May 15, 2013

TO: Citizens and Technical Advisory Committees
FROM: Marlie Sanderson, Director of Transportation Planning
SUBJECT: Meeting Announcement and Agenda

On Wednesday, May 22, 2013, the Technical Advisory Committee will meet at 2:00 p.m. in the Gainesville Regional Utilities (GRU) General Purpose Meeting Room, 301 SE 4th Avenue. Also on Wednesday, May 22, 2013, the Citizens Advisory Committee will meet at 7:00 p.m. in the Grace Knight Conference Room, Alachua County Administration Building 12 SE 1st Street. Times shown on this agenda are for the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting.

I. Introductions (if needed)*

II. Approval of Meeting Agenda

III. Approval of Committee Minutes

IV. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

V. SW 34th Street at Archer Road Intersection-Southbound Right-Turn Movement

VI. List of Priority Projects- 2013

The MTPO must approve all projects in the TIP that contain federal funds (other projects are included for information only)

PDOT District 2 staff will discuss a draft report prepared for this intersection movement.

Each year, the MTPO approves priority lists of needed projects that are eligible to be funded with federal and/or state funds

Dedicated to improving the quality of life of the Region's citizens, by coordinating growth management, protecting regional resources, promoting economic development and providing technical services to local governments.
VII. SW 8th Avenue Multi-Use Path  
APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION

County staff will discuss 60 percent design plans for this project.

VIII. Citizens Advisory Committee- Vacant Positions  
NO ACTION REQUIRED

CAC ONLY

The Chair wants to discuss the MTPO’s new policy to advertise and fill all vacant CAC positions as they occur and to eliminate the “CAC Designate” positions.

IX. Updated Bylaws  
APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION

TAC ONLY

The currently adopted bylaws are out of date and need to be updated.

X. Year 2040 Population Projections  
APPROVE PROJECTIONS

TAC ONLY

Draft Year 2040 projections have been developed for Alachua County municipalities and the unincorporated area.

XI. Transportation Alternative Projects  
NO ACTION REQUIRED

TAC ONLY

Next year, project applications will be due around the end of November.

XII. Election of Officers  
ELECT CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

TAC ONLY

Each year, the Committee elects a Chair and Vice-Chair.

XIII. Information Items

The following materials are for your information only and are not scheduled to be discussed unless otherwise requested.

A. CAC and TAC Attendance Records
B. Meeting Calendar- 2013
C. FDOT Letter dated March 18, 2013- Main Street Transfer

*No handout included with the enclosed agenda matter
At 2:20 p.m., Mr. Marlie Sanderson, Director of Transportation Planning, asked the TAC members present if they wanted to hear the presentations and see if a quorum would occur or cancel the meeting.

It was a consensus of the TAC members present to hear the presentations and see if a quorum would occur.

Mr. Sanderson recommended deferring taking action on the Hull Road Right-of-Way Width until Ms. Linda Dixon was present.

IV. ARCHER BRAID TRAIL- 60 PERCENT PLANS

Mr. Sanderson stated that Alachua County has submitted 60 percent plans for the Archer Braid Trail.

Mr. Chris Zeigler, Alachua County Senior Engineering Technician, discussed the plans and answered questions. He noted that the plans were modified by the Alachua County Board of County Commissioners at its January 22, 2013 meeting.

VI. YEAR 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE-REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ)

VII. YEAR 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE-SCOPE OF SERVICES

Mr. Sanderson stated that the draft Year 2040 RFQ and Long Range Transportation Plan Scope of Services is completed. He asked if there were any questions regarding the draft RFQ and the draft scope-of-services.

Vice Chair Hays discussed his concern regarding how the Scope addressed separation of Bus Rapid Transit, premium bus, bicycle and pedestrian modes.
VIII. PLANNING AREA BOUNDARY, VOTING MEMBERS AND VOTING PROCEDURE

Mr. Sanderson stated that the MTPO, at its December meeting, authorized its staff to prepare a report concerning the advantages and disadvantages of expanding the metropolitan planning area boundary to include all of Alachua County, including corresponding changes that would be needed to existing membership and voting procedures. He discussed the alternatives and answered questions.

V. HULL ROAD EXTENSION - RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDTH

Mr. Sanderson stated that representatives of N.P. International have requested an opportunity to present the Village Point project.

Mr. Gerry Dedenbach, Causseaux, Hewett & Wapole Director of Planning & GIS Services, gave a presentation of the Village Point project and answered questions.

Mr. Sanderson noted a quorum was present.

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Hays called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

V. HULL ROAD EXTENSION - RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDTH (Continued)

Mr. Dedenbach continued discussion of the Village Point project and answered questions.

MOTION: Linda Dixon moved to recommend that the MTPO approve the Hull Road Extension right-of-way width be reduced from 100 feet to 90 feet within the Village Point Project. Dean Mimms seconded; motion passed unanimously.

IV. ARCHER BRAID TRAIL - 60 PERCENT PLANS (Continued)

Mr. Sanderson asked for a motion on the Archer Braid Trail 60 percent Design Plans.

MOTION: Chris Zeigler moved to recommend that the MTPO approve the Archer Braid Trail 60 Percent Plans as modified by the Alachua County Board of County Commissioners at its January 22, 2013 meeting. Dean Mimms seconded, motion passed unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MINUTES

Vice Chair Hays asked for approval of the TAC meeting minutes.

MOTION: Dean Mimms moved to approve the November 28, 2012 TAC minutes. Chris Zeigler seconded; motion passed unanimously
VII. YEAR 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE-SCOPE OF SERVICES

Mr. Sanderson asked for a motion on the draft Scope of Services.

MOTION: Mike Iguina moved to recommend that the MTPO approve the Year 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Scope of Services. Chris Zeigler seconded, motion passed unanimously.

VI. YEAR 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE-REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ) (Continued)

Mr. Sanderson asked for a motion on the draft Request for Qualifications.

MOTION: Chris Zeigler moved to recommend that the MTPO approve the Year 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan update Request for Qualifications. Mike Iguina seconded, motion passed unanimously.

VIII. PLANNING AREA BOUNDARY, VOTING MEMBERS AND VOTING PROCEDURE (Continued)

Mr. Sanderson asked for a motion on the Planning Area Boundary, Voting Membership and Procedure.

It was a consensus of the TAC to not have a recommendation.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

Date

Jeff Hays, Vice Chair
CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Rob Brinkman called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

Vice Chair Brinkman introduced himself and asked others to introduce themselves.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MEETING AGENDA

Mr. Marlie Sanderson, Director of Transportation Planning, asked that the agenda be approved amended to delete item IV. SW 30th Avenue Interstate Overpass.

MOTION: Ruth Steiner moved to approve the meeting agenda amended to delete item IV. SW 30th Avenue Interstate Overpass. James Samec seconded; motion passed unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MINUTES

Chair Frentzen asked for approval of the CAC meeting minutes.

MOTION: James Samec moved to approve the January 23, 2013 CAC minutes. Ruth Steiner seconded; motion passed unanimously.
V. STATE ROAD 226 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT (TSM) PROJECT-
60 PERCENT PLANS

Mr. Sanderson stated that the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has submitted 60 percent
plans for the SE 16th Avenue TSM project to the MTPO for review and comment. He and Ms. Karen
Taulbee, FDOT Transportation Specialist, discussed the Tentative Work Program and answered questions.

MOTION: Ruth Steiner moved to recommend that the MTPO approve the State Road 226
Transportation System Management 60 Percent Plans with a request to try and improve
the line-of-sight for northbound traffic on Main Street using the slip lane to go eastbound
on SE 16th Avenue and make corresponding adjustments to the slip lane pedestrian
crossing to maximize pedestrian safety. Melinda Koken seconded, motion passed
unanimously.

VI. TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES APPLICATIONS

Mr. Sanderson stated that the FDOT has requested that two Transportation Alternatives Project (TAP)
Applications be submitted. He discussed the proposed TAPs and answered questions.

MOTION: Ruth Steiner moved to recommend that the MTPO approve the submission of
Transportation Alternatives Project applications for the NW 45th Avenue sidewalk from
NW 13th Street to NW 6th Street and the SW 27th Street/SW 40th Place/SW 25th
Terrace sidewalk from SW 35th Terrace to Williston Road. James Samec seconded,
motion passed unanimously.

X. CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE- VACANT POSITIONS

Mr. Sanderson noted that Chair Frentzen wanted to discuss the former CAC Designate positions.

It was a consensus of the CAC to defer this topic to a meeting attended by Chair Frentzen.

XI. INFORMATION ITEMS

There was no discussion of the information items.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

Date Jan Frentzen, Chair

CAC MINUTES
February 20, 2013
May 15, 2013

TO: Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area

FROM: Marlie Sanderson, AICP, Director of Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Transportation Improvement Program

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend approval of the Fiscal Years 2013-14 - 2017-18 Transportation Improvement Program.

BACKGROUND

Enclosed please find a draft copy of the Fiscal Years 2013-14 - 2017-18 Transportation Improvement Program. The Transportation Improvement Program is a staged implementation program of transportation projects consistent, to the maximum extent feasible, with adopted comprehensive plans of Alachua County and the City of Gainesville.

Exhibit 1 is a copy of the advertisement that appeared in the Gainesville Guardian and Gainesville Sun on Thursday, May 9, 2012 and in The Independent Florida Alligator on Tuesday, May 14, 2012. A full color copy of the draft Transportation Improvement Program may be viewed at the following website:


Authorization of Funds

The Transportation Improvement Program is the most important document that is approved annually by the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area. In order for federal transportation funds to be spent in the Gainesville Metropolitan Area, they must be approved by the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area and included in this document.

Approval of the Transportation Improvement Program authorizes about $26 million in federal funds for Fiscal Year 2013/14. Of this $26 million, about $17 million are for Regional Transit System projects.
COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION MEETING
June 3, 2013 at 5:00 p.m.
Jack Durrance Auditorium, County Administration Building,
12 SE 1ST STREET, GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

PURPOSE: The Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area has scheduled a public meeting to receive input concerning the proposed Transportation Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2013-14 to 2017-18. The Transportation Improvement Program is a staged implementation program of transportation projects consistent, to the maximum extent feasible, with the Alachua County and City of Gainesville comprehensive plans.

Projects in the proposed Transportation Improvement Program are also consistent with the Gainesville Metropolitan Area Year 2035 Transportation Plan-The Livable Community Reinvestment Plan. This plan identifies transportation system modifications expected to be needed to serve projected volumes and patterns of traffic through the Year 2035. A final decision regarding all projects contained in the Transportation Improvement Program will be forwarded to the Florida Department of Transportation by the adoption of this Transportation Improvement Program document.

The Federal Obligations Report is included in Appendix B of the Transportation Improvement Program. This Report shows the expenditure of federal funds within the Gainesville Metropolitan Area from October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012.

This map only shows some of the transportation projects scheduled during the next five years. The proposed Transportation Improvement Program includes transportation projects such as: bicycle, pedestrian, project development and environmental studies; resurfacing/repaving; school safety concern; transportation enhancement; and transit projects, including transportation disadvantaged projects.

THE MEETING ROOM WILL BE OPEN AT 4:30 PM FOR THE PUBLIC TO REVIEW THE PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND STAFF WILL BE PRESENT TO ANSWER QUESTIONS.

Copies of the meeting agenda and more detailed information concerning the Federal Obligations Report and proposed Transportation Improvement Program can be obtained by writing to the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area, c/o North Central Florida Regional Planning Council, 2006 NW 67th Place, Gainesville, Florida 32653, by appearing in person at the above address during business hours, at the www.ncfrpc.org/mtpo website, or by calling 352.955.2200. All persons are advised that, if they decide to contest any decision made at this public meeting, they will need a record of the proceedings and, 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 it is to be based. All interested persons are invited to attend and be heard. Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, religious status, disability, familial status or gender identity. Persons who require special accommodations under the American with Disabilities Act, or persons who require translation services (free of charge), should contact Mr. Marlie Sanderson at 352.955.2200, extension 103, at least seven (7) days before the public meeting.

The Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area consists of the Gainesville City Commission, the Alachua County Commission and nonvoting advisors of the University of Florida, the Florida Department of Transportation and the Alachua County League of Cities. The Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area is responsible for the continuing, comprehensive and cooperative urban transportation planning program for the Gainesville Metropolitan Area. This planning program is required in order to receive federal and state funds for transportation projects.
May 15, 2013

TO: Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area

FROM: Marjie Sanderson, AICP, Director of Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Archer Road at SW 34th Street Intersection Modifications

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Recommend approval of the Exhibit 2 Conclusion (page 22).

BACKGROUND

On June 4, 2012, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area approved Table 12A Traffic Operations Priorities for the State Highway System (enclosed as Exhibit 1) with one revision to project priority number 4. This revision revised the project description from “Add right turnlanes” to “enhance right turn movement accommodation, such as the accommodation at the SW 34th Street at SW 20th Avenue intersection.” The issue that caused this revision was concern about adding additional lanes to an intersection that is already difficult for pedestrians to cross.

Figure 1- Archer Road at SW 34th Street (southbound)
During this discussion, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area approved a motion to:

"request that appropriate staff present at a future meeting possible modifications to accommodate right turn movements at the Archer Road at SW 34th Street intersection."

Figure 2- SW 34th Street at SW 20th Avenue (southbound)

Traffic Operations Study

Enclosed as Exhibit 2 is a study prepared by the Florida Department of Transportation District 2 entitled District Wide Traffic Operations Studies Project- Task Order Number: 2- SR 24 (SW Archer Road) at SR 121 (SW 34th Street)- Gainesville Florida.
## Table 12A
Traffic Operations Priorities - State Highway System Only
Fiscal Years 2013-14 to 2017-18
(within the Gainesville Metropolitan Area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Newberry Road [SR 26]</td>
<td>AT: NW 76 Street</td>
<td>Reconstruction of traffic signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University Avenue [SR 26]</td>
<td>AT: Hawthorne Road [SR 20]</td>
<td>Reconstruction of traffic signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Newberry Road [SR 26]</td>
<td>FM: Ft Clarke Boulevard</td>
<td>Corridor study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SW 34 Street [SR 121]</td>
<td>AT: Archer Road [SR 24]</td>
<td>Enhance right turn movement accommodation, such as the accommodation at the SW 34 Street at SW 20 Avenue intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NW 13 Street [US 441]</td>
<td>FM: 2100 block TO: 2200 block</td>
<td>Access management and pedestrian refuge islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Partially Funded*</td>
<td>SW 13 Street [US 441]</td>
<td>Signal reconstruction and retaining wall modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Partially Funded</td>
<td>SW 34 Street [SR 121]</td>
<td>Extend southbound left turn lane; install northbound right exclusive right turn lane variable message board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SW 34 Street [SR 121]</td>
<td>AT: Radio Road AT: SW 20 Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic signal replacement to address structural deficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hawthorne Road [SR 20]</td>
<td>AT: SE 43rd Street</td>
<td>Intersection modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Williston Road [SR 121]</td>
<td>AT: SW 62nd Avenue</td>
<td>Intersection modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Partially Funded</td>
<td>Archer Road [SR 24]</td>
<td>Traffic signal replacement to address structural deficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TECHNICAL REPORT

District Wide Traffic Operations Studies Project

Contract Number: C9851
Financial Identification Numbers: 432429-1-12-01, 432429-2-12-01, 432429-3-12-01

Task Work Order Number: 2
SR 24 (SW Archer Road) at SR 121 (SW 34th Street) – Gainesville, Florida

Prepared for:
FDOT, District 2

Prepared by:
Prosser Hallock

Under Contract to:
ETM

Submitted by: Fred Kyle, PE, PTOE
Florida PE No. 40360
May 2013
PROSSER HALLOCK, INC. (PH) under contract to ENGLAND-THIMS & MILLER, INC. (ETM) was tasked by the Florida Department of Transportation with analyzing the intersection of SR 24 (SW Archer Road) and SR 121 (SW 34th Street) in Gainesville, Florida, and providing recommendations to improve traffic flow for motorists at this intersection. The intersection of SR 121 and Windmeadows Boulevard was also included in the study area because of its close proximity to the subject intersection. The focus of this task was to examine the request of the Gainesville Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization (MTPO) to “Enhance the right turn movement accommodation, such as the accommodation at the SW 34th St. at SW 20th St. intersection.” Although the focus of this study was the north approach right turn movement, other capacity/operational improvements at this intersection were also identified and analyzed.

Currently, the intersection of SR 24/SW Archer Road and SR 121/SW 34th Street is a signalized intersection with three through lanes and two left turn lanes on each approach. In addition, right turn channelization islands exist for the right turn movements on SR 24. The signalization at these intersections includes fully protected left turn phases that either lead or lag the through movements by time-of-day.

Currently, speed limits of 45 mph exist on both roadways.
The intersection of SR 121 and Windmeadows Boulevard is approximately 550 feet north of the SR 24 intersection. This "tee" intersection is also signalized. SR 121 has three lanes in each direction with a short left turn lane on the south approach for vehicles turning on Windmeadows Boulevard. Windmeadows Boulevard is a basic two lane road that widens to provide three approach lanes at the intersection – two left turn lanes and a single right turn lane. The speed limit on Windmeadows Boulevard is 25 mph.

As can be seen from these aerial pictures, the land uses around these two intersections is primarily retail commercial. A large shopping center with several out parcels is located on the northwest quadrant of the SR 24/SR 121 intersection. Smaller individual retail businesses and small strip retail centers occupy the other three quadrants. In addition, several large multi-family residential developments are in close proximity to these intersections. Windmeadows Boulevard provides a back access to this large shopping center, as well as access to several of the multi-family developments. The University of Florida campus is north and east of these intersections.

The traffic signals at these two intersections are part of large coordinated signal systems on SR 24 and on SR 121. The SR 24/SR 121 intersection is the critical intersection in both of these systems. The traffic signal at Windmeadows Boulevard is cross-coordinated with the SR 24 intersection to provide coordinated operation on SR 121.

Figure 1 provides an overall view of the study area including the large retail commercial center in the northwest quadrant of the SR 24/SR 121 intersection.
ETM was asked by the Department to identify improvements to the intersection that would improve traffic flow in the area. Of particular interest was the MTPO's request to enhance the right turn movement by converting the through/right lane on the north approach of the SR 24/SR 121 intersection to an exclusive right turn lane either full time or by time-of-day. Although the primary focus of this study was the north approach right turn movement, other potential intersection improvements were also studied.

DATA COLLECTION:

Turning movement counts were made at both intersections. These counts, copies of which are included in the Appendix, were made from 7:00 A.M. to 9:00 A.M., 12:00 P.M. to 2:00 P.M., and 3:00 P.M. to 7:00 P.M. on January 29, 2013. Copies of the turning movement counts are included in the Appendix.

Traffic signal timing data for both intersections was obtained from the City of Gainesville Traffic Management Center. The timing data not only included phase split times for the various traffic
plans in effect at these intersections, but the phase sequencing as well. This is critically important
because the left turn movements at both intersections lead or lag the through movements based on
the specific timing plan in effect. The traffic volume data and signal timing data were used as inputs
into the Synchro/SimTraffic software package. The Synchro/SimTraffic results were then used to
compare Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) for each considered alternative. Copies of the signal
timing sheets are also included in the Appendix. Figures 2, 3, and 4 provide a graphical
representation of the A.M., Mid-day, and P.M. peak hour volumes used in this analysis.

The FDOT provided all of the Long Form Crashes found in the CAR database for the study area from
1/1/09 through 12/31/11. Most of the collisions centered around the two signalized intersections of
SR 24/SR 121 and SR 121/Windmeadows. Figure 5 is a collision diagram showing the various
collision types and the locations. Collision summaries are provided in the Appendix.
The following is a summary of the reported collisions:

SR 24 / SR 121 Intersection – There were 147 total Long Form collisions found in the CAR database.
There were 112 property damage only collisions. Thirty five collisions involved injuries resulting in
47 injuries. There were no reported fatalities. A majority of the collisions were rear-end or
sideswipe collisions. Rear end collisions accounted for 101 (69%) of the total collisions and 40 (85%)
of the injuries. Sideswipe collisions accounted for 24 (16%) of the total collisions and 3 (10%) of the
injuries. There was one collision involving a bicycle and no pedestrian collisions were reported.
There were 112 (76%) collisions during the day and 35 (24%) at night. The roadway was reported
dry for 127 (86%) and wet for 20 (14%) of the collisions.

SR 121 / Windmeadows – There were 59 total Long Form collisions found in the CAR database, of
which 38 were property damage only collisions, and 21 collisions involved injuries resulting in 28
injuries. There were no reported fatalities. A majority of collisions were either rear-end, sideswipe,
right angle, or left turn collisions. Rear end collisions accounted for 26 (44%) of the total collisions
and 14 (24%) of the injuries. Sideswipe collisions accounted for 10 (18%) of the total collisions and 3
(4%) of the injuries. Right angle collisions accounted for 13 (22%) of the total collisions and 4 (14%)
of the injuries. Left turn collisions accounted for 6 (10%) of the total collisions and 6 (21%) of the
injuries. There was one collision involving a bicycle and one pedestrian collision was reported.
There were 45 (76%) collisions during the day and 12 (24%) at night. The roadway was reported
dry for 48 (81%) and wet for 11 (19%) of the collisions.

Driveways in the area – There are numerous driveways within approximately 1,000 feet of the
signalized intersection where collisions were reported that appear to be related to delays at the
signalized intersections. There were 10 total Long Form collisions found in the CAR database that
appear to be related to the signalized intersections. There were seven property damage only
collisions. Three collisions involved injuries, resulting in a total of 4 injuries. There were no reported
fatalities. The majority of collisions were right angle or sideswipe collisions. Right angle collisions
accounted for 5 (50%) of the total collisions and 2 (50%) of the injuries. Sideswipe collisions
accounted for 2 (20%) of the total collisions and no injuries. There was one collision involving a
pedestrian and no bicycle collisions were reported. There were 7 (70%) collisions during the day
and 3 (30%) at night. The roadway was reported dry for all 10 (100%) and wet for none of the
collisions.
- COLLISION DIAGRAM NUMBERS INDICATE AT FAULT DRIVER AND NUMBER OF COLLISIONS OF SIMILAR TYPE DUE TO SPACE CONSTRAINTS. SOME COLLISIONS HAVE MORE THAN ONE NUMBER - THESE INDICATE DIFFERENT AT FAULT DRIVERS WITH SAME TURNING MOVEMENTS.
- COLLISION LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE.
- MORE DETAIL MAY BE OBTAINED IN THE SUMMARY SHEETS; SHEETS ARE ORGANIZED BY INTERSECTION AND DIRECTION OF TRAVEL.
Summary of all collisions – There were 216 total Long Form collisions found in the CAR database. One hundred fifty-seven of these collisions were property damage only. Fifty-nine collisions involved injuries, with a total of 79 injuries. There were no reported fatalities. A majority of the collisions were rear end or sideswipe collisions. Rear end collisions accounted for 129 (60%) of the total collisions and 56 (71%) of the injuries. Sideswipe collisions accounted for 34 (16%) of the total collisions and 6 (8%) of the injuries. There were two collisions involving a bicycle and two pedestrian collisions reported. There were 164 (76%) collisions during the day and 52 (24%) at night. The roadway was reported dry for 185 (86%) and wet for 31 (14%) of the collisions.

OBSERVATIONS:

Site visits to observe traffic operations at these intersections were made on February 27 and 28, 2013. Some of the issues observed are as follows:

- Morning peak period
  - north approach left turn queues on SR 121 at SR 24 often extended north of Windmeadows Boulevard
  - west approach through queues on SR 24 extended almost to SW 35th Boulevard, but cleared each signal cycle
  - other movements cleared the intersections each signal cycle
  - pedestrian activity along SR 24 resulted in the possibility of pedestrian calls most cycles

- Mid-day peak period
  - north approach right turn volumes at the SR 24/SR 121 intersection are heavy
  - north approach right turn volumes at the SR 121/Windmeadows intersection are heavy
  - north approach through volumes at both intersections are also heavy
  - the right-in/right-out commercial driveway on SR 121 between Windmeadows and SR 24 that serves the retail commercial development is heavily used with many of the exiting vehicles continuing south on SR 121
  - east approach right turn volumes on SR 24 at SR 121 are heavy
  - pedestrian activity along SR 24 resulted in the possibility of pedestrian calls most cycles

- Afternoon peak period
  - east approach queues on SR 24 extend over 5,000 feet to the east, taking 3-4 cycles to reach the SR 121 intersection
  - north approach through and left turn queues are also heavy, extending north of Windmeadows Boulevard
  - the right-in/right-out commercial driveway on SR 121 between Windmeadows and SR 24 that serves the retail commercial development is heavily used, with most of the vehicles continuing south on SR 121
  - pedestrian activity along SR 24 resulted in the possibility of pedestrian calls most cycles
In the course of traveling to and from the study area, the team also briefly observed the intersection of SW 34th Street and SW 20th Street. These observations were made between 4:30 P.M. and 4:45 P.M.; at a time when the right turn only restriction was in effect. During the brief visit to this intersection we observed a Gainesville Police Department officer parked over the curb near the intersection for the purpose of enforcing the right turn only restriction. Our team was there only a few minutes when a violation occurred and the officer left the scene and was later observed ticketing the offending driver. While the officer was away, a number of violations of the right turn restriction were observed.

ALTERNATIVES:

The focus of this task work order was to investigate the possibility of restriping the outside lane of the north approach of the intersection of SR 24 and SR 121. Currently this lane is striped as a through/right turn lane. As noted in the field observations, and the turning movement counts, the north approach right turn volumes at this intersection are quite heavy from mid-day through the P.M. peak resulting in vehicle queuing in the outside lane. The goal of this study was to determine if converting this lane to a right turn only lane either full time or only during the peak periods will reduce vehicle queues and improve intersection efficiency. Of note, this alternative was analyzed with and without a right turn overlap signal phase.

Constructing a separate right turn lane was also considered. However, in order to construct the right turn lane, additional right-of-way would be needed from the CVS Pharmacy located in the northwest corner of the intersection. It appears that the right-of-way line is located at the back of sidewalk, which is about 8’ from the back of curb. In places, the CVS parking lot is only about 11’ from the back of curb. Therefore, adding a right turn lane would cause the pharmacy to lose several parking places.

In addition, underground utilities such as water (a fire hydrant is located on the corner), underground electric service for the streetlights, and underground phone ducts (as evidenced by a large switch cabinet) are evident just behind the sidewalk. Also, the traffic signal strain pole on this corner supporting the signal span is located in the back of the sidewalk. If a right turn lane is added, this concrete strain pole would need to be relocated resulting in a complete rebuild of the traffic signal.

Due to limited available right-of-way, the possibility of high business-damage costs (resulting from the loss of private property as well as the loss of existing parking spaces), numerous utility conflicts, and the need to replace the existing traffic signal, adding a separate right turn lane was not analyzed further.

Our site observations also revealed that the north approach left turn queues on SR 121 at SR 24 frequently extended beyond the SR 121/Windmeadows Boulevard intersection during the A.M. and P.M. peak periods. As a result, we analyzed the effects of extending one of the southbound left turn lanes north of the Windmeadows Boulevard intersection.
During our site observations and discussions with City of Gainesville Traffic Management Center staff, it became obvious that improvements to the east approach of SR 24 would also be helpful. As mentioned previously, significant queuing occurs during the P.M. peak with queues measuring over 5,000 feet long. Since this approach currently has three through lanes and two left turn lanes, we also analyzed the benefits of adding a dedicated right turn lane at this intersection. Based on our field reviews, it appears that sufficient right-of-way exists to add this additional turn lane to this approach.

Synchro/SimTraffic software was used to develop Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) for comparing the alternatives to the existing conditions. Inputs used in the analysis included the existing traffic volumes and the current traffic signal timing. Since these two intersections are a part of larger coordinated signal systems, new signal timing was not developed. The following alternatives were analyzed:

- **Existing Conditions**
- **Alternate 1**
  - add a right turn lane to the east approach of SR 24,
  - restripe the outside lane of the north approach of SR 121 creating a right turn only lane, resulting in a right turn only lane, two through lanes, and two left turn lanes on this approach, and
  - lengthen one of the north approach left turn lanes to extend north of the Windmeadows intersection.
- **Alternate 2**
  - Includes Alternate 1 options plus a right turn overlap signal phase for the north approach of the SR24/SR 121 intersection.

Figures 6 – 8 provide graphical representations of the analyzed improvements to SR 121 and SR 24.

It should be mentioned that Synchro is a macroscopic model that represents traffic in an aggregate measure for the time period analyzed. SimTraffic is a microscopic model that individually tracks every vehicle through the network during each 0.1 second of simulation. These differences are important when dealing with over-saturated conditions or conditions where queues extend upstream to the next signalized intersection. SimTraffic provides MOEs for every vehicle during the simulation and better reflects the impacts of oversaturation and downstream roadway conditions on driver behavior.

Tables 1, 2, and 3, contain a summary of the key Synchro Measures of Effectiveness using the existing traffic volumes and Tables 4, 5, and 6 contain a summary of the key SimTraffic Measures of Effectiveness. The Synchro and SimTraffic reports are included in the Appendix.

The analysis was performed using traffic volume and signal timing data for the morning peak, the noon or mid-day peak and the afternoon peak. The specific hours of analysis were from 7:30 A.M. – 8:30 A.M., 12:15 P.M. – 1:15 P.M., and 4:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M. These were the hours when the traffic volumes were the highest. The Synchro and SimTraffic results for each time period indicate that while the conversion of the north approach outside lane helps the right turn traffic, the delay and
Table 1
A.M. Peak Synchro Measures of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing Geometry</th>
<th>Alternate 1</th>
<th>Alternate 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Total Delay (sec/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>142.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Mid-day Peak Synchro Measures of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing Geometry</th>
<th>Alternate 1</th>
<th>Alternate 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Total Delay (sec/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
P.M. Peak Synchro Measures of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing Geometry</th>
<th>Alternate 1</th>
<th>Alternate 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Total Delay (sec/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>110.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>135.2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>128.4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (sec/veh)</th>
<th>Total Delay (sec)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (sec/veh)</th>
<th>Total Delay (sec)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (sec/veh)</th>
<th>Total Delay (sec)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (sec/veh)</th>
<th>Total Delay (sec)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (sec/veh)</th>
<th>Total Delay (sec)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (sec/veh)</th>
<th>Total Delay (sec)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>179.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>341.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>317.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>171.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
queues increase for the through traffic. This is to be expected since the number of through lanes is reduced from three lanes to two.

In regards to the implementation of a right turn only restriction by time-of-day, this would typically be done to relieve congestion during the peak periods. Since this study analyzed the effects of a right turn lane during the peak hours, a time-of-day implementation to address peak hour conditions is not recommended for the same reasons as mentioned previously. In addition, time-of-day implementation would require significant enforcement to insure driver compliance.

These results also indicate that there is a benefit to lengthening one of the north approach left turn lanes. These benefits come from providing more queue storage for left turn vehicles so they do not block the through lanes. A benefit also results from the separating the left turn and through vehicles so the vehicle headways are shorter resulting in less delay. These benefits are especially noticeable in the SimTraffic analyses.

FUTURE VOLUMES

A final step in the study included estimating future traffic volumes and comparing the alternatives under future conditions. The FDOT 2011 Florida Transportation Information data disk contains historic data for traffic counts made on SR 24 east and west of SR 121 and on SR 121 north and south of SR 24. Trends analysis software was used to develop traffic volume growth rates to estimate future volumes. The Trends software projected a very minimal or negative growth rate for these volumes; therefore, a 1% growth rate was used to develop future volumes. After discussions with Department staff, a minimum 20-year horizon was chosen for the future analyses. With this guideline, 2035 was chosen as the horizon year. Future volumes were developed and used in the Synchro/SimTraffic analyses. The future analyses also included the development of new traffic signal timing for the two signalized intersections. Copies of the Trends analysis are included in the Appendix.

Since oversaturated conditions currently exist, the future analyses yielded results that are similar to the current volume analysis, just with a difference in magnitude.

Tables 7, 8, and 9 contain the Synchro results with the future volumes and Tables 10, 11, and 12 summarize the results of the SimTraffic future analyses.
### Table 7
#### A.M. Peak Synchro Measures of Effectiveness

**Future Volumes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing Geometry</th>
<th>Alternate 1</th>
<th>Alternate 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Total Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>275.6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>277.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>163.5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>161.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8
#### Mid-day Peak Synchro Measures of Effectiveness

**Future Volumes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing Geometry</th>
<th>Alternate 1</th>
<th>Alternate 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Total Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9
#### P.M. Peak Synchro Measures of Effectiveness

**Future Volumes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Existing Geometry</th>
<th>Alternate 1</th>
<th>Alternate 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Total Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>150.2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>154.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>315.7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>315.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>197.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>179.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>190.7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>109.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>177.9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10: A.M. Peak SimTraffic Measures of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (s/veh)</th>
<th>Existing Geometry</th>
<th>Total Delay (s)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (s/veh)</th>
<th>Total Delay (s)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (s/veh)</th>
<th>Total Delay (s)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>224.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>2528</td>
<td>216.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>233.7</td>
<td>229.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>235.7</td>
<td>229.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11: Mid-day Peak SimTraffic Measures of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (s/veh)</th>
<th>Existing Geometry</th>
<th>Total Delay (s)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (s/veh)</th>
<th>Total Delay (s)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (s/veh)</th>
<th>Total Delay (s)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>371.2</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>2201</td>
<td>143.8</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>143.8</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>143.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12: P.M. Peak SimTraffic Measures of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (s/veh)</th>
<th>Existing Geometry</th>
<th>Total Delay (s)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (s/veh)</th>
<th>Total Delay (s)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Total Delay/Veh (s/veh)</th>
<th>Total Delay (s)</th>
<th>Avg. Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Avg. Queue (ft)</th>
<th>95% Queue (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>284.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>2432</td>
<td>345.0</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>352.6</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>352.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*North Approach queues extend north of Windmeadows Blvd. Delays and queues shown include those for Windmeadows.*
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based on the Synchro analysis, restriping the outside lane of the north approach of SR 121 to only serve right turn movements does not appear to be justified because of negative impacts to other intersection movements. While restriping the north approach will provide a separate right turn lane, the number of through lanes will be reduced from three lanes to two lanes, resulting in a reduction in operational efficiency on this approach.

As shown in Tables 1 and 3, the delay per through vehicle on this approach in the morning peak increases approximately 14%, from 44.8 seconds per vehicle to 51.1 seconds per vehicle. During the afternoon peak this delay increases 17% (94.3 seconds per vehicle to 110.3 seconds per vehicle).

The impacts of implementing a dedicated right-turn lane are also reflected in the SimTraffic micro-simulation results. During the afternoon peak period, the delay to the through vehicles is increased by 65%, from 104.9 seconds to 173.6 seconds. Not only is the delay increased, but the vehicle queues are also increased, from 1028 feet to 1343 feet (31%).

It should be pointed out that providing a separate right turn lane will indeed reduce the delay to right turn traffic since motorists making this movement would have exclusive use of the right lane. The SimTraffic results for the afternoon peak show a reduction in delay from 66.2 seconds per vehicle to 23.7 seconds per vehicle, a 64% reduction.

In addition to the increased delay and vehicle queues for the through movements, modifying the outside lane has other disadvantages. First, during the field observations, a relatively large number of vehicles were observed exiting the right-in/right-out driveway that is located on SR 121 between SR 24 and Windmeadows Boulevard. Most of these vehicles entered the outside lane and proceeded south through the SR 24/SR 121 intersection. If the outside lane becomes a right turn only lane, these vehicles will need to cross the right turn lane in order to enter a through lane, resulting in increased vehicle conflicts.

Second, restriping the outside lane will require the relocation of the existing bicycle lane that exists along SR 121. While FDOT Standard Index 17347 provides guidance to accomplish this transition, cyclists will be required to cross the right turning traffic in order to stay in the bicycle lane.

Finally, implementing this change would disrupt lane continuity on SR 121. The six-lane section of SR 121 begins just north of W. University Avenue, which is about 1 3/4 miles north of SR 24 and continues to SE Williston Road, a distance of approximately 1.6 miles south of SR 24. Converting the outside lane at SR 24 would eliminate lane continuity in the outside lane resulting in numerous lane changes, increasing the number of vehicle conflict points thus, potentially increasing the crash frequency.

As mentioned previously in this report, implementation of a right turn only restriction by time-of-day would typically be done to relieve congestion during the peak periods. Since this study analyzed the effects of a right turn lane during the peak hours, a time-of-day implementation to address peak
hour conditions is not recommended for the same reasons as mentioned previously. In addition, time-of-day implementation would require significant enforcement to insure driver compliance.

In summary, the analysis shows that restriping the north approach of the SR 24/SR 121 intersection to provide a right turn lane and two through lanes either permanently or by time-of-day will slightly reduce the overall north approach delay and the through movement delay during the A.M. and Midday peak periods, but the approach delay and through movement delay is greatly increased during the P.M. peak period. Because the disadvantages of restriping the outside lane outweigh the advantages gained by the right-turn movement, it was determined that this improvement should not be recommended.

In addition to estimating the impacts of restriping the north approach of the SR 24/SR 121 intersection, the Synchro and SimTraffic analyses were used to identify other improvements that might be considered. The greatest improvement to traffic flow is expected to occur with the construction of a right-turn lane on the east approach of SR 24 at the SR 121 intersection. This improvement is expected to substantially reduce the existing queues and delays on the east approach, especially during the P.M. peak period. Lengthening the outside left turn lane on the north approach of SR 121 at the SR 24 intersection will also improve traffic operations at this location by providing additional storage for the left turning vehicles.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS – OPINION OF PROBABLE COSTS:

Conceptual plans highlighting the recommended improvements are provided for the Department’s consideration (please see Figures 6-8). Based on these concepts, it appears a reasonable cost for these improvements is approximately $230,000. This estimate includes $30,000 for project unknowns and a 30% contingency (because these are relatively-small improvements and historical unit-cost prices may not apply). Also, this opinion does not include any right-of-way costs that may be needed (to reconstruct the proposed right-turn radius on the northeast corner). A detailed cost estimate is included in the report’s Appendix.

CONCLUSION:

Based on the Synchro/SimTraffic analyses and our site investigations, restriping the outside lane of the north approach of the SR 24/SR 121 intersection to form a right turn only lane would reduce delay to the right turn movement. However, the delay to the north approach would be increased since the number of through lanes would be reduced from three lanes to two. In addition, the through traffic on this approach is expected to queue beyond the Windmeadows Boulevard intersection.

This study also identified other improvements that could improve traffic operations at the intersection. Constructing a right turn lane on the east approach of SR 24 at the SR 121 intersection will greatly reduce delay and vehicle queues, especially during the afternoon peak when frequently traffic backs up more than a mile in length. In addition, lengthening one of the left turn lanes on the north approach of SR 121 at the same intersection will improve traffic operations by providing additional storage for the vehicles turning left.
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May 15, 2013

TO: Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area

FROM: Marlie Sanderson, AICP, Director of Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: List of Priority Projects

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend approval of the Fiscal Years 2015 to 2019 List of Priority Projects.

BACKGROUND

Each year, the MTPO develops recommended transportation priorities for projects that are needed, but not currently funded. This information is used by the Florida Department of Transportation each fall to develop its Tentative Five Year Work Program.

A full color copy of the draft *List of Priority Projects* can be viewed at the following website link:

May 15, 2013

TO: Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area

FROM: Marlie Sanderson, AICP, Director of Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: SW 8th Avenue Multi-Use Path- 60 Percent Design Plans

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Recommend approval of the SW 8th Avenue Multi-Use Path 60 Percent Design Plans.

BACKGROUND

As noted in the enclosed Exhibit 1, Alachua County Public Works Department staff has requested that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area and its advisory committees review the SW 8th Avenue Multi-Use Path 60 Percent Design Plans. Also enclosed are:

Exhibit 2- SW 8th Avenue Multi-Use Path 60% Design Plans slideshow; and
Exhibit 3- SW 8th Avenue Multi-Use Path 60% Construction Plans.

Enclosures
I'm requesting to place the SW 8th Ave Multi-use path project – 60% design plans on the June 3 MTPO meeting agenda and the sub-committee meeting agendas related to the June 3rd meeting. I will send the plans and powerpoint in separate emails since they are large files; if you do not receive either file, let me know.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Regards,

Brian M. Singleton, E.I.
Transportation Engineering Manager
Alachua County Public Works
5620 NW 120th Lane
Gainesville, FL 32653
352.548.1306 (Desk)
352.260.7830 (Mobile)
352.337.6243 (Fax)
bsingleton@alachuacounty.us

Office Hours: Mon - Thurs, 7:00a to 5:30p
SW 8th Ave
Multi-Use Path
60% Design Plans
June 3, 2013
Project Location
Project Location
Recommendation

- Approve the 60% design plans
- Direct staff to finalize design and proceed with construction bidding
Presentation Outline

- Project Background
- Review of 60% Design Plans
- Estimated Construction Cost
- Schedule
- Recommendation
- Questions & Comments
Project Background

- #2 Priority of Bike/Ped Work Program
- Scope of work: design & construction of an 8 ft wide multi-use path from SW 91st St to SW 122nd St reducing path width to a minimum of 5 ft in constrained areas
  - Approved by BoCC on September 25, 2012
  - Approved by MTPO on October 1, 2012
- Construction is fully funded through the Federal Transportation Enhancement Program via FDOT
Review 60% Plans
Existing Conditions – SW 8th Ave

- ±2 Miles in Length - SW 122nd St to SW 91st St
- 80’ Right-of-Way
- ±30-40’ Pavement Width
- Vegetation & Fences abut R/W Line
- Drainage Swales Both Sides. Poorly Defined in Areas
- Driveways & Side Streets
- Utility Poles
Proposed Conditions – SW 8th Ave

- 8’ Path Located On South Side of Roadway – 2’ Offset from R/W Line
  - Exceptions to 8’ Width:
    - Driveway Crossings and Side Drains
    - Areas with Limited Space Due to Center Turn Lanes
    - Runoff Volume Sensitive Drainage Areas
  - Exceptions to 2’ Offset:
    - Unmovable Obstacles and Utilities
    - Side-Street Crossings (Visibility at Stop Bar)
- Path Never Less than 6’ Wide
Proposed Conditions – SW 8th Ave

- Swale Blocks on North Side of Road Between SW 115th St and SW 105th Ter (±0.6 miles)
  - Purpose:
    • Retain Runoff within Volume Sensitive Drainage Area
    • Hayes Glen Subdivision Flooding From 2004

- Compensatory Stormwater Management Facility
  - Purpose:
    • Retain Runoff within Volume Sensitive Drainage Area
    • Royal Oaks Subdivision Flooding From 2004
Proposed Typical Section
Deviation from 8' Width

- ±1100 LF East of SW 122nd St
- 6' Wide Path to Avoid Utility Pole
- Spans 60'
Deviation from 8’ Width

- ±1300 LF East of SW 122nd St
- 6’ Wide Path Near Driveway Side Drains
- Spans 195’
Deviation from 8’ Width

- Near SW 117th St
- 6’ Wide Path Near Driveway Side Drain
- Spans 77’
Deviation from 8' Width

- SW 115th St to SW 99th St – Balmoral to Willow Bend Subdivisions
- 6' Wide Path
- Spans 5,375'
- Volume Sensitive Drainage Area - Swale Blocks within Northern Swale to Compensate for Increase in Runoff From Path (between Balmoral and Granite Park)
Deviation from 8’ Width

- Between SW 96th St & SW 93th St
- Spans 260’
- 6’ Wide Path Near Driveway Side Drains
Deviation from 8’ Width

- Between SW 96th St & SW 93rd St
- Spans 250’
- 6’ Wide Path Near Driveway Side Drains
Deviation from 8’ Width

- SW 93rd St
- Spans 115’
- 6’ Wide Path Near Driveway Side Drain
Compensatory SMF

- Across From SW 99th St
- Volume Sensitive Drainage Area
- Stores Runoff Upgradient of Flood Prone Area Within Royal Oaks Subdivision
## Construction Cost Estimate

**SW 8th Ave Multi-Use Path Preliminary Opinion of Probable Cost**

### 60% Plans

### $780,000±

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOT Pay Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price ($)</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104 10 3</td>
<td>Sediment Barrier</td>
<td>9,768</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0.68</td>
<td>$6,582.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200 1</td>
<td>Prevention, Control, and Abatement of Erosion and Water Pollution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 1</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>2281</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$7,983.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 4</td>
<td>Subsoil Excavation</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$7.21</td>
<td>$4,326.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 6</td>
<td>Embankment</td>
<td>2472</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$9,888.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 4</td>
<td>12&quot; LERG Stabilization</td>
<td>9,762</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$2.79</td>
<td>$27,066.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285 70 1</td>
<td>4&quot; Limerock (Optional Sub Base Group 1)</td>
<td>8,647</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$9.15</td>
<td>$79,147.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334 7 30</td>
<td>1.5&quot; SP-9 Asphalt Concrete</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$99.33</td>
<td>$41,529.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 1 2</td>
<td>Concrete Class I, Endwall</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$858.66</td>
<td>$8,580.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 1 11</td>
<td>Curb, Retaining Wall</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$712.11</td>
<td>$52,062.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425 2 21</td>
<td>Manholes, A-2, 10'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$6,344.28</td>
<td>$25,377.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435 16 21</td>
<td>Inlets, Ditch Bottom, Type C, 10'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,455.91</td>
<td>$7,731.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435 19 10</td>
<td>Inlets, Closed Flume</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,780.60</td>
<td>$2,780.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 175 214</td>
<td>Pipe Culvert, Opt MFL, Round, 24&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$525.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 175 218</td>
<td>Pipe Culvert, Opt MFL, Elliptical, 18&quot;</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$41,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 175 224</td>
<td>Pipe Culvert, Opt MFL, Elliptical, 24&quot;</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$16,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 175 236</td>
<td>Pipe Culvert, Opt MFL, Elliptical, 36&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 182 625</td>
<td>Altered End Section, Opt Elliptical 18&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$841.45</td>
<td>$21,877.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 182 629</td>
<td>Altered End Section, Opt Elliptical 24&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$870.00</td>
<td>$870.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 1 2</td>
<td>Pipe Handrail-Galvanized Aluminum</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$42.58</td>
<td>$18,573.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522 2</td>
<td>Sidewalk-Concrete, 6&quot; Thick</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524 2 2</td>
<td>Concrete Ditch, Paving, Non-Rein, 4&quot; (Pond Culvert)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$5,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570 1 2</td>
<td>Performance Turf, 5000</td>
<td>5488</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$1.96</td>
<td>$10,836.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $454,783.79

Mobilization, MOT, Clearing, Grubbing, Striping, Signage, Etc | 30% | $136,435.14

Subtotal | $591,218.93

CBI | 10% | $59,121.89

Subtotal: $650,340.82

Contingency | 15% | $97,551.12

Total | $748,092.94

INSERT DATE
Schedule

- Present 60% design plans to MTPO June 3, 2013
- Finalize design November 2013
- Construction Fiscal Year 2014
Recommendation

- Approve the 60% design plans
- Direct staff to finalize design and proceed with construction bidding
Questions/Comments
SW 8th Ave Multi-use Path
EXHIBIT 3

60% CONSTRUCTION PLANS
for
SW 8TH AVENUE MULTI-USE PATH
ALACHUA COUNTY, FLORIDA

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS:
MIKE BYERLY, CHAIR
LEE PINKOSON, VICE CHAIR
SUSAN BAIRD
ROBERT HUTCHINSON
CHARLES S. CHESTNUT

INDEX OF DRAWINGS

COVER SHEET .................................................. 1
SW 8TH AVENUE GRANITAGE MAP ...................... 2 - 3
TYPICAL SECTIONS ........................................... 6
GENERAL NOTES, LEGEND & ABBREVIATIONS ....... 7
SW 8TH AVENUE PLANS & PROFILES ................. 8 - 27
PROPOSED STORMWATER POND ......................... 28
SW 8TH AVENUE CROSS SECTIONS ..................... 29 - 33

LOCATION MAP

START PROJECT STA. 10+00

NEWBERRY ROAD (SR-26)

END PROJECT STA. 299+4179

INDEX FOR REVIEW ONLY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

MAY, 2013
DRMP PROJECT NO. 11-0160.002
1900 SW 34TH STREET, SUITE 204, GAINESVILLE, FL 32606
DRMP, INC. - CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORIZATION NO. 2648
TYPICAL PAVEMENT SECTION

- 65' (typ)
- 6.5' (typ)
- 2% MAX
- 2" LIMESTONE BASE
- MAX. 100 PSF
- 10" STABILIZED SUBGRADE
- 4% CPF 40

TYPICAL SECTION

- PROJECT Baseline
- Existing Ground
- ROW
- ROW

SHOWN: 2013
GENERAL NOTES:

THIS DESIGN HAS BEEN BASED UPON TOPOGRAPHICAL FIELD SURVEY BY ALACHUA COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS.

CONTRACTOR SHALL PUBLISH, TOGETHER WITH THE OYE, ANY AND ALL SURFACE AND SUB-SURFACE CONDITIONS. THE WORK REQUIRED AND ALL OTHER CONDITIONS THAT MAY AFFECT THE SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF THE JOB PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF WORK.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL GIVE ALL NOTICES AND COMPLY WITH ALL LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES, REGULATIONS AND PERMIT CONDITIONS REARING ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WORK AS DRAWN AND SPECIFIED. IF THE CONTRACTOR OBSERVES THAT THE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS ARE VARIED, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROMPTLY NOTIFY THE CHANGES, IN WRITING, AND ANY NEEDED CHANGES SHALL BE MADE, AS AGREED IN THE AGREEMENT FOR CHANGES IN THE WORK.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE TO THE OWNER AND THE ENGINEER FOR THE ACTS AND OMISSIONS OF CONTRACTOR'S EMPLOYEES AND ALL SUBCONTRACTORS AND THEIR AGENTS AND EMPLOYEES AND OTHER PERSONS PERFORMING ANY OF THE WORK UNDER A CONTRACT WITH THE CONTRACTOR.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAKING ALL NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS WITH GOVERNMENTAL DEPARTMENTS, PUBLIC UTILITIES, PUBLIC OWNERS, SERVICE COMPANIES AND ANY OWNERS OR CONCTROLLING ROADWAYS, RAILWAYS, WATER, SEWER, GAS, ELECTRICAL, TELEPHONE, AND TELEGRAPH FACILITIES SUCH AS PIPELINES, TRENCHES, PIPING, WIRES, CABLES, CONDUCTS, POLES, WIRES, OR OTHER SIMILAR FACILITIES, INCLUDING INCIDENTAL STRUCTURES CONNECTED THERETO, AND THE NECESSARY SAFETY MEASURES SHALl BE TAKEN IN THE WORK IN ORDER THAT SUCH ITEMS MAY BE PROPERLY SUPPORTED, PROTECTED OR LOCATED. UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED IN THE GENERAL CONDITIONS, ALL CONSTRUCTION IS TO BE COVERED BY THE PLANS, APPLICABLE PERMITS, AND SPECIFICATIONS HEREIN, AND ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL BUILDING AND SAFETY CODES, LAWS AND ORDINANCES.

PRIOR TO PERFORMING ANY WORK WITHIN ANY PUBLIC OR UTILITY RIGHT-OF-WAY, CONTRACTOR SHALL OBTAIN AUTHORIZATION AND PERMIT FROM JURISDICTION RESPONSIBLE FOR SUCH RIGHT-OF-WAY. IN ADDITION TO PERMIT PROVISIONS, CONTRACTOR SHALL CONTACT EMERGENCY ONE CALL (AT) LEAST 72 HOURS PRIOR TO START OF WORK.

PRIOR TO PERFORMING ANY WORK WITHIN ANY PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY, CONTRACTOR SHALL DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A TRAFFIC CONTROL PLAN CONSISTENT WITH THE MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES PREPARED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION.

IN THE EVENT THE CONTRACTOR DISCOVERS ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS IN THE PLANS HE SHALL IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY THE OWNER OR OWNER'S AGENT.

THE OWNER OR OWNER'S AGENT AND INSPECTORS OF APPLICABLE GOVERNMENTAL JURISDICTIONS SHALL, AT ALL TIMES, HAVE ACCESS TO THE WORK WHEREVER AND WHENEVER IT IS IN PREPARATION OF PROGRESS, AND THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE PROPER FACILITIES FOR SUCH ACCESS AND FOR THE INSPECTION.

IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO TAKE ALL REASONABLE AND PRUDENT PRECAUTIONS TO ENSURE THAT ALL COMPLETED WORK, MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT STORED ON SITE ARE SAFE AND SECURED FROM UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS OR USE. SUCH PRECAUTIONS MAY INCLUDE INSTALLATION OF BARRIERS, FENCES, OR POSTING OF SECURITY GUARDS.

CONTRACTOR SHALL, AT ALL TIMES, USE ALL NORMALLY ACCEPTED AND REASONABLY EXPECTED SAFETY PRACTICES AND COMPLY WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL REGULATIONS, ORDINANCES AND GUIDELINES PERTAINING TO THE SAFE UTILIZATION OF EQUIPMENT OR MATERIALS AS PUBLISHED BY MANUFACTURER.

PRIOR TO INITIATING ANY EXCAVATION (INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO TUNNELS, DITCHES, STORMWATER PONDS, CANALS, ARTIFICIAL LAKES) CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL FENCES AND TAKE ALL OTHER REASONABLE AND PRUDENT STEPS TO ENSURE THAT ACCESS TO EXCAVATION IS SECURED BY UNAUTHORIZED PERSONNEL IS PREVENTED.

CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY IN EVERY RESPECT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE FLORIDA STATE TRENCH SAFETY ACT.

ADEQUATE TRAFFIC CONTROL BARRIERS AND HIGHWAY SERVICES SHALL BE FURNISHED AND MAINTAINED BY THE CONTRACTOR AT ALL POINTS WHERE CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT IS ENGAGED ON THE WORK AND WHERE ENSURES ENTRIES OR OTHER TRAFFIC CONTROL MACHINES NECESSARY TO RESTRAIN OR CROSSES TRAFFIC-CARRYING ROADS.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL LAWS, ORDINANCES, REGULATIONS AND ORDINANCES RELATING TO THE SAFE UTILIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT AND WORKMEN ON HIGHWAY AND ROADWAYS.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH THE FEDERAL OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1970 AND ALL RULES AND REGULATIONS THEREUNDER IN EFFECT AT THE TIME OF PERFORMANCE OF CONSTRUCTION.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE STATE LAWS AND REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO JOB SAFETY AND HEALTH.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT AN EROSION CONTROL PLAN TO MINIMIZE EROSION AND INFORM FUNCTIONING OF STORMWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.
Marlie Sanderson

From: jfrentzn@bellsouth.net
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 8:31 AM
To: Marlie Sanderson
Subject: Thanks Marlie.

Thanks Marlie.

----- Original Message -----
From: Marlie Sanderson
To: jfrentzn@bellsouth.net
Cc: Scott Koons; Mike Escalante
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 8:22 AM
Subject: Re: alternates to CAC

Jan-

We will put this on the next CAC agenda for discussion. Marlie

Marlie J. Sanderson, AICP
Assistant Executive Director & Director of Transportation Planning
North Central Florida Regional Planning Council
2009 NW 67th Place, Gainesville, FL 32653-1603
Voice: 352.955.2200, ext. 103
Fax: 352.955.2209

PLEASE NOTE: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from government officials regarding government business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communications may be subject to public disclosure.

From: jfrentzn@bellsouth.net [mailto:jfrentzn@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2012 5:31 PM
To: Marlie Sanderson
Subject: Re: alternates to CAC

OK, thanks Marlee. I was feeling kind of guilty about taking a seat that maybe one of the youngbloods should get. I guess with the record of vacancies on our committee there will be more opportunities for them and probably soon.

That brings to mind my biggest concern with the new plan for filling vacancies - the time lag. I know that before appointments only happened once a year, which could mean an empty position for months. Hopefully it is in the new MTPO plan to act more quickly so we don’t have those empty seats. Perhaps we can discuss a recommendation to the MTPO at our next meeting which addresses this, or any other ideas we would like them to consider when it comes to filling vacancies on our committee.

Jan F

----- Original Message -----
From: Marlie Sanderson
To: jfrentzn@bellsouth.net
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2012 9:45 AM
Subject: RE: alternates to CAC

Jan-

Congratulations- you were reappointed to a new three-year term. Also, last night the MTPO approved a new policy not to have CAC Designate positions that are filled automatically as vacancies occur. The new policy is that all CAC positions will be filled by the MTPO at an MTPO meeting.

Marlie
Hi Marlee -

Tuned in at about 9:15 and saw the discussion on "alternates". Don't "we" (don't know if I've been reappointed at this point) now have people ready to fill in when a vacancy occurs, and couldn't they become alternates? I thought we got that done a year or two ago. Also, isn't Comm Baird's motion to have new appointments when vacancies occur in conflict? Lastly, was I reappointed. I don't necessarily disagree with Comm Baird's idea for bringing in new blood, so I'm OK with whatever happened.

Thanks,

Jan
May 15, 2013

TO: Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area

FROM: Marlie Sanderson, AICP, Director of Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Updated Bylaws

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Recommend approval of the draft bylaws.

BACKGROUND

The existing Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area Bylaws were last reviewed and revised in 1983. Consequently, there are sections that are currently outdated and need to be updated. For example, Section 1.02 (1.) (b.) states that the voting members for the City of Gainesville are the “five (5) members of the City Commission.” Enclosed with the meeting packets are updated bylaws.

In the enclosed bylaws, the material that is underlined and “in red” are sections that have been revised since they were reviewed by the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area Attorney. The underlining and “red color” are reminders to have this material reviewed by the Attorney after all remaining comments/revisions have been made.
May 15, 2013

TO: Technical Advisory Committee
FROM: Marlie Sanderson, AICP, Director of Transportation Planning
SUBJECT: Year 2040 Population Projections

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve the population projections in Table 1 as the basis for distributing population to Year 2040 traffic analysis zones.

BACKGROUND

The Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area must approve an updated long range transportation plan by October 26, 2015. One task that is completed early in the plan update process is a projection of future (Year 2040) population for each municipality and the unincorporated area. The following steps describe how the projections in Table 1 were developed:

Step One- Obtain the latest available Alachua County “medium” population projections from the University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research for the Year 2040. Table 1 shows this projection to be 305,400.

Step Two- Obtain the latest available population estimates from the University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research in order to determine the “percent of total” that each municipality and the unincorporated area is of the total Alachua County population estimate. This information is shown in Table 1.

Step Three- Use the “percent of total” population estimate information in Table 1 as the basis for projecting Year 2040 population for each municipality and the unincorporated area.
### Table 1

**Population Estimates and Projections**

Alachua County, 2012 to 2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>April 1, 2012</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2040 Projection</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>9,134</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>123,903</td>
<td>50.21%</td>
<td>153,341</td>
<td>50.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Springs</td>
<td>5,355</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
<td>6,627</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaCrosse</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micanopy</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry</td>
<td>4,957</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
<td>6,139</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>98,972</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.11%</strong></td>
<td><strong>122,496</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.11%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>246,770</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>305,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


May 15, 2013

TO: Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area

FROM: Marlie Sanderson, AICP, Director of Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Transportation Alternative Projects

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

No action required. This agenda item is for information only.

BACKGROUND

Attached is an email from the Florida Department of Transportation discussing the Transportation Alternatives Program. In this email, Mr. Barney Bennette, Florida Department of Transportation District 2 Enhancement Program Coordinator, states that the next solicitation cycle for transportation alternatives projects begins early next year. Next year's schedule is to request new projects for funding in September, with applications due around the end of November.

Recommended Timetable

July 24th and 25th- Recommendations are made by the MTPO Advisory Committees concerning two new projects for funding applications. According to page 13 of the List of Priority Projects, the next two highest priorities for funding are Priority #3 (E. University Avenue) and Priority #4 (Norton Elementary Trail).

August 5th- MTPO Approves Two New Projects for Funding Applications

September/October- Two Project Applications Prepared

Late November- Two Project Applications Submitted
Marlie and Debbie,

We have reviewed the TAP applications for the Gainesville area MPO.

- Priority 1, NW 45th Ave: We did not create a Candidate project for the NW 45th Avenue because the 30' R/W is believed to be too narrow to accommodate a sidewalk and the existing utilities along the roadway. Given the narrow right of way and proximity to residences and apartments, easements may be required. This may be better if it were funded by local government and is really not a good candidate for federal transportation funding.

- Priority 2, SE 27th Path: I have entered a Candidate Project for the SW 27th Street path from Williston Road to 35th Place. The project will be administered by the City of Gainesville using the Local Agency Program. The project number is 433989-1.

Tentatively the design will be programmed in FY 2017 and the construction in FY 2019. These dates may need to be adjusted based on our allocation and balancing the program and a more definitive time-frame will be presented during the Work Program public hearings in November or December.

Finally, the new Transportation Legislation (MAP-21) has given us added challenges in managing the Transportation Alternatives Program. Beginning with the next solicitation cycle, we will request new projects sometime in September with the applications for new projects due around Thanksgiving time.

Thanks,
Barney Bennette, PE
Florida Department of Transportation, District 2
Strategic Intermodal System Coordinator
Enhancement Program Coordinator
1109 S. Marion Avenue, MS 2007
Lake City, FL 32025-5874
(386) 961-7878
barney.bennette@dot.state.fl.us
PE # 41821
May 15, 2013

TO: Technical Advisory Committee
FROM: Marlie Sanderson, AICP, Director of Transportation Planning
SUBJECT: Election of Officers

Each year, the Technical Advisory Committee elects a Chair and a Vice-Chair. Officers for last year were as follows:

Chair- Doug Robinson
Vice-Chair Jeff Hayes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAC MEMBER AND ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>MEETING DATE 11/28/2012</th>
<th>MEETING DATE 1/23/2013</th>
<th>IN VIOLATION IF ABSENT AT NEXT MEETING?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEVE LACHNICH</td>
<td>Alachua County</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Jeff Hays [Vice Chair]</td>
<td>Department of Growth Management Office of Planning and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Chris Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Kathleen Pagan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD HEDRICK</td>
<td>Alachua County</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Chris Zeigler</td>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Michael Fay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Dave Cerlanek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEKOVA BATEY</td>
<td>Alachua County/City of Gainesville/MTPO</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Vacant</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Steve Kabat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIK BREDFELDT</td>
<td>City of Gainesville</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Dean Mimms</td>
<td>Department of Community Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Onelia Lazzari*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Jason Simmons**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBBIE LEISTNER</td>
<td>City of Gainesville</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Don Hambridge</td>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Phil Mann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESUS GOMEZ</td>
<td>City of Gainesville</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Matthew Muller</td>
<td>Regional Transit System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - David Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL IGUINA</td>
<td>Gainesville/Alachua County</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Laura Aguilar</td>
<td>Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Allan Penksa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN GIFFORD</td>
<td>Gainesville Regional Utilities</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Steve Phelps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAREN TAUlBEE</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Thomas Hill</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT Koons</td>
<td>North Central Florida</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Steve Dopp</td>
<td>Regional Planning Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL REESE</td>
<td>Santa Fe College</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilities Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARREL HARRISON</td>
<td>School Board of Alachua County</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Edward Gable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - David Deas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA DIXON</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Carol Walker</td>
<td>Facilities Planning &amp; Construction Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON FULLER</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt - Scott Fox</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Parking Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND KEY - P = Present A = Absent ** = New Member**

- City of Gainesville Level of Service (LOS) Subcommittee Member, ** LOS Subcommittee Alternate only.
- Santa Fe College representative currently is a non-voting position.

Attendance Rule:
1. Each voting member of the TAC may name one (1) or more alternates who may vote only in the absence of that member on a one vote per member basis.
2. Each member of the TAC is expected to demonstrate his or her interest in the TAC's activities through attendance of the scheduled meetings, except for reasons of an unavoidable nature. In each instance of an unavoidable absence, the absent member should ensure that one of his or her alternates attends. No more than three (3) consecutive absences will be allowed by the member. The TAC shall deal with consistent absences and is empowered to recommend corrective action for MTPO consideration.
## ATTENDANCE RULE

Any appointee of the MTPO to the CAC shall be automatically removed from the committee upon filing with the Chairman of the MTPO appropriate proof that such person has had three (3) or more consecutive unexcused absences, or that the overall attendance record of any such person (including excused and unexcused absences) is less than 66-2/3% for any six (6) month consecutive period or less than 66-2/3% for six (6) consecutive meetings if meetings are not held each month, whichever is longer. Excused absences are here defined to be those absences which occur from regular or special meetings after notification by such person to the Chairman prior to such absence explaining the reasons therefore. All other absences are here defined to be unexcused.

### ADDITIONAL NOTES:

1. On October 30, 1985, staff asked the CAC to clarify the procedures staff should use to record attendance at CAC meetings. The CAC instructed staff to use the following procedures:
   - A. all CAC meetings will require mandatory attendance by all members; and
   - B. attendance is recorded at all CAC meetings, even if a quorum is not present.

2. On April 28, 1999, the CAC decided to limit attendance by teleconferencing to medical emergencies only.

3. Members denoted in BOLD ITALICS are at risk for attendance rule violation if the next meeting is missed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTPO MEETING MONTH</th>
<th>TAC [At 2:00 p.m.]</th>
<th>B/PAB [At 7:00 p.m.]</th>
<th>MTPO MEETING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>January 23</td>
<td>January 24</td>
<td>February 4 at 3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>February 20</td>
<td>February 21</td>
<td>March 4 at 3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>May 22</td>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>June 3 at 5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>July 24</td>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>August 5 at 3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>September 18</td>
<td>September 19</td>
<td>September 30 at 3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>November 20</td>
<td>November 21</td>
<td>December 2 at 5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, unless otherwise scheduled:

1. Shaded boxes indicate the months that we may be able to cancel MTPO meetings if agenda items do not require a meeting and corresponding Advisory Committee meeting may also be cancelled;
2. TAC meetings are conducted at the Gainesville Regional Utilities (GRU) Administration general purpose meeting room;
3. CAC meetings are conducted in the Grace Knight conference room of the County Administration Building; and
4. MTPO meetings are conducted at the Jack Durrance Auditorium of the County Administration Building unless noted.
March 18, 2013

The Honorable Mike Byerly, Chair
Alachua County Board of County Commissioners
12 SE 1st Street
Gainesville, FL 32601

The Honorable Craig Lowe, Mayor
200 E. University Ave.
Gainesville, FL 32601

Subject: SR 329 (Main Street) transfer from Depot Avenue to SR 331 (Williston Road)

Dear Commissioner Byerly and Mayor Lowe:

The December 3, 2012, meeting of the Gainesville MTPO included a presentation by the Gainesville Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) regarding Main Street south of Depot Avenue. The presentation outlined changes to the roadway typical section including reducing the number of travel lanes, on-street parking, medians, etc. As explained at the meeting, Main Street remains under the jurisdiction of the Florida Department of Transportation as SR 329 between SR 331 (Williston Road) and Depot Avenue. Prior commitments by the Alachua County Board of County Commissioners included the transfer of this section of roadway from the Department to Alachua County upon the completion of the reconstruction of Main Street between Depot Avenue and NW 8th Avenue. The Department has completed the reconstruction project. However, the transfer of Main Street to Alachua County has not been completed due to changes by the Alachua County Board of County Commissioners.

The Florida Department of Transportation encourages the Alachua County Board of County Commissioners and the City of Gainesville to work together to reach an agreement on which agency should assume the ownership and maintenance of Main Street. Until such time that the above reference section of roadway is removed from the state system, no further modifications to Main Street will be approved by the Department. Any requested modifications or changes to a state facility must be submitted to the Department and a permit issued in advance of any activities with the Department’s rights-of-way.
The Department welcomes the opportunity to work with Alachua County and the City of Gainesville to finalize the ownership and maintenance responsibilities for this section of roadway. If you have any questions or need any further information, please contact me at (904) 360-5646 or via email at James.Bennett@dot.state.fl.us.

Respectfully,

James G. Bennett, P.E.
Urban Transportation Development Manager

CC:  Alachua County Commissioners
      City of Gainesville Commissioners
      Gainesville MTPO