for people and freight.
5. Protect and enhance the **environment**, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
6. Enhance the **integration and connectivity** of the transportation system, across and between modes, people and freight.
7. Promote **efficient** system management and operation.
8. Emphasize the **preservation** of the existing transportation system.
9. Improve the **resiliency and reliability** of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation; and
10. Enhance **travel and tourism**.

Due to the constrained nature of the LRTP, the priorities of the County and its municipalities will help to identify local priorities and needs in order to define the prioritized in the 2045 cost feasible plan.

Plans Reviewed

This report provides a review and synthesis of the following relevant transportation and capital improvement plans in Marion County and its municipalities:


- Marion County 2035 Comprehensive Plan
- Ocala/Marion County MPO 2040 LRTP
- City of Ocala 2035 Comprehensive Plan
- City of Ocala 2035 Vision
- City of Belleview Comprehensive Plan
- City of Dunnellon Comprehensive Plan
- Ocala Downtown Master Plan
- Silver Springs Community Redevelopment Plan
- Dunnellon Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Blueway Facilities Master Plan
- Ocala/Marion TPO 2035 Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan
- SunTran Ocala/Marion County Florida Transit Development Plan (created in 2017)
- Ocala International Airport Master Plan (created in 2014)
- Ocala Marion 2018 ITS Strategic Plan
- FDOT Freight Mobility and Trade Plan
- SIS Cost Feasible Plan
- Regional Trails Facilities Plan
- Marion County 2045 population and employment forecasts
- Ocala/Marion TPO Congestion Management Process

The purpose of this planning review and synthesis is to identify the common themes across modal and regional plans in Marion County to inform the development of a list of projects to be considered for inclusion in the LRTP.

II. MARION COUNTY AND MUNICIPALITIES

The 2045 LRTP update is focused on the transportation plans and needs for Marion County, the cities of Ocala, Dunnellon, and Belleview, and unincorporated communities of Ocala Estates, Lake Bryant, Marion Oaks, Homosassa Springs/ Beverly Hills/Citrus Springs, Rainbow Lake Estates, Citra, McIntosh, Reddick, Silver Springs Shores, and Salt Springs. The County and urbanized area boundaries are depicted in **Figure 1**.

Figure 1. Ocala Marion County TPO Urbanized Area



III. PLANNING REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS

The results of this planning review and synthesis identifies priorities, projects, common themes and areas of conflict organized under each of the following topic areas:

Development & Growth

- INFILL & REDEVELOPMENT
- NEW DEVELOPMENT

Multimodal Facilities

- PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION
- BIKE/PED/TRAILS

Roadways

- LOS/CONGESTION MANAGEMENT
- NEW ROADS
- ROADWAY EXPANSION
- INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS
- ITS & CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT

Intermodal & Freight

- AIRPORT
- RAIL
- FREIGHT

Emergency & Safety

- SAFETY/CRASH REDUCTION
- EVACUATION ROUTES

Development & Growth

The plans reviewed include analysis of how to manage growth as new residents move to the state of Florida and the Ocala-Marion region. The plans discuss supporting and encouraging infill and redevelopment in already-developed areas of the county, while recognizing that new development will occur and identifying ways to ensure that the needs of the existing and future populations are addressed.

INFILL & REDEVELOPMENT

Infill and redevelopment optimizes existing infrastructure and targets places that are already developed to foster communities that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit. This is consistent with the national planning factor regarding system preservation, which emphasizes improvement, as opposed to expansion of the existing infrastructure. Plans reviewed indicate a preference for walkable, livable communities, which are dependent on employment centers and residential areas within walking distance of each other. The plans focus on encouraging clustered and mixed-use developments, especially in downtown areas, to facilitate non-motorized forms of transportation and support transit and pedestrian accessibility. The County requires development review procedures to consider multimodal system impacts.

The Marion County Comprehensive Plan stresses protection of the unique assets, character, and quality of life in the County by conserving natural, cultural, and physical resources to discourage urban sprawl and enhance neighborhoods. The County will accomplish these goals by considering all transportation options and impacts and ensuring that transportation investments recognize the unique character of the County. Strategies include supporting a balanced transportation network for all modes, including bicycle and pedestrian and establishment of cooperative agreements with local governments and transportation agencies to discourage urban sprawl and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through compact, mixed-use, energy-efficient development. The City of Belleview has incorporated similar goals in its Comprehensive Plan, encouraging infill development through higher density/intensity development and targeted redevelopment programs. The City of Dunnellon chooses not to implement transportation currency or level of service standards to encourage infill development.

The Silver Springs Community Redevelopment Plan is focused on removing the slum and blighting influences identified in the Silver Springs “Finding of Necessity” study. **Figure 7** depicts the Silver Springs Community Redevelopment Area boundaries.

  Silver Springs Proposed Redevelopment Area

Image copied from Silver Springs Community Redevelopment Plan

identifies two broad areas of capital improvement needs, including Stormwater Management/Utilities and Transportation, which in many cases go hand in hand. Aside from general stormwater management improvements, streetscaping and improved lighting on SR 40, support for FDOT's SR 40 improvement plans, access management, public transit expansion, and pedestrian/bicycle improvements. The plan notes the absence of curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes in the majority of the study area and the insufficiency of existing transit service and bus stop amenities.

POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH

The 2045 population and employment projections that are used to forecast future demand on the transportation system for the LRTP are based on the University of Florida's Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) and Woods & Poole forecast control totals for the County. The projected growth totals are allocated to high growth areas across the County based on approved large development data, historical trends, and vacant land. Figures 2 through 5 depict 2045 population and population growth; and 2045 employment and employment growth, respectively. The primary growth areas, as can be seen in Figures 3 and 5, is concentrated in the south part of the County, with most of the growth clustered around the SR 200, Maricamp Rd, I-75 and SR 40 corridors. **Table 1** summarizes population and employment in 2015 and 2045, and corresponding growth rates.

Table 1. Population and Employment

	2015	2045	2015-2045 GROWTH RATE
Population	333,200	444,900	33.5%
Employment	111,500	174,500	56.5%

Figure 2. 2045 Population




Figure 3. Population Growth 2015 – 2045




Figure 4. 2045 Employment





Figure 5. Employment Growth 2015 – 2045



NOTEWORTHY PROJECTS

The Ocala Downtown Master Plan notably includes an infill component titled the, “Infill Housing Sites South of Seminole Feed”. The goal of this plan is to convert the existing surface parking lots and manufacturing/services land uses south of the Seminole Feed plant between Watula Ave and First Avenue into higher density housing developments.

The Master Plan recognizes the decreased demand for parking as a result of shared mobility services such as Uber and Lyft. The Plan highlights the advantages of this infill project’s location because of its proximity to Downtown Ocala and Tuscaawilla Park. Transportation infrastructure projects proposed in the Downtown Master Plan to help spur redevelopment include five segments of the Osceola Greenway project, recommended to be implemented in three phases, as outlined in **Table 2**.

Table 2. Osceola Greenway Phases

OSCEOLA GREENWAY	FROM	TO	COST
Phase 1	BROADWAY	SILVER SPRINGS BLVD	\$88,000
Phase 2	FIRST ST	SILVER SPRINGS BLVD	\$97,000
	SILVER SPRINGS BLVD	NW 1ST ST	\$97,000
Phase 3	NE FIRST ST	AMTRAK STATION	\$585,000
	FORT KING	SE THIRD ST	\$195,000

NEW DEVELOPMENT

While plans encourage infill and redevelopment that makes use of existing developed land and infrastructure, most also recognize that new development will also occur in the County. Marion County's compact development initiative is designed to discourage sprawl and disjointed development. The County also requires development review procedures to consider multimodal transportation system impacts. Strategies are proposed to manage this growth and encourage the creation of communities that have services and employment centers within walking distance of residential neighborhoods.

The City of Belleview Comprehensive Plan states that new development shall provide for a bicycle and pedestrian friendly environment. It also emphasizes circulation and access as important elements of new development.

Multimodal Facilities PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Public transportation investments align with the above goals to discourage sprawl and encourage density, and address equity issues in the region. Marion County intends to improve accessibility and increase mobility for people who are transportation disadvantaged. The County aims to integrate transit service into a multimodal network and provide resources to transportation disadvantaged people. The municipal comprehensive plans support improvements to transit-related policy as well. For example, the City of Belleview promotes land use patterns that support a compact transit system. The City of Ocala supports improving access to bus stops by adding sidewalks and wheelchair ramps.

Existing transit services in Marion County are provided by SunTran and the Marion Transit Service. SunTran provides fixed-route services operating primarily in the urban area. Marion Transit Service (MTS) provides paratransit service throughout the county and ADA service within the fixed-route area for SunTran. MTS is also the designated Community Transportation Coordinator through the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged.

The SunTran Transit Development Plan lists four primary goals:

1. Increase ridership and accessibility for current and potential transit users;
2. Maximize coordination and efficiency of transportation services to better serve the entire population of Marion County, including the transportation disadvantaged, and regional commuters
3. Provide for the most cost-effective transportation services possible; and
4. Promote and provide for the necessary expansion of the fixed-route transit services necessary to meet the future needs of the general public, including the transportation disadvantaged.

The themes in SunTran's goals that correlate very closely with national planning goals and the L RTP goals include increasing accessibility, efficiency improvements, equity considerations, and addressing high growth areas with public transit service.

NOTEWORTHY PROJECTS

The 2040 L RTP identified six routes for frequency improvements and new express, local, and circulator bus services in addition to two rail corridors. The SunTran Transit Development Plan (TDP) also outlines service and capital improvements including realignment of existing routes, adding hourly service on Sundays, and new transit services. Proposed transit improvements in the L RTP include:

Frequency Improvements

- Green Route (70 to 45-minute frequency)
- Blue Route (70 to 45-minute frequency)
- Purple Route (70 to 45-minute frequency)
- Orange Route (70 to 45-minute frequency)
- Red Route (120 to 60-minute frequency)
- Yellow Route (120 to 60-minute frequency)

New Local and Express Bus Routes

- Intercity Connector – express service connecting Ocala to Belleview and beyond
- Marion-Ocala Express – express service connecting Ocala to Marion Oaks
- SR 200 Local – local service connecting Ocala to southwest Marion County
- Ocala West Connector – local service connecting downtown Ocala to areas west of I-75
- Villages-Belleview Limited Express – express service connecting The Villages, Belleview, and downtown Ocala
- Marion Oaks Express – express service connecting south Marion County to downtown Ocala

New Circulator Services

- Downtown Circulator
- SR 200 North and Marion Oaks
- East and South Ocala
- Belleview

Flex Services

- SR 200 Flex – flexible route service on SR 200 from I-75 to SW 60th Ave
- Marion Oaks Flex – flexible route service on I-75 from southern Marion County to downtown Ocala
- On-Top-of-the-World Flex – flexible route service on SR 200 north and south of Cross Florida Greenway
- Baseline Flex – flexible route service along Baseline Rd in east Ocala

New Rail Lines

- Light Rail – connecting Ocala to Silver Springs Shores

Capital and infrastructure improvements highlighted in the TDP include park-n-ride lots, bus stop accessibility, and capital vehicle replacements:

- Expand and improve bus stop infrastructure, safety, and ADA accessibility
- Establish shared park-and-ride lots on SR200, west of I-75, and along SW County Highway 484 and I-75
- Replace and add new vehicles

Other proposed service expansions in the TDP include the Downtown Circulator and the Marion Oaks Express fixed routes and the Baseline, Marion Oaks, and On-Top-Of-The-World Flex routes. The plan also suggests frequency increases on all routes and improving bus stop infrastructure to provide safer, more accessible, and comfortable bus stops. Shared park-n-ride lots are also planned at I-75/SR 200 and I-75/484. Traffic signal preemption is a roadway operations strategy that can improve bus speeds, thus providing more competitive and attractive service. Intersections identified in the TDP for potential signal preemption treatments include:

- SW 43rd Street Road at SR 200
- SW 38th Court at SR 200
- I-75 South at SR 200
- I-75 North at SR 200
- SW 34th Avenue at SR 200

BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND TRAILS PROJECTS

One of the greatest transportation-related assets of Marion County is the extensive trail system that supports the County's equestrian, cycling, and outdoor recreational culture. The Marjorie Harris Carr Cross Florida Greenway trail connects Dunnellon in the southwest corner of the County to the Ocala National Forest on the east side of the County, providing the foundation of a trail system that can be leveraged to link population and employment centers across the County. The TPO completed the Regional Trails Facilities Plan in 2019 to build onto the Cross Florida and other trails in the region in an effort to accomplish three primary goals, including:

- Make key connections between populated areas and the regional trail system
- Provide safety and facility recommendations as more facilities are constructed and user numbers increase
- Provide appropriate information and amenities to trail users

Connectivity, Safety, and Information/Amenities are the hallmarks of an accessibility-based strategy to improve the ability for residents and visitors to reach destinations via non-motorized modes of travel. This expands the purpose and function of the County's trail system beyond the recreational value of trails, leveraging the system to provide an actual travel option.

Other bicycle, pedestrian and multiuse trail projects are noted in several plans in order to support the growth of multimodal transportation options. The 2035 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan identifies hundreds of sidewalk gaps, bicycle infrastructure improvements, and trail improvements throughout the County to improve walkability, safety, regional connections, and economic development. The Marion County Comprehensive Plan has specific policies to provide increased bicycle and pedestrian access to schools. The City of Belleview's Comprehensive Plan includes an objective to provide an energy-efficient multimodal system by maintaining the existing network and including provisions to promote bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in certain developments and transportation planning projects.

NOTEWORTHY PROJECTS

Regional Trails

The City of Dunnellon Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan proposes the Withlacoochee Trail Extension, a priority non-motorized project that involves multiple segments over four phases. This project will require coordination of multiple entities in the western area of the county. The phases for this extension are as follows:

- Phase 1 – Cross Florida Greenway – Dunnellon Sports Complex
- Phase 2 – Blue Run Park Spur Trail
- Phase 3 – Short term signing solution
- Phase 4 – Long-term connection

The Ocala-Marion TPO 2035 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan also outlines three regional multiuse trail projects, which aim to connect communities from Downtown Ocala to the Cross Florida Greenway:

- The Silver Springs Bikeway Extension
- The Cross Florida Greenway Multiuse Path
- The Florida Northern Railroad (FNOR) Rail Trail

The 2035 Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan, TPO project priority lists, and other sources were used by the TPO to identify fourteen multi-use trail projects, six of which are included in the 2040 LRTP Cost Feasible Plan. Those projects are listed in **Table 3**.

Table 3. Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan Trail Projects

STATUS IN 2040 LRTP	PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	DISTANCE	PLAN(S)
Cost Feasible	Downtown Ocala to Silver Springs Trail (Project # 4367561)	Multiuse trail	6.0	2040 LRTP
	Indian Lake Trail: Silver Springs State Park to Indian Lake Trailhead	Multiuse trail	5.0	2040 LRTP
	Silver Springs Bikeway Phase II: Baseline paved trail – North Trailhead to CR 42	Multiuse trail	18.5	2040 LRTP
	Bellevue Greenway Trail: Lake Lillian Park to Cross Florida Greenway	Multiuse trail	5.3	2040 LRTP
	Ocala National Forest Trail: Silver Springs State Park to Wildcat Lake Boat Ramp	Multiuse trail	27	2040 LRTP
	Lake County Connection: along SE HWY 42 and SE HWY 452	Multiuse trail	4.8	2040 LRTP
Unfunded	Cross Florida Greenway Gap: Silver Springs Bikeway to E HWY 40	Multiuse trail	3.7	2040 LRTP
	Chiefland to Dunnellon Corridor: Levy County Line to Citrus County Line	Multiuse trail	8.6	2040 LRTP
	Cross Florida Greenway Corridor: East HWY 40 to Putnam County Line	Multiuse trail	32.5	2040 LRTP
	Gainesville to Ocala Corridor: Alachua County Line to NE 58th Ave	Multiuse trail	26.5	2040 LRTP
	Lake to Cross Florida Greenway Corridor: Santos Gap Trail to Sumter County	Multiuse trail	12.7	2040 LRTP
	Orange Creek Corridor: Alachua County Line to Ocklawaha River	Multiuse trail	24.0	2040 LRTP
	Silver River to Bronson Corridor: Levy County Line to NE 58th Ave	Multiuse trail	27.7	2040 LRTP
	Williston to Orange Creek Corridor: Levy County to Alachua County Line	Multiuse trail	12.1	2040 LRTP

Table 4. Regional Trails Facilities Plan Projects

PROJECT	FROM	TO	TRAIL TYPE	LENGTH	COST
SE Maricamp Rd	SE 31st St	Baseline/SE 58th Ave	12' multi-use trail	2.10	\$602,000
Maricamp Rd	Baseline/SE 58th Ave	Designated Bike Lane east of Oak Rd	12' multi-use trail	4.85	\$1.4 m
CR 484	Cross Florida Greenway	Designated Bike Lane on CR 484	12' multi-use trail	4.4	\$1.2 m
McIntosh to Ocala Connector			12' multi-use trail	21	\$6 m
Old Ocala-Summerfield Rd/135th St/SE 80th Ave			Sharrows, signage, traffic calming	7	\$210,000
US 27/Bonnie Heath Blvd	NW 60th Ave	CR 225A	12' multi-use trail	1.15	\$330,000

In the TPO's 2019 Regional Trails Facilities Plan, six key multi-use trail projects were identified and vetted as key safety and connectivity improvements to the County's multimodal system, listed in **Table 4**. These projects will help to complete the Cross Florida Greenway, which will enable 60,000 Marion County residents to live within ¼ mile of a paved trail.

Bicycle Facilities

The 2035 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan organized bicycle facility recommendations in three distinct categories. The first includes regional projects that improve connections to recreation areas, complete links in the Heart of Florida loop trail system, improve connections to the Withlacoochee Trail and to Lake County. The second category of bicycle improvements includes more localized needs such as bike lanes and shoulders on existing roadways that improve the connections between Marion County neighborhoods to the regional trail system. The third and final category includes improvements suggested by members of the public to provide shoulder and/or bike lane improvements on various roadways throughout the County. All three categories and associated improvements are included in **Table 5**.

The 2035 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan listed the seven projects in **Table 6** as the Urban Sidewalk Plan, focused on improving multimodal access to transit, schools, parks, and economic hubs. These projects were also vetted by the project team through field observations, stakeholder interviews, and safety considerations. The Urban Sidewalk Plan is supplemented by over 160 sidewalk gap projects on functionally classified roadways also included in the 2035 plan and listed in **Table 7**.

Table 5. Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan Bicycle Projects

TYPE	FACILITY	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDATION	LENGTH	EST. COST*
Regional Improvements – Bicycle Beltway	NE 97th Street Rd	NE 58th Ave	CR 200A	5' paved shoulder	3.8	\$585,000
	CR 200A	NE 97th Street Rd	NE 100th St	5' paved shoulder	0.18	\$39,550
	NE/NW 100th St	CR 200A	CR 225A	5' paved shoulder	7.5	\$1,695,000
	CR 225A	NE 100th St	SR 40	5' paved shoulder	8.0	\$1,808,000
	SW 80th Ave	SR 40	SW 90th St	5' paved shoulder	6.5	\$1,469,000
	SW 95th Street Rd	SW 60th Ave	SW 49th Ave	5' paved shoulder	1.0	\$226,000
	SW 49th Ave	SW 95th Street Rd	Marion Oaks Course	5' paved shoulder	3.5	\$791,000
	Marion Oaks Course	SW 49th Ave	CR 484	5' paved shoulder	0.85	\$192,100
	CR 484	SW 16th Ave	SR 25 (Hames Rd)	5' paved shoulder	7.6	\$1,717,600
	SR 25 (Hames Rd)	US 441	SR 35 (Baseline Rd)	5' paved shoulder	0.35	\$79,100
	SR 35 (Baseline Rd)	SR 25 (Hames Rd)	SE Mericamp Rd	Designated bike lane	5.4	\$1,220,400
	SR 35 (Baseline Rd)	SR 40	NE 97th Street Rd	Designated bike lane	10.5	\$2,373,000
Regional Improvements – Lake Weir Connection	CR 25 (Ocala Rd)	SR 35 (Baseline Rd)	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	5' paved shoulder	12.5	\$2,825,000
	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	CR 25 (Ocala Rd)	SE 100th Ave	5' paved shoulder	3.75	\$847,500
	SE 100th Ave	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	CR 25 (Ocala Rd)	5' paved shoulder	4.4	\$994,400
	SE 132nd Place	SE 100th Ave	Carney Island Park Entrance	5' paved shoulder	1.5	\$339,000

*Estimated project costs are presented for the addition of 5' paved shoulders only, not the cost of resurfacing the existing roadway. These estimates do not include costs associated with roadway resurfacing, such as mobilization, maintenance of traffic, silt fencing, and stabilization of the shoulder. These estimates assume that the shoulder was stabilized when the road was originally constructed.

TYPE	FACILITY	FROM	TO	RECOMMENDATION	LENGTH	EST. COST*
Local Bicycle Improvements	Goethe Connection	Downtown Dunnellon	Levy County line	12' shared use path	8.34	\$1,928,863
	Withlacoochee Bay Trail	Downtown Dunnellon	Levy County line	12' shared use path	4.62	\$1,068,507
	Villages Trail	Lake Weir	Lake County line	12' shared use path	2.5	\$578,196
	Interlachen/Hawthorne Trail	Silver Springs State Park	Putnam County line	12' shared use path	25.75	\$5,955,424
	SR 40 Trail	Baseline Rd	Lake County line	12' shared use path	26.27	\$3,075,689
	SR 40 to Silver Springs State Park Connection	Half Mile Creek Trailhead	Silver Springs State Park	Bicycle bridge or underpass	0.12	\$1,200,000
	Indian Lake State Forest Connection	Half Mile Creek Trailhead	Indian Lake State Forest	12' shared use path	1.5	\$346,917
Other Bicycle Improvements	CR 200A	NE 35th St	CR 200	5' paved shoulder	12.5	\$2,825,000
	SR 40	CR 328	US 41	5' paved shoulder	9.6	\$2,169,600
	CR 42	CR 475	County line	5' paved shoulder	29.0	\$6,554,000
	SE 110 Street Rd	CR 25	SE Maricamp Rd	5' paved shoulder	4.0	\$904,000
	CR 464C	CR 25	CR 314A	5' paved shoulder	4.6	\$1,039,600
	CR 475A (SW 27 Ave)	SR 200	CR 475	5' paved shoulder	13.0	\$2,938,000
	CR 475 (S Magnolia Ave)	US 27	South County line	5' paved shoulder	14.0	\$3,164,000
	CR 314	SR 35	CR 214A	5' paved shoulder	14.0	\$3,164,000
	CR 314A	CR 314	CR 464C	5' paved shoulder	15.0	\$3,390,000
	SE 36th Ave	SR 40	Maricamp Rd	5' paved shoulder	2.7	\$610,200
	SE 95th St	CR 475	US 441	5' paved shoulder	3.3	\$745,800
	NE Osceola Ave	Bonnie Heath Blvd	NE 14th St	5' paved shoulder	0.3	\$67,800

Table 6. Urban Sidewalk Plan

ROADWAY	FROM	TO	SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS	LENGTH (IN MILES)	COST
NE 12th Ave	NE 14th Sr	Silver Springs Blvd	Provides a collector sidewalk for students crossing with the crossing guard	0.76	\$83,000
NE 17th Ave	NE 14th St	NE 3rd St	Improves school access, crossing guard access, and transit access	0.74	\$82,000
SE 32nd Ave	SE Fort Kiing St	SE 13th St	Increases safety for students walking and provides access to future trail	0.69	\$76,000

YMCA/Hillcrest School Sidewalk Gap

24th St	36th Ave	SE Maricamp Rd	Connectivity to the park and YMCA	0.95	\$105,000
SE 17th St	SE 30th St	SE 32nd Ave			
SE 30th Ave	SE 32nd Ave	Existing sidewalk to the south			
SW 1st Ave	Ft. King St	SE Pine Ave	Fills critical sidewalk gap	0.86	\$95,000
NE 28th St	NE 12th Court	NE 19th Ave	Improves access to transit, and school crossing	0.61	\$67,000

Bellevue sidewalk connection to Cross Florida Trail

SE 95th St	Cross Florida Trail	SE 36th Ave	Crossing at US 441	2.53	\$279,000
SE 36th Ave	SE 95th St	SE 110th St			
SE 110th St	US 301	Lilian Lake Park			

Table 7. Sidewalk Gap Projects

ROADWAY	FROM	TO	SIDE OF ROAD	LENGTH (MILES)	ESTIMATED COST
NE 10th St	NE 8th Ave	NE 9th St	E	0.31	34,581.13
US-27 (S Pine Ave)	SE 38th St	SE 52nd St	E	1.11	122,058.42
NE 14th St	NE 24th Ave	NE 25th Ave	S	0.07	8,153.95
US-27 (S Pine Ave)	SE 3rd Ave	SE 30th St	W	0.37	41,083.38
SW College Rd	SW 39th St	SW 17th St	S	0.59	65,294.35
US-27 (S Pine Ave)	SE 3rd Ave	SE 30th St	E	0.33	36,420.99
US-301	W Anthony Rd	NW 28th St	E	0.23	24,880.01
NE 35th St	NE 25th Ave	NE 49th Ct	S	0.21	23,437.39
SE 17th St	SE 25th Ave	SE 29th Terr	N	0.23	25,632.69
SW 38th St	SW 60th Ave	SW 51st Terr	N	0.75	83,274.87
SE 11th Ave	SE 5th St	SE 17th St	E	0.74	81,455.91
SE 18th Ave	SE 18th St	SE 21st Ln	W	0.13	14,572.58
SE 3rd Ave	S Magnolia Ave	SE 17th St	W	0.25	27,535.27
SE 1st Ave	SW 1st Ave	SW 6th St	W	0.20	21,722.97
N Magnolia Ave	NW 28th St	NW 20th St	E	0.59	64,855.29
SW 32nd Ave	SW College Rd	SW 31st Rd	W	0.11	12,398.19
SW 32nd Ave	SW 33rd Rd	SW 34th Ave	W	0.09	9,889.28
SW 1st Ave	SW 15th Pl	SW 17th St	E	0.11	12,502.73
SE 22nd Ave	SE 12th St	SE 17th St	E	0.36	39,536.22
SE 24th St	SE 32nd Ave	SE 36th Ave	S	0.34	37,131.85
SE 3rd Ave	SE 6th St	SE 8th St	E	0.07	7,798.53
SE 17th Ave	SE 29th Terr	SE 30th Ave	N	0.09	9,492.04
SW 43rd Ct	SW 40th St	N of SW 44th St	E	0.15	16,349.72
SW 32nd Ave	SW 34th Ci	SW 34th Cr	E	0.06	6,774.05
NE 19th Ave	NE 28th St	NE 14th St	W	0.99	109,409.33
SE 17th St	SE 30th Ave	W of SE 36th Ave	S	0.15	16,600.61
SE 11th Ave	Silver Springs Blvd	E Fort King St	W	0.05	5,164.17
NE 19th Ave	NE 28th St	NE 14th St	E	1.00	110,057.47
SE Maricamp Rd	SE 36th Ave	SE 39th Ave	N	0.32	34,978.37
SE 22nd Ave	E Fort King St	SE 12th St	E	0.57	62,639.09
SE 24th St	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 32nd Ave	S	0.05	5,164.17
NE 8th Ave	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 14th St	W	0.72	79,197.89
SE 11th Ave	SE 5th St	SE 17th St	W	0.74	81,623.17
SE 18th Ave	SE 21st Ln	SE 27th St	W	0.18	19,653.12
SW 1st Ave	SW 10th St	SW 11th St	E	0.11	11,750.06
SW 13th St	SW 33rd Ave	SW 12th St	N	0.38	41,815.15
NE 28th St	US 301	E of NE Jacksonville Rd	N	1.23	136,296.47

ROADWAY	FROM	TO	SIDE OF ROAD	LENGTH (MILES)	ESTIMATED COST
SE 18th Ave	SE 17th St	S of SE 18th St	E	0.15	16,872.41
SW 38th St	SW 51st Terr	SW 48th Ave	N	0.32	35,417.43
SW 43rd Ct	N of SW 32nd Pl	SW 40th St	E	0.64	70,437.62
NE 8th Ave	NE 24th St	NE 14th St	E	0.73	80,201.45
NE 8th Ave	NE 14th St	NE 10th St	W	0.06	6,878.59
Dirt Rd	SW 43rd Ct	SW College Rd	N	0.19	21,012.11
SE 11th Ave	E Fort King St	SE 5th St	W	0.19	20,907.57
SE 19th Ave	SE 24th Rd	SE 31st St	E	0.09	9,910.19
SW 1st Ave	SE 14th Pl	SW 15th St	E	0.06	6,460.44
NW 27th Ave	S of NW 17th St	NW Old Blitchton Rd	E	0.09	10,014.73
SE 24th St	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 32nd Ave	N	0.10	10,976.48
SE Maricamp Rd	SE 36th Ave	SE 31st St	S	0.27	29,542.40
SE 22nd Ave	E Fort King St	SE 12th St	W	0.57	62,994.52
SW 13th St	SW 12th St	SW 27th Ave	N	0.07	8,237.58
SE 11th Ave	Silver Springs Blvd	SE 5th St	E	0.27	30,274.17
SE 38th St	SE Lake Weir Ave	SE 19th Ave	N	0.25	27,681.63
SE 22nd Ave	SE 12th St	SE 17th St	W	0.36	39,912.56
SE 17th St	SE 25th Ave	SE 29th Terr	S	0.24	26,489.90
SE 38th St	SE 19th Ave	SE 31st St	N	1.79	198,036.54
NE 3rd St	NE Tusawilla Ave	NE Sanchez Ave	N	0.06	7,129.48
SW 1st Ave	SW 12th St	SE 14th Pl	E	0.04	4,265.15
SE 17th St	SE 30th Ave	SE 36th Ave	N	0.45	49,300.06
SE 19th Ave	SE 28th St	SE 31st St	W	0.27	30,127.81
SE 24th St	SE 32nd Ave	SE 36th Ave	N	0.39	42,839.62
SE Maricamp Rd	SE 39th Ave	SE 38th St	N	0.76	84,006.63
SW 1st Ave	US 27 (S Pine Ave)	SW 29th St Rd	E	0.20	21,806.6
NE 36th Ave	NE 21st St	NE 17th Pl	W	0.24	26,531.71
SW 17th St	SW 15th Ave	SW 12th Ave	S	0.13	14,447.13
SW 17th St	SW College Rd	SW 19th Ave Rd	S	0.23	25,047.27
NE 36th Ave	NE 17th Pl	NE 14th St	E	0.22	24,670.94
SW 17th St	SW 19th Ave Rd	SW 15th Ave	S	0.31	34,622.94
SW 17th St	SW 18th Ave	SW 12th Ave	N	0.41	45,055.82
NE 35th St	US 301	NE Jacksonville Rd	N	1.32	145,851.24
SW 20th St	SW 37th Ave	SW 34th Ct	N	0.29	31,465.90
SE Lake Weir Ave	SE 31st St	SE 38th St	E	0.54	59,816.57
NW 16th Ave	NW 16th Rd	NW 31st St	E	0.10	11,394.63
W Anthony Rd	NW 34th Pl	US 301	E	0.20	22,224.75
NE 25th Ave	NE 24th St	NE 23rd St	W	0.58	13,255.40

ROADWAY	FROM	TO	SIDE OF ROAD	LENGTH (MILES)	ESTIMATED COST
W Anthony Rd	NW 44th St	NW 35th St	W	0.58	63,768.10
NW MLK Jr Ave	NW 31st St	NW 22nd St	W	0.48	52,791.62
NE 25th Ave	NE 35th St	NE 24th St	W	0.85	94,104.99
SW 20th St	SW 60th Ave	SW 57th Ave	N	0.30	33,263.95
NW Gainesville Rd	NW 37th St	S of NW 35th St	W	0.40	43,655.01
SW 20th St	SW 60th Ave	SW 57th Ave	S	0.30	33,452.12
NE 25th Ave	NE 23rd St	NE 14th St	W	0.47	51,558.08
NE 7th St	NE 43rd Ct	NE 58th Ave	S	1.32	145,809.42
NE 35th St	US 301	W Anthony Rd	S	0.05	5791.40
SW 20th St	I-75	SW 31st Ave	S	0.53	58039.43
SW 19th Ave Rd	SW 17th St	W of SW 21st Ave	W	0.41	45097.64
NE 25th Ave	NE 24th St	NE 14th St	E	0.74	81,497.72
NE 7th St	NE 36th Ave	NE 43rd Ct	S	0.62	68,681.38
NE 7th St	NE 36th Ave	NE 43rd Ct	N	0.64	70,207.63
NW 16th Ave	NW Gainesville Rd	NW 31st St	E	0.48	53,209.78
NW 35th St	NW Gainesville Rd	US 301	S	0.15	16,830.60
NW MLK Jr Ave	NW 31st St	NW 22nd St	E	0.39	43,299.59
NE 35th St	W Anthony Rd	NE Jacksonville Rd	S	1.14	126,302.65
NE 35th St	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 25th Ave	S	1.21	133,306.69
NE 25th Ave	NE 35th St	NE 24th St	E	0.84	92,306.94
NE 24th St	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 19th Ave	S	0.85	93,540.49
NE 12th Ave	NE 4th St	Silver Springs Blvd	W	0.24	26,197.19
NE 12th Ave	NE 9th St	NE 6th Pl	W	0.18	19,423.14
NE 12th Ave	NE 14th St	NE 9th St	W	0.32	35,438.34
NW 16th Ave	NW Gainesville Rd	NW 16th Rd	E	0.33	36,358.27
SW 5th St	SW 1st Ave	Pine Ave	N	0.26	29,145.16
US 441	US 301	Del Webb Blvd	E	0.35	38,532.66
US 441	US 301	Del Webb Blvd	W	0.35	38,825.36
SE 110th St	SE 36th Ave	US 441	N	1.21	133,683.03
SE 36th Ave	SE 95th St	SE 100th St	E	0.48	52,854.35
SE 36th Ave	SE 95th St	SE 103rd Ln	W	0.62	68,681.38
SE 102nd Pl	US 441	SE 52nd Ct	S	0.64	70,563.06
SE 95th St	SE 36th Ave	SE 38th Ct	S	0.19	21,492.99
CR 484	SE 36th Ave	SE 35th Ave Rd	N	0.29	31,779.51
SE 110th St Rd	SE Baseline Rd	W of SE 83rd Terr	N	1.81	199,583.70
CR 484	SE Brown Rd	US 27 (SE Ashbier Blvd)	W	0.33	36,567.35
CR 484	US 27 (SE Ashbier Blvd)	CR 484/SE 132nd St Rd	E	0.22	24,650.03
SE 110th St/CR 25	SE Baseline Rd	CR 25A	S	1.25	138,303.60

ROADWAY	FROM	TO	SIDE OF ROAD	LENGTH (MILES)	ESTIMATED COST
SE 55th Ave Rd	US 27 (SE Ashbier Blvd)	SE 132nd St Rd	W	0.25	27,472.55
SE 55th Ave Rd	US 27 (SE Ashbier Blvd)	SE 132nd St Rd	E	0.25	27,368.01
E Pennsylvania Ave	Palmetto Way	SW 196th Terr	N	0.06	6,355.90
E Pennsylvania Ave	Palmetto Way	SW 196th Terr	S	0.05	5,624.14
E Fort King St	NE 48th Ave	NE 58th Ave	N	0.90	99,373.70
E Fort King St	SE 48th Ct	SE 48th Ave	S	0.90	99,143.72
NE 35th St	NE 25th Ave	NE 36th Ave Rd	N	0.96	106,335.92
NE 35th St	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 25th Ave	N	1.20	132,616.74
NW 35th St	NW Gainesville Rd	US 301	N	0.16	17,645.99
NE 7th St	NE 52nd Ct	NE 58th Ave	N	0.44	48,777.37
W Anthony Rd	NW 44th St	NW 35th St	E	0.60	66,381.55
NW 35th St	NW 16th Ave	NW Gainesville Rd	N	0.08	8,927.53
CR 25	SE 110th St Rd	E of SE 80th Ct	N	1.22	135,000.20
CR 25	CR 25A	SE 108th Terr Rd	S	0.33	36,316.46
SE Maricamp Rd	SE 31st St	SE 44th Ave Rd	S	0.75	82,522.19
SE Maricamp Rd	SE 47th Ave	SE 58th Ave	N	1.15	127,473.48
NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 53rd St	NE 35th St	W	1.31	144,701.32
NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 49th St	NE 35th St	E	0.98	108,343.05
SE Maricamp Rd	SE 58th Ave	SE 55th Pl	W	0.94	103,680.66
SE Maricamp Rd	SE 55th Pl	Midway Rd	E	1.13	124,588.23
SE Maricamp Rd	SE 58th Ave	SE 67th Ave	W	0.91	100,962.67
SE Maricamp Rd	Pine Rd	Midway Rd	W	0.89	97,993.80
SE Maricamp Rd	Midway Rd	Cedar Trace	W	0.09	10,119.27
SE Maricamp Rd	Bahia Ave	Oak Rd	W	0.24	26,573.53
SE Maricamp Rd	Bahia Rd	Oak Rd	E	0.21	23,019.24
SE Maricamp Rd	SE 42nd St	SE 58th Ave	W	0.84	93,059.61
CR 42 (SE Hwy 42)	SE 165th Mulberry Ln	US 441	S	1.74	191,847.90
SE Maricamp Rd	SE 44th Ave Rd	SE 47th Ave	N	0.12	13,150.86
SE Maricamp Rd	SE 44th Ave Rd	SE 42nd St	S	0.43	47,439.29
CR 42 (SE Hwy 42)	SE 80th Ave	SE 84th Terr	N	0.44	48,631.02
CR 42 (SE Hwy 42)	SE 84th Terr	US 441	N	1.44	159,085.73
SE 79th St	SE 41st Ct	Juniper Rd	S	0.29	32,344.02
SW 40th St	SW 48th Ave	SW 43rd Ct	N	0.35	38,114.51
SE 38th St	SE 38th St / SE 36th St	SE 37th Ct	S	0.12	12,983.60
SE 44th Ave Rd	SE 48th Place Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	W	0.74	82,229.49
NE 25th Ave	NE 49th St	NE 35th St	E	0.99	109,451.15

ROADWAY	FROM	TO	SIDE OF ROAD	LENGTH (MILES)	ESTIMATED COST
NE 25th Ave	NE 49th St	NE 35th St	W	0.99	109,262.98
SE 95th St	SE 93rd Pl	US 441	N	0.43	47,669.27
SE 95th St	SE 38th Ct	US 441	S	0.23	24,838.20
NW 44th Ave	NW 73rd Pl	S of NW 63rd St	W	0.91	100,879.04
NW 44th Ave	S of W Hwy 326	S of NW 63rd St	E	1.06	116,601.54
SE Sunset Harbor Rd	SE 95th Ave	SE 155th St	E	1.38	152,646.20
SE Sunset Harbor Rd	SE 95th Ave	SE 99th Ave	S	0.41	45,515.79
SE Sunset Harbor Rd	SE 155th St	CR 42 (SE Hwy 42)	W	1.15	126,616.27
CR 42 (SE Hwy 42)	US 441	SE 104th Terr	S	0.44	48,359.22
SE Sunset Harbor Rd	SE 103rd Terr	SE 105th Ave	E	0.56	61,321.91
SE Sunset Harbor Rd	US 441	SE 95th Ave	S	0.55	61,112.84
SE 147th Pl	SE 84th Terr	US 441	S	0.32	35,605.60
SE 110th St Rd	W of SE 83rd Terr	SE 90th Ct	S	0.89	98,704.66
SE 110th St Rd	W of SE 83rd Terr	Oak Rd	N	0.64	71,043.94
SE 36th Ave	CR 484	SE Hwy 42	W	0.30	32,950.34
SE 36th Ave	CR 484	SE Hwy 42	E	0.30	32,992.15
SE 36th Ave	SE 110th St	CR 484	E	0.25	27,493.46
SE 36th Ave	SE 110th St	CR 484	W	0.25	27,388.92
SE 36th Ave	SE 100th St	SE 110th St	E	0.97	107,444.02
SE 36th Ave	SE 103rd Ln	SE 110th St	W	0.46	50,261.81
CR 42 (SE Hwy 42)	US 441	SE 105th Ave	N	0.45	49,634.58
SE Sunset Harbor Rd	US 441	SE 95th Ave	N	0.62	68,409.58
SE 147th Pl	SE 84th Terr	US 441	N	0.32	35,250.17
SE 110th St Rd	CR 25	W of SE 83rd Terr	S	1.12	123,919.19
NE 35th St	NE 48th Terr	NE 59th Terr	S	0.97	107,360.39
NE 35th St	NE 36th Ave Rd	NE 59th Terr	N	0.22	24,106.43
US 27 (Pine Ave)	W of SE 10th Ave	SE 10th Ave	E	0.04	4,244.24
US 441	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	SE 173rd St	E	0.31	34,685.67
US 441	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	SE 173rd St	W	0.32	35,459.25
US 441	Del Webb Blvd	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	E	0.79	86,745.52
US 441	Del Webb Blvd	SE 147th Pl	W	0.74	82,020.41
CR 484	SE 25th Ave	SE 47th Ave	S	0.20	21,743.88
CR 484	SE 30th Ct	SE 36th Ave	N	0.48	52,603.46
SE 132nd St Rd	SE 55th Ave Rd	US 301	N	0.13	14,614.39
CR 484	SE 47th Ave	SE 132nd St Rd	S	0.40	44,616.76
SE 95th St	E of SE 25th Ave	SE 35th Ct	N	0.40	43,634.11

Roadways - Expansion, extension, & creation

Though many of the plans placed a focus on managing growth and fostering communities that support multimodal transportation options, they also include new roads and road widening.

The Transportation Element in Marion County's Comprehensive Plan includes a checklist regarding the provision of infrastructure for new developments. The City of Belleview plan highlights the importance of providing standards and definitions to preserve and protect existing and future right-of-way in land development regulations. The City of Ocala focuses on multimodal opportunities whenever an existing roadway is expanded or when a new roadway is created. The City of Dunnellon emphasizes coordination with Marion County and the TPO to expand CR 484. This project is prioritized in the Transportation Improvement Program.

Some priorities identified include:

- Congestion Management
- Maintaining Level of Service (LOS) Standards
- System preservation: Preserving existing & future roadways
- Intersection improvements

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT/ LOS STANDARDS

The reviewed documents share a focus on implementing LOS standards for the County and for each municipality within the County. LOS is a common metric used to prioritize funding for CIPs. Most LOS standards differentiate between county and state roads, and urban and rural roads. The Marion County 2010 Congestion Management Process (CMP) describes a detailed congestion and safety monitoring program and identifies a toolbox of non-capacity strategies to mitigate congestion and safety issues. The CMP is guided by four broad goals, including:

1. Reduce vehicle miles of travel per capita.
2. Increase the viability and usage of non-automobile modes of travel.
3. Improve and increase transit as a viable transportation option.
4. Improve roadway operations to reduce congestion.

The CMP identified two primary corridors of concern, based on two dimensions: period, defined as current network versus five year network, and level of congestion defined by level of service (LOS). The two corridors identified for further study include:

- SR 200/SW College Rd from I075 to Pine Ave
- SR 40/Silver Springs Blvd from Pine Ave to 25th Ave

Potential improvement strategies identified in the CMP to address the congestion on SR 200 and SR 40 include a variety of both demand management strategies and operational management strategies. Specific demand management interventions include:

- Transportation Demand Management policies and strategies like telecommuting/alternative work hours and congestion priced lanes
- Public Transit Improvements like reduced transit fares and premium transit improvements
- Bicycle/Pedestrian/Trail like new sidewalk connections and Complete Streets
- Land use/growth management like Transit Oriented Development (TOD) guidelines and mixed use development

Operational strategies, many of which were identified as potential solutions for various intersections and segments along the SR 200 and SR 40 corridors, include:

- Corridor preservation/management
- Access management policies and improvements
- Incident management strategies like freeway incident detection and management systems
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) improvements

Marion County's Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element emphasized that the LOS standards should not require the County to construct new roadways or widen existing roadways outside of the Urban Growth Boundary. Other measures should be considered to provide capacity for new development or to address the impacts of unmitigated development from adjacent areas.

The City of Belleview CIP states that all future private developments should assume 100% of the cost of facility improvements necessitated by each development at LOS D for roadways funded through the Transportation Regional Incentive Program and state roadways, and LOS E for County and City roadways.

The City of Dunnellon CIP states that all future development should bear a proportionate cost of facility improvements necessitated by the development to sustain LOS C as a general guide. The City should coordinate with the TPO on short and long-range transportation improvements.

The City of Ocala CIP states that the City will ensure that all development receives public facility levels of service greater than or equal to the standards that the City adopted. These standards are LOS E for City and County facilities, LOS D +10% for all state facilities, and LOS C for state facilities on the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS).

NEW ROADS

The City of Ocala Comprehensive Plan, Marion County Comprehensive Plan and 2040 LRTP all include significant lists of new roads that are needed to facilitate travel within and outside of the county. Projects in particular that appear in all three of these plans, include:

- SW 44th Ave from SW 32nd ST to SR 200 – New 4 Lane
- I-75 at NW 49th St – New Interchange

PROJECTS – NEW ROADS

Table 8 summarizes the new roadway projects identified in the plans reviewed, including both funded and unfunded projects.

Table 8. New Roadways Projects

PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	PHASE (YEAR)	COST	PLAN(S)
NW 49th/35th St Ph 2b from City Limit to North end of Limerock Pit	New 4-lane divided pit area	2018/19	\$7,800,000	Marion County Comp Plan
NW 49th/35th St Ph 2c from NW 44th Ave to North end of Limerock Pit	New 4-lane divided with interchange 0.9 miles	2018/19	\$2,400,000	Marion County Comp Plan
		2019/20	\$4,145,000	
		2020/21	\$26,415,531	
		2021/22	\$1,490,000	
SW 49th/40th Ave Ph 1 from SW 66th St to SW 42nd St Flyover	New 4-lane divided 2.1 miles	2019/20	\$6,800,000	Marion County Comp Plan
SW 49th/40th Ave Ph 2 & 3 from SW 95th St to SW 66th St	New 4-lane divided 2.9 miles	2018/19	\$10,700,000	Marion County Comp Plan
Emerald Rd Extension from SE 92nd Loop to Florida Northern Railroad	New 2 lanes 1.8 miles	2018/19	\$600,000	Marion County Comp Plan
		2019/20	\$1,000,000	
		2020/21	\$4,500,000	
SW 44th Ave SR 200 to SW 32nd St Project # 4355471	New road construction	2018/19	\$4,428,000	Marion County Comp Plan
NW 49th St Ext from NW 44th Ave to NW 35th Ave for 0.8 miles (West impact fee district)	New 4 lanes	2021-25	PE: \$544,000 ROW: \$3.26 million CST: \$5.71 million	2040 LRTP
SW 44th Ave from SR 200 to SW 20th St for 1.8 miles (West impact fee district)	New 4 lanes	2026-30	CST: \$7.55 million	2040 LRTP
SW 44th Ave from SR 40 to NW 10th St for 0.8 miles (West impact fee district)	New 4 lanes	2026-30	PE: \$599,000 ROW: \$3.6 million CST: \$6.29 million	2040 LRTP
Marion Oaks Manor Ext from SW 18th Ave Rd to CR 475 for 2.4 miles (West impact fee district)	New 2 lanes	2026-30	PE: \$1.33 million ROW: \$7.98 million CST: \$17.87 million	2040 LRTP
SW 49th Ave from Marion Oaks Tr to CR 484 for 0.7 miles (West impact fee district)	New 4 lanes	2026-30	PE: \$527,000 ROW: \$3.16 million	2040 LRTP
		2031-40	CST: \$7.08 million	

PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	PHASE (YEAR)	COST	PLAN(S)
SW 49th Ave from CR 484 to Marion Oaks Manor for 1.9 miles (West impact fee district)	New 4 lanes	2026-2030	PE: \$1.53 million ROW: \$9.21 million	2040 LRTP
		2031-2040	CST: \$20.61 million	
SW 95th St from interstate 75 to CR 475A for 1 mile (West impact fee district)	New 4 lanes	2031-2040	PE: \$815,000 ROW: \$6.07 million CST: \$10.63 million	2040 LRTP
Emerald Rd Ext from SE 92nd Loop to Emerald Rd for 0.5 miles	New 2 lanes	2031-2040	PE: \$362,000 ROW: \$2.18 million CST: \$3.8 million	2040 LRTP

Unfunded

NW 49th St from NW 80th Ave to NW 44th Ave for 2.5 miles (West impact fee district)	New 2 lanes	Unfunded	PE: \$923,000 ROW: \$5.54 million CST: \$9.96 million	2040 LRTP
NW 60th Ave from US 27 to NW 49th St for 1.1 miles (West impact fee district)	New 2 lanes	Unfunded	PE: \$401,000 ROW: \$2.4 million CST: \$4.21 million	2040 LRTP
Dunnellon Bypass from CR 40 to US 41 for 1.3 miles (West impact fee district)	New 2 lanes	Unfunded	PE: \$478,000 ROW: \$2.87 million CST: \$5.02 million	2040 LRTP
SE 17th St from SE 44th Ave to SE 47th Ave for 0.3 miles (East impact fee district)	New 2 lanes	Unfunded	PE: \$96,000 ROW: \$573,000 CST: \$1 million	2040 LRTP

ROADWAY EXPANSION

Roadway expansion projects are significant in both the Marion County Comprehensive Plan and the 2040 LRTP. These include widening from two to four lanes, and four to six lanes. **Table 9** lists the roadway expansion projects identified in the SIS cost feasible and unfunded needs plans; 2040 LRTP cost feasible and unfunded needs plans; and the Marion County Comprehensive Plan.

Table 9. Roadway Expansion Projects

PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	PHASE (YEAR)	COST	PLAN(S)
I-75 (SR93) from SR 200 to CR 234	Project Dev. & Env.	2020	\$7,590,000	SIS 1st 5 yrs
I-75 (SR 93) from Turnpike (SR 91) to SR 200	Project Dev. & Env.	2020	\$6,305,000	SIS 1st 5 yrs
I-75 Interchange at SW 95th St from 49th Ave to CR 475a	Project Dev. & Env	2020	\$40,000	SIS 1st 5 yrs
I-75 (SR93) at NW 49th St from End of NW 49th St to End of NW 35th St	Modify interchange	2020	\$4,000	SIS 1st 5 yrs
		2022	\$2,104,000	
SR 326 from SR 326 RXR Crossing to E of CR 25 a (nw Gainesville Rd)	Add Turn Lane	2020	\$1,511,000	SIS 1st 5 yrs
		2021	\$122,000	
SR 40 from East of CR 314 to E of CR 314a	Preliminary Engineering	2020	\$14,000	SIS 1st 5 yrs

PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	PHASE (YEAR)	COST	PLAN(S)
SR 40 from end of 4 Lanes to E of CR 314	Add 2 to build 4 lanes	2020	\$4,580,000	SIS 1st 5 yrs
		2021	\$2,600,000	
		2022	\$223,000	2nd 5 yrs
		2029 (const)	\$185,303,000	
I-75 from CR 318 to Marion/ Alachua county line	Add 4 lanes (special use lanes)	PD&E, PE - 2029-35	\$16,695,000	SIS 2045 CFP
I-75 from CR 484 to CR 318	Add 2 lanes to build 8	PE, CST - 2029-35	\$195,061,200	SIS 2045 CFP
I-75 from CR 484 to CR 318	Add 4 lanes (special use lanes)	PD&E, PE - 2029-35	\$46,746,000	SIS 2045 CFP
I-75 from CR 318 to Marion/ Alachua county line	Add 2 lanes to build 8	PE - 2029-35 ROW,CST - 2036-40	\$9,540,000 \$212,127,300	SIS 2045 CFP
I-75 from Sumter/Marion county line to CR 484	Managed lanes	PDE,PE - 2029-35 ROW,CST - 2036-40	\$66,764,100 \$522,637,500	SIS 2045 CFP
I-75 from end of NW 49th St to end of NW 35th St	New Interchange	PE - 2029-35 ROW - 2036-40 CST - 2041-45	\$3,816,000 \$18,939,900 \$70,795,200	SIS 2045 CFP
I-75 at US 27	Modify Interchange	PE - 2029-35 CST - 2041-45	\$3,100,500 \$57,521,100	SIS 2045 CFP
SR 326 from SR25/US301/ US441 to old US301/CR200A	Add 2 lanes to build 4	PE - 2029-35 ROW,CST - 2041-45	\$2,321,400 \$61,884,900	SIS 2045 CFP
SR 40 from E of CR 314 to CR 314A	Add 2 lanes to build 4	PE, ROW,CST - 2029-35	\$250,351,860	SIS 2045 CFP
SR 40 from SR 314A to Levy Hammock Rd	Add 2 lanes to build 4	PE, ROW,CST - 2029-35	\$28,424,430	SIS 2045 CFP
NW/NE St Ph 1b from 600 feet East of W Anthony Rd to 200A	Add 2 lanes 0.9 miles	2018/19	\$1,100,000	Marion Co. Comp Plan
		2019/20	\$4,190,000	
		2020/21	\$560,000	
NE 35th St Ph 4 from NE 36th Ave to SR 40	Add 2 lanes 2.6 miles	2018/19	\$250,000	Marion Co. Comp Plan
		2019/20	\$1,500,000	
CR 484 from SW 49th Ave to SW 20th Ave Rd	Add 2 lanes 1.3 miles	2018/19	\$630,000	Marion Co. Comp Plan
		2020/21	\$1,300,000	
		2021/22	\$2,170,000	
CR 484 interchange with Interstate 75 from SW 20th Ave Rd to CR 475A	Add lanes and ramps 0.6 miles	2020/21	\$12,000,000	Marion Co. Comp Plan
SR 35 at Foss Rd, Robinson Rd & SR 25 Project # 4352081	Add lanes and reconstruct	2018/19	\$1,005,000	Marion Co. Comp Plan
SR 40 East, SR 40 End of 4 lanes to CR 314 - Project # 4106742	Add lanes and reconstruct for 4.803 miles	2018/19	\$2,085,100	Marion Co. Comp Plan
		2019/20	\$123,330,473	
		2020/21	\$344,270	

PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	PHASE (YEAR)	COST	PLAN(S)
SR 40/Interstate 75 SR 40 interchange SR 40 SW 40th Ave 27th Ave Project # 4336521	Add turn lane(s)	2018/19	\$43,600	Marion Co. Comp Plan
		2019/20	\$3,420,000	
		2020/21	\$1,274,359	
		2021/22	\$1,041,576	
US 441 at SE 98th Lane Project # 4356861	Add left turn lanes	2019/20	\$667,007	Marion Co. Comp Plan
Interstate 75 Rest Area, N of CR 484, S of SR 200 Project # 4385621	Expand services 0.547 miles	2018/19	\$1,830,000	Marion Co. Comp Plan
SR 326 at CR 25A Project # 4356602	Add turn lane(s) 0.034 miles	2018/19	\$197,000	Marion Co. Comp Plan
		2019/20	\$1,201,676	
		2020/21	\$68,920	
US 41 SW 111th Place Lane to SR 40 Project # 2386481	Add lanes & reconstruction for 3.585 mi	2018/19	\$40,377,044	Marion Co. Comp Plan
SR 40 from NE 60th Ct to CR 314 Project # 4106742)	Widen to 4 lanes	2016-2019	ROW: \$8,184,630	2040 LRTP
		2020	CST: \$105,371,872	
US 41 from SW 111th Place Ln to SR 40 Project # 2386481	Widen to 4 lanes	2019	CST: \$29,495,120	2040 LRTP
SR 40 from CR 314 to CR 314A for 5.8 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2021-2025	ROW: \$29.94 million	2040 LRTP
		2026-2030	CST: \$118.96 million	
SR 40 from CR 314A to Levy Hammock Rd for 2.7 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2031-2040	ROW: \$29.94 million CST: \$87.50 million	2040 LRTP
US 301 from CR 42 to SE 143rd Pl for 2.3 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2031-2040	ROW: \$8.09 million CST: \$24.29 million	2040 LRTP
NE 36th Ave from NE 14th St to NE 20th Pl for 0.5 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2021-2025	ROW: \$4.48 million CST: \$3.49 million	2040 LRTP
NE 36th Ave from NE 25th St to NE 35th St for 0.7 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2021-2025	ROW: \$5.77 million CST: \$3.49 million	2040 LRTP
NE 25th Ave from NE 14th St to NE 24th St for 1.6 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2021-2025	ROW: \$11.61 million CST: \$24.32 million	2040 LRTP
NE 25th Ave from NE 24th St to NE 35th St for 0.9 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2021-2025	ROW: \$4.23 million	2040 LRTP
		2026-2030	CST: \$8.27 million	
NE 35th St from W Anthony Rd to CR 200A for 1.2 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2026-2030	PE: \$634,000 ROW: \$6.84 million CST: \$6.65 million	2040 LRTP
NE 35th St from CR 200A to NE 25th Ave for 1.2 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2026-2030	PE: \$649,000 ROW: \$7.01 million CST: \$6.82 million	2040 LRTP
NE 35th St from NE 25th Ave to NE 36th Ave for 1 mile (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2026-2030	PE: \$529,000 ROW: \$4.76 million CST: \$5.55 million	2040 LRTP

PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	PHASE (YEAR)	COST	PLAN(S)
CR 25 from SR 35 to SE 92nd Loop for 1.5 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2031-2040	PE: \$985,000 ROW: \$5.91 million CST: \$10.34 million	2040 LRTP
CR 25 from SE 92nd Loop to SE 108 Tr Rd for 3 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2031-2040	PE: \$2 million ROW: \$11.98 million CST: \$20.96 million	2040 LRTP
SW 44th Ave from SW 13th St to SR 40 for 0.9 miles (West impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2026-2030	CST phase: \$7.3 million	2040 LRTP
SW 49th Ave from SW 95th St to Marion Oaks Tr for 3.4 miles (West impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2026-2030	PE: \$1.8 million ROW: \$10.78 million	2040 LRTP
		2031-2040	CST: \$24.12 million	
SW 95th St from SW 60th Ave to interstate 75 for 1 mile (West impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2031-2041	PE: \$670,000 ROW: \$4.02 million CST: \$7.03 million	2040 LRTP
SR 200 from Citrus Line to CR 484 for 6 miles (West impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	2021-2025	CST: \$32.75 million	2040 LRTP
		2026-2030	CST: \$15.4 million	
Unfunded Needs				
Interstate 75 from Sumter County Line to SR 326 for 21.5 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$20.96 million present day costs (PDC) ROW: \$83.85 million (PDC) CST: \$160.71 million		2040 LRTP
Interstate 75 from SR 326 to CR 318 for 10.2 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$9.97 million ROW: \$39.90 million CST: \$76.47 million		2040 LRTP
Interstate 75 from CR 318 to Alachua County Line for 5.9 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$5.75 million ROW: \$23.01 million CST: \$44.10 million		2040 LRTP
SR 326 from US 441 to CR 200A for 2.3 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$1.46 million ROW: \$5.85 million CST: \$11.21 million		2040 LRTP
SR 326 from CR 200A to NE 36th Ave for 1.2 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$750,000 ROW: \$3 million CST: \$5.75 million		2040 LRTP
SR 35 from CR 25 to SE 92nd Place Rd for 1.8 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$1.12 million ROW: \$4.46 million CST: \$8.35 million		2040 LRTP
US 27 from interstate 75 to NW 27th Ave for 0.6 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$852,000 ROW: \$6.81 million CST: \$6.53 million		2040 LRTP
SR 40 from interstate 75 to SW 27th Ave for 1 mile (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$697,000 ROW: \$2.79 million CST: \$5.34 million		2040 LRTP
US 441 from Sumter County Line to CR 42 for 2 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	ROW: \$5.10 million CST: \$15.27 million		2040 LRTP

PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	PHASE (YEAR)	COST	PLAN(S)
US 441 from CR 42 to SE 132nd Street Rd for 4 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$282,000 ROW: \$11.26 million CST: \$21.58 million		2040 LRTP
SR 40 from US 41 to SW 140th Ave for 3.9 miles (West impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	ROW: \$3.36 million CST: \$10.16 million		2040 LRTP
SR 40 from SW 140th Ave to CR 328 for 2 miles (West impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	ROW: \$1.69 million CST: \$5.11 million		2040 LRTP
SR 40 from SW 60th Ave to interstate 75 for 2.1 miles (West impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$1.45 million ROW: \$5.80 million CST: \$11.12 million		2040 LRTP
US 41 from SR 40 to Levy County Line for 1 mile (West impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$3.63 million ROW: \$14.50 million CST: \$27.80 million		2040 LRTP
US 27 from NW 44th Ave to interstate 75 for 0.6 miles (West impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$450,000 ROW: \$3.60 million CST: \$3.45 million		2040 LRTP
CR 475A from SW 66th St to SW 42nd St for 1.8 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$595,000 ROW: \$3.57 million CST: \$6.25 million		2040 LRTP
CR 484 from SW 20th Ave Rd to CR 475A for 0.6 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$1.73 million ROW: \$20.73 million CST: \$18.14 million		2040 LRTP
SW 20th St from I-75 to SR 200 for 1.1 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$371,000 ROW: \$2.22 million CST: \$3.89 million		2040 LRTP
Lake Weir Ave from SE 31st St to SR 464 for 1.1 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$384,000 ROW: \$2.31 million CST: \$4.03 million		2040 LRTP
SE 92nd Pl Rd from US 441 to SR 35 for 1.7 miles (East impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$575,000 ROW: \$3.45 million CST: \$6.03 million		2040 LRTP
NW 44th Ave from NW 60th St to SR 326 for 1.1 miles (West impact fee district)	Add 2 lanes	PE: \$462,000 ROW: \$2.78 million CST: \$4.86 million		2040 LRTP

INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

A number of intersection improvements are identified in the Marion County Comprehensive Plan and the 2040 LRTP to improve access to and from I-75 to the surrounding areas and alleviate existing congestion and safety issues. These projects address a wide range of other issues, including livability, by alleviating traffic on local roads and economic development, by providing direct access to the growing Ocala 489 Commerce Park adjacent to I-75 and other growing areas. Intersection improvements are listed in **Table 10** below.

ITS AND CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT

ITS and Corridor Management projects typically provide lower-cost solutions to addressing congestion and are a key aspect of the Ocala-Marion TPO's transportation efficiency solutions. Such improvements provide operational solutions, directly addressing the national planning goal to preserve the existing transportation system and employ a "fix it first" approach to addressing transportation challenges.

2018 ITS STRATEGIC PLAN - PROJECTS

The goals of the 2018 ITS Strategic Plan plan include a focus on efficient multimodal movement of people and goods; safety and security; and providing a predictable transportation experience. The 2018 strives to learn from and build upon the original ITS plan developed by the TPO in 2008 and resulting ITS projects that have since been developed. The existing ITS infrastructure was used to screen initial projects to determine opportunities to expand remote communication (fiber or radio), CCTV cameras and Bluetooth® travel time devices. Identification of intersecting facilities that are also in the Top 25 lists were also identified and used to determine starting and ending points of a projects. With the project limits defined, the existing ITS infrastructure was once again referenced and used to identify appropriate locations to expand the communication infrastructure, locations of CCTV cameras and Bluetooth® travel time devices. Additionally, locations for Advanced Traffic Controller (ATC) upgrades were identified along these corridors.

Table 10. Intersection Improvements

PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	PHASE (YEAR)	COST	PLAN(S)
SR 40 @ interstate 75 (SW 27th Ave to SW 40th Ave) (Project # 4336521)	Interchange operational improvements	2018-2020	ROW phase: \$10,848,976	2040 LRTP
		2021-2025	CST: \$7.21 million	
US 441 intersection operations (Project # 4336601)	Intersection improvements	2019-2020	\$363,709	Marion County Comp Plan
		2020-2021	\$280,000	
		2021-2022	\$232,744	
NW 49th St Ext at interstate 75 (West impact fee district)	New interchange	2021-2025	PE: \$4.58 million CST: \$45.19 million	2040 LRTP
Marion Oaks Manor Ext at interstate 75 (West impact fee district)	New overpass	2031-2040	CST: \$16.75 million CST: \$12.41 million	2040 LRTP
SW 95th St at interstate 75 (West impact fee district)	New interchange	2031-2040	PE: \$8.86 million CST: \$67.96 million	2040 LRTP

Unfunded

Interstate 75 at US 27 (East impact fee district)	Operational improvements	Unfunded	ROW: \$7.50 million CST: \$5.50 million	2040 LRTP
---	--------------------------	----------	--	-----------

Table 11 summarizes the Proposed Project Corridors the limits, and the recommended devices. The table also includes a cost estimate which includes capital costs, maintenance and operations cost and life-cycle replacement costs.

2040 LRTP

While the 2018 ITS Strategic Plan focuses on high priority improvements recommended on a 10-year timeline, the 2040 LRTP Cost Feasible Plan includes a broader set of ITS and Corridor Management projects that are listed in **Table 12**.

Table 11. ITS Strategic Plan Projects

PROJ #	ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	ATC CONTROLLERS	CCTV DEVICES	RADIO DEVICES	BLUETOOTH DEVICES	CAPITAL COST ESTIMATE
1	US 27	NW 70th Ave	I-75	4	0	2	3	\$161,370
2	SR 40	SR 35	CR 314A	4	1	0	2	\$171,600
3	SR 326	I-75	SR 200A	6	1	5	2	\$279,870
4	SR 200	CR 484	SR 464	15	6	0	1	\$671,360
5	US 301/ US 441	SE 165th St	SR 464	19	0	0	3	\$549,570
6	US 301	NW 35th St	SR 326	0	1	1	0	\$52,640
7	SR 40	Hwy 328	SW 27th Ave	3	1	3	1	\$166,260
8	SR 40	NE 1st Ave	SE 25th Ave	0	4	0	0	\$167,650
9	E Magnolia Ave/E 1st Ave	NE 20th St	SR 200A	18	6	0	0	\$743,070
10	SR 464	SR 200	Oak Rd	24	2	0	0	\$739,280
11	SE 36th St	SR 464	SR 40	5	3	0	0	\$262,290
12	NW 35th St	Nw 35th Ave Rd.	NE 36th Ave	5	0	4	0	\$179,470
13	SR 200A	US 301	NE 49th St	4	3	0	1	\$245,210
14	SW 42nd St	SR 200	SR 464	6	2	0	1	\$257,910
15	SR 484	Marion Oaks Course	US 441	11	0	0	2	\$320,860
16	Hwy 42	US 301	US 441	4	0	5	1	\$173,120
17	SW 27th Ave/SW 29th Ave Road	SW 42nd St	SR 464	4	0	0	0	\$109,240
18	SW 20th St	Nw 60th Ave	SR 200	5	0	0	1	\$146,780

Table 12. Other ITS Projects

CORRIDOR DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS	COST (\$ MILLIONS PDC)
State Corridors		
SR 200 from CR 484 to I-75	9	\$1.575
SR 200 from I-75 to US 441	11	\$1.925
SR 326 from I-75 to US 441	3	\$0.525
SR 35 from SE 92nd Pl Rd to SR 464	3	\$0.525
SR 35 from SR 464 to SR 40	5	\$0.875
SR 40 from SW 60th Avenue to SR 35	20	\$3.500
SR 464 from SR 200 to SR 35	19	\$3.325
US 27 from NW 27th Ave to US 441	2	\$0.350
US 27 from SW 27th Ave to SR 35	18	\$3.150
US 301 from SE 143rd Pl to US 441	2	\$0.350
US 301 from Sumter line to CR 42	1	\$0.175
US 441 from SE 132nd St Rd to US 301	3	\$0.525
US 441 from US 301 to CR 475	11	\$1.925
US 441 from CR 475 to SR 200	2	\$0.350
US 441 from SR 200 to CR 25A	9	\$1.575
US 41 from Citrus line to SW 111th Place Ln	3	\$0.525
US 41 from SW 111th Place Ln to SR 40	4	\$0.700
Local Corridors		
CR 464 from SR 35 to Midway Rd	4	\$0.700
CR 464 from Midway Rd to Oak Rd	6	\$1.050
NW/SW 27th Ave from SW 42nd St to SR 200	4	\$0.700
NW/SW 27th Ave from SR 200 to SR 40	3	\$0.525
NW/SW 27th Ave from US 27 to NW 35th St	2	\$0.350
SW 20th St from SW 60th Ave to I-75	4	\$0.700



Intermodal & Freight

AIRPORT

Two airports operate within Marion County, including the Marion County Airport in unincorporated Dunnellon and the Ocala International Airport, which is owned and operated by the City of Ocala. The Marion County Airport is owned by Marion County and overseen by the Dunnellon Airport Authority and has two functioning runways. The Ocala International Airport, which is owned and operated by the City of Ocala, serves a mixture of business, commercial, and general uses and contributes nearly \$89 million in economic impact to the city of Ocala and Marion County.


The planning documents reviewed demonstrate a focus on the importance of providing aviation-compatible land uses for the airports and outline the applicability of a special zoning category or Special Use Permit. An airport overlay district is outlined in the City of Ocala's Comprehensive Plan, Transportation Element with provisions outlining noise exposure levels, building height restrictions, housing criteria for nearby dwellings, and noise studies. Both the County and the City of Ocala recognize the importance of minimizing the environmental impacts associated with airport operations as well as coordinated expansion improvements as the airports grow.

The Ocala International Airport Master Plan, updated in 2014, projects annualized growth of 1.02 percent, reaching 64,000 annual aircraft operations by 2032, 96% of which are expected to be conducted by general aviation aircraft. It is expected that 500 large cargo aircraft operations will occur in 2032, the majority of which are equine related freight. **Figure 6** depicts the Airport's projected freight trend from 2012 to 2032. The plan recommends development of a portion of the airport dedicated to large cargo aircraft, taking advantage of local and statewide initiatives to increase trade in Florida. **Table 13** lists relevant projects from the Airport Master Plan.

RAIL

The Marion County Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element focuses on freight and rail's integral significance to goods movement. This plan highlights the importance of having industrial uses located near rail lines and continuing this land use relationship into the future as well as maintaining the intermodal relationships between freight modes of transport. Since the City of Belleview has a CSX line traveling through it, the Belleview comprehensive plan focuses on coordination with CSX regarding their S-line to mitigate possible negative impacts of increased rail traffic as well as promoting safe operations within the City.

Figure 6. Air Cargo Operations Forecast




Note: Graph copied from Ocala International – Jim Taylor Field Master Plan Update

Table 13. Aviation Projects

PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	PHASE (YEAR)	COST	PLAN(S)
Design and Construct Parking Facilities	General aviation terminal parking facilities located adjacent to existing terminal	2015	\$495,000	Airport Master Plan 2023
West Industrial Park Roads (North)	Construct North portion of the West industrial park roads for non-aeronautical development	2018	\$500,000	Airport Master Plan 2023
		2019	\$710,461	
West Industrial Park Roads (South)	Construct ~0.5 miles of roadway on the south end of West Industrial Park off SW 67th Ave	2018	\$1,031,754	Airport Master Plan 2023
Extend West Side Access Road	Extension of northern portion of west side access road	2019	\$212,500	Airport Master Plan 2023

Figure 7. Marion County Rail Corridors



FREIGHT ROADWAYS

Marion County identified freight needs and challenges as a planning principle. The County's plan has provisions to enhance the freight transportation network, including aviation, highways, and rail, by ensuring that industry and manufacturing entities have access to the network, promoting an intermodal freight strategy, reaching out to industries on future land use decisions, and taking special considerations in terms of design for infrastructure that carries freight traffic.

The city's largest industrial and distribution employment center and the planned Ocala Marion County Commerce Park (MCCP, the Magna project) are within the boundaries of the West Ocala Vision Plan.

The 2019 update of the Florida Freight Mobility and Trade Plan includes one project to enhance the freight network in Marion County by improving the interchange at County Highway 484 and I-75, as described in the table below.

PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	COST (ALL YEARS)
CR 484 from SW 20th Ave to CR 475A	Interchange improvement	\$13,455,000

Safety & Security SAFETY/CRASH REDUCTION

Roadway safety is a clear priority for Marion County and its municipalities. The Marion County Comprehensive Plan, the Ocala Comprehensive Plan, the West Ocala Vision and Community Plan, and the Belleview Comprehensive Plan all contain safety provisions. The County aims to coordinate land use decisions, access locations, and configurations to maintain and improve safety of the transportation system for effective movement of all modes. It will do so by upholding access standards on State roads and evaluating annual accident frequency reports on all collectors and arterial roads to determine safety capital improvement priorities.

The City of Ocala aims to provide a safe and aesthetic transportation system. It aims to reduce vehicular accidents by identifying high accident intersections, conducting traffic counts and accident summaries on selected streets, and referencing TPO Crash Data Management Systems. The City also aims to employ Complete Streets design to promote safety and "Road Diets" to promote bicycle and pedestrian safety. The City also aims to provide safe transit. The City will increase safety for various modes by employing Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technologies.

The West Ocala area aims to ensure safe connections between destinations. It, too, is interested in Complete Streets design as a means of increasing safety. The City of Belleview desires to maintain a safe transportation system, which includes multimodal transportation. It aims to reduce accidents by requiring all development proposals to include provisions for the safe flow of traffic. The City also will emphasize safety through design and maintenance of the transportation system.

The TPO has set its safety targets based on historical crash data, aiming to reduce traffic fatalities and working toward established targets through crash analysis and identification of safety improvements, all of which will be assessed and included in the LRTP. Analysis of high crash corridors will support this effort and result in potential safety studies to be included in the Cost Feasible Plan.


EVACUATION ROUTES

Marion County notes a number of evacuation routes in its Comprehensive Plan, depicted in **Figure 8**. Improvements to these facilities are included in a number of plans reviewed and will be summarized in the context of security related improvements in the final LRTP documentation.

IV. THEMATIC SYNTHESIS - SUMMARY OF PRIORITIES & ALIGNMENT WITH NATIONAL PLANNING FACTORS

This review of planning documents revealed overlapping themes in objectives, priorities, strategies and projects. These are summarized in **Table 14** with a correlation to respective National Goals and 2045 LRTP goals.

Figure 8. Marion County Evacuation Routes



\\mchec1\dfs\GIS_GS_Shared\2013 Comp Plan Update\FLUM Map Series\2035 Map 3 CHHA and Evacuations Routes.mxd

Table 14. Synthesis Themes and Goals

PLAN SYNTHESIS THEMES	2045 LRTP GOALS	NATIONAL PLANNING FACTORS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote walkable, livable communities and multimodal accessibility of employment centers from nearby population centers. Support creation of jobs and stabilization of existing businesses in downtowns, major activity centers and redevelopment areas of Marion County. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide efficient transportation that promotes economic development 	Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve network connectivity and safety to encourage use of non-motorized modes of transportation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on improving safety and security of the transportation system 	Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on efficient multimodal movement of people and goods; safety and security; and providing a predictable transportation experience through ITS infrastructure improvements 		Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage higher density/intensity development through infill and redevelopment strategies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote travel choices that are multimodal and accessible 	Increase the accessibility and mobility for people and freight.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect unique natural, cultural, and physical resources in Marion County and discourage urban sprawl. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions by supporting non-motorized transportation options and discouraging urban sprawl. Manage growth as the County's population continues to grow. Integrate transit service into a multimodal network and provide resources to transportation disadvantaged people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect natural resources and create quality places Ensure the transportation system meets the needs of the community 	Protect and enhance the environment , promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support regional facilities that provide connections to recreation areas, the Heart of Florida loop trail system, and the Withlacoochee Trail and Lake County. Enhance freight infrastructure, including aviation, highways, and rail, ensuring that industry and manufacturing land uses have access to the freight network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote travel choices that are multimodal and accessible 	Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, people and freight.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on efficient multimodal movement of people and goods; safety and security; and providing a predictable transportation experience through congestion management strategies and ITS infrastructure improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optimize and preserve existing infrastructure 	Promote efficient system management and operation.

APPENDIX H

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

2045 Long Range Transportation Plan

FINANCIAL RESOURCE PROJECTIONS TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

APRIL 2020



CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. 2040 VS 2045 LRTP FORECASTS	3
III. INFLATION FACTORS	4
IV. STATE/FEDERAL REVENUES	4
V. LOCAL REVENUES	5
VI. REVENUE PROJECTIONS	5
State and Federal Sources	5
Other Roads, Transit	6
Strategic Intermodal System	6
Other State/Federal	7
Local Revenue Sources	8
State-Levied Fuel Taxes	8
Local Option Fuel Taxes	8
Summary of Fuel Taxes	10
Impact Fees	11
SunTran	13
Infrastructure Sales Surtax	13
Potential New Revenues	14
Summary of Projected Revenues	14
Revenues Available for Capacity	16
APPENDIX A. DATA INPUT REFERENCES	
APPENDIX B. FDOT REVENUE FORECASTING GUIDEBOOK	
APPENDIX C. FDOT REVENUE FORECAST – OCALA MARION TPO	


I. INTRODUCTION

The Ocala Marion LRTP is required, by federal law, to demonstrate the cost feasibility of improvements contained in the 2045 cost feasible plan. The period between 2021 and 2025, reflecting the FDOT Work Program and local capital improvement programs, is based on available revenues in the short term, as projected by those agencies. Financial resources expected to be available during the remainder of the cost feasible plan period, between 2026 and 2045, must be projected based on a variety of data, including historical receipts, future population growth, expected changes in fuel efficiency, and inflation. **Appendix A** includes data source references for key inputs informing the forecasts. The total revenue projected to be available between the years 2026 and 2045 for Ocala Marion transportation capacity improvements is \$3.3 billion, in Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars, inclusive of Strategic Intermodal System funding, which is allocated by the FDOT.

II. 2040 VS 2045 LRTP FORECASTS

Each update of the Long Range Transportation Plan, which occurs once every five years, includes a re-examination of the assumptions built into revenue projections based on changing economic conditions at the local, state, and national levels. The revenue projections must also take into consideration changes in fiscal policy, including both potentially new revenue sources as well as shifts in allocations as directed by policy makers. Other important factors include updated population growth projections, fuel consumption trends, and travel behaviors, as these represent the core mathematical drivers of the revenue forecasts. **Figure 1** provides a comparison of 2045 revenue forecasts to the 2040 forecasts prepared five years ago for a consistent 20-year period between 2026-2045 and 2021-2040, respectively. The comparison indicates a significant increase in the 2045 forecast relative to 2040, reflecting the distance and continued recovery from the Great Recession which occurred in the period from 2007 to 2009; passage of an infrastructure sales surtax referendum in 2016; and significant increases in SIS investments on I-75, SR 326, and SR 40.

Figure 1. 2045 vs 2040 Revenue Forecasts (present day \$ in millions)



III. INFLATION FACTORS

All revenue projections in this report, with the exception of the comparative analysis presented in Figure 1, are represented in Year of Expenditure dollars (YOE). It is a federal requirement that the LRTP cost feasible plan be represented in YOE terms, based on period inflation factor rates applied to both revenues and project costs. For cost projections in the LRTP, FDOT provides present-day cost inflation factors, which are shown in **Table 1**. These factors are used to inflate project costs based on the time period when the funded activity is expected to occur to meet the FHWA requirements for illustrating financial feasibility using YOE project costs.

Table 1. FDOT Inflation Factors

TIME PERIOD	FDOT INFLATION FACTOR
2024-2025	1.19
2026-2030	1.32
2031-2035	1.55
2036-2045	2.05

IV. STATE/FEDERAL REVENUES

State and Federal transportation revenue forecasts are provided by the Florida Department of Transportation, reflecting current policy and based on State Revenue Estimating Conference (REC) and FDOT Federal Aid Forecasts.

Some of the State and Federal funding programs include allocations to the Ocala Marion TPO area, while others are estimated at the FDOT district level or statewide level. The largest allocation of State/Federal funds to transportation improvements in central Florida is dedicated to Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) facilities. Due to the nature of the SIS as a statewide system of roadways, rail lines, and intermodal hubs, project prioritization and funding allocations are determined by FDOT at the district level as part of the SIS Cost Feasible Plan and are not subject to TPO prioritization or cost feasible plan development.

There are two other revenue programs that are subject to TPO planning and cost feasible plan development, including Other Roads Construction & ROW and Transit. While the Ocala Marion TPO area is not currently classified as a Transportation Management Area (TMA), it may be designated at TMA after the 2020 US Census, which would result in additional funding. These revenue sources represent two of the most flexible, with respect to the TPO's ability to allocate the funds to projects and/or programs. Another funding source with some degree of flexibility is the Other Roads Construction & ROW program. The other revenue programs have very specific eligibility requirements that dictate the types of improvements that can be funded. A portion of Other Roads can be allocated to capital improvements on off-system facilities, defined as facilities not part of the State Highway System.

The remainder of State and Federal funding includes a mix of capital, operations, and enhancement funding for both highway and multimodal uses that are forecast at the FDOT district or statewide level. These programs include statewide Florida New Starts, Transportation Alternatives (TALL and TALT), Transportation Regional Incentives Program (TRIP), and non-capacity funding for the following purposes:

- Safety
- Resurfacing
- Bridge
- Product Support
- Operation and Maintenance
- Administration

Detailed descriptions of these programs and statewide estimates of their funding allocations are included in **Appendix B** to this report.

V. LOCAL REVENUES

Local revenues also include a variety of sources and types of funds with varying eligibility requirements for their expenditure based on state and local policy. Local transportation revenues in Marion County include revenues collected based on Home Rule Authority and revenues authorized by the Florida Legislature. Home Rule Authority revenues include transportation impact fees, assessed against new development based on a fee rate schedule by development type. State authorized revenues include state-shared revenues distributed to all counties and state authorized local revenues enacted by local governments. State-shared transportation revenues sources include the Constitutional Fuel tax and County Fuel tax. Locally enacted transportation revenues in Marion County include the 1-6 and 1-5 cent Local Option Gas Taxes (LOGT) and the Ninth-Cent fuel tax on non-diesel motor fuel. A portion of these revenues are dedicated to debt service on series 2010 and 2016 Public Improvement Revenue bonds and to the operation and maintenance of the existing transportation system and the remainder is eligible for capacity improvements.

In 2016, Marion County voters approved a 1% Local Government Infrastructure Surtax, scheduled to sunset in 2020. For the purpose of developing revenue forecasts for the 2045 LRTP, three distinct Surtax scenarios were prepared. The first assumes that the surtax will be extended and will be collected for the duration of the plan period. The second assumes the Surtax will be collected for a period of four years, and the third assumes the Surtax will not pass in 2020. In 2017, The Marion County Board of County Commissioners reinstated the transportation impact fee program, which had been suspended since 2010 to facilitate recovery from the Great Recession.

VI. REVENUE PROJECTIONS

State and Federal Sources

The Florida State Transportation Trust Fund (STTF) is comprised primarily of state revenues, including State fuel taxes, motor vehicle fees, rental car surcharge, Documentary Stamp taxes, and several others. Combined, these State-collected revenues account for approximately 70% of the Trust Fund. Of that 70%, almost half is State fuel taxes and the rest is composed of various sources, none of which makes up more than 16% of the trust fund. (source: FDOT Office of Policy Planning). State and Federal revenue projections developed by FDOT and provided to the Ocala Marion TPO are categorized as TPO allocations, FDOT districtwide, and statewide revenues. The first category includes the monies that can be expected by the TPO to be allocated to projects, as determined by the TPO in the cost feasible plan. The other categories require local matching funds and, in most cases cannot be assumed to be available for cost feasible plan development. TPO allocated funds are summarized below in **Table 2**.

Table 2. State and Federal Projections (County Specific in millions of YOE \$)

	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2045	TOTAL
Other Roads Construction & ROW	\$16.1	\$118.3	\$143.7	\$155.1	\$161.3	\$161.3	\$756.0
Transit	\$6.4	\$35.5	\$44.8	\$49.1	\$51.1	\$51.1	\$238.1
TOTAL	\$22.5	\$153.8	\$188.5	\$204.2	\$212.4	\$212.4	\$994.1

OTHER ROADS, TRANSIT

The Other Roads Construction & ROW program can be allocated to non-SIS roadways on the State Highway System (SHS), with up to 15% eligible for off-system facilities. Transit program revenues can be allocated to operating and capital assistance for transit, paratransit, and rideshare programs. The Transportation Alternatives Program, distinguished as urban (TALU), distributed to TMAs with population greater than 200,000, and districtwide (TALT) funding allocations, are eligible for locally and regionally defined projects, respectively, that expand modal travel choices and improve cultural, historic, or environmental aspects of the transportation infrastructure. Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) funds apply to improvements on facilities designated as regionally significant and the funds are allocated within each district based on regional project prioritization processes. More details on eligible expenditures for each of the programs is defined in **Appendix C. FDOT Revenue Forecast – Ocala Marion TPO.**

STRATEGIC INTERMODAL SYSTEM

The SIS program, representing the majority of STTF, in terms of allocation to transportation improvements, is allocated to facilities at the regional level by FDOT. Three separate documents are prepared by FDOT as part of the SIS Funding Strategy, including the SIS Adopted 5-Year Plan, SIS Approved 2nd 5-Year Plan, and SIS 2029-2045 Long Range Cost Feasible Plan. SIS facilities with planned improvements in one or more of those three plan documents include:

Interstate 75

- New Interchange at end of NW 49th St /End of NW 35th St (ROW, CST)
- Add lanes from Sumter/Marion Co Line to CR 484 (PE, ROW, CST)
- Add lanes from CR 484 to CR 318 (PE, CST)
- Add lanes from CR 318 to Marion/Alachua Co Line (PE, ROW, CST)
- Managed lanes from Sumter/Marion Co Line to CR 484 (PDE, PE, ROW, CST)
- Modify interchange at US 27 (PE, CST)

SR 326

- Add lanes from SR 25/US 301/US 441 to Old US 301/CR 200A (PE, ROW, CST)

SR 40

- Add lanes from end of 4 lanes to E of CR 314 (ROW, CST)
- Add lanes from E of CR 314 to CR 314A (PE, ROW, CST)
- Add lanes from CR 314A to Levy Hammock Rd (PE, ROW, CST)

The improvements in the SIS cost feasible plan are all slated for construction in the period between 2020 and 2045. For the purpose of reflecting SIS allocations in the revenue forecasts, improvement costs for those projects are summarized in **Table 3.**

Table 3. Strategic Intermodal System Projections (in millions of YOE \$)

	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2045	TOTAL
SIS Highways/ FIHS Constr/ ROW	N/A	\$46.2	\$185.3	\$730.4	\$349.9	\$56.9	\$1,368.7

OTHER STATE/FEDERAL

Other districtwide and statewide revenue projections that are discretionary and therefore not appropriate to assume available for the 2045 Cost Feasible Plan are summarized in **Table 4**.

Table 4. State and Federal Projections (Districtwide and Statewide in millions of YOE \$)

	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2045	TOTAL
Districtwide State Hwy System O&M	\$561.0	\$2,362.0	\$2,785.0	\$3,006.0	\$3,108.5	\$3,108.5	\$14,931.0
TALL (<200k pop., Districtwide funds)	\$0.8	\$4.1	\$4.1	\$4.1	\$4.1	\$4.1	\$21.3
TALT (Districtwide funds)	\$5.2	\$25.9	\$25.9	\$25.9	\$25.9	\$25.9	\$134.7
TRIP Funds (districtwide)	\$4.7	\$32.8	\$49.0	\$54.4	\$55.9	\$55.9	\$252.6
New Starts Funds (statewide)	\$41.8	\$226.3	\$259.2	\$282.4	\$296.7	\$296.7	\$1,403.1



Local Revenue Sources

There are two broad categories of fuel taxes distributed to Marion County. The first includes the Constitutional and County Fuel Taxes, and Ninth-Cent tax on diesel fuel, all levied by the State and distributed to all counties. The second includes Local Option Fuel Taxes, levied at the county level based on local referendum or County Commission adoption. All fuel tax revenues were projected based on historical receipts, projected population growth, projected Gross State Product (GSP) growth, and projected inflation. A fuel efficiency factor was applied to fuel tax revenue projections, at a 1.05% annualized rate, per the U.S. Energy Information Administration.

STATE-LEVIED FUEL TAXES

Distribution of State-levied fuel taxes to counties is based on three basic factors that are a function of the geographical size of the County relative to the State, the current population of the County relative to the State population, and the historical proportion of tax receipts collected in the County relative to the total for the State. The Constitutional Fuel Tax is collected on every gallon of motor fuel sold in the State at a rate of two cents per gallon. Proceeds from this revenue source can be used by counties for roadway right of way acquisition, construction, operation, and maintenance, but only after debt service is paid on any bonds on the revenue source. The County Fuel Tax is levied by the State at a rate of one cent per gallon of motor fuel sold. The distribution and eligibility of this source for transportation improvements is the same as the Constitutional Fuel Tax. Both the Constitutional and County fuel taxes were projected based on the last five years of distribution to Marion County (2014-2018), an annualized growth rate based on GSP growth projections, and projected inflation on an annual basis. The GSP projections used for this process were developed by the University of Central Florida Center for Economic Competitiveness and inflation rates used to factor the growth were developed and published in FDOT's Revenue Forecasting Handbook (July 2018).

Projections of the State-levied fuel taxes distributed to Marion County are presented in **Table 5**. The combined state distributed fuel tax revenues, approximately \$254 million are available for the period between 2020 and 2045 for the acquisition, construction and routine maintenance of local roadway infrastructure, including multimodal components of roadways.

LOCAL OPTION FUEL TAXES

A maximum of 12 cents per gallon of fuel sold can be levied by county governments in three separate programs. The first is the Ninth-Cent Fuel tax, which can be levied at a rate of one cent per gallon on non-diesel fuel sales. This tax is levied in all Florida counties for diesel fuel. Marion County levies this tax on non-diesel motor fuel. The Ninth-Cent tax proceeds may be used by the County for most roadway and public transportation operation and maintenance expenses. The second program is the 1-5 cent Local Option Fuel Tax (LOFT). This tax can be levied up to five cents per gallon of fuel sold and is levied for the full 5 cents by Marion County. The third program is the 1-6 cent LOFT, which is authorized by the Florida Legislature in all counties on diesel fuel sales. Counties also have the option of levying this fuel tax on all motor fuel, by either majority vote of the Board of County Commissioners or by a countywide referendum. Marion County does levy the 1-6 LOFT on all motor fuel sold in the County. Eligible uses of LOFT revenues include public transportation operations and maintenance; roadway and right-of-way maintenance; roadway and right-of-way drainage; street lighting installation, operation, maintenance, and repair; traffic signs, traffic engineering, signalization, and pavement markings, installation, operation, maintenance, and repair; bridge maintenance and operation; debt service and current expenditures for transportation capital projects, including construction or reconstruction of roads and sidewalks.

The projection of LOFT revenues for Marion County assumes a base revenue amount equal to the average of LOFT revenues distributed to Marion County over the last five years (2014-2018). For the period between 2020 and 2045, the per capita revenue in the preceding five years is extrapolated based on projected population growth in the County, adjusted for inflation using the annual inflation rates published in FDOT's Revenue Forecasting Handbook.

Projections of local option fuel taxes collected in Marion County are presented in **Table 6**. A portion of the Local Option Fuel Tax revenues are netted out of the total projection to cover 2010 and 2016 Public Improvement Revenue bonds issued against this revenue source, which are scheduled to be paid by 2020 and 2029, respectively. The remainder of the LOFT revenues, approximately \$665 million, are available for the acquisition, construction and routine maintenance of local roadway infrastructure, including multimodal components of roadways.

Table 5. State-Levied Fuel Taxes (in millions of YOE \$)

	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2045	TOTAL
Constitutional Fuel	\$4.4	\$24.5	\$28.4	\$33.4	\$39.4	\$46.4	\$176.5
County Fuel	\$2.0	\$10.8	\$12.5	\$14.8	\$17.4	\$20.5	\$77.9
TOTAL	\$6.6	\$35.3	\$40.9	\$48.2	\$56.8	\$66.9	\$254.4

Notes:

Fuel tax collections and distribution rates as reported by the Florida Department of Revenue's Office of Tax Research.
Municipal fuel tax distributions are not included.

Table 6. Local Option Fuel Taxes (in millions of YOE \$)

	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2045	TOTAL
Ninth Cent	\$2.2	\$12.1	\$14.0	\$16.3	\$18.9	\$21.8	\$85.2
Local Option Fuel 1 to 6	\$9.8	\$53.4	\$61.8	\$72.1	\$83.6	\$96.4	\$377.0
Local Option Fuel 1 to 5	\$6.3	\$34.3	\$39.8	\$46.4	\$53.8	\$62.1	\$242.7
Debt Service	(\$4.0)	(\$19.8)	(\$15.9)	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$39.6)
TOTAL (net of debt service)	\$14.3	\$80.0	\$99.7	\$134.8	\$156.3	\$180.3	\$665.3

Notes:

Fuel tax collections and distribution rates as reported by the Florida Department of Revenue's Office of Tax Research.

Totals may not sum perfectly due to rounding.

Municipal fuel tax distributions are not included.

Fuel tax revenues projected to decline 1% per year from the base assumption over time on a per capita basis to account to reflect declining fuel consumption trends.

SUMMARY OF FUEL TAXES

The state-levied and local option fuel tax revenues expected to be distributed to and/or collected by Marion County are partially encumbered to fund existing infrastructure operation and maintenance (O&M). The total amount of gas tax revenues estimated to cover O&M expenses for the plan period, extrapolated based on the 2020 Marion County budget for O&M costs covered by gas tax revenues, is approximately \$728 million. The balance of gas tax revenue for capacity improvements over the plan period is approximately \$191 million, as outlined in **Table 7** below..

Table 7. Fuel Taxes (in millions of YOE \$)

	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2045	TOTAL
Local Option Fuel Taxes ¹ (net of debt service)	\$14.4	\$79.9	\$99.6	\$134.7	\$156.3	\$180.3	\$665.3
State Distributed Fuel Taxes	\$6.40	\$35.30	\$40.90	\$48.20	\$56.80	\$66.90	\$254.40
O&M Obligations	(\$17.7)	(\$93.2)	(\$116.9)	(\$137.3)	(\$181.6)	(\$181.6)	(\$728.3)
TOTAL (net of O&M obligations)	\$3.1	\$22.0	\$23.6	\$45.6	\$31.5	\$65.6	\$191.4

Notes:

Fuel tax collections and distribution rates as reported by the Florida Department of Revenue's Office of Tax Research.

Totals may not sum perfectly due to rounding.

Municipal fuel tax distributions are not included.

Fuel tax revenues projected to decline 1% per year from the base assumption over time on a per capita basis to account to reflect declining fuel consumption trends.

¹ Includes 9th cent fuel tax on both diesel and non-diesel fuel

IMPACT FEES

In 2017, the Marion County Board of County Commissioners reinstated the County's transportation impact fee program, adopting a rate schedule that was substantially lower than the rates recommended in the 2015 Marion County Transportation Impact Fee Update Study. The 2017 ordinance reflects rates approximately 20% and 11% of the rates recommended in the 2015 study for residential and non-residential development, respectively. Impact fee revenues were projected on a unit and 1,000 square feet of development basis, respectively, for residential and non-residential development. For the purpose of projecting impact fee revenues, the discounted rates were used, as outlined in fee rates in **Table 8**, under the assumption that those rates would remain in place for the duration of the plan period. 2045 Population and employment growth projections developed for the Ocala Marion LRTP were used, with the impact fee rates, to project total revenues. Due to differences in population and employment categories in the socioeconomic data growth projections, relative to impact fee rate categories, assumptions were made to convert the former to units consistent with the latter. **Table 8** illustrates those assumptions in each category for which population and employment projects are available.

Table 8. Growth Category Conversion Assumptions for Impact Fees

	SOCIOECONOMIC DATA	IMPACT FEE RATES
Residential	Single-Family dwelling units	Single Family detached – 1,501 sf to 2,499 sf
	Multi-Family dwelling units	Average of rates for Multi-Family (1 & 2 stories) and Multi-Family (3 & more stories)
Non-Residential	Industrial	Average of rates per 1,000 square feet of all Industry categories
	Commercial	Average of rates per 1,000 square feet of all retail categories (with 1,000 square foot unit, excluding gas/service station, self-service car wash, and quick lube)
	Service	Average of rates per 1,000 square feet of all Office categories

The average impact fee assumptions per land use for the two residential and three non-residential development categories are shown in **Table 9**. The average annual number of new dwelling units and workers forecast from 2020-2045 was multiplied by the relevant impact fee rate assumption for that jurisdiction to estimate the annual revenue from transportation impact fees. Non-residential employment growth was factored by 75% to account for a portion of that growth in employment allocated to existing structures, rather than new development. Conversion factors were used to relate employment to each 1,000 square feet of non-residential development. For industrial development the factor assumes one employee per 1,000 square feet; for commercial, 2 employees per 1,000 square feet; and for service, 3 employees per 1,000 square feet.

Impact fee districts adopted as part of the 2015 ordinance include the east district and the west district, defined as the areas east and west of I-75, respectively. **Table 10** includes impact fee revenue projections over the course of the plan period, by district, based on the effective rates outlined in **Table 9**. Inflation was not applied to impact fee rates, but was applied to the revenue projections themselves.

Table 9. Impact Fee Rates

	DEVELOPMENT TYPE	RECOMMENDED RATES	EFFECTIVE RATE
Residential	Single Family Detached (per unit)	\$ 6,994	\$ 1,397
	Multi Family (per unit)	\$ 3,682	\$ 735
Non-Residential	Commercial (per 1,000 sq ft)	\$ 13,841	\$ 1,463
	Service (per 1,000 sq ft)	\$ 9,418	\$ 996
	Industrial (per 1,000 sq ft)	\$ 2,003	\$ 212

Table 10. Impact Fee Revenue Projections at 2017 rates (in millions of YOE \$)

	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2045	TOTAL
East of I-75 Impact Fees	\$1.1	\$6.4	\$7.1	\$8.3	\$11.0	\$11.0	\$44.8
West of I-75 Impact Fees	\$2.1	\$12.8	\$14.1	\$16.6	\$22.0	\$22.0	\$89.6
TOTAL	\$3.2	\$19.1	\$21.2	\$24.9	\$33.0	\$33.0	\$134.4

Notes:

Impact Fee revenues based on 2020-2045 household and employment forecasts, using current effective fee rates.

Totals may not sum perfectly due to rounding.

SUNTRAN

SunTran receives operating and capital revenues from federal, state, and local sources. Local revenue estimates are documented in SunTran's FY 2018-2027 Transit Development Plan (TDP). Revenue projections for subsequent years, between 2028 and 2045, were estimated using average annual revenues reflected in the TDP, FDOT's inflation rates and projected population growth during that period. Federal and state revenue estimates provided in FDOT's 2045 Revenue Forecast Handbook were used in lieu of estimates in the TDP, for consistency with FDOT revenue guidance. Projections to 2045 were estimated using annual local revenues reported in the TDP, relative to projected population in those years, extrapolated to 2045 on a per capita basis, adjusted for inflation using FDOT inflation rates.

Table 11 reports local transit revenue forecasts.

INFRASTRUCTURE SALES SURTAX

The Infrastructure Sales Surtax approved by Marion County voters in 2016, is a 1% local sales surtax, the proceeds of which are divided and allocated to the Fire Department, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Communications, Sheriff Department, and Transportation. The surtax is scheduled to sunset in 2020 and will be reassessed by voters in November 2020. For the purpose of 2045 revenue forecasts, 3 projection scenarios were estimated based on whether the 2020 referendum passes and whether future sales surtax referenda pass. The first scenario assumes no sales surtax starting in 2020. The second assumes the referendum will pass, re-enacting the surtax for a period of four years and the third assumes that the tax will be re-enacted multiple times, covering the entire plan period to 2045. The allocation of surtax revenues to the various functions is broken down to 60% for transportation and 40% for the other functions. The surtax revenue forecasts in **Table 12** below includes only the County portion of the surtax for transportation improvements and is based on Florida Department of Revenue's Office of Tax Research (FDOR) guidance and population growth estimates for Marion County. The unallocated portion is allocated to municipalities per FDOR guidance.

Table 11. Transit Local Revenue Projections (in millions of YOE \$)

	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2045	TOTAL
SunTran Local Revenue	\$1.1	\$5.7	\$7.3	\$9.5	\$11.6	\$14.1	\$49.2

Notes:

Totals may not sum perfectly due to rounding.

Table 12. Infrastructure Sales Surtax Projections (in millions of YOE \$)

	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2045	TOTAL
Sales Surtax Scenario 1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Sales Surtax Scenario 2	\$26.1	\$117.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$143.2
Sales Surtax Scenario 3	\$26.1	\$146.3	\$178.6	\$219.7	\$268.7	\$326.9	\$1,166.3

Notes:

Figures include 60% of total surtax forecast allocated to Marion County.

Scenario 1 – assumes no sales surtax

Scenario 2 – assumes sales surtax for 4 years

Scenario 3 – assumes sales surtax for entirety of plan period

Potential New Revenues

Other revenue sources that may be available to fund some infrastructure improvements include private developer contributions, grants, and other tax revenue mechanisms that may be instituted, including value capture or mobility fee revenues. Estimates of these types of sources are not included in estimates developed for the LRTP, due to the uncertainty of both the potential and the magnitude of these sources. Other potential revenue sources that, while not reflective of current local policy, can easily be estimated based on historical and future growth data, include the balance of impact fee revenues, defined as the difference between the 2015 recommended rates and the effective rates and ad valorem property tax. Currently, Marion County does not allocate ad valorem property tax revenues to transportation infrastructure. The property tax revenue forecast summarized in **Table 13** reflects one additional mil added to the current millage rate forecasted based on the last 30 years of taxable value in Marion County extrapolated to 2045. The added mil would most likely be split between transportation capacity improvements and O&M, but for the purpose of revenue forecasting, it is presented in aggregate.

Summary of Projected Revenues

The total revenues available in the 26-year period between 2020 and 2045 include a total of \$4.1 billion in YOE dollars, including \$2.8 billion in state/federal revenues, and \$1.2 billion in local revenues. **Table 14** provides a summary of revenues by period, by source, but does not include the discretionary programs like TRIP, TALT, and New Starts.

Table 13. Potential New Revenues (illustrative - in millions of YOE \$)

	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2045	TOTAL
Transportation Impact Fees (balance of rec. rates – 80%/89%)	\$15.1	\$90.1	\$99.9	\$117.3	\$155.1	\$155.1	\$632.6
Property tax revenue (assumed at 1 mil for transportation)	\$19.3	\$123.4	\$152.6	\$197.6	\$285.8	\$310.1	\$1,088.9
TOTAL	\$34.4	\$213.5	\$252.5	\$314.9	\$440.9	\$465.2	\$1,721.5

Notes:

Impact Fee revenues reflects the difference between rates recommended in the 2015 Marion County Transportation Impact Fee Update Study and the reduced rates of 80% for residential and 71% commercial.

Property tax revenue is forecast based on historical taxable property values between 1990 and 2019 obtained from the Florida Department of Revenue, extrapolated to 2045.

Table 14. Summary of Local, State, Federal Revenues (in millions of YOE \$)

	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2045	TOTAL
STATE/FEDERAL REVENUES (1)							
SIS Highways/ FIHS Constr/ ROW	\$17.8	\$5.0	\$185.3	\$622.8	\$753.7	\$190.2	1,774.8
Other Roads Construction & ROW	\$16.1	\$118.3	\$143.7	\$155.1	\$161.3	\$161.3	\$756.0
Transit	\$6.4	\$35.5	\$44.8	\$49.1	\$51.1	\$51.1	\$238.1
TMA Funds	N/A	N/A	\$25.0	\$25.0	\$25.0	\$25.0	\$100.0
Subtotal State/Federal	\$40.3	\$158.9	\$398.9	\$852.0	\$991.2	\$427.7	\$2,868.9
LOCAL REVENUES (2)							
Marion County Impact Fees (capacity) (3)	\$3.2	\$19.1	\$21.2	\$24.9	\$33.0	\$33.0	\$134.4
Constitutional Fuel (4)	\$4.4	\$24.5	\$28.4	\$33.4	\$39.4	\$46.4	\$176.5
County Fuel (4)	\$2.0	\$10.8	\$12.5	\$14.8	\$17.4	\$20.5	\$77.9
Ninth Cent fuel tax (4)	\$2.2	\$12.1	\$14.0	\$16.3	\$18.9	\$21.8	\$85.2
Local Option Fuel 1 to 6 (4)	\$9.8	\$53.4	\$61.8	\$72.1	\$83.6	\$96.4	\$377.0
Local Option Fuel 1 to 5 (4)	\$6.3	\$34.3	\$39.8	\$46.4	\$53.8	\$62.1	\$242.7
Infrastructure Sales Surtax (5)	\$26.1	\$117.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$143.2
SunTran Local Revenues	\$1.1	\$5.7	\$7.3	\$9.5	\$11.6	\$14.1	\$49.2
Subtotal Local	\$55.10	\$277.00	\$185.00	\$217.40	\$257.70	\$294.30	\$1,286.1
TOTAL	\$95.40	\$435.90	\$583.98	\$1,069.40	\$1,248.90	\$722.00	\$4,155.00

Notes:

(1) State/Federal Revenues from November 2018 2045 Revenue Forecast Ocala Marion TPO - 2045 Forecast of State and Federal Revenues for Statewide and Metropolitan Plans

(2) Fuel tax collections and distribution rates as reported by the Florida Department of Revenue's Office of Tax Research. Municipal fuel tax distributions are not included.

(3) Impact Fees revenues based on 2020-2045 household and employment forecasts, using current fee rates (80%/71% of recommended rates). Totals may not sum perfectly due to rounding.

(4) Fuel tax revenues projected decline 1% per year from the base assumption over time on a per capita basis to account for declining fuel consumption trends.

(5) Sales Surtax projection assumes passage of 2020 referendum, enacting the tax for a period of four years

Revenues Available for Capacity

Each revenue source has specific requirements with regard to the types of eligible expenditures. For example, some revenue sources are very flexible and can be allocated to both capital and operating expenses. Others are specifically limited to one or the other. **Table 15** summarizes revenues that are available for capacity improvements only, net of debt service and O&M obligations, broken down by State/Federal and Local revenues for a total of \$3.3 billion.

Table 15. Summary of Revenues for Capital Improvements (in millions of YOE \$)

	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2045	TOTAL
STATE/FEDERAL REVENUES (1)							
SIS Highways/ FIHS Constr/ ROW	\$17.8	\$5.0	\$185.3	\$622.8	\$753.7	\$190.2	1,774.8
Other Roads Construction & ROW	\$16.1	\$118.3	\$143.7	\$155.1	\$161.3	\$161.3	\$756.0
Transit	\$6.4	\$35.5	\$44.8	\$49.1	\$51.1	\$51.1	\$238.1
TMA Funds	N/A	N/A	\$25.0	\$25.0	\$25.0	\$25.0	\$100.0
Subtotal State/Federal	\$40.3	\$158.9	\$398.9	\$852.0	\$991.2	\$427.7	\$2,868.9
LOCAL REVENUES (2)							
Impact Fees (capacity) (3)	\$3.2	\$19.1	\$21.2	\$24.9	\$33.0	\$33.0	\$134.4
Fuel Taxes net of O&M, debt service obligations (4)	\$3.1	\$22.0	\$23.6	\$45.6	\$31.5	\$65.6	\$191.4
Infrastructure Sales Surtax	\$26.1	\$117.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$143.2
Subtotal Local	\$32.40	\$158.20	\$44.80	\$70.50	\$64.50	\$98.60	\$469.00
TOTAL	\$72.70	\$317.10	\$443.70	\$922.50	\$1,055.70	\$526.30	\$3,337.90

Notes:

(1) State/Federal Revenues from November 2018 2045 Revenue Forecast Ocala Marion TPO - 2045 Forecast of State and Federal Revenues for Statewide and Metropolitan Plans

(2) Fuel tax collections and distribution rates as reported by the Florida Department of Revenue's Office of Tax Research. Municipal fuel tax distributions are not included.

(3) Impact Fees revenues based on 2015-2045 household and employment forecasts, using current fee rates. Totals may not sum perfectly due to rounding.

(4) Fuel tax revenues projected decline 1% per year from the base assumption over time on a per capita basis to account for declining fuel consumption trends.

APPENDIX A. DATA INPUT REFERENCES

VARIABLE	DATA INPUT ASSUMPTIONS	SOURCE
Inflation Factors	Period specific inflation factors applied to represent revenues in Year of Expenditure terms	<i>FDOT Revenue Forecasting Guidebook</i> https://fdotwww.blob.core.windows.net/sitefinity/docs/default-source/content/planning/revenueforecast/revenue-forecasting-guidebook.pdf?sfvrsn=b40e9ddc_0
Strategic Intermodal System revenue	Based on costs of improvements in Marion County included in SIS Cost Feasible Plan	<i>SIS 1st five Years, 2nd Five Years, 2045 Cost Feasible Plan</i> https://www.fdot.gov/planning/systems/programs/mspi/plans/default.shtm
Historical gas tax receipts	Historical gas tax receipts used to estimate per capita local option gas tax revenue 2014-2018	<i>Local Government Financial Information Handbook</i> (2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 editions) prepared by The Florida Legislature's Office of Economic and Demographic Research http://edr.state.fl.us/Content/local-government/reports/index.cfm
Fuel consumption reduction rate	Projected to account for the emergence of electric vehicles and fuel efficiency improvements	U.S. Energy Information Administration https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/data/browser/#/?id=2-AEO2019&cases=ref2019&sourcekey=0
Gross State Product (GSP) growth projection	Projected GSP growth used to estimate Constitutional and County gas tax revenue growth 2020-2045	<i>Florida & Metro Forecast 30 Year Report 2018-2047</i> prepared by University of Central Florida Institute for Economic Competitiveness https://business.ucf.edu/
Marion County LOFT debt service requirements	Based on remaining 10 years of debt service requirements on existing Series 2010 and 2016 LEFT bonds	<i>Marion County, Florida Comprehensive Annual Financial Report 2018</i> https://frontrunner-mccc.s3.amazonaws.com/F27D2E8D-5056-907D-8D6E-42E5CE245096.pdf
Impact Fee Rates	Current impact fee rates used to estimate impact fee revenue	<i>Marion County Transportation Impact Fee Schedule</i> https://www.marioncountyfl.org/home/showdocument?id=11666
Local Transit Revenue	SunTran operating and capital revenue projections 2018-2027	<i>2017 Transit Development Plan</i> https://www.suntran.org/about-us/2018-2027-transit-development-plan
Ad Valorem tax revenue	Based on 29 years of historical Ad Valorem tax receipts (1991-2019)	<i>Florida Department of Revenue – Florida Ad Valorem Valuation and Tax Data Book</i> https://floridarevenue.com/property/Pages/DataPortal_DataBook.aspx

APPENDIX B. FDOT REVENUE FORECASTING GUIDEBOOK

APPENDIX C. FDOT REVENUE FORECAST – OCALA MARION TPO

APPENDIX I

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY

2045 Long Range Transportation Plan

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY

NOVEMBER 2020



CONTENTS

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN	3
WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS	3
Government Agency Coordination	4
Business Stakeholders	6
Ocala Realtors Association	6
Marion County Road Builders Association	6
Ocala Builders Association	6
Ocala Business Leaders	7
Ocala/Marion County Chamber & Economic Partnership	7
Marion County School Board	7
Environmental and Natural Resource Agencies	9
Public Workshops	9
Kick-off Workshops	9
Needs Plan Workshop	13
Performance Indicators	20
ON-LINE SURVEY	23
SOCIAL MEDIA	25
Facebook	25
Instagram	27
Social Media and Web Comments	28
COORDINATION WITH LAKE/SUMTER MPO	30
APPENDIX 1. PUBLIC MEETING ADVERTISEMENTS	31

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

The LRTP Public Involvement Plan (PIP) supplements the TPO's general PIP, providing specific guidance for the public involvement process associated with the update of the LRTP. The LRTP PIP identifies the activities and media used to collect public input; a schedule of public involvement activities; and the variety of media used to do public outreach, including a website, social media, in-person workshops, and virtual workshops. The PIP also includes a map of Environmental Justice areas, defined as those areas with a significant minority and/or low income population and a strategy to conduct workshops in those areas to maximize accessibility to the planning process for those populations.

A new addition to the PIP, relative to past LRTP updates, is the establishment of public outreach evaluation criteria and targets, measured through a questionnaire administered at public outreach workshops and other metrics outlined in the PIP. The metrics were designed to provide feedback and facilitate continuous improvements throughout the plan update process, applying performance-based planning principles to the coordination process, in addition to the technical analysis. Targets were also set for each of the metrics.


WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS

A series of meetings were held with stakeholders and the public at large at key milestones in the plan update process. Stakeholders include both private and government organizations with a stake and a role in transportation infrastructure. Private stakeholder groups include land and infrastructure development trade groups; freight and business interest groups; and environmental and institutional representatives. Government organizations include the cities of Ocala, Belleview, and Dunnellon; the TPO's citizen and technical advisory committees, TPO Governing Board; and neighboring Lake/Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The TPO relied on the guidance of these private and government groups and the public at large to weight the LRTP goals, identify and evaluate needs, and shape the ultimate Cost Feasible Plan.

Public workshops were held in locations chosen specifically to maximize access for disadvantaged communities, defined as areas with greater than the County average proportion of low income and minority households.

Figure 1 displays workshop locations.

Figure 1. Public Workshop Locations



GOVERNMENT AGENCY COORDINATION

More than 30 separate meetings were conducted or attended with the TPO Board, TPO committees and the cities of Ocala, Belleview, and Dunnellon. The TPO focused on the LRTP Goals and Objectives at meetings early in the process in October and November of 2019, shifting to reports of public involvement summaries and performance metrics in the period between January and March of 2020. Subsequent meetings, in the summer of 2020, were focused on the Needs Plan and the results of the virtual needs workshop with the public and final meetings in the fall of 2020 were used to present a draft and make subsequent revisions to the Cost Feasible Plan. The following list provides a timeline of the meetings and the specific LRTP milestone at each.

TPO BOARD MEETINGS

- May 2019 – kick off
- November 2019 – Goals & Objectives
- February 2020 – Finalized Goals & Objectives
- April 2020 – Overview of revised public outreach approaches due to COVID-19
- June 2020 – Increase awareness of public workshop on June 18th /Needs Plan
- August 2020 – Summary of public workshop/ comments received
- September 2020 – Cost Feasible Plan
- October 2020 – DRAFT Adoption Document
- November 2020 – FINAL Adoption Document

Technical Advisory Committee Meetings

- August 2019 – Metroquest survey awareness & basics of LRTP
- October 2019 – Goals & Objectives Worksheets (Pairwise exercise)
- November 2019 – Goals & Objectives
- January 2020 – LRTP Metrics
- February 2020 – LRTP Metrics
- March 2020 – LRTP Metrics
- May 2020 – Needs List
- August 2020 – Public Outreach summary
- September 2020 – Cost Feasible Plan
- October 2020 – DRAFT Adoption Document
- November 2020 – FINAL Adoption Document

Citizen Advisory Committee Meetings

- August 2019 – Metroquest survey awareness & basics of LRTP
- October 2019 – Goals & Objectives Worksheets (Pairwise exercise)
- November 2019 – Goals & Objectives
- January 2020 – LRTP Metrics
- February 2020 – LRTP Metrics
- March 2020 – LRTP Metrics
- May 2020 – Needs List
- August 2020 – Public Outreach summary
- September 2020 – Cost Feasible Plan
- October 2020 – DRAFT Adoption Document
- November 2020 – FINAL Adoption Document

City Council Meetings

- City of Belleview
 - July 21, 2020 – Needs Plan and to garner public awareness surrounding the public involvement effort from June 18th – July 31st
- City of Ocala
 - July 21, 2020 – Needs Plan and to garner public awareness surrounding the public involvement effort from June 18th – July 31st
- City of Dunnellon
 - July 13, 2020 – Needs Plan and to garner public awareness surrounding the public involvement effort from June 18th – July 31st

Other institutional stakeholders that were engaged during the plan development process include the Ocala Marion Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board and the Florida Engineering Society. In addition to the meetings that were used to communicate with these various committees and trade groups, the L RTP team provided the L RTP Steering Committee with an on-line resource to review and comment on transportation projects during the Needs Plan phase of the plan update. The website, hosted by the project consulting team, included an interactive map format to facilitate the process over a several month period of time, enabling committee members to review projects at their leisure and log comments transparently. **Figures 2 and 3** provides a snapshot of the interactive tool.

Figure 2. Interactive Mapping Tool – Motorized Projects





Figure 3. Interactive Mapping Tool – Non-Motorized Projects



BUSINESS STAKEHOLDERS

Another category of stakeholders not specifically represented on the TPO committees includes business, land development, infrastructure development, environmental, and educational groups. The following is a list of the stakeholders in this category that were engaged early in the plan update process to gain input on the Vision, Goals and Objectives, and general transportation concerns:

- Ocala/Marion County Chamber & Economic Partnership
- Ocala Realtors Association
- Marion County Road Builders Association
- Ocala Builders Association
- Ocala Business Leaders
- Marion County School System

Primary themes that were brought up by most of these stakeholders include the transportation needs associated with the County's growing freight and land development industries; the bucolic nature of the County; preservation of the County's horse farms and natural resources; and balancing the need to promote tourism with the desire to protect the County's delicate environment. In addition to free flowing discussion with stakeholders regarding their specific concerns, they were asked to select from a list of thirteen categories of transportation issues that are particularly relevant or important. The following summarizes each stakeholder's specific concerns and priorities.

OCALA REALTORS ASSOCIATION

The LRTP project team met with Vicky Morrison of the Ocala Realtors Association, who expressed her concern on behalf of her organization for the delicate balance of preserving Marion County's horse farms and tourism with the inevitable growth in the freight and logistics industry that is expected to continue in the County. A specific transportation challenge cited by Ms. Morrison is the World Equestrian Center and associated traffic. Her primary concern, however, is associated with preserving farms and natural resources. The most important categories of transportation issues selected by Ms. Morrison include Economic Development, Air/Water Quality, Traffic Congestion, and Affordable Housing.

MARION COUNTY ROAD BUILDERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Harvey Vandeven of the Marion County Road Builders Association shared his concerns with respect to transportation assets and issues in the County, citing tourism and growth as the most important assets to the County. He stipulated that economic growth is important and favorable, but that it must be met with adequate infrastructure to support it. Mr. Vandeven recognized the fact that the County's tourism industry is very much dependent on the bucolic rolling hills and safety that characterize Marion County's landscape and that currently traffic is not a huge problem, but that it will become a problem if not addressed. Specific needs that he described include the need for better east/west connections similar to SR 326 and that a broad countywide highway loop will eventually be needed. Mr. Vandeven selected Economic Development, Safety/Security, Air/Water Quality, Tourism, Traffic Congestion, and Accessibility as the most important categories of transportation issues facing Marion County.

OCALA BUILDERS ASSOCIATION

The LRTP team met with Sue Slavich of the Ocala Builders Association to gain the perspective of the home building industry. Ms. Slavich shared that the horse farm industry is a significant economic contributor to the County, estimated to be worth more than three billion dollars annually. She also shared the Association's support for growth and modernization and that accommodating that growth will likely require a toll road, but that it must be balanced with the rural character of the County. She offered that approximately half of freight and logistics workers, particularly at the distribution centers clustered around I-75 north of SR 40 live south of Marion County, necessitating north/south infrastructure improvements to continue to accommodate this growing industry. Ms. Slavich shared that expansion of Silver Springs Shores with additional construction will create more traffic in the Maricamp corridor. Her biggest concerns for the future of Marion County include the loss of rural landscape with the development of the Villages, the On Top of the World developments and the impacts of growth in general on the County's springs and water quality. Ms. Slavich selected Economic Development, Safety/Security, Air/Water Quality, Tourism, Traffic Congestion, Accessibility, and Natural Resources as the most important categories of transportation issues facing Marion County.

OCALA BUSINESS LEADERS



In a meeting with Connie Ann Pendleton of the Ocala Business Leaders, the team learned about the business community's perspective on the assets, challenges, and priorities of transportation and growth in Marion County. Ms. Pendleton shared that one of the County's major tourism assets used to be Silver Springs, but that now a new marquee tourist attraction is needed. She also shared that with relatively easy access to three major metropolitan areas, Ocala is in need of a passenger airport. Some of the challenges that she shared include the continued development in southwest Marion County, putting more pressure on SR 200; demand for north/south capacity between Leesburg and Ocala; congestion and safety concerns on I-75 due to increasing heavy truck traffic; and the need to accommodate growing demand along the SR 40 corridor west of I-75, particularly with the development of the World Equestrian Center. Ms. Pendleton shared that her biggest concerns include traffic congestion and the need for better access to water attractions like the springs and water park. Ms. Pendleton selected Economic Development, Tourism, Network Connectivity, and Natural Resources as the most important categories of transportation issues facing Marion County.

OCALA/MARION COUNTY CHAMBER & ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP

Input received from Kevin Sheilley of the Ocala/Marion County Chamber and Economic Partnership revealed strong support for Economic Development, Travel Choices, and Community Needs as the three most important transportation related issues in Marion County. The Chamber operates at the crossroads of the need to balance the County's bucolic nature and the need to promote economic development, recognizing that the communities of Marion County generally desire preservation of the rural character while supporting the growing tourism and logistics industries that provide financial stability to the growing County.

MARION COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

The LRTP team met with David Herlihy of the Marion County School Board, who shared that some of the County's greatest assets include open spaces and other natural resources. In terms of challenges, Mr. Herlihy shared that the aging population of Marion County emphasizes the need for effective public transit and, if possible, a fixed guideway system. He recognized the need for supportive land use in order to make premium transit effective and that adhering to City and County plans to develop activity centers could work toward that goal. Mr. Herlihy selected Air/Water Quality, Tourism, Traffic Congestion, and Network Connectivity as the most important categories of transportation issues facing Marion County.



The chart in **Figure 4** illustrates a summary of the most noted issues facing Marion County by the industry stakeholders that were engaged during the plan update process.



Figure 4. Business Stakeholder Concerns

ENVIRONMENTAL AND NATURAL RESOURCE AGENCIES

A third category of stakeholders that were engaged by the LRTP team includes environmental and natural resource agency representatives. The potential environmental impacts of transportation infrastructure improvements is an area that, while not necessarily examined in depth for each project in the LRTP, must be coordinated and assessed on a systemwide basis. There are three ways this is accounted for in the Ocala Marion 2045 LRTP.

1. The first involves an inventory of environmentally sensitive areas and mitigation programs in the County.
2. The second is the assessment of needed transportation improvements relative to their proximity or intrusion into the environmentally sensitive areas.
3. The third is through a closely coordinated process to ensure that the previous two methods are done comprehensively and that nothing is left out.

A workshop with natural resource agencies that oversee or otherwise have a stake in Marion County lands was conducted during the Needs Plan phase of the LRTP update. In addition to the workshop, two of the natural resource agencies, the US Forest Service and Florida Department of Environmental Protection, were consulted continuously during the plan update through their membership on the LRTP Steering Committee. Participants in the Needs Plan workshop include the following agencies:

- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
- Federal Highway Administration, Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division
- St Johns River Water Management District
- Florida Department of Environmental Protection
- US Forest Service

The agenda for the workshop included an overview of the LRTP process and the goals of the plan update with respect to environmental analysis and environmental mitigation programs; a presentation of the Needs Plan, including motorized and non-

motorized improvements; and the LRTP team's understanding of environmentally sensitive lands and programmatic environmental mitigation programs.

Important feedback was received by these stakeholders in terms of all three data series that were presented. In addition to validating the team's approach to environmental impacts, the stakeholders made several important suggestions resulting in additional datasets to be included in the environmentally sensitive areas. A comprehensive discussion of the datasets and how they were used in the technical needs assessment phase of the LRTP update is included in chapter four of the LRTP document.

PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

One of the key methods used to engage the general public in the LRTP update process was to hold a series of workshops early in the process and then again in the Needs Plan phase of the plan update. A third and final opportunity for real-time engagement was a public hearing held by the TPO Governing Board during the October 27th, 2020 TPO Board meeting. A total of eight public meetings were held throughout the process, including a virtual workshop during the COVID-19 pandemic and the public hearing in October. The TPO Board adopted a formal resolution (Resolution #20-07) on April 28, 2020 outlining alternative public participation procedures during emergency situations, like the COVID-19 pandemic, leading to the decision to hold a virtual workshop to present the Needs Plan to the public. Following is a description of each phase of public involvement and the resulting input.

KICK-OFF WORKSHOPS

A series of in-person public workshops were held in August 2019 to kick off the plan update process. Five of the six workshops were held in predominantly low income, predominantly minority, and/or both. The venues for the workshops in these areas include the Marion Oaks Community Center, Belleview City Hall, Silver Springs Shores Community Center, Lillian Bryant Community Center, and Reddick-Collier Elementary School. The venues were selected based on these variables as well as geographic consideration to ensure that the meetings were distributed across the County, maximizing accessibility to Marion County residents. The 2019 workshops focused on an overview of the plan update process; the LRTP goals and objectives; collection of specific area or facility comments; and promotion of an on-line survey that could be completed on tablets at the workshops.

More than 65 people attended the workshops and provided their input through a variety of means, including marking up maps, completing an online survey, and discussing their needs and concerns regarding transportation in Marion County. The input received at the workshops informed the Goals and Objectives established to guide the plan and the Goal weights that were recommended to the TPO Governing Board. Specific facility- and mode-related input was also provided, which was used in the later technical needs assessment. Comments logged on maps and questionnaires are listed by mode of travel in **Table 1**.

Table 1. Kick-off Workshops Comments

Ped/Bike	Indian Lake Trail
	Pruitt Trail
	Expand sidewalks in existing neighborhoods between SR 200/SR40/NW 27th Ave/US 27
	Expand sidewalks in existing neighborhoods between SR40/NW 14th St/NW 27th Ave/US 441
	Extend Cross Seminole Trail to Dunnellon (ends at (virtual) 155th)
	All major roads in Ocala ought to have bike lanes, sidewalks to serve disadvantaged pop.
	Multi-use path as part of 49th Ave ext.
	SR 200/49th Ave could be a multi-modal focal point
	Sidewalks on CR 484 - for people walking to work
	Bike path on W Silver Springs Blvd
	Bike trail on 484 to Blue Run Park in Dunnellon
	Bike trail on US 41 to KP Hole State Park in Dunnellon
	Bike trail on SW 108th Ave Rd to Dunnellon HS and Elem. School
	Improved bike trails connecting dntn Ocala to regional bike trails
	Bike trail in downtown Ocala
	Bike trail along US 301 north of Belleview
	Need bike lanes in Marion Oaks
	Bike route on CR 484 east of Marion Oaks
	Bike lanes in area near Cracker Barrel
	Bike lanes on SR 40 west of NW 110th Ave
	Bike lanes on SW 80th Ave south of SR 40
	Bike lanes on SR 40 east of Ocala
	Bike lanes on SR 464 south of Ocala
	I am a long time Marion Oaks resident.I My concern has been the lack of transportation for Marion Oaks residents who lack transportation
	Wish to learn about funding for proposed bike trail into Dunellon and pedestrian bridge (safety issue) over the Rainbow River from Blue Run of Dunnellon Park.
	add bikelanes to major routes HWY 40, Maricamp, Hwy 27, 80th Ave, 60th Ave,
	Include interpretation in trails.
	Complete Rt 484 pedestrian bridge over Rainbow River.
	Consider completing trail north of Rt 484 over Rainbow River on greenways Right-of-Way to Goethe Forest Trail. Trail is included in master plan

Table 1. Kick-off Workshops Comments cont'd

Transit	Public transit on US 27 west of Ocala
	Public transit on SR 40 west of Ocala
	Public transit on US 301 north of Ocala
	Bus route in southeast Ocala (SR 464)
	More transit in Belleview
	Public transit on US 301 corridor between Ocala and Belleview
	N/S and E/W public transit US 301 and SR 326 north of Ocala
	Better transit from Marion Oaks to Walmart, downtown
	Transit to Pine Oaks (from dntn Ocala), reduced headways, shelters connecting with projects in W. Ocala
	Shorter headways, more bus shelters in Ocala, more bus pull off areas in ROW
	Bus route in downtown Belleview
	Bus route on SR 200
	Public transit Marion Oaks to Ocala
	More frequent bus service
	Public transit Dunnellon to Ocala
	Trolley route in dntn Ocala
	Bus route involving Belleview
	Extend public transit to rural areas
	create mass transit




Table 1. Kick-off Workshops Comments cont'd

Roadway	Emerald Rd extension (in Belleview)
	Better lighting in Marion Oaks (for safety)
	Need turn lane in Marion Oaks
	Widen CR 484 east of Marion Oaks
	WB left turn lane SR 40/80th Ave timing issue
	I-75 safety improvements - fix what we have first, before adding new roads
	Bridge on SR 200 (across Withlacoochee River??)
	Flyover on CR 42 (165th St) across I-75
	Complete 4-lane SR 40 west of SW 119th Ave
	Interchange improvement at I-75/CR 484
	No Turnpike connector!
	Turn lane on SW 108th Ave Rd/CR 484
	Interchange at I-75/49th St
	NW 44th Ave - complete ROW/roadway construction
	SW 49th Ave extension
	Resurface CR 316 east of I-75
	Highway bypass north of Dunnellon
	Congestion back up on SW 180th Ave Rd in Dunnellon due to tourism/traffic
	Traffic signal on US 41 at entrance to Rainbow Springs State Park
	Access mngmt, frontage roads SR 200 between I-75 and dntn
	Better traffic circulation in dntn Dunnellon
	No toll roads in SW Marion or Dunnellon
	NO TOLL ROADS, WIDEN I75
	Widening 40 into 41 should be a priority as traffic is increasing on that 2 lane section and 4 laning 41 from dunellon to 40.
	Eliminate any Suncoast plans in the Dunnellon area due to conservation areas of Lake Rousseau, Halpata Tastanaki and Greenways land.
	I learned that lots of people have concerns and most of the concerns seem to center around not wanting the Suncoast Toll Rd nor extensions as they would affect recharge basin for our river and our water sources
	200 is a bottleneck -- considerations should be made for improvement. Possible public transport additions.
	We need current road improvement, not NEW turnpikes
	need to improve I-75

NEEDS PLAN WORKSHOP

A Needs Plan workshop, which coincided with the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic, was held virtually, with the option on the first day of the workshop for people to attend in person at the County Commission Chambers in Ocala. The workshop was available on-line for people to attend at any time for a period of six weeks from June 18 to July 31, 2020. The focus of the workshop was to present the LRTP Needs Plan, including identified sidewalk, bicycle lane, trail, transit, and roadway improvements for consideration in the LRTP Cost Feasible Plan. Participants could comment on existing projects or suggest new ones and a summary of comments by type were available in real time for people to review and/or react to. More than 30 people attended the live workshop on June 18, 2020. The primary objective of the workshop was to engage participants in the assessment of needed improvements in the County's transportation system, both in terms of already identified improvements making up the draft Needs Plan at the time, and potentially new improvement needs.

Participants in the Needs Plan workshop were encouraged to comment on specific improvement needs, but they were also engaged more generally by categorizing their comments in terms of generalized transportation needs or concerns, like traffic congestion, safety, network connectivity,

and others. The results of the workshop indicated the largest share of concerns were related to traffic congestion, making up 33 percent of the total comments received. Network connectivity also represented an area of concern, with 22 percent of the comments, and safety comments comprised almost 20 percent as well. While the traffic congestion comments are all related to the auto mode of travel, the connectivity and safety comments were divided between modes. Half of the connectivity comments were related to trails and 30 percent related to roadways. The remaining 20 percent were sidewalk and transit related. With regard to safety, the breakdown was reversed, with 60 percent of the safety comments related to auto travel and 40 percent related to the bicycle and pedestrian modes of travel.

Visual representations of motorized and non-motorized comments entered into the virtual workshop are included in **Figures 5** and **6**, respectively. The images are screenshots of the last section of the virtual workshop, which allows participants to interact with comments, represented by icons on the map, and either like or comment on others' comments. The resulting enhanced version of traditional public comment tools enables not only commenting, but dialogue on transportation concerns or projects.




Figure 5. Virtual Workshop Motorized Results






Figure 6. Virtual Workshop Non-Motorized Results



Specific roadway or transportation facility comments provided during the Needs Plan workshop included more than 20 facilities, with six of them representing 54 percent of the comments. Interstate 75, SR 200, SR 40, and US 27 were the most commonly mentioned roadways in the comments as displayed in **Figure 7**. The remainder of facility-specific comments include a mix of state highways and local roadways. A breakdown of the comments by facility for the top six most cited roadways highlights the congestion, connectivity and safety concerns on the part of workshop participants.

Figure 7. Needs Plan Comment Summary by Facility



A full tabulation of comments received in the virtual workshop include 27 motorized-related comments and 19 non-motorized related comments. **Tables 2** and **3** include a comprehensive list of comments received through the virtual workshop for non-motorized and motorized projects, respectively.

Table 2. Non-Motorized Comments

MODE	FACILITY	COMMENT
Pedestrian	US 441	It would be nice to have sidewalks everywhere so the community could exercise
Bicycle	US 441	We need our roads to accommodate bikes. Very dangerous right now
Pedestrian	Jacksonville Rd	Almost every day I see pedestrians walking on the road shoulder. It is dangerous for both them and drivers
Pedestrian	NE 55th Ave	Lots of pedestrians walking in grass alongside road. Difficult to see at night
Trails	n/a	Great way to be inclusive to all members of our community during these troublesome times. Encourages community involvement, outdoor activities, and economic profit. Is a great way to connect people from different areas of the county.
Bicycle	SR 40	Safety very important
Trails	SR 40	Converting the rail line running through downtown Ocala to a bicycle/pedestrian alternative transportation corridor would provide a higher quality of life for city and county residents and visitors while creating tremendous economic benefit for our community. Please include this project as a high priority item in your planning process.
Pedestrian	NE 7th St	Pedestrian lighting needed at intersection with NE 58th Ave. Difficult to see pedestrians at night and lots of NB to EB turning traffic that do not watch for pedestrians.
Trails	Bikeway to Silver Springs gap	Any way to allow the communities on south side of 314 to connect to trail directly rather than using bike lane? Concern with vehicles that speed through this corridor.
Trails	Osceola Avenue	Converting the rail line through downtown to a bike/ped trail would be an economic boon to Ocala and provide alternative transportation for citizens and visitors. The Cross Florida Greenway had the greatest local economic impact of all the Florida state parks in 2019. The Greenway generated nearly \$264 million in local economic impact. (ADDING MORE TRAIL CONNECTIONS TO THE GREENWAY, ESPECIALLY FROM DOWNTOWN, WOULD ENHANCE THIS ECONOMIC BENEFIT)
Bicycle	Osceola Avenue	Request conversion of the rail line on Osceola Ave and south of City Hall to a bicycle/pedestrian transportation corridor to provide an alternative route for residents to access offices, retail businesses, and restaurants in downtown Ocala.
Pedestrian	SR 200	Improve lighting for people crossing this intersection (SR 200 at SW 20th Ct)
Trail	SW 80th Ave	Include multi-use trail along roadway to connect to a bicycle beltway around Ocala.
Pedestrian	CR 475	Add sidewalk from 31st St down to Shady Hill Elementary

Table 2. Non-Motorized Comments cont'd

MODE	FACILITY	COMMENT
Trail	Santos to Baseline Trail	Important trail connection between Baseline and Santos to complete the Cross Florida Greenway Trail and connect Ocala to the Withlacoochee Trail. Great economic opportunity for tourism in Marion County. Also should connect to and provide access to Rotary Sportsplex
Pedestrian	US 441 from US 301 to Del Webb Blvd	Sidewalk project is a waste of money
Trail	CR 484	Pennsylvania Avenue is a high priority for Dunnellon to support redevelopment and economic impact from trail connectivity.
Trail	Cannon- Dunnellon Segment	Great opportunity for regional trail connection and economic impacts to Marion County.
Trail	Osceola Ave	Converting the rail line running through downtown Ocala to a bicycle/pedestrian alternative transportation corridor would provide a higher quality of life for city and county residents and visitors while creating tremendous economic benefit for our community. Please include this project as a high priority item in your planning process. Also, completing the paved Greenway bike trail through to Dunnellon and other points. Both projects provide huge economic benefit to the area.

Table 3. Motorized Comments

MODE	FACILITY	COMMENT
Road	n/a	We need to stop building in the National Forest we have enough roads there.
Road	SR 40 at NE Highway 315	Longer eastbound to northbound left turn lane needed. SR 40 westbound volume can prevent the left turn movement and turning traffic can back up to eastbound traffic.
Road	NW 44th Ave	Roadway extension needed to get local north-south traffic off I-75
Road	SR 40	Fix mis-alignment of NW/SW 38th Ave
Road	NW Pine Ave	Very congested during the PM peak hour. Not enough green time for 10th St
Road	N Magnolia Ave at 10th St	It takes forever for the light to change and let traffic on N Magnolia through.
Road	NE 10th St at NE 8th Ave	The north side of the intersection is dangerous. Ever since the left turn lane to NE 14th St was shortened, traffic backs up and people use the right turn only lane to pass and cut over at the railroad tracks or even through the intersection
Road	E Fort King	A truck bypass east of Pine Street over towards Bonnie Heath and meet up on the east side of town
Road	SR 200 at SW 27th Ave	Add dual left turn lane
Road	SE Lake Weir Ave	Congestion only related to school traffic, don't think widening would be needed
Road	SR 200	Extension to the north from SW 42nd St Flyover needed to relieve congestion on SR 200
Road	SW 32nd St at SW 7th Ave	Traffic signal needed for safety

Table 3. Motorized Comments cont'd

MODE	FACILITY	COMMENT
Road	SE 32nd St at SE 3rd Ave	Right turn lanes needed on northbound and eastbound directions
Road	SE 32nd St at SE 3rd Ave	Southbound to westbound right turn lane needed. Traffic backs up unnecessarily.
Road	US 441	Access management issues between Ocala and Belleview. Lots of median openings without left turn lanes creates rear end crashes.
Road	SW 80th Ave	Widening of 80th Ave is important to provide an additional north/south 4-lane corridor.
Road	SR 200 at SW 60th Ave	Congested intersection
Road	I-75	Widening of I-75 is sorely needed. Interstate is unsafe due to large % of trucks
Road	SW 27th Ave at SW 66th St	Eastbound to Northbound left turn backs up. Need more lanes in all directions.
Road	US 441	Expand to 6 lanes
Road	SR 200 south of CR 484	This section of SR 200 has long been identified as needing widening to match existing section to the north. Design plans were complete, right of way acquisition is complete, and project should receive top priority for construction.
Road	SR 200 south of CR 484	This should be #1 priority. Traffic congestion is terrible, 2 lanes with the amount of traffic is very unsafe. How many more deaths will it take to get this stretch 4-laned?
Road	CR 484 at I-75	Capacity improvements needed on each side of interchange. The interchange does not operate well.
Road	CR 484 at I-75	The traffic from workers coming home between 4pm and 6pm creates an unnecessary back up from 475A to just after the I-75 southbound exit 341 on CR 484.
Road	I-75 at CR 42	Potential solution to another interchange for south Marion County and The Villages vs. SW 95th St
Road	US 441 at SW 135th St	Consider the need for a right turn from US 441 south onto SW 135th St west.
Transit	Baseline Rd	Routes need to extend down major roads; intersection of 200/484 and into Belleview.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The effectiveness of the public involvement program for the LRTP was measured in two ways. The first is through a questionnaire distributed at the workshops that includes questions on the effectiveness of meeting locations, meeting time of day, content of materials distributed at meetings, style and presentation of meeting materials, and electronic media effectiveness. The questionnaire depicted in **Figure 8** was distributed at the workshops and was completed by 22 participants. Other metrics used to evaluate the program include attendance at workshops, survey response rates, social media followers, and others, as described in the PIP. Unfortunately, due in large part to the COVID-19 pandemic, in-person workshops throughout the planning process were limited to the initial six workshops, plus an in-person option on the opening day of the virtual workshop. In spite of that, the performance targets were largely met, and in some cases exceeded.

There were three metrics, in particular, for which the targets were not met in the kick-off workshop series. These were addressed through a variety of strategies to improve the program performance in the subsequent Needs Plan workshop, as outlined in **Table 4**.



Table 4. Remedies for Unmet Performance Targets





METRIC	TARGET	AVERAGE SCORE	HOW ADDRESSED
Average Workshop Attendance	30	14	Subsequent workshop was held virtually and marketed extensively through advertisement purchases on social media, web, print newspaper and email blasts. Attendance at the live virtual workshop exceeded the target of 30.
Meeting Content Clarity/Usefulness	4.5	4.1	The virtual Needs Plan workshop included a robust and user friendly interactive application with mapping, commenting, and browsing capabilities.
Demographics of participants*	n/a	n/a	The age group representation of participants in the kick-off workshops were consistent with Census estimates with the exception of the 18 & younger age group. A measure taken to increase participation of this age group was to add a second social media platform (Instagram).

*Not a metric defined in PIP

Figure 8. Public Involvement Evaluation Questionnaire

Ocala Marion 2045

RACING *TOWARD* A CONNECTED FUTURE



Thank you for attending our meeting or visiting our booth today! We appreciate and value your participation in this process and we are focused on providing quality information that is accessible to all who participate. We also are committed to making our interactions with the communities of Marion County accessible, in terms of where, when and how we hold these meetings. Please take a few moments to complete this survey to help us to continuously improve this process. Thank you!

For all questions, 1 is not good, 5 is great.

1. How would you rate the **TIME OF DAY** chosen to hold this meeting?

1

2

3

4

5

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

2. How would you rate the **LOCATION** chosen to hold this meeting?

1

2

3

4

5

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

3. How would you rate the clarity and usefulness of the **CONTENT** presented at this meeting?

1

2

3

4

5

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

4. How would you rate the **STYLE AND PRESENTATION** of materials presented at this meeting?

1

2

3

4

5

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

5. How would you rate the **ELECTRONIC MEDIA** developed for the project (Website, Metroquest, Facebook)?

1

2

3

4

5

☐

☐

☐

☐


☐

Please tell us how you learned about the meeting you attended and any comments you have on the process or transportation issues in Marion County.

2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN – PUBLIC SUMMARY | 21

Figure 9 displays the results of public involvement measures, summarizing the effectiveness of the LRTP public involvement program. Unfortunately, the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic during the plan update process limited the usefulness of all the measures envisioned in the PIP and actions to improve the process, given the reduced in-person interactions as a result.

Figure 9. Public Involvement Performance Report



ON-LINE SURVEY

An on-line survey administered between June and September 2019 collected input on existing conditions of pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and roadway infrastructure; goal ranking; and desired investments by mode and improvement type. The survey was advertised extensively on social media, with spikes in the numbers of completed surveys clearly correlated with social media boosting efforts at various points in the three-month survey period. While the survey administration did not include a statistically significant sampling methodology, demographic questions were asked to assess representation of the County population in the sample. The results of the demographic analysis, as depicted in **Figure 10**, indicate a general resemblance of the County's demographics in the survey sample, with the exception of under-representation of the County's 18 or younger population. All the other age groups and general ethnicity was well represented, the latter in terms of caucasian and non-caucasian.



607
SITE VISITS



257
PARTICIPANTS



313
COMMENTS




5,439
DATA POINTS

Figure 10. Public Involvement Demographics


US Census 2010
Survey

18 or younger
19-35
36-50
51-65
65 or older



US Census 2010
Survey


White Caucasian
Non-White



The goal ranking question in the survey was included to provide input to the TPO committees and Governing Board in the goal weighting process. The survey results indicated the County's natural resource protection goal as the most important goal, followed by system preservation.



The question asking survey respondents to rank the types of transportation improvements they feel are most important found that roadways were the most important facilities for needed improvements, with improvement of existing roadways the highest ranked category. The second highest category was the construction of new roadways, followed by the need to improve multimodal and transit facilities. Freight improvements were the lowest ranked category of needed improvements in the survey.



SOCIAL MEDIA

Social media is an important medium of communication with the public and perhaps one of the best ways to reach the maximum possible number of people. One of the specific reasons for incorporating social media into the 2045 plan update process is to attempt to engage a younger demographic than has historically been reached in long range planning public involvement programs. The initial establishment of a social media presence for the LRTP was the launch of a Facebook account in June 2019.

FACEBOOK

Since launching in June 2019, the **Ocala Marion 2045 Transportation Plan** Facebook page has garnered 469 followers and generated more than 160 comments since the launch, with an average of 109 unique users engaging on a weekly basis. An advertising campaign was also launched

early in the plan update process to increase participation, particularly in the weeks leading up to public workshops. Facebook engagements tracked since the social media launch in 2019 indicate the value and success of the marketing investments, as indicated by the spikes in engagement during advertising campaigns for the workshops displayed in **Figure 11**.

Every Facebook post for the page was set up with a goal in mind—either to build trust with followers, gather comments, or ask for an action related to the LRTP, such as attending an event. The most popular post reached 10,873 people. 400 people clicked to open the post, 327 people clicked to the project website, and 71 people reacted, commented, or shared.

Figure 12 includes a compilation of the most commented-on posts on the LRTP Facebook page.

Figure 11. Social Media Activity by Month




Figure 12. Most Popular Social Media Posts

Ocala Marion 2045 Transportation Plan July 1 · 🌐

How will transportation in Marion County change by 2045? Your input shapes the vision!

Right now, we're collecting feedback through an interactive website that functions like a virtual public meeting. When you visit the website, you can view a collection of potential sidewalk, bicycle, trail, roadway, and transit projects, and give us your opinion by liking or commenting on the projects. This website closes on July 18 so be sure to check it out!

<https://storymaps.arcgis.com/.../7fad6f489ae3493c847450134382...>



Ocala Marion 2045 Transportation Plan August 2, 2019 · 🌐

Starting next week, we're holding six interactive public workshops to hear from residents of Marion County. We encourage you to attend the workshop closest to where you live, and provide input that will help us shape the 2045 Transportation Plan! Here is the full list of dates and schedules:

- August 6: Marion Oaks Community Center
- August 7: Silver Springs Shores Community Center
- August 8: Belleview City Hall
- August 13: Lillian Bryant Community Center... [See More](#)



4 7 Comments 32 Shares

Ocala Marion 2045 Transportation Plan July 1 · 🌐

How will transportation in Marion County change by 2045? Your input shapes the vision!

Right now, we're collecting feedback through an interactive website that functions like a virtual public meeting. When you visit the website, you can view a collection of potential sidewalk, bicycle, trail, roadway, and transit projects, and give us your opinion by liking or commenting on the projects. This website closes on July 18 so be sure to check it out!

https://storymaps.arcgis.com/_/7fad6f489ae3493c84745013...

STORYMAPS.ARCGIS.COM

Ocala Marion 2045 Long Range Transportation ...

Welcome to our virtual public meeting. Please scroll down and review the proje...

[Learn More](#)

19 22 Comments 21 Shares

Ocala Marion 2045 Transportation Plan June 26, 2019 · 🌐

Welcome to the official page for the Ocala Marion 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)! This plan will be a comprehensive "blueprint" that guides us over the next 25 years to meet the transportation needs of Marion County—so we want to hear from YOU along the way!

Start by giving us your input through this survey to help guide Marion County's long-term transportation needs:

<https://storymaps.arcgis.com/.../7fad6f489ae3493c847450134382...>

OCALAMARION2045.COM

Ocala-Marion 2045 LRTP

Learn more about the Ocala-Marion TPO 2045 long-range transport...



Ocala Marion 2045 Transportation Plan July 29 · 🌐

Have you viewed our "virtual public meeting" to provide feedback on the future of transportation in Marion County? The website is closing on July 31, so don't miss this chance to weigh in (without leaving your home)!

Click the link below for an interactive website that shows you a collection of potential sidewalk, bicycle, trail, roadway, and transit projects and asks for your feedback. We are looking for input from as many Marion County community members as possible. Add yo... [See More](#)



Ocala Marion 2045 Transportation Plan July 9 · 🌐

The Ocala Marion 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) will serve as the vision and planning framework for Marion County's multimodal transportation system. We're looking for YOUR input as we assemble this plan! Right now, you can provide direct feedback on a set of proposed transportation projects in our county at this website:

https://storymaps.arcgis.com/_/7fad6f489ae3493c84745013...

STORYMAPS.ARCGIS.COM

Ocala Marion 2045 Long Range Transportation ...

Welcome to our virtual public meeting. Please scroll down and review the proje...

[Learn More](#)

7 18 Comments

INSTAGRAM

LRTP Demographic data collected through the Metroquest survey described in the previous section indicated a relatively low participation in the 18 or younger age group, so subsequent to the survey deployment, the team established an Instagram account, recognizing the higher level of participation by younger demographics in Instagram, relative to Facebook. The ocalamarion2045 Instagram page was launched in October 2019. Posts on Instagram have emphasized the uniqueness and beauty of Marion County while informing followers of engagement opportunities and encouraging them to weigh in on the LRTP. The page has accumulated 283 followers and received 9 comments. The most popular Instagram post reached over 100 users and received 18 likes.



[View Insights](#)

[Promote](#)




Liked by **violetcoasts** and **17 others**

ocalamarion2045 Tag a friend or family member who might want to have input on improvements to Marion County's transportation systems! [#ocalamarion2045](#) [#marioncountyflorida](#) [#longrangetransportationplan](#) [#transportationplanning](#) [#lovewhereyoulive](#)

[View 1 comment](#)

January 10



SOCIAL MEDIA AND WEB COMMENTS

More than fifty substantial or procedural comments were logged on LRTP social media pages and the project website, many of which provided commentary on needed improvements, and others commenting on the public involvement process. Some of the more common themes in the social media commentary include the need for a passenger airport, congestion relief, more transit connecting south Marion County to the north, and traffic signal improvements. **Table 5** includes a summary of those comments.

Table 5. Social Media Comments

COMMENTS
Would also like to see the transportation system in Marion County start maintaining some of the secondary dirt roads we all pay taxes but most areas they won't even grade the roads alone black top them
Ocala definitely needs passenger air to come into the airport stop sending our money out of the community to Orlando and Tampa. Also the bus service needs bus stops with some kind of enclosure to protect those who need to use the bus system not to be waiting in the rain and storms and the heat people need some kind of protection while waiting
Passenger air service would be a tremendous addition. We have two airports here. One of them is for private aircraft. The other is certainly large enough to handle commercial passenger service.
We pay for both of these with our tax dollars. It would be wonderful if we could use them.
Ocala needs a comprehensive bus system!! Clean fuel buses, if possible. We also need covered bus stations. It gets too hot outside and it rains a lot!!
Widen Highway E 40!!!
OUR voices matter? Who are you kidding? Marion County leaders don't give a crap about listening to the people of this county. What a bunch of bunk!
They are going to do what they want anyway. Just asking for input to make everyone "think" we have a say. Just like a review from your workplace. What can we do better. Lol Oh good idea we'll "take that into consideration"
Waze can help give us real time traffic counts too. (in response to FL511 Florida Traffic, Commuter Information post)
Lol when I was 10 it was still difficult to do. If you wanna see more injuries in the ER, let's have more people trying this, SMH (in reference to article on Pogo Sticks as a microbility solution)
Horse Capital of The World makes for Picturesque Scenery!!!!
Do you realize that about half the people or more that are taking this survey will be dead by 2045? If you don't want to expand the bus routes, how about a shared taxi program that can get people to the jobs they need? You have one designed for seniors. Why not for the rest of the community? (in response to post advertising on-line survey)
We have a high percentage of pedestrians struck, so I wonder how this will factor. Will there be special paths for these??? These questions need to be addressed no doubt. I work in the OR, so I see first-hand the deaths and injury from pedestrians struck! (in response to E-scooter post)
I'm sure people already have transportation. With Coronavirus people will not ride public transportation they are buying used cars. Read the New York Times it will tell you that nobody is going to be using public transportation anywhere. Street Legal golf carts are the most fun transportation.
Buses, buses and buses. A lot of people need transportation to and from work
Can't wait, No really I can't. (in response to virtual workshop post)
Clean energy buses. Also a cross county tram.
Many old people should not be driving but public transportation is useless if expensive. People who need it most can afford it least.

COMMENTS

Why is there no Sunday service. How are people who rely on public transportation supposed to get to church or work without this. With the limited service it greatly limits where you are able to live if you don't own a car. Bus schedules are totally useless when trying to figure times for getting anyplace. There is a need to indicate times when buses will be at strategic locations along each route. Schedule today are very inadequate and very confusing. Routes should include transportation further out 200 as more medical offices extend out that way also there is no public transportation to West Marion Hospital.

Horse-friendly paths (appropriate footing), hitching posts or rails outside restaurants, offices, all businesses, in fact. Watering troughs also, well positioned. Great job creation, as manure scooping and removal (can be used to fertilize the public landscaping). will be necessary...hitching posts or the rails will need to be covered for shade in hot weather. Kiosks providing horse treats, and hay cubes....

LOVE this idea but I'd be worried about the idiots that would be stupid enough to try and spook the horses or hurt them while standing hitched...

Train service to Orlando airport and south Florida. If you need to/want to get to either and can't drive you are SOL. 2020 only transportation to Orlando airport is Ocala Shuttleliner, which I highly recommend

It would be cool if they did a maglev train from here to Orlando or even further south. I rode one on a trip to China and it was fast and smooth!

Need an airport. It is a long and dangerous ride to either Orlando or Tampa.

Just finish Hwy 41 in Dunnellon

Statewide railway giant circle with cross state connections and transport hubs for bus and car at all embarkation locations. Or just look at the way South Korea has it set up (being a Peninsula) and copy that.

Toll road from Florida State line straight to Miami no exits till Orlando!

I'll be dead. No problem for me and no family lives here.

Will Ocala even exist then?

Monorail on I-75 to anywhere- run it down the median

How about a public transportation here in Marion Oaks

a bus from Marion Oaks to 484 and SR 200 and there be able to transfer to the City buses

2045.... Sooooo not anytime soon

2045, what's happening tomorrow?

Will there even be an Ocala in 2045?

Train service...North, South, East, and West

Man you can tell elitist run Ocala, just stupid ideas constantly. Hey our economy is crap, let's go build some roads and shit for this future abandoned city so that people can see what poor leadership can do.

Bus transport routes to remote areas of Forest communities. Too many without vehicles or jobs!

How about a commercial truck route around Ocala from Pine Street to where Bonnie Heath comes back into 40. How about some new bus routes nothing new in 10 years. How about some bus routes that actually go somewhere and help people

I would like to see an airport we can fly in and out of instead of going to Orlando or Tampa

Ocala needs buses in the Marion Oaks area. And SW SR 200.

Bus systems should connect with Gainesville transit route 13 on 441.

Having a turn lane going into large parking lots and taking the humps out of them so entry can be made without stopping.

Does this transportation include the poorest of our community. Please say yes

I'll be long dead by 2045

COMMENTS

For the Love of God they need to fix the streets first. I live near of 35 N E it is impossible drive in this roads. Every 6 months I am fixing the struts in the car. The main streets of the downtown of Ocala need to be fixed and then we talk about transportation they are going to sell the apples first without planting the tree.

I moved here to get away from the city people im against this leave the country life alone!!!

How about repaving 25th Ave north of the tracks. All you do to it is patch holes and that makes it worse. County also needs to repave some of the residential roads off NE 35th st. Guess if we were in the "right neighborhoods", we'd have beautiful roads.

The road department needs to be retrained in the proper repair of Marion County roads. They do not have a clue.

We need more roadways to accommodate all the traffic. The influx of residents over the last 8 years doesn't take into account all the traffic. There's also so many visitors here. Traffic lights need to be adjusted as well.

We have numerous retirement communities along the 200 corridor. Everyone complains about seniors driving skills. Wouldn't it make sense to have public transportation out here? I know many people who would use public transport if it were available.

need public transportation from Marion Oaks to downtown

Wasting money again I see lol

Why not put a bridge over 66th Street, as part of the SW 49th Ave project. Traffic is gonna backup to SR 200 or cr475(shady road).

SR 200 needs more lighting west of I-75.

The county policy toward lighting on major thoroughfares seems very dim-why? A prime example: NW 44th Ave is lite on both sides but highway 27 is dark.

COORDINATION WITH LAKE/SUMTER MPO

The TPO team also coordinated with the neighboring counties to the south through the Lake Sumter MPO, which shares a portion of the urbanized area in the region. The teams coordinated during the Needs Plan phase of the plan update process, which is the point at which needed infrastructure improvements are identified and evaluated for potential inclusion in the Cost Feasible Plan. The reason for coordination at this point was to ensure that improvement needs on regional facilities traversing both the Marion County and Lake/Sumter County areas are closely coordinated for consistency. It was determined that there were no inconsistencies and that FDOT's plans for I-75, which is the primary regional facility shared by the three counties, are captured consistently in the SIS Cost Feasible Plan.

APPENDIX 1. MEETING ADVERTISEMENTS

Kick-off Workshop Flyer



Please take our survey at: <https://marioncounty2045.metroquest.com/>
Visit the LRTP website at: <https://www.ocalamarion2045.com/>



WE ARE HERE!

LET'S START THE CONVERSATION!
Join us at one or more public workshops at...

August 6th at Marion Oaks Community Center 6-8pm

August 7th at Silver Springs Shores Community Center 6-8pm

August 8th at Belleview City Hall 6-8pm

August 13th at Lillian Bryan Community Center 6-8pm

August 14th at Dunnellon City Hall 6-8pm

August 15th at Reddick-Collier Elementary School 6-8pm

Summer 2019

PROJECT KICK OFF
The LRTP serves as the vision and planning framework for the multimodal transportation system of Marion County. The current 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan was adopted in November 2015. By federal law, the 2045 update must be adopted no more than 5 years from that date.

Fall 2019

ESTABLISH GOALS & OBJECTIVES
Please take the survey at <https://metroquest.com> so we can incorporate your goals and priorities for the County's transportation system

Spring 2020

IDENTIFY NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS
Attend one of our workshops to tell us about needed improvements to the transportation system

Summer 2020

PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
We will prioritize needed improvements based on Goals & Objectives and your input to develop a cost feasible plan

Fall 2020

PLAN ADOPTION
The TPO Board will adopt the 2045 LRTP in a Public Hearing at 601 SE 25th Avenue, Ocala, FL 34471

DRAFT GOALS & OBJECTIVES

1. Provide a transportation system that offers **Travel Choices** accessible to residents, visitors, and businesses.
2. Provide for efficient transportation that **Stimulates Economic Development** and growth.
3. Improve the **Safety and Security** of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.
4. Ensure that the transportation system reflects the **Needs of the Community**, including the Traditionally Underserved.
5. Create **Quality Places** and promote healthy, active living and **Protection of Natural Resources**.
6. **Optimize Existing Revenues** by emphasizing **Preservation of the Existing System** and selection of cost-effective projects.

PUBLIC MEETING

Marion County is growing. How should our transportation system grow with us? RSVP for our online public workshop on June 18 at 2pm to tell us your perspective on what transportation projects are most needed. Attend virtually at <https://bit.ly/37cmhCR> or in person at the Marion County Commission Chambers at 601 SE 25th Avenue, Ocala, FL 34471

OCALA MARION 2045

RACING TOWARD
A CONNECTED FUTURE



Needs Workshop Media Advertisement



MEETING NOTICE

June 18, 2020

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION VIRTUAL WORKSHOP 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

The June 18th virtual workshop of the Ocala Marion TPO will be held online and in person at the Marion County Board of County Commissioners Auditorium, 601 SE 25th Ave, Ocala, FL 34471.

www.ocalamariontpo.org

This meeting will also be accessible via web. Instructions listed below.

Register by web as a link will be sent out prior to the meeting

<https://bit.ly/37cmhCR>

Agenda Item(s):

1. 2045 Long-Range Transportation Needs Plan (Project) Discussion

All meetings are open to the public, the TPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, disability and family status. Anyone requiring special assistance under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), or requiring language assistance (free of charge) should contact Liz Mitchell, Title VI/Nondiscrimination Coordinator at (352) 438-2634 or liz.mitchell@marioncountyfl.org forty-eight (48) hours in advance, so proper accommodations can be made.

Please be advised that if any person wishes to appeal any decision made by the Board with respect to any matter considered at the above meeting, they will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, they may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

Public Hearing Media Advertisement

Ocala Gainesville Media CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

2700 SW 13th Street, Gainesville, FL 32608
352-372-4222 fax 352-338-3131

2121 SW 19th Ave, Rd
352-732-9565 fax

Order:	A000974209	Pubs:	1.11	Rate:	
Phone:	(352)629-8568	Class:	0001	Charges:	
Account:	671077	Start Date:	10/19/2020	List Price:	
Name:	SHAKAYLA IRBY,	Stop Date:	10/19/2020	Payments:	
Caller:	Shakayla Irby	Insertions:	2	Balance:	
Taken By:	G046	Columns:	1	Lines:	
Schedule:	10/19 1x, 10/19 1x, . .			Taken On:	

OCALA MARION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

DRAFT LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION FEEDBACK

The Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) has completed a DRAFT of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (L RTP). The L RTP is the foundational planning document that guides the TPO in all its projects, plans, and priorities for the future. It lists all of the TPO's goals and objectives, including which revenues will be utilized to fund the projects listed in the L RTP. The TPO is welcoming any and all comments on the L RTP until November 6th as it is currently in DRAFT form. Additionally, the TPO will be holding a public hearing on October 27th at 4:00 p.m. in the Marion County Commission Auditorium located at 601 SE 25th Avenue, Ocala, FL 34471 for anyone who wishes to provide their comments in person, to the TPO Board. The document can be found at the following website: <https://ocalamariontpo.org/plans-and-programs/long-range-transportation-plan-lrtp/> or you can call the TPO office at (352) 438-2630 to request a hard copy. If you have any questions or concerns please contact the TPO's Project Manager Derrick Harris at derrick.harris@marioncountyfl.org or (352) 438-2632.

All meetings are open to the public, the TPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, disability and family status. Anyone requiring special assistance under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), or requiring language assistance (free of charge) should contact Liz Mitchell, Title VI/Nondiscrimination Coordinator at (352) 438-2634 or liz.mitchell@marioncountyfl.org forty-eight (48) hours in advance, so proper accommodations can be made.

Please be advised that if any person wishes to appeal any decision made by the Board with respect to any matter considered at the above meeting, they will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, they may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

October 19, 2020
#A000974209

OCALA MARION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

DRAFT LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION FEEDBACK

The Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) has completed a DRAFT of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (L RTP). The L RTP is the foundational planning document that guides the TPO in all its projects, plans, and priorities for the future. It lists all of the TPO's goals and objectives, including which revenues will be utilized to fund the projects listed in the L RTP. The TPO is welcoming any and all comments on the L RTP until November 6th as it is currently in DRAFT form. Additionally, the TPO will be holding a public hearing on October 27th at 4:00 p.m. in the Marion County Commission Auditorium located at 601 SE 25th Avenue, Ocala, FL 34471 for anyone who wishes to provide their comments in person, to the TPO Board. The document can be found at the following website: <https://ocalamariontpo.org/plans-and-programs/long-range-transportation-plan-lrtp/> or you can call the TPO office at (352) 438-2630 to request a hard copy. If you have any questions or concerns please contact the TPO's Project Manager Derrick Harris at derrick.harris@marioncountyfl.org or (352) 438-2632.

All meetings are open to the public, the TPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, disability and family status. Anyone requiring special assistance under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), or requiring language assistance (free of charge) should contact Liz Mitchell, Title VI/Nondiscrimination Coordinator at (352) 438-2634 or liz.mitchell@marioncountyfl.org forty-eight (48) hours in advance, so proper accommodations can be made.

Please be advised that if any person wishes to appeal any decision made by the Board with respect to any matter considered at the above meeting, they will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, they may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

October 19, 2020
#A000974209

Attention: _____ Fax: _____

This is a final proof. If any information is incorrect, please contact your sales representative prior to the deadline of the first insertion. Otherwise your order is accepted as having been approved.

Media Advertisement

Ocala Gainesville Media CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

2700 SW 13th Street, Gainesville, FL 32608
352-372-4222 fax 352-338-3131

2121 SW 19th Ave. Rd.
352-732-9565 fax:

Order:	A000973970	Pubs:	1,11	Rate:	
Phone:	(352)629-8568	Class:	0001	Charges:	
Account:	671077	Start Date:	10/07/2020	List Price:	
Name:	SHAKAYLA IRBY,	Stop Date:	10/07/2020	Payments:	
Caller:	Shakayla Irby	Insertions:	2	Balance:	
Taken By:	G046	Columns:	1	Lines:	
Schedule:	10/7 1x, 10/7 1x, . .			Taken On:	

OCALA MARION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION DRAFT LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION FEEDBACK

The Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) has completed a DRAFT of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The LRTP is the foundational planning document that guides the TPO in all its projects, plans, and priorities for the future. It lists all of the TPO's goals and objectives, including which revenues will be utilized to fund the projects listed in the LRTP. The TPO is welcoming any and all comments on the LRTP until November 6th as it is currently in DRAFT form. Additionally, the TPO will be holding a public hearing on October 27th at 4:00 p.m. in the Marion County Commission Auditorium located at 601 SE 25th Avenue, Ocala, FL 34471 for anyone who wishes to provide their comments in person, to the TPO Board. The document can be found at the following website: <https://ocalamariontpo.org/plans-and-programs/long-range-transportation-plan-lrtp/> or you can call the TPO office at (352) 438-2630 to request a hard copy. If you have any questions or concerns please contact the TPO's Project Manager Derrick Harris at derrick.harris@marioncountyfl.org or (352) 438-2632.

All meetings are open to the public, the TPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, disability and family status. Anyone requiring special assistance under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), or requiring language assistance (free of charge) should contact Liz Mitchell, Title VI/Nondiscrimination Coordinator at (352) 438-2634 or liz.mitchell@marioncountyfl.org forty-eight (48) hours in advance, so proper accommodations can be made.

Please be advised that if any person wishes to appeal any decision made by the Board with respect to any matter considered at the above meeting, they will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, they may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

October 7, 2020
#A000973970

OCALA MARION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION DRAFT LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION FEEDBACK

The Ocala Marion Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) has completed a DRAFT of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The LRTP is the foundational planning document that guides the TPO in all its projects, plans, and priorities for the future. It lists all of the TPO's goals and objectives, including which revenues will be utilized to fund the projects listed in the LRTP. The TPO is welcoming any and all comments on the LRTP until November 6th as it is currently in DRAFT form. Additionally, the TPO will be holding a public hearing on October 27th at 4:00 p.m. in the Marion County Commission Auditorium located at 601 SE 25th Avenue, Ocala, FL 34471 for anyone who wishes to provide their comments in person, to the TPO Board. The document can be found at the following website: <https://ocalamariontpo.org/plans-and-programs/long-range-transportation-plan-lrtp/> or you can call the TPO office at (352) 438-2630 to request a hard copy. If you have any questions or concerns please contact the TPO's Project Manager Derrick Harris at derrick.harris@marioncountyfl.org or (352) 438-2632.

All meetings are open to the public, the TPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, disability and family status. Anyone requiring special assistance under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), or requiring language assistance (free of charge) should contact Liz Mitchell, Title VI/Nondiscrimination Coordinator at (352) 438-2634 or liz.mitchell@marioncountyfl.org forty-eight (48) hours in advance, so proper accommodations can be made.

Please be advised that if any person wishes to appeal any decision made by the Board with respect to any matter considered at the above meeting, they will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, they may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

October 7, 2020
#A000973970

Attention: _____ Fax: _____

This is a final proof. If any information is incorrect, please contact your sales representative prior to the deadline of the first insertion. Otherwise your order is accepted as having been approved.

APPENDIX J

MCORES PROJECT


Program Overview

The Multi-use Corridors of Regional Economic Significance (M-CORES) Program has been created by Section 338.2278, Florida Statutes (F.S.) to revitalize rural communities, encourage job creation and provide regional connectivity while leveraging technology, enhancing quality of life and public safety, and protecting the environment and natural resources. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is charged with assembling task forces to study three specific corridors:

- The Suncoast Corridor, extending from Citrus County to Jefferson County
- The Northern Turnpike Corridor, extending from the northern terminus of Florida's Turnpike northwest to the Suncoast Parkway
- The Southwest-Central Florida Corridor, extending from Collier County to Polk County

The objective of the M-CORES Program is to advance the construction of regional corridors that will accommodate multiple modes of transportation and multiple types of infrastructure. The Program benefits include, but are not limited to, addressing issues such as hurricane evacuation; congestion mitigation; trade and logistics; broadband, water, and sewer connectivity; energy distribution; autonomous,

connected, shared, and electric vehicle technology; other transportation modes, such as shared-use non-motorized trails, freight and passenger rail, and public transit; mobility as a service; availability of a trained workforce skilled in traditional and emerging technologies; protection or enhancement of wildlife corridors or environmentally sensitive areas; and protection or enhancement of primary springs protection zones and farmland preservation. Additional information is available at www.floridamcores.com.



Northern Turnpike Corridor Study Area

The Northern Turnpike Corridor study area spans four (4) counties—Citrus, Sumter, Marion, and Levy (as shown in the map). The Ocala Marion TPO area is part of the Northern Turnpike Corridor study area.

LRTP Considerations

M-CORES projects are considered to be projects of regional significance and therefore are required by Title 23 of the Code of Federal Register (CFR), Section 450.324(d) and Section 339.175(7), F.S. to be included in the MPO/ TPO Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

MPOs and TPOs are responsible for actively involving all affected parties in an open, cooperative, and collaborative process when developing LRTPs and TIPs. Regional coordination is required since M-CORES projects affect more than one MPO. Public participation required for the development of LRTP and TIP is neither affected nor replaced by the public engagement activities conducted as part of the M-CORES corridor development process.

The Ocala Marion TPO will use travel demand forecasts generated by the Florida Turnpike Statewide Model for M-CORES projects. As such, Ocala Marion TPO will coordinate all M-CORES related analyses with FDOT for consistency purposes.

The proposed projects within the Northern Turnpike Corridor will be tolled facilities and will be part of the Florida's Turnpike system and the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS). The projects will be included in the LRTP and TIP/STIP in accordance with guidance provided in the FDOT MPO Program Management Handbook, as information on the projects becomes available. FDOT is working with the Northern Turnpike Corridor Task Force to develop purpose and need, guiding principles, and potential paths/courses. The Ocala Marion TPO is a member of the Northern Turnpike Corridor Task Force and is actively engaged in pertinent aspects of planning and corridor analysis through the Task Force activities. The Task Force will submit its evaluation report to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by November 15, 2020. As the M-CORES Program progresses to Project Development and Environment (PD&E), design and construction phases, FDOT will identify projects, prepare cost estimates, and coordinate with Ocala Marion TPO to add identified projects into the LRTP and TIP. Subject to the economic and environmental feasibility statement requirements of Section 337.25, F.S., projects may be funded through Turnpike revenue bonds or right-of-way and bridge construction bonds or financing by the Florida Department of Transportation Financing Corporation; by advances from the State Transportation Trust Fund; with funds obtained through the creation of public-private partnerships; or any combination thereof. FDOT also may accept donations of land for use as transportation rights-of-way or to secure or use transportation rights-of-way for such projects in accordance with Section 337.25, F.S. To the maximum extent feasible, construction of the M-CORES projects will begin no later than December 31, 2022, and the corridors will be open to traffic no later than December 31, 2030.

APPENDIX K

TECHNICAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS

CONTENTS

NEEDS ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY OVERVIEW	3
SCALING EVALUATION SCORES	6
WEIGHTING EVALUATION SCORES	6
GOAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	7
Goal 1. Promote travel choices that are multimodal and accessible	7
Goal 2. Provide efficient transportation that promotes economic development	8
Goal 3. Focus on improving safety and security of the transportation system	9
Goal 4. Ensure the transportation system meets the needs of the community	10
Goal 5. Protect natural resources and create quality places	10
Goal 6. Optimize and preserve existing infrastructure	11
NEEDS ASSESSMENT SCORING MATRIX	12
PROJECT SCORING MATRIX	34
TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL SUMMARY	40

NEEDS ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY OVERVIEW

The Needs Assessment process for the LRTP involves the use of a range of data sources and criteria to assess the entire federal aid eligible roadway system (FAHWYSYS) in Marion County against the LRTP Goals and Objectives. This process is consistent with federal performance-based planning requirements in that it utilizes a data-driven process to measure transportation system performance consistently with required performance monitoring, including safety, reliability, and recurring congestion categories of performance. The process of assessing and prioritizing the improvement of those facilities scoring highly against the criteria complements the performance monitoring and target setting requirements outlined in Appendix F: System Performance Report. While setting targets and monitoring system performance provides a systemwide framework of desired outcomes and historical analysis, the needs assessment process addresses specific facility deficiencies and needs based on historical and forecast data, effectively planning facility improvements that, together, can realize the performance targets at the system level.

This appendix includes a description of the needs assessment process, including the specific scoring process for each of the evaluation criteria tied to specific goals and objectives; matrices of network analysis; and a report of travel demand model forecasts. The matrices include one with project scoring and another with the needs assessment results for the entire federal aid eligible network.

The technical needs assessment and project evaluation method used for Ocala Marion’s 2045 LRTP update entailed the following steps:

1. Establish plan goals.
2. Select objectives that advance the overarching goals.
3. Select quantitative metrics that represent each objective.
4. Analyze metrics for every segment in the network as part of a systemic needs assessment. The results of this process are the raw objective scores.
5. Scale raw objective scores so that the goals are equally represented in the quantitative raw aggregate scores.
6. Sum scaled objective scores for each goal. The results of this process are the goal scores.
7. Weight the goal scores based on relative importance of each goal, as determined by the Ocala Marion TPO.
8. Select the maximum network score along the project corridor to create a final project score.
9. Rank the project scores to identify high-priority projects and corridors.

Table 1 describes the metrics calculated for each goal objective and summarizes the scaling of each objective score, aggregation to a goal total, and weighting of each goal to arrive at final project scores.

GOAL	OBJECTIVE	OBJECTIVE SCORE DESCRIPTION
1: Promote travel choices that are multimodal and accessible	1.1: Increase transit ridership by providing more frequent and convenient service.	Sum of Transit Orientation Index (TOI) composite scores along corridor (only applied in areas with relatively high population density)
	1.2: Increase bicycle and pedestrian travel by providing sidewalks, bike lanes, and multi-use trails throughout the county.	Sum of Bike Lane Score + Sidewalk Score. For each, score is the max score along the corridor where 2 = gaps exist, 1 = insufficient facilities are provided, and 0 = sufficient facilities are provided
	1.3: Provide safe and reasonable access to transportation services and facilities for use by the transportation disadvantaged (TD) population; and	Objectives 1.3 and 1.4 are captured in a single composite score of overlapping equity criteria in census tracts along the corridor. The criteria consist of high proportion of youth, seniors, households with no vehicle, low-income people, or minorities
	1.4: Provide desirable and user-friendly transportation options for all user groups regardless of socioeconomic status or physical ability.	
2: Provide efficient transportation that promotes economic development	2.1: Improve access to and from areas identified for employment development and growth.	Number of areas along corridor that are projected to have high job growth, where each area is weighted by 2 if the absolute job growth is the top quartile of growth and 1 if the job growth is in the 2nd quartile
	2.2: Foster greater economic competitiveness through enhanced, efficient movement of freight.2.3:	Freight access provided by corridor, where 2 = direct freight activity center access OR indirect freight activity center access and 25% daily truck volumes, 1 = indirect freight activity center access OR 25% daily truck volumes, and 0 = no freight implication
	2.3: Address mobility needs and reduce the roadway congestion impacts of economic growth.	Facility congestion level (projected 2045 PM peak period volume-to-capacity ratio under LOS C conditions in no-build network scenario)
3: Focus on improving safety and security of the transportation system	3.1: Provide safe access to and from schools.	Number of schools within walking distance (1/2 mile) on non-limited access facilities
	3.3: Improve security by enhancing the evacuation route network for natural events and protecting access to military asset.	Evacuation routes, where 2 = Yes, and has project V/C >0.89, 1 = Yes, and has projected V/C <=0.89, and 0 = Not an evacuation route
	3.4: Reduce the number of fatal and severe injury crashes for all users	Composite score consisting of severity-weighted annual crash frequency (all crashes) + five-year frequency for crashes involving people walking and biking
5: Protect natural resources and create quality places	5.1: Limit impact to existing natural resources, such as parks, preserves, and protected lands.	Composite score of affected resource areas, including wetlands over half acre in size, impaired waters, vulnerable aquifer areas, environmentally sensitive areas, spring protection zones, and parks/recreational land (acreage of area intersected, weighted by number of areas touched, normalized by total acreage within 1/4 mile of corridor)
	5.3: Improve the resiliency of the transportation system through mitigation and adaptation strategies to deal with catastrophic events	Acreage of FEMA 100-year flood zone area within 1/4 mile of corridor
	5.4: Enhance access to tourist destinations, such as trails, parks, and downtowns	Number of tourist destination parcels within 1/4 mile of corridor
6: Optimize and preserve existing infrastructure	6.1: Improve the performance of the transportation system through intersection modifications, access management strategies, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) applications, and other emerging technologies.	Cumulative score of existing ITS infrastructure and opportunities for expansion, where 5 = identified in Strategic Master Plan and LRTP 2040, 4 = identified in LRTP 2040, 3 = identified in Strategic Master Plan as ITS corridor, 2 = intersects existing fiberoptic cable, and 1 = within 1/4 mile of existing fiberoptic cable 1 point assigned to non-ITS operational improvements.

Note: Goal 4: Ensure the transportation system meets the needs of the community was addressed through the public engagement process instead of the project scoring.

	SCALED OBJECTIVE SCORE	GOAL TOTAL	GOAL WEIGHT*	WEIGHTED GOAL SCORE	PROJECT/SEGMENT SCORE
	Scale to (10/3)				
	Scale to (10/3)				
		Sum of 3 scaled objective scores	13	(Goal Total) x (Weight)	
	Scale to (10/3)				
	Scale to (10/3)				
	Scale to (10/3)				
	Scale to (10/3)	Sum of 3 scaled objective scores	18	(Goal Total) x (Weight)	
	Scale to (10/3)				
	Scale to (10/3)				
	Scale to (10/3)	Sum of 3 scaled objective scores	19	(Goal Total) x (Weight)	
	Scale to (10/3)				
	Scale to (10/3)				
	Scale to (10/3)	Sum of 3 scaled objective scores	13	(Goal Total) x (Weight)	
	Scale to (10/3)				
	Scale to (10/3)				
	Scale to 10	No aggregation needed.	24	(Goal Total) x (Weight)	

Sum of weighted goal totals; maximum score for segment along project corridor assigned as project score where project consisted of multiple network segments

The project scoring analysis was completed using the following process:

1. A system needs assessment quantified the metrics for each objective for the entire federal-aid-eligible network in Marion County. Network corridors were split at major intersections to create roadway segments. Each segment was scored using a GIS-based process, in which spatial data for demographics, transportation facilities, crashes, job-growth areas, freight-activity areas, schools, tourist destinations, environmentally sensitive areas, and ITS technologies were joined to nearby or adjacent federal-aid-eligible network segments.
2. The scores for every network segment were scaled and weighted using the process outlined in Table 1, to arrive at a set of weighted goal totals for each segment.
3. For each project, the overlapping network segments were identified, and the weighted goal totals for those segments were attributed to the project.
4. Two scoring adjustments were conducted:
 - a. For network segments traversing FEMA flood zones, the Goal 5 (Protect natural resources and create quality places) score was adjusted as follows: projects that would improve operations or increase multimodal capacity without increasing the environmental footprint of the roadway were awarded points for potential to include mitigation and adaptation measures; projects that would increase roadway capacity through widening or building new roads were penalized (i.e. negative points were assigned proportionally based on the amount flood zone area near the project).
 - b. Scores for Goal 6 (Optimize and preserve existing infrastructure) were adjusted as follows: projects that would improve operations, deploy ITS, or increase multimodal capacity were awarded points for Goal 6; projects that would increase roadway capacity through widening or building new roads received a score of zero.
3. The maximum score for network segments along each project was assigned as the project's final score.

SCALING EVALUATION SCORES

The purpose of scaling, or normalizing, is to create equivalency among objective scores before aggregating them to a goal total. Some objective scores were based on a cumulative number of point-based data along the roadway and could have high maximum scores – for example, 2,556, for the crash score, or 1,108 for the number of accessible tourist destinations. Other objective scores were based on a scoring structure of 0, 1, or 2 points. To make these scores equivalent, all raw objective scores were scaled to a common maximum. Since the scoring was structured so that each goal would have a possible total of 10 points, each raw objective score was scaled to a maximum of 10 divided by the number of quantifiable objectives for the corresponding goal.

- Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5 each had three quantifiable objectives, so the raw objective scores were scaled to 10/3, or approximately 3.33
- Goal 6 had one quantifiable objective, so the raw objective score was scaled to 10.

WEIGHTING EVALUATION SCORES

The weighting step in the scoring process is designed to acknowledge that some goals are more important for prioritizing long-range projects, relative to other goals. In general, weighting is intended to represent the values and intention of the agency or communities involved in the prioritization process. If all goals were given an equal weight, each would contribute an equal amount to the final segment scores. Instead, goal weights adopted by the TPO Governing Board were applied to the goal-specific score totals as a multiplier.

GOAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Each of the objectives have evaluation criteria against which network segments and projects are scored. The following description of the evaluation criteria provides a summary of the evaluation process by goal and objective.

GOAL 1. PROMOTE TRAVEL CHOICES THAT ARE MULTIMODAL AND ACCESSIBLE

Objective 1.1 – Increase transit ridership by providing more frequent and convenient service.

This metric assesses FAHWYSYS facilities that have the greatest potential to improve service to populations most reliant on transit. Areas with high transit potential are represented through the Transit Orientation Index, which scores census tracts with a composite of youth, seniors, households in poverty, and households with no access to a vehicle, and is limited to areas with relatively high population density. FAHWYSYS facility scores are calculated by summing the composite scores of the Transit Orientation Index intersecting with each facility in these high-density areas. These scores are then scaled to make them comparable to other metrics and weighted based on the Goal priority.

Objective 1.2 – Increase bicycle and pedestrian travel by providing sidewalks, bike lanes, and multi-use trails throughout the county.

The bicycle and pedestrian needs assessment scores FAHWYSYS facilities based on the presence of sidewalks and bicycle lanes, taking into account gaps, whether the facility is on one or both sides of the roadway, and, for bicycles, whether the facilities are bike lanes or wide shoulders. Roadway segments were given scores based on the following criteria, in terms of a range of priority status along the corridor for both sidewalks and bike lanes.

- Gap in Existing Network: Gaps in the network, where a bike lane or sidewalk is present on either side of the missing link, are considered the highest priority.
- No Facility – Outside of Existing Network: Corridors that lacked a sidewalk or bike lane but are not connected to other sidewalk or bike lanes on both sides are considered medium priority.
- One Side Only: Sidewalks or bike lanes that were only present on one side of the road or, in the case of bike lanes, were wide shoulders but not a designated bikelane, are considered medium priority.
- Facility – Both Directions: Corridors with sidewalks or bike lanes on both sides are considered low priority.

These scores are then scaled to make them comparable to other metrics and weighted based on the Goal priority.

Objective 1.3 – Provide safe and reasonable access to transportation services and facilities for use by the transportation disadvantaged (TD) population.

--AND--

Objective 1.4 – Provide desirable and user-friendly transportation options for all user groups regardless of socioeconomic status or physical ability.

Objectives 1.3 and 1.4 are assessed together as they are captured by similar analysis. Transportation disadvantaged populations include youths, seniors, those in poverty, and those without access to a vehicle. The analysis also includes minorities and those with disabilities. FAHWYSYS facilities are scored based on the number of population characteristics that intersect with or are immediately adjacent to the roadway. These scores are then scaled to make them comparable to other metrics and weighted based on the Goal priority.

GOAL 2. PROVIDE EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION THAT PROMOTES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Objective 2.1 – Improve access to and from areas identified for employment development and growth.

Objective 2.1 seeks to identify FAHWYSYS facilities that can improve access to areas of high employment growth, thus promoting economic development. Facilities are scored based on the number of high growth areas that are intersected or immediately adjacent to the roadway. Each 1st quartile growth area that is intersected with or adjacent to the roadway is given a score of two, while each 2nd quartile area is given a score of one. These scores are then scaled to make them comparable to other metrics and weighted based on the Goal priority.

Objective 2.2 – Foster greater economic competitiveness through enhanced, efficient movement of freight.

Objective 2.1 seeks to identify FAHWYSYS facilities that provide access to freight intensive areas such as industrial, manufacturing, and logistics land uses and/or carry a high proportion of truck volumes. Facilities are scored based on the directness of access to 6 identified freight intensive areas, where:

- 1 = Facility provides indirect access (i.e. one turn needed to access the site)
- 2 = Facility provides direct access (i.e. site driveway is located on the facility)

In addition, facilities are scored based on the percentage of daily truck volumes, where:

- 1 = Trucks comprise over 25% of AADT

These two scores are summed for a total freight score, where:

- 0 = Facility does not have major implications for the movement of freight
- 1 = Facility provides indirect access to freight areas OR serves over 25% truck volumes
- 2 = Facility provides direct access to freight areas OR Facility provides indirect access to freight activity areas and serves over 25% truck volumes

These scores are then scaled to make them comparable to other metrics and weighted based on the Goal priority.

Objective 2.3 – Address mobility needs and reduce the roadway congestion impacts of economic growth.

Objective 2.3 seeks to identify FAHWYSYS facilities where future economic growth is projected to result in increased roadway congestion. The congestion score is based on Central Florida Regional Planning Model (CFRPM) outputs for 2045 projected PM peak period levels of congestion as indicated in the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio under LOS C conditions. By using LOS C conditions, the level of congestion is conservative (i.e. inflated to capture worst-condition scenarios). These V/C values are then scaled to make them comparable to other metrics and weighted based on the Goal priority.

GOAL 3. FOCUS ON IMPROVING SAFETY AND SECURITY OF THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Objective 3.1 – Provide safe access to and from schools.

This metric scores FAHWYSYS facilities based on the number of schools within a half mile, a reasonable walking distance, from the roadway. Limited access roadways are excluded.

- 0 = Facility provides does not provide access to schools within half mile
- 1 = Facility provides access to 1-4 schools within half mile
- 2 = Facility provides access to 5-8 schools within half mile

These scores are then scaled to make them comparable to other metrics and weighted based on the Goal priority.

Objective 3.2 – Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and freight within the region and to other areas.

This objective is addressed through the mobility needs assessment in Objective 2.3.

Objective 3.3 – Improve security by enhancing the evacuation route network for natural events and protecting access to military asset.

Objective 3.3 seeks to identify FAHWYSYS facilities that serve as evacuation routes and are projected to be congested in 2045. Evacuation routes were sourced from the Marion County Comprehensive Plan. The congestion score is based on Central Florida Regional Planning Model (CFRPM) outputs for 2045 projected PM peak period levels of congestion as indicated in the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio under LOS C conditions (see Objective 2.3).

These two data sources are combined into an evacuation route score, where:

- 0 = Facility is not a designated evacuation route
- 1 = Facility is a designated evacuation route and projected V/C ≤ 0.89
- 2 = Facility is a designated evacuation route and projected V/C > 0.89

These scores are then weighted based on the Goal priority.

Objective 3.4 – Reduce the number of fatal and severe injury crashes for all users

Objective 3.4 is addressed through a systemic crash analysis that contains two score components:

- Equivalent Property Damage Only (EPDO) crash frequency score, which weights all crashes by level of severity
- Multimodal crash score, which is based on total number of pedestrian and bicycle crashes over 5 years

The crash analysis used University of Florida's Signal Four data from 2013 to 2017. The EPDO crash score is calculated based on KABCO severity scale, using Florida costs:

CRASH SEVERITY	CRASH UNIT COST
Fatal (K)	\$10,120,000
Severe Injury (A)	\$574,080
Evident Injury (B)	\$155,480
Possible Injury (C)	\$96,600
Property Damage Only (O)	\$7,600

Crashes for each segment are multiplied by their respective severity cost weight and then divided by the number of years of data (5) to arrive at the annualized EPDO crash frequency. Since pedestrian and bicycle crashes are less frequent due to low volumes caused by auto-centric environments, the total of five years of crashes involving people biking or walking were summed for a simple multimodal crash score.

These scores are then scaled to make them comparable to other metrics, summed for the facility, and weighted based on the Goal priority.

GOAL 4. ENSURE THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MEETS THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY

Objectives 4.1 through 4.4 are not assessed here as they focus on programmatic opportunities. The objectives are as follows:

- Objective 4.1 – Provide opportunities to engage citizens, particularly traditionally underserved populations, and other public and private groups and organizations.
- Objective 4.2 – Support community education and involvement in transportation planning.
- Objective 4.3 – Coordinate with local government to consider local land use plans when identifying future transportation projects.
- Objective 4.4 – Collaborate with various agencies including FDOT, Marion County School District, Marion County and its municipalities, SunTran, and providers of freight and rail travel to create strategies for developing a multimodal transportation system.

Objective 4.5 – Improve the safety of the transportation system for all user groups regardless of socioeconomic status or physical ability.

This objective is addressed through:

- The population characteristics assessments in Objectives 1.3 and 1.4 which cover youth, seniors, those in poverty, those without access to a vehicle, minorities, and those with disabilities.
- The bicycle and pedestrian crash scores included in Objective 3.4.

GOAL 5. PROTECT NATURAL RESOURCES AND CREATE QUALITY PLACES

Objectives 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 are specific to the project evaluation criteria and are not included in the systemwide Needs Assessment. The objectives are as follows:

- Objective 5.1 – Limit impacts to existing natural resources, such as parks, preserves, and protected lands.
- Objective 5.2 – Avoid or minimize negative impacts of projects and disruption to residential neighborhoods.
- Objective 5.3 – Improve the resiliency of the transportation system through mitigation and adaptation strategies to deal with catastrophic events.

Objective 5.4 – Enhance access to tourist destinations, such as trails, parks and downtowns

The needs assessment for access to tourist destinations scores FAHWYSYS facilities by counting the number of tourist destination parcels that the roadways provide indirect or direct access to. Tourist destinations include those designated as tourism locations by the county as well as State parks, the Ocala National Forest, trailheads, boating, or other locations expected to draw visitors. Tourist destinations exclude neighborhood parks, sports facilities, or other local-use destinations. Indirect or direct access is reflected by counting any tourist destination parcel within a quarter mile of the roadway. These scores are then scaled to make them comparable to other metrics and weighted based on the Goal priority.

GOAL 6. OPTIMIZE AND PRESERVE EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE

Objective 6.1 – Improve the performance of the transportation system through intersection modifications, access management strategies, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) applications, and other emerging technologies.

ITS projects identified in either the 2040 LRTP or the Strategic Master Plan are included in the assessment of this metric. FAHWYSYS facilities are scored based on both opportunities to expand existing ITS infrastructure (e.g. facilities that intersect with or are within a quarter mile of existing fiberoptic) and identification as an ITS expansion corridor in the 2040 LRTP, SMP, or both. The existing ITS infrastructure and ITS expansion corridor scores are summed for each facility, where:

Existing ITS Infrastructure:

- 1 = Facility within quarter mile of fiber
- 2 = Facility intersects corridor with fiber

ITS Expansion corridor

- 3 = Corridor identified in SMP
- 4 = Corridor identified in 2040 LRTP
- 5 = Corridor identified in both 2040 LRTP and SMP

These scores are then scaled to make them comparable to other metrics and weighted based on the Goal priority.

Objective 6.2 – Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system and establish priorities to ensure optimal use.

Objective 6.2 focuses on programmatic solutions and is not included in the Needs Assessment.

Objective 6.3 – Maintain the transportation network by identifying and prioritizing infrastructure preservation and rehabilitation projects such as asset management and signal system upgrades.

Objective 6.3 is specific to the project evaluation criteria and is not included in the systemwide Needs Assessment.

Objective 6.4 – Plan for the future of Automated, Connected, Electric and Shared (ACES) vehicles and other emerging technologies into the transportation network

This objective is addressed through the ITS needs assessment in Objective 6.1.

Objective 6.5 – Improve the reliability of the transportation system through operational and incident management strategies.

This objective is addressed through the ITS needs assessment in Objective 6.1.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT SCORING MATRIX

PROJECT ID	ROADWAY	FACILITY	FROM	TO	
232	36000159	Bahia Rd	Midway Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	
231	36000159	Bahia Rd	Pine Rd	Midway Rd	
291	36000153	Baseline Rd	SE 110th St	SE Abshier Blvd	
180	36000147	Buena Vista Blvd	CR 42	Sumter County Line	
371	36150000	Cedar St/Pennsylvania Ave	US 41	Powell Rd	
275	36000166	Chestnut Rd	Juniper Rd	SE 58th Ave	
33	36000033	CR 314	Ft Brooks Rd	SE 1st St Rd	
512	36550000	CR 314A	Ft Brooks Rd	CR 464C	
162	36140000	CR 315	N of CR 318		
351	36190000	CR 315	NE 212th St Rd	CR 316	
354	36190000	CR 315	NE 10th St	NE 90th St Rd	
355	36190000	CR 315	CR 316	NE 10th St	
352	36190000	CR 315	CR 318	NE 212th St Rd	
353	36190000	CR 315	NE 90th St Rd	Ft Brooks Rd	
467	36660000	CR 315	US 21	Putnam County Line	
435	36520000	CR 316	NE Jacksonville Rd	CR 315	
432	36520000	CR 316	CR 316	NE 148th Ter Rd	
433	36520000	CR 316	NE 203rd Ave Rd	SR 19	
434	36520000	CR 316	NE 150th Ave	NE 203rd Ave Rd	
164	36140000	CR 318	US 441	US 301	
163	36140000	CR 318	US 301	CR 315	
165	36140000	CR 318	W of US 441		
464	36540000	CR 318	I-75	US 441	
466	36540000	CR 318	CR 329	I-75	
465	36540000	CR 318	CR 329	Levy County Line	
369	36150000	CR 336	Levy County Line	CR 40	
370	36150000	CR 40	CR 336	Powell Rd	
494	36508500	CR 40	Levy County Line	CR 336	
266	36130000	CR 42	US 441	Ocala Rd	
265	36130000	CR 42	Villages Buena Vista Blvd	US 441	
264	36130000	CR 42	US 301	Villages Buena Vista Blvd	
267	36130000	CR 42	Ocala Rd	SE 138th Ter	
450	36590000	CR 452	CR 42	Lake County Line	
349	36200000	CR 464C	SE 135th Ave	CR 314A	
366	36170000	CR 475	CR 484	Sumter County Line	
372	36150000	CR 484	US 41	SW 140th Ave	
373	36150000	CR 484	SW 140th Ave	SW College Rd	
482	36570000	CR 484	Marion Oaks Manor	Marion Oaks Course	
483	36570000	CR 484	Marion Oaks Course	Marion Oaks Blvd	
479	36570000	CR 484	SW College Rd	Marion Oaks Trail	
484	36570000	CR 484	Marion Oaks Blvd	I-75	
431	36570000	CR 484	SE 55th Ave Rd	SE 132nd St Rd	
510	36570000	CR 484	CR 475	SE 36th Ave	
507	36570000	CR 484	SE 36th Ave	SE 132nd St Rd	
508	36570000	CR 484	I-75	SW 16th Ave	
481	36570000	CR 484	Marion Oaks Trail	Marion Oaks Manor	
430	36570000	CR 484	SE Abshier Blvd	SE 55th Ave Rd	
509	36570000	CR 484	SW 16th Ave	CR 475	
485	36570000	CR 484	E of I-75		

	WEIGHTED SCORES			
	GOAL 1	GOAL 2	GOAL 3	GOAL 6
	7.02	5.82	4.59	0.00
	5.20	5.58	3.92	0.00
	2.95	5.68	3.94	0.00
	4.33	5.65	0.26	0.00
	2.77	5.18	7.81	0.00
	4.51	5.00	4.09	0.00
	2.95	3.12	0.07	0.00
	3.29	4.66	0.96	0.00
	3.29	1.10	3.90	0.00
	3.64	3.44	7.86	6.00
	2.60	4.05	4.47	0.00
	3.29	3.11	4.15	6.00
	3.64	1.59	4.11	0.00
	2.60	3.94	3.93	0.00
	3.29	1.11	4.37	0.00
	5.03	6.33	8.48	6.00
	3.64	5.53	7.94	9.00
	3.29	3.00	4.25	0.00
	2.95	3.60	4.12	0.00
	5.72	3.76	4.42	0.00
	4.33	5.11	4.31	0.00
	5.03	4.21	0.03	0.00
	5.72	4.21	8.68	0.00
	4.68	5.34	8.05	0.00
	3.29	3.00	4.80	0.00
	3.29	2.78	3.90	0.00
	3.29	4.02	7.83	0.00
	3.29	2.82	3.93	0.00
	4.85	11.76	4.80	0.00
	5.46	8.46	0.80	15.00
	6.07	9.38	0.22	9.00
	2.95	7.57	0.03	0.00
	2.60	3.81	0.58	0.00
	4.68	5.32	1.09	0.00
	3.64	7.79	0.32	0.00
	4.07	9.60	12.61	0.00
	4.42	12.70	8.24	3.00
	5.29	16.51	12.61	6.00
	3.64	14.03	12.26	15.00
	7.89	9.59	9.28	6.00
	3.64	18.00	9.02	9.00
	4.68	5.02	8.58	15.00
	3.21	6.35	8.57	9.00
	5.29	5.70	8.16	9.00
	1.30	8.29	8.09	9.00
	4.94	8.27	8.04	0.00
	4.77	5.39	8.01	15.00
	2.95	7.34	7.91	9.00
	3.29	6.72	3.90	0.00

PROJECT ID	ROADWAY	FACILITY	FROM	TO	
480	36570000	CR 484	at SW College Rd		
506	36570000	CR 484	N of SE 132nd St Rd		
511	36511501	Crossover road	SE 110th St Rd	Ocala Rd	
62	36000143	E Fort King St	SE 25th Ave	SE 29th Ter	
101	36000021	E Ft King St	SE 22nd Ave	SE 25th Ave	
97	36000021	E Ft King St	S Magnolia Ave	SE 1st Ave	
17	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	NW 11th Ave	NE 25th Ave	
15	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	NE 8th Ave	NE 11th Ave	
12	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	N Pine Ave	N Magnolia Ave	
14	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	NE Watula Ave	SE 7th Ter	
11	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	NE 3rd St	NE 7th St	
93	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	SE 183rd Ave Rd	SR 19	
10	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	NE 25th Ave	NE 3rd St	
16	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	S Magnolia Ave	SE 1st Ave	
90	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	CR 315	Salt Springs Hwy	
9	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	NE 7th St	NE 36th Ave	
7	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	NE 36th Ave	NE 14th St	
13	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	SE 1st Ave	SE Watula Ave	
5	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	NE 55th Ave	SR 326	
8	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	SR 492	NE 55th Ave	
89	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	SR 326	CR 315	
94	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	E of SR 19		
6	36080000	E Silver Springs Blvd	E of SR 326		
24	36000162	Emerald Rd	SE 79th Ave Rd	Oak Rd	
25	36000162	Emerald Rd	Oak Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	
23	36000162	Emerald Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	Spring Rd	
91	36080000	Ft Brooks Rd	Salt Springs Hwy	CR 314A	
92	36080000	Ft Brooks Rd	CR 314A	SE 183rd Ave Rd	
384	36210000	I-75	SW 66th St	CR 484	
385	36210000	I-75	CR 484	Sumter County Line	
380	36210000	I-75	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 20th St	
379	36210000	I-75	NW Blitchton Rd	W Silver Springs Blvd	
382	36210000	I-75	SW College Rd	SW 43rd St Rd	
376	36210000	I-75	CR 318	CR 329	
377	36210000	I-75	CR 329	SR 326	
375	36210000	I-75	Alachua County Line	CR 318	
381	36210000	I-75	SW 20th St	SW College Rd	
378	36210000	I-75	SR 326	NW Blitchton Rd	
383	36210000	I-75	SW 43rd St Rd	SW 66th St	
113	36000164	Juniper Rd	SE 79th St	Chestnut Rd	
114	36000164	Juniper Rd	Chestnut Rd	SE 58th Ave	
112	36000164	Juniper Rd	SE 58th Ave	SE 79th St	
49	36000173	Marion Oaks Blvd	Marion Oaks Dr	Marion Oaks Ln	
47	36000173	Marion Oaks Blvd	CR 484	Marion Oaks Dr	
50	36000173	Marion Oaks Blvd	Marion Oaks Ln	Marion Oaks Manor	
48	36000173	Marion Oaks Blvd	Marion Oaks Manor	Marion Oaks Manor	
178	36000174	Marion Oaks Course	CR 484	Marion Oaks Ln	
179	36000174	Marion Oaks Course	Marion Oaks Ln	Marion Oaks Manor	
177	36000174	Marion Oaks Course	N of CR 484		
268	36000176	Marion Oaks Dr	Marion Oaks Blvd	Marion Oaks Ln	
269	36000176	Marion Oaks Dr	Marion Oaks Ln	Marion Oaks Manor	

	WEIGHTED SCORES			
	GOAL 1	GOAL 2	GOAL 3	GOAL 6
	7.02	11.65	3.90	0.00
	2.86	3.97	0.10	0.00
	3.29	5.34	0.00	0.00
	2.17	3.35	4.06	0.00
	1.91	0.80	3.97	0.00
	1.65	3.19	3.92	9.00
	3.38	3.94	19.00	15.00
	3.90	3.43	16.83	15.00
	3.73	5.08	13.12	12.00
	3.38	3.35	12.89	15.00
	1.56	3.95	9.84	12.00
	2.95	5.23	9.72	0.00
	1.99	4.46	8.64	12.00
	1.65	4.52	8.55	15.00
	2.95	6.38	8.51	9.00
	1.82	3.77	8.50	12.00
	1.82	4.75	8.39	18.00
	3.03	3.46	8.26	15.00
	4.07	6.87	8.03	9.00
	2.77	8.52	8.00	12.00
	2.60	6.75	7.86	9.00
	2.60	3.93	7.80	0.00
	2.60	6.75	0.00	0.00
	5.20	7.35	3.92	0.00
	6.33	6.44	3.90	0.00
	6.41	1.84	0.15	0.00
	3.29	7.04	13.02	9.00
	2.95	5.72	10.19	0.00
	1.82	8.46	11.84	6.00
	0.69	6.78	10.38	0.00
	3.55	8.44	9.65	18.00
	4.42	12.46	8.90	6.00
	3.29	6.87	7.96	6.00
	3.12	2.33	7.06	0.00
	4.51	2.63	6.78	0.00
	2.08	2.47	5.79	0.00
	2.51	2.87	5.32	6.00
	4.85	17.01	5.22	9.00
	1.47	7.92	4.09	6.00
	3.21	6.70	3.92	0.00
	3.21	4.48	3.91	0.00
	4.51	4.53	0.02	0.00
	4.59	6.07	0.85	0.00
	4.59	8.73	0.26	0.00
	4.94	7.98	0.18	0.00
	5.29	8.25	0.04	0.00
	3.64	7.47	4.47	0.00
	3.29	4.99	4.05	0.00
	4.94	8.65	3.90	0.00
	1.99	6.35	4.15	0.00
	3.99	5.96	3.90	0.00

PROJECT ID	ROADWAY	FACILITY	FROM	TO	
96	36000175	Marion Oaks Ln	Marion Oaks Dr	Marion Oaks Blvd	
95	36000175	Marion Oaks Ln	Marion Oaks Course	Marion Oaks Dr	
302	36000172	Marion Oaks Manor	Marion Oaks Dr	Marion Oaks Blvd	
299	36000172	Marion Oaks Manor	CR 484	Marion Oaks Blvd	
301	36000172	Marion Oaks Manor	Marion Oaks Course	Marion Oaks Dr	
300	36000172	Marion Oaks Manor	Marion Oaks Blvd	Marion Oaks Course	
147	36000140	Marion Oaks Trail	SW 49th Ave	CR 484	
263	36000171	Marion Oaks Trail	CR 484	SW 49th Ave	
493	36600500	Martin Luther King Jr Ave	NE 35th St	NW 10th St	
19	36000161	Midway Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	Bahia Rd	
335	36000030	N Magnolia Ave	NW 17th Pl	NW 14th St	
333	36000030	N Magnolia Ave	NW 28th St	NW 20th St	
334	36000030	N Magnolia Ave	NW 20th St	NE Jacksonville Rd	
233	36000050	N Magnolia Ave	NE 14th St	NW 10th St	
234	36000050	N Magnolia Ave	NW 10th St	NW 6th Pl	
63	36000082	N Magnolia Ave	NE 1st Ave	NE 3rd St	
64	36000082	N Magnolia Ave	NE 3rd St	W Silver Springs Blvd	
167	36001000	N Pine Ave	NW 35th St	W Anthony Rd	
168	36001000	N Pine Ave	S of W Anthony Rd		
119	36030000	N Pine Ave	NW 20th St	NW 10th St	
118	36030000	N Pine Ave	NW 28th St	NW 20th St	
116	36030000	N Pine Ave	NW 28th St		
117	36030000	N Pine Ave	Crossover N of NW 28th St		
417	36008000	NE 10th St	N Magnolia Ave	NE 8th Ave	
414	36008000	NE 14th St	NE 36th Ave	E Silver Springs Blvd	
415	36008000	NE 14th St	NE 25th Ave	NE 36th Ave	
413	36008000	NE 14th St	NE 8th Ave	NE 19th Ave	
416	36008000	NE 14th St	NE 20th Ave	NE 25th Ave	
188	36000034	NE 19th Ave	NE 24th St	NE 14th St	
236	36000050	NE 1st Ave	NE 3rd St	E Silver Springs Blvd	
235	36000050	NE 1st Ave	N Magnolia Ave	NE 3rd St	
87	36000032	NE 24th St	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 19th Ave	
86	36000032	NE 24th St	NE 19th Ave	NE 25th Ave	
88	36000032	NE 24th St	NE 25th Ave	NE 36th Ave	
55	36000041	NE 25th Ave	NE 35th St	NE 24th St	
57	36000041	NE 25th Ave	NE 14th St	NE 3rd St	
58	36000041	NE 25th Ave	NE 3rd St	E Silver Springs Blvd	
56	36000041	NE 25th Ave	NE 24th St	NE 14th St	
102	36000073	NE 25th Ave	NE 70th St	NE 35th St	
454	36523000	NE 25th Ave	E Silver Springs Blvd	E Fort King St	
455	36523000	NE 25th Ave	E Fort King St	SE 17th St	
456	36523000	NE 25th Ave	SE 17th St	SE Maricamp Rd	
1	36000035	NE 35th St	NE 36th Ave	NE 55th Ave Rd	
22	36000047	NE 35th St	NE 25th Ave	NE 36th Ave	
310	36000042	NE 36th Ave	NE 14th St	E Silver Springs Blvd	
309	36000042	NE 36th Ave	NE 24th St	NE 14th St	
311	36000042	NE 36th Ave	E Silver Springs Blvd	NE 7th St	
257	36000042	NE 36th Ave	NE 70th St	NE 35th St	
312	36000042	NE 36th Ave	NE 7th St	E Fort King St	
308	36000042	NE 36th Ave	NE 35th St	NE 24th St	
307	36000042	NE 36th Ave	N of NE 35th St		

	WEIGHTED SCORES			
	GOAL 1	GOAL 2	GOAL 3	GOAL 6
	1.99	5.54	4.08	0.00
	3.64	5.49	3.90	0.00
	3.99	5.69	0.04	0.00
	3.64	9.41	0.03	0.00
	3.64	5.37	0.02	0.00
	3.29	6.41	0.01	0.00
	3.64	8.65	7.84	6.00
	2.95	3.83	4.61	0.00
	8.06	10.96	4.41	0.00
	5.46	8.32	4.08	0.00
	1.04	3.32	0.03	9.00
	7.11	3.25	0.01	0.00
	0.95	3.43	0.00	9.00
	1.04	1.70	3.91	9.00
	0.35	1.19	3.91	9.00
	1.65	0.81	4.32	9.00
	1.65	1.74	3.91	9.00
	6.85	6.10	7.91	0.00
	7.11	4.18	4.06	12.00
	8.93	7.11	9.38	18.00
	5.81	6.36	8.46	18.00
	7.11	5.76	3.96	12.00
	7.11	4.18	0.00	12.00
	5.29	3.01	4.13	6.00
	2.69	4.64	8.40	0.00
	3.99	6.55	5.92	0.00
	4.25	5.88	4.36	0.00
	3.73	6.69	4.28	0.00
	6.41	4.75	4.07	0.00
	1.65	1.50	4.24	9.00
	1.65	0.70	3.91	9.00
	5.46	2.55	4.25	0.00
	6.41	3.04	0.03	0.00
	5.37	3.31	0.02	0.00
	4.68	4.33	4.26	6.00
	4.94	5.30	4.13	0.00
	3.38	3.68	0.51	0.00
	6.67	7.27	0.25	0.00
	5.63	3.03	4.53	0.00
	2.25	3.32	0.42	0.00
	1.91	2.70	0.32	0.00
	1.82	3.58	0.00	0.00
	4.68	3.15	0.53	0.00
	5.89	4.53	4.93	9.00
	4.25	5.43	8.81	0.00
	7.54	9.15	4.53	0.00
	2.08	3.59	4.45	9.00
	5.72	5.28	4.24	3.00
	2.34	2.18	4.24	9.00
	4.68	5.77	0.04	0.00
	4.68	4.23	0.00	0.00

PROJECT ID	ROADWAY	FACILITY	FROM	TO	
228	36000036	NE 3rd St	NE 8th Ave	NE 25th Ave	
226	36000036	NE 3rd St	NE Watula Ave	NE 8th Ave	
227	36000036	NE 3rd St	NE 1st Ave	NE Watula Ave	
225	36000036	NE 3rd St	NE 25th Ave	E Silver Springs Blvd	
229	36000036	NE 3rd St	Magnolia Ave	NE 1st Ave	
332	36000081	NE 55th Ave	NE 35th St	E Silver Springs Blvd	
330	36000081	NE 55th Ave Rd	SR 326	NE 35th St	
331	36000081	NE 58th Ave	S of SR 326		
395	36000083	NE 58th Ave	S of SR 326		
394	36000037	NE 7th St	NE 58th Ave	SE 1st St Rd	
393	36000037	NE 7th St	W of NE 58th Ave		
496	36620500	NE 7th St	NE 36th Ave	NE 58th Ave	
495	36620500	NE 7th St	E Silver Springs Blvd	NE 36th Ave	
176	36000029	NE 8th Ave	NE 3rd St	E Silver Springs Blvd	
175	36000029	NE 8th Ave	NE 14th St	NE 3rd St	
174	36000029	NE 8th Rd	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 14th St	
497	36658500	NE 97th St Rd	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 33rd Ave	
420	36000012	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 20th St	N Magnolia Ave	
250	36040000	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 70th St	NW 35th St	
247	36040000	NE Jacksonville Rd	CR 316	NE 97th St Rd	
252	36040000	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 28th St	NE 24th St	
251	36040000	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 35th St	NE 28th St	
249	36040000	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 95th St	NE 70th St	
246	36040000	NE Jacksonville Rd	US 301	CR 316	
253	36040000	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 8th Rd	NE 2nd Ave	
248	36040000	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 97th St Rd	NE 95th St	
419	36008000	NW 10th St	N Pine Ave	N Magnolia Ave	
418	36008000	NW 10th St	W of N Pine Ave		
216	36070000	NW 10th St	NW Martin Luther King Ave	N Pine Ave	
215	36070000	NW 10th St	NW 27th Ave	NW Martin Luther King Ave	
492	36600500	NW 16th Ave	NW Gainesville Rd	NW 35th St	
254	36040000	NW 20th St	N Magnolia Ave	NE Jacksonville Rd	
255	36040000	NW 20th St	US 301	N Magnolia Ave	
184	36000016	NW 27th Ave	NW 10th St	W Silver Springs Blvd	
183	36000016	NW 27th Ave	N of NW 10th St		
169	36000017	NW 27th Ave	NW 21st St	NW 10th St	
189	36000106	NW 27th Ave	NW 35th St	NW 21st St	
159	36000031	NW 28th St	N Magnolia Ave	NE Jacksonville Rd	
160	36000031	NW 28th St	E of N Pine Ave		
30	36000052	NW 35th St	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 25th Ave	
29	36000052	NW 35th St	W Anthony Rd	NE Jacksonville Rd	
28	36000052	NW 35th St	N Pine Ave	W Anthony Rd	
27	36000052	NW 35th St	NW Gainesville Rd	N Pine Ave	
26	36000052	NW 35th St	NW 16th Ave	NW Gainesville Rd	
44	36000103	NW 35th St	NW 27th Ave	NW Gainesville Rd	
290	36000127	NW 38th Ave	NW Blitchton Rd	W Silver Springs Blvd	
281	36000130	NW 3rd St	N Pine Ave	N Magnolia Ave	
313	36000070	NW 44th Ave	SR 326	NW Blitchton Rd	
289	36000004	NW 60th Ave	NW Blitchton Rd	W Silver Springs Blvd	
158	36000005	NW 70th Ave	Old Blitchton Rd	NW 69th St	
271	36000100	NW 80th Ave	NW 10th St	W Silver Springs Blvd	

	WEIGHTED SCORES			
	GOAL 1	GOAL 2	GOAL 3	GOAL 6
	6.41	9.41	8.50	0.00
	6.50	7.30	3.93	0.00
	3.47	7.53	3.92	0.00
	5.98	5.83	3.92	6.00
	1.65	6.48	3.90	0.00
	4.33	5.61	0.08	0.00
	4.42	3.19	0.00	0.00
	2.95	3.19	0.00	0.00
	3.64	4.77	0.01	0.00
	4.68	4.02	1.24	0.00
	4.94	4.49	0.00	0.00
	5.46	5.02	4.37	0.00
	2.08	4.12	3.91	0.00
	4.77	0.91	7.82	0.00
	4.85	1.58	4.68	0.00
	8.84	5.51	4.27	0.00
	3.64	2.75	3.90	6.00
	3.55	1.92	0.00	6.00
	8.49	6.29	8.98	9.00
	4.68	8.02	8.88	6.00
	3.47	4.52	8.46	9.00
	3.73	3.58	8.32	9.00
	5.11	9.38	8.03	0.00
	3.99	7.44	7.89	0.00
	1.91	3.63	7.84	18.00
	3.64	7.51	7.80	0.00
	5.63	4.90	4.25	0.00
	5.63	5.42	0.00	0.00
	4.77	6.99	12.73	18.00
	6.15	14.34	12.05	12.00
	4.33	5.05	0.00	0.00
	0.95	3.12	4.14	15.00
	1.65	4.36	4.11	15.00
	7.80	15.59	4.28	0.00
	7.02	3.68	0.08	0.00
	10.14	5.25	4.21	12.00
	7.19	10.15	0.03	12.00
	7.02	2.80	4.80	6.00
	7.11	3.33	0.00	0.00
	5.63	3.61	4.23	9.00
	6.93	4.41	3.97	9.00
	5.29	6.80	3.92	9.00
	2.43	5.58	3.92	9.00
	1.73	5.83	0.01	9.00
	1.73	11.16	0.08	9.00
	6.59	5.84	3.95	9.00
	6.33	4.19	4.06	0.00
	5.81	10.22	0.25	0.00
	5.46	7.55	4.13	0.00
	5.03	12.81	4.54	6.00
	3.29	5.08	0.01	0.00

PROJECT ID	ROADWAY	FACILITY	FROM	TO	
134	36070000	NW Blitchton Rd	NW 60th Ave	NW 44th Ave	
214	36070000	NW Blitchton Rd	I-75	NW 27th Ave	
136	36070000	NW Blitchton Rd	NW 38th Ave	I-75	
135	36070000	NW Blitchton Rd	NW 44th Ave	NW 38th Ave	
133	36070000	NW Blitchton Rd	NW 70th Ave Rd	NW 60th Ave	
137	36070000	NW Blitchton Rd	at I-75 interchange		
286	36030000	NW Gainesville Rd	US 441	CR 329	
287	36030000	NW Gainesville Rd	CR 329	SR 326	
288	36030000	NW Gainesville Rd	SR 326	NW 37th St	
18	36030000	NW Gainesville Rd	NW 35th St	W Anthony Rd	
462	36600501	NW Martin Luther King Ave	NW 10th St	W Silver Springs Blvd	
463	36600501	NW Martin Luther King Ave	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 10th St	
461	36600501	NW Martin Luther King Ave	N of NW 10th St		
427	36000119	Oak Rd	Emerald Rd	SE 110th St Rd	
426	36000119	Oak Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	Emerald Rd	
211	36000160	Oak Rd	Silver Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	
212	36000160	Oak Rd	Silver Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	
224	36010000	Ocala Rd	CR 42	SE 180th St	
220	36010000	Ocala Rd	SE 108th Terr Rd	SR 484	
221	36010000	Ocala Rd	SE 135th Ave	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	
218	36010000	Ocala Rd	SE 110th St Rd	SE 100th Ave	
222	36010000	Ocala Rd	SR 464	SW 135th Ave	
219	36010000	Ocala Rd	SE 100th Ave	SE 108th Terr Rd	
223	36010000	Ocala Rd	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	CR 42	
131	36070000	Old Blichton Rd	NW 110th Ave	NW 70th Ave Rd	
129	36070000	Old Blichton Rd	SR 326	NW 110th Ave	
132	36070000	Old Blichton Rd	N of NW 70th Ave Rd		
305	36000158	Pine Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	Spring Rd	
303	36000158	Pine Rd	SE 64th Ave Rd	Bahia Rd	
304	36000158	Pine Rd	Bahia Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	
306	36000158	Pine Rd	Spring Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	
148	36000132	Powell Rd	Cedar St	N Williams St	
66	36000082	S Magnolia Ave	E Fort King St	SR 200	
65	36000082	S Magnolia Ave	E Silver Springs Blvd	SW Fort King St	
365	36170000	S Magnolia Ave	SW 80th St	CR 484	
364	36170000	S Magnolia Ave	SE 52nd St	SE 80th St	
487	36600001	S Magnolia Ave	SW 10th St	SE 3rd Ave	
486	36600001	S Magnolia Ave	N of SE 1st Ave		
199	36010000	S Pine Ave	SW 10th St	SW 17th St	
203	36010000	S Pine Ave	SE 32nd St	SW 52nd St	
204	36010000	S Pine Ave	SE 52nd St	SE 80th St	
200	36010000	S Pine Ave	SW 17th St	SE 1st Ave	
202	36010000	S Pine Ave	SE 3rd Ave	SE 31st St	
201	36010000	S Pine Ave	SE 1st Ave	SE 3rd Ave	
122	36030000	S Pine Ave	E Silver Springs Blvd	SW 10th St	
121	36030000	S Pine Ave	NW 3rd St	E Silver Springs Blvd	
120	36030000	S Pine Ave	NW 10th St	NW 3rd St	
81	36020000	Salt Springs Hwy	CR 314A	Fort Brooks Rd	
80	36020000	Salt Springs Hwy	NE 127th St Rd	CR 314A	
79	36020000	Salt Springs Hwy	US 19	NE 127th St Rd	
172	36000046	SE 100th Ave	CR 25	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	

	WEIGHTED SCORES			
	GOAL 1	GOAL 2	GOAL 3	GOAL 6
	8.93	12.88	10.28	9.00
	4.42	14.31	9.22	0.00
	5.46	11.28	8.32	9.00
	5.46	12.17	7.88	9.00
	6.41	7.96	4.08	9.00
	7.02	4.35	3.90	0.00
	5.72	3.65	8.55	0.00
	5.72	5.97	4.96	6.00
	4.33	6.09	2.08	0.00
	5.63	2.88	0.01	0.00
	12.65	6.68	8.14	0.00
	13.00	4.92	7.99	0.00
	7.02	6.77	4.08	0.00
	3.64	7.90	3.96	9.00
	6.76	12.97	3.90	6.00
	6.67	3.43	4.09	0.00
	7.19	1.50	0.04	0.00
	2.95	6.94	4.03	3.00
	3.64	6.25	1.65	0.00
	3.64	6.91	1.47	0.00
	4.94	9.87	0.88	3.00
	3.64	5.52	0.61	0.00
	4.07	7.33	0.38	0.00
	2.95	7.33	0.28	0.00
	4.33	10.19	5.36	0.00
	3.99	3.14	4.50	0.00
	4.33	7.04	0.00	0.00
	6.50	4.54	4.39	0.00
	3.99	3.98	0.04	0.00
	4.94	7.60	0.04	0.00
	6.41	3.79	0.02	0.00
	3.29	6.44	3.91	0.00
	1.65	1.72	8.15	15.00
	1.65	1.29	4.35	9.00
	2.95	7.88	5.12	0.00
	3.29	5.59	4.02	0.00
	5.03	4.44	3.91	0.00
	4.25	0.67	3.90	0.00
	2.86	5.47	11.79	18.00
	5.55	16.47	10.61	15.00
	3.64	15.03	10.34	15.00
	2.17	5.63	9.95	21.00
	7.02	6.28	8.02	21.00
	2.43	3.98	3.93	15.00
	4.42	6.49	17.73	12.00
	3.73	6.20	16.39	12.00
	9.01	5.44	12.28	18.00
	2.95	3.32	1.36	3.00
	2.60	3.25	0.83	0.00
	2.60	2.63	0.28	0.00
	4.33	9.08	0.61	0.00

PROJECT ID	ROADWAY	FACILITY	FROM	TO	
85	36000045	SE 108th Terr Rd	SE 110th St Rd	CR 25	
84	36000045	SE 108th Terr Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 110th St Rd	
213	36000078	SE 110th St	SE 36th Ave	US 441	
154	36010000	SE 110th St	SE Front Rd	SE Baseline Rd	
153	36010000	SE 110th St	SE Baseline Rd	SE Arthur Rd	
217	36010000	SE 110th St	SE Baseline Rd	SE 70th Ave	
458	36511500	SE 110th St Rd	Oak Rd	SE 108th Terr Rd	
459	36511500	SE 110th St Rd	SE 70th Ave	Oak Rd	
460	36511500	SE 110th St Rd	E of SE 70th Ave		
256	36000169	SE 114th St Rd	SR 464	SE 135th Ave	
124	36000134	SE 11th Ave	E Fort King St	SE 17th St	
123	36000134	SE 11th Ave	E Silver Springs Blvd	E Fort King St	
67	36000152	SE 132nd St Rd	US 301	US 441	
68	36000152	SE 132nd St Rd	CR 484	US 301	
350	36200000	SE 135th Ave	SE 114th St Rd	Ocala Rd	
150	36000053	SE 145th St	SE 36th Ave	US 301	
149	36000053	SE 145th St	SE 25th Ave	SE 36th Ave	
258	36000013	SE 147th St	US 301	US 441	
397	36000025	SE 17th St	SE 25th Ave	SE 36th Ave	
322	36004000	SE 17th St	SE 11th Ave	SE 18th Ave	
323	36004000	SE 17th St	SE 18th Ave	SE Clatter Bridge Rd	
319	36004000	SE 17th St	SE 3rd Ave	S Magnolia Ext	
321	36004000	SE 17th St	SE Lake Weir Ave	SE 11th Ave	
324	36004000	SE 17th St	SE Clatter Bridge Rd	SE 25th Ave	
326	36004000	SE 17th St	SE 24th St	SE 36th Ave	
151	36000114	SE 18th Ave	SE 17th St	SE 31st St	
238	36000050	SE 1st Ave	E Fort King St	S Magnolia Ave	
237	36000050	SE 1st Ave	E Silver Springs Blvd	E Fort King St	
239	36000050	SE 1st Ave	SW 1st Ave	S Magnolia Ave	
362	36170000	SE 1st Ave/SE 3rd Ave	S Pine Ave	SE 32nd St	
69	36000024	SE 22nd Ave	E Fort King St	SE 17th St	
182	36000116	SE 24th St	SE 36th Ave	SE 58th Ave	
181	36000116	SE 24th St	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 36th Ave	
277	36000118	SE 31st St	SE Lake Weir Ave	SE 19th Ave	
276	36000118	SE 31st St	S Pine Ave	SE Lake Weir Ave	
279	36000118	SE 31st St	SE 19th Ave	SE 36th Ave	
280	36000118	SE 31st St	SE 36th Ave	SE Maricamp Rd	
278	36000118	SE 31st St	S of Pine Ave		
429	36000151	SE 32nd St	SW 7th Ave	SE 3rd Ave	
428	36000151	SE 32nd St	SE 3rd Ave	S Pine Ave	
296	36000023	SE 36th Ave	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 31st St	
297	36000023	SE 36th Ave	SE 31st St	SE 38th St	
295	36000023	SE 36th Ave	N of SE Maricamp Rd		
396	36000025	SE 36th Ave	E Fort King St	SE 17th St	
103	36000049	SE 36th Ave	SE 17th St	SE 24th St	
104	36000049	SE 36th Ave	SE 24th St	SE Maricamp Rd	
438	36659000	SE 36th Ave	SE 110th St	CR 484	
437	36659000	SE 36th Ave	SE 95th St	SE 110th St	
439	36659000	SE 36th Ave	CR 484	SE 145th St	
440	36659000	SE 36th Ave	SE 145th St	SE 150th St	
298	36000023	SE 38th St	SE Lake Weir Ave	SE 36th Ave	

	WEIGHTED SCORES			
	GOAL 1	GOAL 2	GOAL 3	GOAL 6
	3.99	7.18	0.61	0.00
	4.33	8.99	0.00	0.00
	4.42	4.69	3.91	6.00
	3.21	5.10	7.84	0.00
	2.95	6.53	3.94	0.00
	3.29	6.53	3.93	9.00
	3.99	7.64	4.08	0.00
	3.99	6.39	0.88	0.00
	3.29	5.34	0.00	0.00
	4.33	5.42	0.02	0.00
	6.41	2.66	7.84	6.00
	5.89	2.24	3.90	0.00
	4.25	7.08	0.54	0.00
	3.12	4.92	0.52	0.00
	3.99	4.42	0.03	0.00
	4.42	3.81	0.09	0.00
	3.81	1.90	0.02	0.00
	3.64	10.00	8.04	3.00
	4.25	2.72	4.07	0.00
	4.07	4.61	4.80	15.00
	3.29	4.87	4.46	15.00
	2.69	3.90	4.10	15.00
	2.95	3.86	4.04	15.00
	1.82	4.79	1.20	15.00
	1.30	5.74	0.80	15.00
	3.29	3.52	3.98	6.00
	2.95	3.17	7.88	15.00
	1.65	1.08	4.07	9.00
	4.25	2.64	3.90	0.00
	6.41	7.63	4.05	0.00
	4.77	0.91	3.91	0.00
	3.21	5.10	4.45	0.00
	5.03	3.60	3.94	0.00
	3.47	2.40	3.99	0.00
	3.73	4.76	3.95	0.00
	1.99	2.20	0.05	0.00
	1.56	2.20	0.01	0.00
	3.29	4.92	0.00	0.00
	1.39	5.54	0.11	0.00
	3.38	6.50	0.03	0.00
	1.82	2.52	0.05	0.00
	4.42	2.87	0.03	6.00
	1.30	2.92	0.00	0.00
	4.51	2.01	4.43	9.00
	2.69	2.35	4.27	9.00
	2.43	3.44	3.93	9.00
	4.59	6.57	4.74	6.00
	2.95	5.15	3.98	0.00
	3.81	5.24	0.42	0.00
	3.81	5.13	0.01	0.00
	5.11	4.23	0.26	6.00

PROJECT ID	ROADWAY	FACILITY	FROM	TO	
421	36000074	SE 38th St	SE 36th Ave	SE 44th Ave Rd	
363	36170000	SE 3rd Ave	SW 32nd St	SE 52nd St	
241	36000110	SE 41st Ct	SE 52nd St	SE 80th St	
422	36000074	SE 44th Ave Rd	SE 38th St	SE 52nd St	
21	36000156	SE 44th Ave Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 38th St	
424	36000074	SE 52nd St	S Pine Ave	SE 41st Ct	
423	36000074	SE 52nd St	S Magnolia Ave	S Pine Ave	
190	36000168	SE 55th Ave Rd	SE Abshier Blvd	CR 484	
77	36009000	SE 58th Ave	Juniper Rd	SE 109th St	
75	36009000	SE 58th Ave	Juniper Rd	Chestnut Rd	
76	36009000	SE 58th Ave	Chestnut Rd	Juniper Rd	
74	36009000	SE 58th Ave	SE Maricamp Rd	Juniper Rd	
70	36009000	SE 58th Ave	E Silver Springs Blvd	NE 7th St	
72	36009000	SE 58th Ave	E Fort King St	SE 28th St	
73	36009000	SE 58th Ave	SE 28t St	SE Maricamp Rd	
71	36009000	SE 58th Ave	NE 7th St	E Fort King St	
138	36000167	SE 62nd Ave Rd	US 441	SE Foss Rd	
139	36000167	SE 62nd Ave Rd	SE Foss Rd	SE 110th St	
157	36000157	SE 64th Ave Rd	Pine Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	
59	36000165	SE 79th St	SE 41st Ct	Juniper Rd	
105	36000109	SE 80th St	US 301	SE 41st Ct	
436	36505000	SE 80th St	S Magnolia Ave	US 301	
31	36000102	SE 92nd Pl	E of US 441		
115	36000077	SE 95th St	SE 36th Ave	US 441	
208	36010000	SE Abshier Blvd	SE 55th Ave Rd	SR 484	
209	36010000	SE Abshier Blvd	SE 110th St	SE 55th Ave Rd	
156	36010000	SE Abshier Blvd	CR 484		
360	36220000	SE Abshier Blvd	SE 147th Pl	CR 42	
358	36220000	SE Abshier Blvd	SE 132nd St Rd	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	
357	36220000	SE Abshier Blvd	SE Hames Rd	SE Babb Rd	
361	36220000	SE Abshier Blvd	CR 42	Sumter County Line	
359	36220000	SE Abshier Blvd	SE Baseline Rd	SE 92nd Loop	
356	36220000	SE Abshier Blvd	US 301	SE Baseline Rd	
78	36009000	SE Baseline Rd	SE 109th St	SE 110th St	
262	36000026	SE Fort King St	NE 36th Ave	NE 58th Ave	
261	36000026	SE Fort King St	SE 29th Terr	NE 36th Ave	
425	36000177	SE Foss Rd	SE Baseline Rd	SE Front Rd	
155	36010000	SE Hames Rd	SE Front Rd	SE Abshier Blvd	
489	36600001	SE Lake Weir Ave	SE 17th St	SE 31st St	
490	36600001	SE Lake Weir Ave	SE 31st St	SE 38th St	
491	36600001	SE Lake Weir Ave	SE 38th St	S Pine Ave	
488	36600001	SE Magnolia Ext	SE 3rd Ave	SE 17th St	
325	36004000	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 25th St	SE 24th St	
329	36004000	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 44th Ave Rd	SE 58th Ave	
327	36004000	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 36th Ave	SE 39th Ave	
328	36004000	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 31st St	SE 44th Ave Rd	
513	36004000	SE Maricamp Rd	W of SE 58th Ave		
475	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	Oak Rd	Emerald Rd	
477	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	Emerald Rd	Oak Rd	
471	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	Midway Rd	Bahia Rd	
470	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	Pine Rd	Midway Rd	

	WEIGHTED SCORES			
	GOAL 1	GOAL 2	GOAL 3	GOAL 6
	3.73	2.70	0.06	3.00
	3.99	7.92	3.98	0.00
	4.68	4.92	0.02	0.00
	4.68	5.25	3.99	3.00
	3.47	5.95	0.02	6.00
	4.94	12.10	0.17	6.00
	3.99	9.78	0.02	0.00
	5.37	4.27	3.91	0.00
	3.81	10.59	13.55	12.00
	0.61	8.63	12.32	12.00
	0.61	8.10	11.76	12.00
	2.77	10.88	8.19	12.00
	2.25	3.77	4.72	12.00
	1.56	4.64	4.54	12.00
	3.29	6.26	4.20	12.00
	1.04	2.89	4.00	12.00
	4.42	6.55	4.60	0.00
	3.81	5.49	3.91	0.00
	4.51	6.75	0.72	0.00
	4.42	7.56	0.03	0.00
	4.77	7.00	0.01	0.00
	3.64	5.61	0.68	6.00
	3.47	4.12	3.90	6.00
	4.07	4.96	7.82	0.00
	2.77	6.15	13.34	18.00
	3.38	5.96	7.81	0.00
	3.47	5.62	3.90	0.00
	4.33	11.52	13.65	15.00
	3.99	11.79	12.32	12.00
	2.17	6.27	12.00	18.00
	5.63	10.50	10.57	6.00
	4.33	7.85	8.57	18.00
	3.21	5.05	7.84	21.00
	3.81	6.81	11.96	0.00
	5.46	3.46	4.41	6.00
	2.08	2.42	4.11	0.00
	3.81	7.43	3.90	0.00
	2.17	6.60	11.80	6.00
	6.15	2.73	8.07	0.00
	6.33	2.55	3.94	0.00
	5.11	5.36	0.01	0.00
	5.29	3.88	7.82	0.00
	1.82	6.01	5.43	15.00
	5.37	7.39	5.43	15.00
	3.90	5.21	1.23	15.00
	3.73	7.41	0.54	15.00
	5.37	6.35	0.07	12.00
	5.46	7.71	4.35	0.00
	3.73	11.22	4.34	0.00
	7.02	7.95	4.27	15.00
	6.50	7.96	4.02	15.00

PROJECT ID	ROADWAY	FACILITY	FROM	TO	
476	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	Oak Rd	SE 108th Terr Rd	
469	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 64th Ave Rd	Pine Rd	
473	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	Pine Rd	Emerald Rd	
472	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	Bahia Rd	Pine Rd	
474	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	Emerald Rd	Oak Rd	
478	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 108th Terr Rd	Locust Rd	
449	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 114th St Rd	SE 120th St	
468	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	SE 58th Ave	SE 64th Ave Rd	
448	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	Locust Rd	SE 114th St Rd	
457	36600000	SE Maricamp Rd	CR 464	Ocala Rd	
260	36000013	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	SE 100th Ave	Ocala Rd	
259	36000013	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	US 441	SE 100th Ave	
340	36000133	SE Watula Ave	E Fort King St	SE Magnolia Ext	
339	36000133	SE Watula Ave	E Silver Springs Blvd	E Fort King St	
341	36000133	SE Watula Ave	SE Magnolia Ext	SE 17th St	
338	36000133	SE Watula Ave	NE 3rd St	E Silver Springs Blvd	
342	36000133	SE Watula Ave	SE 17th St	S Pine Ave	
20	36000161	Silver Rd	Midway Rd	Oak Rd	
125	36000163	Spring Rd	Pine Rd	Emerald Rd	
284	36090000	SR 19	E Silver Springs Blvd	Juniper Creek	
294	36090000	SR 19	Salt Springs Hwy	Juniper Creek	
293	36090000	SR 19	NE 142nd Pl Rd	Salt Springs Hwy	
292	36090000	SR 19	Putnam County Line	NE 142nd Pl Rd	
285	36090000	SR 19	E Silver Springs Blvd	Lake County Line	
314	36090100	SR 19	S of Juniper Creek		
346	36180000	SR 326	I-75	NW Gainesville Rd	
388	36180000	SR 326	I-75	NW 49th Ave	
347	36180000	SR 326	W of I-75		
348	36180000	SR 326	E of NW Gainesville Rd		
389	36180000	SR 326	NW 44th Ave	I-75	
374	36180001	SR 326	NW 77th St	US 441	
501	36518000	SR 326	W Anthony Rd	NE Jacksonville Rd	
504	36518000	SR 326	NE 36th Ave Rd	NE 58th Ave	
503	36518000	SR 326	NE 25th Ave	NE 36th Ave Rd	
502	36518000	SR 326	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 25th Ave	
499	36518000	SR 326	US 301	W Anthony Rd	
505	36518000	SR 326	NE 58th Ave	E Silver Springs Blvd	
500	36518000	SR 326	W of US 441		
242	36000123	SW 103rd St Rd	SR 200	SW 80th Ave	
243	36000123	SW 103rd St Rd	SW 80th Ave	SW 62nd Ave Rd	
244	36000123	SW 103rd St Rd	SW 62nd Ave Rd	SW 49th Ave	
240	36000050	SW 10th St	S Pine Ave	SW 1st Ave	
398	36100000	SW 10th St	SW Martin Luther King Ave	S Pine Ave	
45	36000121	SW 13th St	SW 33rd Ave	SW 27th Ave	
152	36000124	SW 140th Ave	SW 41st Pl	CR 484	
317	36004000	SW 17th St	SW 19th Ave Rd	S Pine Ave	
318	36004000	SW 17th St	S Pine Ave	SW 1st Ave	
320	36004000	SW 17th St	SW 1st Ave	SE 3rd Ave	
316	36004000	SW 17th St	SW College Rd	SW 19th Ave Rd	
230	36000111	SW 19th Ave Rd	SW 66th St	SW 80th St	
106	36000126	SW 19th Ave Rd	SW 27th Ave	SW 17th St	

	WEIGHTED SCORES			
	GOAL 1	GOAL 2	GOAL 3	GOAL 6
	2.69	12.04	3.93	0.00
	6.50	7.40	1.03	15.00
	7.97	6.07	0.72	15.00
	8.32	7.11	0.45	15.00
	7.02	7.36	0.27	9.00
	3.73	3.44	0.18	0.00
	4.33	2.97	0.18	0.00
	5.37	7.42	0.09	15.00
	4.33	5.75	0.02	0.00
	3.64	3.52	0.01	0.00
	3.29	8.26	4.47	9.00
	2.95	7.75	4.46	3.00
	3.29	2.48	8.03	0.00
	3.03	2.57	4.08	0.00
	2.69	1.81	3.91	0.00
	3.03	1.27	3.91	0.00
	5.03	2.65	3.90	0.00
	8.15	6.00	3.93	0.00
	5.72	2.24	0.89	0.00
	2.60	1.39	4.41	0.00
	2.60	2.75	4.39	0.00
	3.29	2.76	3.96	0.00
	3.29	1.11	3.91	0.00
	2.60	1.39	3.90	0.00
	2.60	1.70	3.91	0.00
	5.37	6.72	1.35	15.00
	3.64	6.97	0.28	0.00
	5.37	3.58	0.06	0.00
	4.33	4.34	0.05	9.00
	3.64	2.47	0.04	0.00
	4.33	4.76	4.58	15.00
	5.11	6.43	0.64	6.00
	3.64	5.76	0.61	0.00
	4.16	5.19	0.42	3.00
	5.11	6.46	0.22	6.00
	4.33	5.94	0.19	0.00
	3.64	3.82	0.04	0.00
	5.63	4.24	0.03	0.00
	4.07	7.93	4.61	6.00
	6.67	8.91	0.76	0.00
	5.29	2.61	0.08	0.00
	2.34	4.88	3.92	0.00
	6.93	6.79	16.28	6.00
	5.72	7.09	3.92	0.00
	3.64	10.11	1.02	0.00
	4.16	8.13	5.02	15.00
	2.17	5.14	4.87	15.00
	2.43	3.70	4.26	15.00
	5.63	6.60	0.70	15.00
	2.60	2.74	0.01	0.00
	2.25	4.87	1.34	9.00

PROJECT ID	ROADWAY	FACILITY	FROM	TO	
270	36000120	SW 1st Ave	SW 10th St	SW 17th St	
46	36000121	SW 20th Ct	SW 27th Ave	SW College Rd	
140	36000003	SW 20th St	SW 60th Ave	I-75	
142	36000003	SW 20th St	I-75	SW 31st Ave	
143	36000003	SW 20th St	SW 31st Ave	SW 27th Ave	
141	36000003	SW 20th St	SW 38th Ave	I-75	
144	36000003	SW 20th St	SW 27th Ave	SW College Rd	
186	36000016	SW 27th Ave	SW 10th St	SW 20th St	
185	36000016	SW 27th Ave	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 10th St	
187	36000016	SW 27th Ave	SW 20th St	SW College Rd	
442	36657000	SW 27th Ave	SW 24th Ave	SW 42nd St	
444	36657000	SW 27th Ave	SW 42nd St	SW 66th St	
441	36657000	SW 27th Ave	SW College Rd	SW 19th Ave Rd	
443	36657000	SW 27th Ave	SW 19th Ave Rd	SW 24th Ave	
446	36657000	SW 27th Ave	S of CR 484		
445	36657000	SW 27th Ave/SW 16th Ave	SW 66th St	CR 484	
283	36000137	SW 31st St	SW 13th St	SW 20th St	
282	36000137	SW 33rd St	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 13th St	
191	36000146	SW 34th St	SW College Rd	SW 27th Ave	
82	36000141	SW 38th Ave	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 20th St	
83	36000141	SW 38th Ave	SW 20th St	SW 40th St	
53	36000138	SW 38th Ct	SW 38th Ct	SW College Rd	
51	36000138	SW 38th St	SW 80th Ave	SW 60th Ave	
52	36000138	SW 40th St	SW 60th Ave	SW College Rd	
60	36000145	SW 42nd St	I-75	SW 27th Ave	
498	36657001	SW 42nd St	SW 27th Ave	SW 10th Ave	
453	36657002	SW 42nd St	SW 10th Ave	SW 7th Ave	
61	36000145	SW 43rd St Rd	SW College Rd	I-75	
146	36000140	SW 49th Ave	SW 103rd St Rd	Marion Oaks Trail	
145	36000140	SW 49th Ave/SW 95th St	SW 60th Ave	SW 103rd St Rd	
127	36000128	SW 60th Ave	SW College Rd	SW 95th St	
126	36000128	SW 60th Ave	N of SW College Rd		
387	36502000	SW 60th Ave	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 20th St	
386	36502000	SW 60th Ave	N of W Silver Springs Blvd		
368	36502001	SW 60th Ave	SW 38th St	SW College Rd	
367	36502001	SW 60th Ave	SW 20th St	SW 38th	
128	36000128	SW 62nd Ave Rd	SW 95th St	SW 103rd St Rd	
345	36000076	SW 66th St	SW 27th Ave	SW 19th Ave Rd	
344	36000076	SW 66th St	I-75	SW 27th Ave	
343	36000076	SW 66th St	SW College Rd	I-75	
273	36000100	SW 80th Ave	SW 38th St	SW 90th St	
272	36000100	SW 80th Ave	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 38th St	
274	36000100	SW 80th Ave	SW 90th St	SR 200	
4	36000170	SW 80th Ave	SW College Rd	SW 103rd St Rd	
3	36000170	SW 80th Ave	N of SW College Rd		
2	36000108	SW 80th St	SW 19th Ave Rd	S Magnolia Ave	
390	36000140	SW 90th St	SW 80th Ave	SW College Rd	
392	36000140	SW 95th St	E of SW 60th Ave		
391	36000140	SW 95th St	SW College Rd	SW 60th Ave	
406	36100000	SW College Rd	SW 43rd St Rd	SW 66th St	
410	36100000	SW College Rd	SW 80th Ave	SW 86th Cir	

	WEIGHTED SCORES			
	GOAL 1	GOAL 2	GOAL 3	GOAL 6
	2.17	1.88	4.11	0.00
	6.93	6.01	4.44	0.00
	3.81	12.32	4.72	21.00
	4.16	9.21	4.50	0.00
	2.69	6.16	4.05	0.00
	4.42	8.20	0.01	0.00
	4.94	3.63	0.00	0.00
	4.68	4.54	1.37	12.00
	7.45	7.02	1.17	12.00
	4.94	3.80	0.44	12.00
	3.47	6.59	4.19	12.00
	4.77	4.92	4.05	0.00
	4.94	4.38	1.21	12.00
	2.25	5.97	0.38	12.00
	2.60	6.17	0.15	0.00
	2.60	8.93	1.14	6.00
	6.24	3.07	4.07	6.00
	3.64	11.75	4.25	0.00
	4.16	4.46	0.15	0.00
	3.81	3.83	8.06	9.00
	3.81	4.94	4.30	0.00
	5.46	8.70	8.01	9.00
	4.33	10.87	4.43	0.00
	6.59	12.95	4.11	6.00
	2.43	5.37	4.16	0.00
	2.17	3.04	3.99	0.00
	1.39	3.93	0.03	0.00
	1.47	5.60	3.97	6.00
	4.68	5.98	4.19	3.00
	1.47	5.20	3.95	0.00
	6.85	8.46	4.07	6.00
	6.24	7.97	3.90	0.00
	2.69	15.60	0.10	0.00
	3.99	6.50	0.00	0.00
	4.16	10.06	4.96	6.00
	2.69	15.65	0.46	0.00
	5.29	5.24	0.07	0.00
	2.60	2.41	0.17	6.00
	2.60	8.42	0.09	0.00
	5.03	8.63	0.05	0.00
	4.68	13.09	4.18	6.00
	3.99	7.45	3.95	6.00
	2.95	7.30	0.35	6.00
	6.67	10.62	0.00	3.00
	5.55	5.20	0.00	0.00
	2.60	4.25	0.33	0.00
	2.95	7.92	0.00	6.00
	1.82	5.20	0.22	0.00
	2.17	5.84	0.01	3.00
	2.69	10.67	15.10	9.00
	5.72	8.74	14.21	9.00

PROJECT ID	ROADWAY	FACILITY	FROM	TO	
411	36100000	SW College Rd	SW 103rd St Rd	CR 484	
407	36100000	SW College Rd	SW 66th St	SW 60th Ave	
399	36100000	SW College Rd	SW Martin Luther King Ave	SW 20th Ct	
408	36100000	SW College Rd	SW 60th Ave	SW 90th St	
404	36100000	SW College Rd	SW 38th Ct	SW 43rd St Rd	
405	36100000	SW College Rd	I-75	SW 38th Ct	
403	36100000	SW College Rd	SW 32nd Ave	I-75	
400	36100000	SW College Rd	SW 20th Ct	SW 20th St	
412	36100000	SW College Rd	CR 484	Citrus County Line	
409	36100000	SW College Rd	SW 95th St Rd	SW 80th Ave	
402	36100000	SW College Rd	SW 27th Ave	SW 32nd Ave	
401	36100000	SW College Rd	SW 20th St	SW 27th Ave	
447	36525000	SW Martin Luther King Ave	SW 17th At	SW 10th St	
161	36140000	US 21	N of CR 315		
130	36070000	US 27	Levy County Line	SR 326	
315	36002000	US 301	US 441	NE Jacksonville Rd	
205	36010000	US 301	SE 80th St	SE 92nd Place Rd	
207	36010000	US 301	SE 95th St	SE 102nd Pl	
206	36010000	US 301	SE 92nd Place Rd	SE 95th St	
210	36010000	US 301	SE 102nd Pl	SE 110th St	
337	36040000	US 301	CR 318	NE 172nd Pl	
245	36040000	US 301	N of NE Jacksonville Rd		
336	36040000	US 301	Alachua County Line	CR 318	
108	36050000	US 301	SE 132nd St Rd	SE 145th St	
107	36050000	US 301	SE Abshier Blvd	SE 132nd St Rd	
111	36050000	US 301	CR 42	SE 180th St	
110	36050000	US 301	SE 147th St	CR 42	
109	36050000	US 301	SE 145th St	SE 147th St	
193	36060000	US 41	SR 40	Powell Rd	
192	36060000	US 41	Levy County Line	SR 40	
194	36060000	US 41	Powell Rd	Pennsylvania Ave	
195	36060000	US 41	Pennsylvania Ave	Citrus County Line	
166	36001000	US 441	NW 70th St	NW 35th St	
170	36001000	US 441	CR 329	NW 70th St	
54	36001000	US 441	NW Gainesville Rd	US 301	
171	36001000	US 441	S of NW 70th St		
196	36030000	US 441	NW 230th St	CR 318	
197	36030000	US 441	CR 318	SR 25 A	
198	36030000	US 441	Access Rd N of Gainesville Rd		
173	36000007	W Anthony Rd	NW 35th St	N Pine Ave	
452	36506500	W Anthony Rd	NE 70th St	NE 35th St	
451	36506500	W Anthony Rd/NE 95th St	NE 95th St	NE 70th St	
99	36000021	W Ft King St	SE Watula Ave	SE 11th Ave	
100	36000021	W Ft King St	SE 11th Ave	SE 22nd Ave	
98	36000021	W Ft King St	SE 1st Ave	SE Watula Ave	
42	36110000	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 27th Ave	NW Martin Luther King Ave	
43	36110000	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW Martin Luther King Ave	SW 9th Ave	
34	36110000	W Silver Springs Blvd	US 41	SW 140th Ave	
35	36110000	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 140th Ave	NW 80th Ave	
41	36110000	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 33rd Ave	SW 27th Ave	
36	36110000	W Silver Springs Blvd	NW 80th Ave	NW 60th Ave	

	WEIGHTED SCORES			
	GOAL 1	GOAL 2	GOAL 3	GOAL 6
	3.73	9.48	13.65	9.00
	3.64	9.53	13.26	9.00
	5.63	5.42	13.12	0.00
	3.64	11.21	13.12	9.00
	1.82	5.71	12.10	9.00
	3.12	6.11	12.03	9.00
	4.42	6.63	10.78	9.00
	5.63	5.84	9.46	9.00
	4.77	8.13	9.35	3.00
	4.25	8.90	8.82	9.00
	6.24	4.71	6.94	15.00
	6.24	4.56	4.98	9.00
	4.33	3.16	3.92	0.00
	3.29	1.10	3.91	0.00
	3.64	1.79	4.09	0.00
	4.33	7.00	10.02	3.00
	4.16	6.83	13.04	18.00
	4.07	7.97	12.19	24.00
	4.07	6.85	11.77	21.00
	3.12	6.98	8.99	18.00
	3.29	7.64	8.53	0.00
	3.29	5.55	7.81	0.00
	3.29	6.61	3.96	0.00
	4.33	7.97	12.58	12.00
	4.77	4.37	10.51	15.00
	5.20	6.94	8.81	12.00
	4.68	8.38	8.58	0.00
	3.81	7.99	8.01	0.00
	3.99	13.56	9.33	12.00
	3.64	4.09	9.18	0.00
	2.77	5.76	8.00	12.00
	2.77	4.47	7.82	12.00
	7.02	5.34	10.17	15.00
	6.76	7.24	6.19	6.00
	6.41	2.09	5.31	3.00
	5.63	3.77	0.00	0.00
	3.73	2.18	9.05	0.00
	5.03	1.63	3.99	0.00
	4.33	2.08	0.00	0.00
	4.51	2.78	3.91	6.00
	4.25	4.68	4.56	0.00
	3.99	3.14	4.11	6.00
	4.16	1.55	8.15	0.00
	3.55	1.40	4.45	0.00
	3.03	3.26	3.90	0.00
	11.44	5.18	12.86	18.00
	8.67	4.42	11.73	18.00
	3.99	11.63	9.64	0.00
	3.99	13.99	9.56	9.00
	6.85	14.85	9.41	15.00
	4.68	13.39	9.26	18.00

PROJECT ID	ROADWAY	FACILITY	FROM	TO	
37	36110000	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 60th Ave	SW 41st Ave	
39	36110000	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 40th Ave	I-75	
40	36110000	W Silver Springs Blvd	I-75	SW 33rd Ave	
38	36110000	W Silver Springs Blvd	NW 40th Ave	SW 40th Ave	
32	36110500	W Silver Springs Blvd	SW 9th Ave	N Pine Ave	

	WEIGHTED SCORES			
	GOAL 1	GOAL 2	GOAL 3	GOAL 6
	6.85	16.97	8.66	21.00
	7.89	6.40	8.42	15.00
	3.99	13.51	8.40	15.00
	6.15	6.00	8.36	12.00
	6.76	4.97	11.77	18.00

PROJECT SCORING MATRIX

Project ID	Facility	From	To	Description	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 5	Goal 6	Goal 1: Travel Choices										Goal 2: Economic Development												
OPS16	SR 40	SW 60th Avenue	SR 35	ITS/Corridor Management	6.8	17.0	8.7	6.1	21.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS34	SR 40	Hwy 328	SW 27th Ave.	ITS/Corridor Management	6.8	17.0	8.7	6.1	21.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT10	SR 200 North Circulator			New Circulator Service	6.8	17.0	8.7	6.1	21.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS13	US 27	SW 27th Avenue	SR 35	ITS/Corridor Management	5.5	16.5	10.6	6.5	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
OPS32	US 301/US 441	SE 165th St.	SR 464	ITS/Corridor Management	5.5	16.5	10.6	6.5	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
OPS8	US 441	US 301	CR 475	ITS/Corridor Management	5.5	16.5	10.6	6.5	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
PT3	Purple Route			Existing Routes expansion (Frequency Improvements)	11.4	5.2	12.9	4.5	18.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
TIP6	I-75 FRAME OFF SYSTEM			ITS Communication System	9.0	5.4	12.3	5.6	18.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS10	US 441	SR 200	CR 25A	ITS/Corridor Management	9.0	5.4	12.3	5.6	18.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT14	South Ocala Circulator			New Circulator Service	4.3	11.5	13.6	5.4	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS42	SR 484	Marion Oaks Course	US 441	ITS/Corridor Management	3.6	14.0	12.3	4.9	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS53	Marion Oaks Blvd	Marion Oaks Blvd	CR 484	Reconfigure intersection	3.6	14.0	12.3	4.9	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT11	SR 200/Marion Oaks Circulator			New Circulator Service	3.6	14.0	12.3	4.9	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS27	SW 20th Street	SW 60th Avenue	I-75	ITS/Corridor Management	3.8	12.3	4.7	7.1	21.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS45	SW 20th St.	NW 60th Ave.	SR 200	ITS/Corridor Management	3.8	12.3	4.7	7.1	21.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS12	US 27	NW 27th Avenue	US 441	ITS/Corridor Management	6.2	14.3	12.1	4.2	12.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT2	Blue Route			Existing Routes expansion (Frequency Improvements)	6.2	14.3	12.1	4.2	12.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT29	Silver Route			Existing Routes expansion (Frequency Improvements)	6.2	14.3	12.1	4.2	12.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS35	SR 40	NE 1st Ave.	SE 25th Ave.	ITS/Corridor Management	3.4	3.9	19.0	5.8	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT1	Green Route			Existing Routes expansion (Frequency Improvements)	3.4	3.9	19.0	5.8	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS2	I-75 (Interchange)	CR 484		Operational Improvements	3.6	18.0	9.0	6.9	9.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS52B	shared park-and-ride lots	CR 484 at I-75		Shared Park-n-Ride lots	3.6	18.0	9.0	6.9	9.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS28	US 27	NW 70th Ave.	I-75	ITS/Corridor Management	8.9	12.9	10.3	5.1	9.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT13	Bellevue Circular			New Circulator Service	2.8	6.1	13.3	5.8	18.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT8	Marion-Ocala Express	Ocala	Marion Oaks	New Express Services	4.4	6.5	17.7	5.2	12.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT9	SR 200/VA	Ocala	SW Marion County	New Local Services	4.4	6.5	17.7	5.2	12.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS7	US 441	SE 132nd Street Rd	US 301	ITS/Corridor Management	4.3	7.8	8.6	6.2	18.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS49	US 41	SW 111th Place Lane	SR 40	ITS/Corridor Management	4.0	13.6	9.3	5.6	12.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
R64	CR 484	SW 49th Avenue	Marion Oaks Pass	Add 2 lanes	5.3	16.5	12.6	10.1	0.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS46	SR 35	Foss Rd		Intersection improvement	3.8	10.6	13.5	4.2	12.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS9	US 441	CR 475	SR 200	ITS/Corridor Management	2.2	5.6	10.0	5.0	21.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
TIP17	US 441	at SR 464		Traffic ops improvement	2.2	5.6	10.0	5.0	21.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS31	SR 200	CR 484	SR 464	ITS/Corridor Management	5.7	8.7	14.2	5.6	9.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS29	SR 40	SR 35	CR 314A	ITS/Corridor Management	3.3	7.0	13.0	10.6	9.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS52A	shared park-and-ride lots	SR200 W of I-75		Shared Park-n-Ride lots	2.7	10.7	15.1	5.4	9.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
R13	SR 40	SW 60th Avenue	I-75	Add 2 lanes	6.8	17.0	8.7	10.4	0.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT4	Orange Route			Existing Routes expansion (Frequency Improvements)	2.9	5.5	11.8	4.7	18.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
R26	CR 484	SW 49th Avenue	SW 20th Avenue Road	Add 2 Lanes	3.6	18.0	9.0	11.5	0.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
R27	CR 484	SW 20th Avenue Road	CR 475A	Add 2 Lanes	3.6	18.0	9.0	11.5	0.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS6	US 301	SE 143rd Place	US 441	ITS/Corridor Management	4.3	8.0	12.6	5.3	12.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
R28	NW 49th Street	NW 80th Avenue	NW 44th Avenue	New 2 Lane	8.9	12.9	10.3	9.8	0.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS33	US 301	NW 35th St.	SR 326	ITS/Corridor Management	7.0	5.3	10.2	4.0	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS56	SR 40 Downtown Operational Imp.	US 441	NE 8th Ave	Pedestrian and traffic ops improvements	3.4	3.4	12.9	6.1	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT32	Downtown Circulator			New Circulator Service	3.7	5.1	13.1	5.9	12.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
R14	SR 40	I-75	SW 27th Avenue	Add 2 lanes	6.8	14.8	9.4	8.6	0.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
TIP11	SR 40	SW 40th Ave	SW 27th Ave	Add turn lanes	6.8	14.8	9.4	8.6	0.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
R5	US 441	CR 42	SE 132nd Street Rd	Add 2 lanes	4.3	11.5	13.6	10.2	0.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS26	CR 464	Midway Rd	Oak Rd	ITS/Corridor Management	7.0	7.9	4.3	4.8	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS37	SR 464	SR 200	Oak Rd	ITS/Corridor Management	7.0	7.9	4.3	4.8	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT5	Red Route			Existing Routes expansion (Frequency Improvements)	7.0	7.9	4.3	4.8	15.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
OPS5	US 301	Sumter County Line	CR 42	ITS/Corridor Management	5.2	6.9	8.8	5.6	12.0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PT6	Yellow Route			Existing Routes expansion (Frequency Improvements)	2.8	8.5	8.0	7.2	12.0	1	2																					

2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN – TECHNICAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS | 35

Project ID	Facility	From	To	Description	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 5	Goal 6	Goal 1: Travel Choices	Goal 2: Ec
OPS14	SR 35	SE 92nd Place Rd	SR 464	ITS/Corridor Management	2.8	10.9	8.2	4.6	12.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS25	CR 464	SR 35	Midway Rd	ITS/Corridor Management	6.5	8.0	4.0	4.6	15.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R12	SR 40	SW 140th Avenue	CR 328	Add 2 lanes	4.0	14.0	9.6	10.5	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R62	NW 37th Ave	SR 40	US 27	New 2 lane	4.4	14.3	9.2	9.8	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R9	US 27	I-75	NW 27th Avenue	Add 2 lanes	4.4	14.3	9.2	9.8	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
PT12	East Ocala Circular			New Circulator Service	5.4	7.4	5.4	4.6	15.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS17	SR 464	SR 200	SR 35	ITS/Corridor Management	5.4	7.4	5.4	4.6	15.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS20	Marion Oaks Manor Ext	Overpass at I-75		New Overpass	3.6	18.0	9.0	6.9	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R10	SR 35	CR 25	SE 92nd Place Rd	Add 2 lanes	3.8	10.6	13.5	9.0	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R3	US 441	Sumter County Line	CR 42	Add 2 lanes	5.6	10.5	10.6	10.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS1	I-75 (Interchange)	SR 40			4.0	13.5	8.4	10.7	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS1	I-75 (Interchange)	SR 40			4.4	12.5	8.9	10.9	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS50	SR 200A	US 301	NE 49th St.	ITS/Corridor Management	8.5	6.3	9.0	3.8	9.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS24	NW/SW 27th Avenue	US 27	NW 35th Street	Corridor Enhancement	10.1	5.3	4.2	4.5	12.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R31	Dunnellon Bypass	CR 40	US 41	New 2 Lane	4.0	13.6	9.3	9.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R53	US 41	SW 111th Place Lane	SR 40	Widen to 4 lanes, multi-use trail	4.0	13.6	9.3	9.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R8	US 27	NW 44th Avenue	I-75	Add 2 lanes	5.5	12.2	7.9	10.5	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS36	E Magnolia Ave/E 1st Ave.	NE 20th St.	SR 200/SE 10th St	ITS/Corridor Management	2.9	3.2	7.9	6.7	15.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R11	SR 40	US 41	SW 140th Avenue	Add 2 lanes	4.0	11.6	9.6	10.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS30	SR 326	I-75	SR 200A	ITS/Corridor Management	4.3	4.8	4.6	6.7	15.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R70	SW 38th St	SW 60th Ave	SW 43rd Ct	Add 2 lanes - after 10 year horizon	6.6	12.9	4.1	5.6	6.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS43	Hwy 42	US 301	US 441	ITS/Corridor Management	5.5	8.5	0.8	5.4	15.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
C3	CR 484	US 41	SW 140th Ave	Corridor Study (capacity, safety)	4.1	9.6	12.6	8.8	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS18	US 41	Citrus County Line	SW 111th Place Ln	ITS/Corridor Management	2.8	5.8	8.0	6.1	12.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS41	SW 42nd St.	SR 200	SR 464	ITS/Corridor Management	1.8	5.7	12.1	5.2	9.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS71	US 27	I-75	NW 27th Ave	Emergency vehicle preemption	4.4	14.3	9.2	5.6	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R66	NW 70th/80th Ave	SW 80th Street	US 27	Widen to four lanes	4.7	13.1	4.2	10.5	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R74	NW 70th/80th Ave	SR 40	US 27	Add 2 lanes	4.7	13.1	4.2	10.5	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R75	SW 70th/80th Ave	SW 90th St	SW 38th St	Add 2 lanes	4.7	13.1	4.2	10.5	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS22	NW/SW 27th Avenue	SW 42nd Street	SR 200	ITS/Corridor Management	3.5	6.6	4.2	6.1	12.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS23	NW/SW 27th Avenue	SR 200	SR 40	ITS/Corridor Management	7.5	7.0	1.2	4.7	12.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R29	NW 60th Avenue	US 27	NW 49th Street	New 2 Lane	5.0	12.8	4.5	9.8	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R65	NW 70th Ave	US 27	NW 43rd St/NW 49th Street	Add 2 lanes	5.0	12.8	4.5	9.8	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS63	NW 27th Ave	US 27	SR 40	Emergency vehicle preemption	7.8	15.6	4.3	4.4	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
C2	CR 484	SR 200	Marion Oaks Tr	Corridor Study (capacity, safety)	7.9	9.6	9.3	5.3	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS48	SR 35	SR 25 (Hames Rd)		Intersection improvement	2.2	6.6	11.8	5.4	6.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R71	CR 484	Marion Oaks Pass	SR 200	Add 2 lanes	7.9	9.6	9.3	5.3	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R2	US 301	CR 42	SE 143rd Place	Add 2 lanes	4.7	8.4	8.6	10.0	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
C4	SR 40	SE 183rd Ave Rd	Lake Co line	Corridor Study (capacity, safety)	2.9	5.2	9.7	13.0	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS65	60th Ave	US 27	SW 95th St	Emergency vehicle preemption	6.8	8.5	4.1	5.4	6.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS65	60th Ave	US 27	SW 95th St	Emergency vehicle preemption	4.2	10.1	5.0	5.5	6.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS59	US 301	SR 326	W Hwy 329	Emergency vehicle preemption	6.8	7.2	6.2	4.5	6.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS15	SR 35	SR 464	SR 40	ITS/Corridor Management	3.3	6.3	4.2	4.8	12.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R32	NE 36th Avenue	NE 14th Street	NE 20th Place	Add 2 Lanes	7.5	9.1	4.5	9.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R61	SW 49th Ave	Marion Oaks Trail	CR 484	New 4-lane	3.6	8.6	7.8	10.0	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS21	SW 95th Street	Interchange at I-75		New Interchange	1.8	8.5	11.8	7.9	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R17	SW 44th Avenue	SR 200	SW 20th Street	New 4 Lane	2.7	15.7	0.5	10.6	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS58	SW 20th St	Interchange at I-75		New Interchange	3.6	8.4	9.7	7.5	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R18	SW 44th Avenue	SW 13th Street	SR 40	Add 2 Lanes	2.7	15.6	0.1	10.6	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS39	NW 35th St.	NW 35th Ave. Rd.	NE 36th Ave.	ITS/Corridor Management	5.3	6.8	3.9	3.8	9.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R60	Marion Oaks Manor	SW 18th Ave Rd	CR 475	New 2 lanes	2.9	7.3	7.9	10.4	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
C8	Oak Rd	Emerald Rd	SE Maricamp Rd	Corridor Study (capacity, goods movement)	6.8	13.0	3.9	4.8	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R43	SW 20th Street	I-75	SR 200	Add 2 Lanes	4.2	9.2	4.5	10.3	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN – **TECHNICAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS** | 37

Project ID	Facility	From	To	Description	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 5	Goal 6	Goal 1: Travel Choices	Goal 2: Economic Development
R1	SR 200	Citrus County Line	CR 484	Add 2 Lanes	4.8	8.1	9.3	5.8	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R19	SW 44th Avenue	SR 40	NW 10th Street	New 4 Lane	6.6	5.8	3.9	11.7	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS69	CR 42	US 441	Ocala Rd	Emergency vehicle preemption	4.9	11.8	4.8	6.4	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R73	CR 42	US 441	CR 25	Add 2 lanes	4.9	11.8	4.8	6.4	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R72	CR 200A Ph 3	NE 35th St	SR 326	Add 2 lanes	8.5	6.3	9.0	3.8	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS47	SR 35	Robinson Rd		Intersection improvement	3.8	6.8	12.0	4.9	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R46	Lake Weir Avenue	SE 31st Street	SR 464	Add 2 Lanes	6.2	2.7	8.1	10.0	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPSS4	SR 40 - East Multimodal Imp.	NE 49th Terr	NE 60th Ct	Add turn lanes, enhance illumination, ped. Safety	2.8	8.5	8.0	7.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS62	NE 36th Ave	NE 35th St	SR 40	Emergency vehicle preemption	7.5	9.1	4.5	4.7	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
TIP8	NE 36TH AVENUE	NE 20th PI	N of NE 25th St	Construct grade separation over CSX 'S'-line.	7.5	9.1	4.5	4.7	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R41	CR 25	SR 35	SE 92nd Loop	Add 2 Lanes	4.9	9.9	0.9	10.0	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R42	CR 25	SE 92nd Loop	SE 108th Terrace Rd	Add 2 Lanes	4.9	9.9	0.9	10.0	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R68	CR 484	SW 145th (approximate)	New access road to future commerce park	Marion County Comp Plan	3.6	7.5	4.5	10.0	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R16	NW 49th Street Ext.	NW 44th Avenue	NW 35th Avenue	New 4 Lane	5.8	10.2	0.3	9.3	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R30	NW 44th Avenue	NW 60th Street	SR 326	Add 2 Lanes	5.8	10.2	0.3	9.3	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R40	Emerald Road Extension	SE 92nd Loop	Emerald Rd	New 2 Lane	3.6	7.9	4.0	9.9	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS38	SE 36th St.	SR 464	SR 40	ITS/Corridor Management	4.5	2.0	4.4	5.4	9.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
C6	CR 316	CR 315	NE 148th Terr Rd	Corridor Study (capacity, safety)	3.6	5.5	7.9	7.9	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R20	SW 49th Ave	SW 95th Street	Marion Oaks Trail	Add 2 Lanes	4.7	6.0	4.2	10.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R69	SW 38th St	SW 80th Ave	SW 60th Ave	Add 2 lanes - 10 year horizon	4.3	10.9	4.4	5.4	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R76	SW 49th Ave	Marion Oaks Manor	SW 142nd PI Rd	New 4 Lane	4.7	6.0	4.2	10.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS70	Maricamp Rd	Oak Rd	SE 108th Terrace Rd	Emergency vehicle preemption	3.7	11.2	4.3	5.1	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS60	US 492	US 301	SR 40	Emergency vehicle preemption	5.3	3.0	4.1	5.7	6.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R48	CR 475A	SW 66th Street	SW 42nd Street	Add 2 Lanes	4.8	4.9	4.0	10.3	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS64	SW 20th St	I-75	SR 200	Emergency vehicle preemption	4.2	9.2	4.5	5.9	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R39	NE 35th Street	NE 25th Avenue	NE 36th Avenue	Add 2 Lanes	5.9	4.5	4.9	8.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R36	NE 35th Street	W Anthony Rd	CR 200A	Add 2 Lanes	6.9	4.4	4.0	8.1	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS67	SW 49th Ave	SW 95th St	CR 484	Emergency vehicle preemption	4.7	6.0	4.2	5.5	3.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
C1	NW 35th Ave.	NW 49th St	NW 63rd St	Corridor Study (new 4 lane)	4.3	6.1	2.1	10.8	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R15	US 41	SR 40	Levy County Line	Add 2 lanes, multi-use trail	3.6	4.1	9.2	6.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS61	25th Ave	NE 35th St	SR 464	Emergency vehicle preemption	4.7	4.3	4.3	3.9	6.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R34	NE 25th Avenue	NE 14th Street	NE 24th Street	Add 2 Lanes	6.7	7.3	0.3	8.6	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
C7	SE Sunset Harbor Rd	SE 100th Ave	CR 25	Corridor Study (capacity, safety)	3.3	8.3	4.5	6.3	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS44	SW 27th Ave/SW 19th AveRoad	SW 42nd St.	SR 464	ITS/Corridor Management	2.3	4.9	1.3	4.4	9.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R38	NE 35th Street	CR 200A	NE 25th Avenue	Add 2 Lanes	5.6	3.6	4.2	8.3	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R35	NE 25th Avenue	24th Street	NE 35th Street	Add 2 Lanes	4.7	4.3	4.3	8.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R47	SE 17th Street	SE 44th Avenue	SE 47th Avenue	New 2 Lane	3.2	5.1	4.5	8.5	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R7	SR 326	CR 200A	NE 36th Avenue	Add 2 lanes	5.1	6.5	0.2	9.3	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R25	SW 95th Street	I-75	CR 475A	New 4 Lane	2.6	8.4	0.1	9.9	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R63	SW 40th Ave Realignment			Add 2 lanes	1.5	5.6	4.0	9.8	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R24	SW 95th Street	SW 60th Avenue	I-75	Add 2 Lanes	1.5	5.2	3.9	10.1	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R50	NE 35th St/NE 60th Ct	NE 36th Ave	SR 40	Add 2 lanes	4.3	5.6	0.1	10.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R67	Marion Oaks Manor	Marion Oaks Blvd	Marion Oaks Dr	Complete EB lanes	4.0	5.7	0.0	10.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R44	SE 92nd Place Rd	US 441	SR 35	Add 2 Lanes	3.5	4.1	3.9	8.3	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS57	NE 8th Ave	SR 40	SR 492	Remove 2 lanes, add multimodal enhancements	4.8	0.9	7.8	5.3	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
R33	NE 36th Avenue	NE 25th Street	NE 35th Street	Add 2 Lanes	4.7	5.8	0.0	8.3	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
C5	NE Jacksonville Rd	NE 49th St	SR 326	Corridor Study (safety, equity, multimodal)	5.6	3.0	4.5	4.1	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS68	SE 132nd St	CR 484	US 441	Emergency vehicle preemption	4.2	7.1	0.5	5.2	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
OPS66	SW 95th St	SW 60th Avenue	SW 49th Ave	Emergency vehicle preemption	1.5	5.2	3.9	5.4	0.0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN - **TECHNICAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS** | 39

TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL SUMMARY


The Central Florida Regional Planning Model (CFRPM) was used to inform evaluation criteria for objectives 2.3 and 3.3, which deal with traffic congestion reduction and improving mobility on evacuation routes, respectively. In addition to the volume/capacity ratio data used for those evaluation criteria, the following table summarizes model results for the base year and cost feasible plan, in terms of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), vehicle hours of travel (VHT), and volume to capacity ratio (V/C) and the maps depict V/C for the base year and 2045 cost feasible scenarios.

MODEL MEASURES		2015	2045
Vehicle Miles Traveled (Daily)		11,249,261	14,453,229
Vehicle Hours Traveled (Daily)		244,735	360,209
VC Ratio (based on LOS C capacity)	1: Rural - Interstate	0.55	0.68
	11: Urban - Interstate	0.65	0.76
	12: Urban - Freeway/Expressway	0.26	0.25
	14: Urban - Principal Arterial	0.77	0.87
	16: Urban - Minor Arterial	0.64	0.74
	17: Urban - Major Collector	0.45	0.52
	18: Urban - Minor Collector	0.41	0.52
	19: Urban - Local	0.23	0.30
	4: Rural - Principal Arterial	0.44	0.49
	6: Rural - Minor Arterial	0.56	0.69
	7: Rural - Major Collector	0.52	0.59
	8: Rural - Minor Collector	0.45	0.54
	9: Rural - Local	0.22	0.35

**2015 PM Peak
Volume/Capacity (LOS
C conditions)**

Base Year (2015)

- >1.00
- 0.90 - 0.99
- 0.80 - 0.89
- 0.70 - 0.79
- <0.70



**Projected 2045 PM Peak
Volume/Capacity (LOS
C conditions)**

Cost Feasible Plan

- >1.00
- 0.90 - 0.99
- 0.80 - 0.89
- 0.70 - 0.79
- <0.70

