

Serving Alachua Bradford • Columbia Dixie • Gilchrist • Hamilton Lafayette • Levy • Madison Suwannee • Taylor • Union Counties

16

January 31, 2018

SUBJECT:	Meeting Announcement and Agenda	
FROM:	Scott R. Koons, AICP, Executive Director	
TO:	Citizens Advisory Committee Technical Advisory Committee	

On February 7, 2018, the Technical Advisory Committee will meet at 2:00 p.m. in the Charles F. Justice Conference Room, North Central Florida Regional Planning Council, 2009 NW 67th Place. Also, on February 7, 2018 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.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

7:00 p.m.	I.	Introductions (if needed)*	
	II.	Approval of Meeting Agenda	APPROVE AGENDA
Page [#] 3	III.	Approval of Committee Minutes	APPROVE MINUTES
Page [#] 13 7:10 p.m. CAC Only	IV.	State Highway System Roundabouts The Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization re ranked list of roundabout locations on the State Highway S committees.	FOR DISCUSSION ONLY ferred development of a system to its advisory
Page [#] 37 7:20 p.m.	V.	State Road 222 (NE 39th Avenue) Crosswalk	APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION
		A citizen concern regarding pedestrian safety on State Roa Florida Department of Transportation District 2 Safety Eng	d 222 was forwarded to the gineer.

Page [#] 45	VI.	Kermit Sigmon Citizen Participation Award - 2017	SELECT RECIPIENT
7:30 p.m. CAC Only		Each year, the Citizens Advisory Committee selects a recipien	t for this award.
	VII.	Committee Elections* ELECT A CH	AIR AND VICE-CHAIR
7:40 p.m. CAC Only		Each year, a new Chair and Vice-Chair are elected.	
	VIII.	Information Items	
		The following materials are for your information only and are discussed unless otherwise requested.	not scheduled to be
Page [#] 47 Page [#] 49		A. Advisory Committee Attendance RecordsB. Meeting Calendar- 2018	
		*No handout included with the enclosed agenda item. *No handout included with the enclosed agenda item.	

t:\scott\sk18\cac\agendafeb7.docx

MINUTES

GAINESVILLE URBANIZED AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Gainesville Regional Utilities General Purpose Room 301 SE 4th Avenue Gainesville, Florida

November 15, 2017 2:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ron Fuller James Green Deborah Leistner Dean Mimms

Jesus Gomez Chandler Otis STAFF PRESENT

Dekova Batey Jeffrey Hays, Chair Erik Lewis Krys Ochia Suzanne Schiemann Thomas Strom

James Speer

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Michael Escalante

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jeffrey Hays, Alachua County Transportation Planning Manager, called the meeting to order at 2:20 p.m.

Ι. INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Hays introduced himself and asked others to introduce themselves.

APPROVAL OF THE MEETING AGENDA II.

Chair Hays asked for approval of the agenda.

Michael Escalante, Senior Planner, asked that the agenda be amended to add item VIII.B Transportation Improvement Program Amendment - State Road 222 (NW 39th Avenue) Railroad Crossing and item XI.B Shared-Use Nonmotorized Trail Network - 2018 Applications.

MOTION: Erik Lewis moved to approve the meeting agenda as amended. Thomas Strom seconded; motion passed unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MINUTES

Chair Hays stated that the October 11, 2017 minutes are ready for consideration of approval by the Technical Advisory Committee.

MOTION: Erik Lewis moved to approve the October 15, 2017 Technical Advisory Committee minutes. Thomas Strom seconded; motion passed unanimously.

IV. SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND TARGETS

Mr. Escalante stated that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization needs to set Safety Targets for fatalities and serious injuries to meet federal legislation requirements. He discussed the safety measures and targets and answered questions:

MOTION: Erik Lewis moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization:

- 1. Set safety performance targets consistent with the Florida Department of Transportation targets; and
- 2. In addition, show the bicycle and pedestrian targets and interim performance measures separately in the Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries.

Krys Ochia seconded; motion passed unanimously.

V. NONE

VI. COMMITTEE ELECTIONS

Mr. Escalante stated that the Citizens Advisory Committee needs to elect a new Chair and Vice-Chair. He also stated that Jeffrey Hays is the current Chair and Linda Dixon is the current Vice-Chair.

MOTION: Erik Lewis moved to elect Jeffrey Hays as the Technical Advisory Committee Chair and Linda Dixon as the Technical Advisory Committee Vice-Chair. Krys Ochia seconded; motion passed unanimously.

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS

There was no discussion of the information items..

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:52 p.m.

Date

Jeffrey Hays, Chair

t:\mike\em18\tac\minutes\nov15tac.doc

MINUTES

GAINESVILLE URBANIZED AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Grace Knight Conference Room 12 SE 1st Street Gainesville, Florida

May 17, 2017 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

STAFF PRESENT

E. J. Bolduc Thomas Bolduc Mary Ann DeMatas Luis Diaz Jan Frentzen, Vice-Chair Delia Kradolfer Gilbert Levy Chandler Otis James Samec Ruth Steiner Paul Thur de Koos Rob Brinkman, Chair Nelle Bullock John Picket Ewen Thomson Dekova Batey

Michael Escalante Scott Koons

CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Jan Frentzen called the meeting to order at 7:12 p.m.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

Vice-Chair Frentzen introduced himself and asked others to introduce themselves.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MEETING AGENDA

Vice-Chair Frentzen asked that the agenda be approved.

MOTION: Thomas Bolduc moved to approve the meeting agenda. James Samec seconded; motion passed unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MINUTES

Vice-Chair Frentzen asked for approval of the March 15, 2017 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting minutes.

MOTION: Thomas Bolduc moved to approve the March 15, 2017 Citizens Advisory Committee minutes. James Samec seconded; motion passed unanimously

IV. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT -FOR FISCAL YEARS 2016-17 TO 2020-21 FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION SECTION 5310 CAPITAL GRANT

Michael Escalante, Senior Planner, stated that the Florida Department of Transportation has requested an amendment to the Fiscal Years 2016-17 to 2020-21 Transportation Improvement Program. He reported that the amendment is for the purchase of one vehicle and wheelchair tie-downs for existing vehicles funded by a Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Capital Grant.

MOTION: E. J. Bolduc moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization amend the Fiscal Years 2016-17 to 2020-21 Transportation Improvement Program to add the purchase of one vehicle and wheelchair tie-downs for existing vehicles funded by a Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Capital Grant. Thomas Bolduc seconded; motion passed unanimously.

V. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT -FOR FISCAL YEARS 2017-18 TO 2021-22

Mr. Escalante stated that the Transportation Improvement Program is the most important document that is approved annually by the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization. He said that the Transportation Improvement Program is a staged implementation program of transportation projects to the maximum extent feasible consistent with adopted comprehensive plans of Alachua County and the City of Gainesville. He added that, in order for Federal transportation funds to be spent in the Gainesville Metropolitan Area, they must be approved by the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization and included in the Transportation Improvement Program. He discussed the project in the draft Transportation Improvement Program, including modifications by the Florida Department of Transportation in response to Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization comments, and answered questions.

MOTION: Ruth Steiner moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approve the Fiscal Years 2017-18 to 2021-22 Transportation Improvement Program. James Samec seconded; motion passed unanimously.

VI. LIST OF PRIORITY PROJECTS

Mr. Escalante stated that, each year, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization develops priorities for unfunded projects. He said that these priorities are used by the Florida Department of Transportation to develop its Tentative Work Program. He added that the draft List of Priority Projects includes projects from the recently adopted Year 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan and from local agency recommendations. He discussed the draft List of Priority Projects, reported the Technical Advisory Committee recommendation and answered questions.

Dekova Batey, Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator, discussed the Downtown Connector crossing and answered questions.

MOTION: Thomas Bolduc moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approve the Fiscal Years 2018-19 to 2022-23 List of Priority Projects revisions shown in Exhibit 1. James Samec seconded; motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ruth Steiner moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization refer the Glen Springs Braid project to its Technical Advisory Committee to identify segments for Safe Routes to School funding in the Fiscal Years 2019-20 to 2023-24 List of Priority Projects. Thomas Bolduc seconded; motion passed unanimously.

VII. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

Mr. Escalante stated that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization reviews the Public Involvement Plan each year. He discussed revisions to the plan and answered questions.

MOTION: Thomas Bolduc moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approve the revised Public Involvement Plan. James Samec seconded; motion passed unanimously.

VIII. COMMITTEE ELECTIONS

Mr. Escalante stated that the Citizens Advisory Committee needs to elect a new Chair and Vice-Chair. He also stated that Rob Brinkman is the current Chair and Jan Frentzen is the current Vice-Chair.

MOTION: Gilbert Levy moved to re-elect Rob Brinkman as the Citizens Advisory Committee Chair and Jan Frentzen as the Citizens Advisory Committee Vice-Chair. Chandler Otis seconded; motion passed unanimously.

IX. INFORMATION ITEMS

There was no discussion of information items.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

Date

Rob Brinkman, Chair

-7-

and the second se

4 51 5 5 5 5

<u>*</u>

Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities

2

Table 1 identifies bicycle/pedestrian project priorities - state Safe Routes to School State Highway System and SUNTrail funds and federal Transportation Alternatives Program funds for the Fiscal Years 2017-18 to 2021-22 Transportation Improvement Program.

Table 1Bicycle/Pedestrian PrioritiesFiscal Years 2017-18 to 2021-22(within the Gainesville Metropolitan Area)

Number	Project	Location	Description
	Safe	Routes to School Funds	
PROMIN HITH		FM: NW 13 Street	
1-SR	NW 42 Avenue	TO: NW 6 Street	Construct Sidewalk
S		FM: Hawthorne Road	
2-SR	SE 43 Street	TO: University Avenue	Pedestrian Modifications
		FM: SW 87 Way	
3-SR	SW 24 Avenue	TO: SW 77 Street	Construct Multi-use Path
		FM: NW 34 Street	
4-SR	NW 45 Avenue	TO: NW 24 Boulevard	Construct Multi-use Path
END SOUTH STAT	State	Highway System Funds	
		AT: NW 16 Street	Install Enhanced Pedestrian
TAC/CAC*		AT: NW 17 Street	Crossings 129,000 AADTI
1-SH	W University Avenue [SR 26]	AT. NW 19 Street	Crossings [29,000 AAD1]
TAC/CAC*		TO W/ 13 Street (SP 25)	CONSTRUCT BIKEWAY/SIDEWAIK
2-511	W University Avenue [SR 26]		Pedestrian-Oriented
2 64		AT: Waldo Road (SR 24)	Intersection Design [18,700 AADT]
		FM: F 7 Street	Construct Baised Median
4-SH	F University Avenue ISB 261	TO: E 10 Street	[20,500 AADT]
			Install Transit Shelters and
5-SH	University Avenue [SR 26]	AT: Corridorwide	Benches [29,000 AADT]
		FM: E 1 Street	Construct Midblock Pedestrian
6-SH	E University Avenue [SR 26]	TO: E 3 Street	Crossings [20,500 AADT]
			Install Bicycle Striping and
7-SH	University Avenue [SR 26]	AT: Corridorwide	Signal Detection [29,000 AADT]
0.011	Noutbern / Road reason	FM: NW 59 Street	 Restripe the pavement to 11-foot general purpose travel lanes with protected bikelanes between NW 52nd Terrace and NW 34th Street (State Road 121) without loss of the westbound right turnlane at NW 43rd Street; Conduct a speed zone study between NW 59th Street and NW 40th Drive; and Prioritize this project for State Highway System funding. [29 000 AADT]

Table 1 (Continued)Bicycle/Pedestrian PrioritiesFiscal Years 2017-18 to 2021-22(within the Gainesville Metropolitan Area)

Number	Project	Location	Description
		SUNTrail Funds	
		FM: La Chua Trail Entrance	
1-ST	Gainesville-Hawthorne Trail	TO: Depot Park	Resurface Trail
TAC	Downtown Connector Rail-		Construct Grade-Separated
2-ST	Trail Crossing	AT: Williston Road [SR 331]	Crossing
			Construct Grade-Separated
3-ST	Hull Road	AT: SW 34 Street [SR 121]	Crossing
TAC/CAC*	NW 6 Street Rail/Trail	FM: NW 16 Avenue	Extend the Rail/Trail North to
4-ST	Extension	TO: NW 39 Avenue	NW 39 Avenue
Number	Project	Location	Description
GRI CHE	Transportat	ion Alternatives Program Fu	inds
	l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l	FM: SW 34 Street ISR 1211	Add Midblock Pedestrian-
1-T	Archer Road [SR 24]	TO: SW 16 Avenue [SR 226]	Actuated Crossings
			Fill In Sidewalk Gaps and Add
		FM: SW 43 Street	Midblock Pedestrian-Actuated
2-T	SW 20th Avenue	TO: SW 34 Street [SR 121]	Crossings
	Williston Road [SR 331] @ Downtown Connector Rail-	FM: SE 4 Street	 4th Street to determine the feasibility of extending the 35 mile per hour speed zone to include the Downtown Connector Rail-Trail crossing; 2. Conduct a pedestrian signal analysis at the Downtown Connector Rail-Trail crossing; 3. Conduct a line-of-sight analysis of the curve; and 4 Increase visibility of both
3-T	Trail	TO: SE 12 Avenue	motorists and trail users.
4-T	Glen Springs Braid	FM: Gainesville High School TO: NW 34 Street ISR 1211	Construct Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail
	Gainesville Regional Utilities	FM: Depot Park	Construct Bicycle/Pedestrian
5-T	Right-Of-Way	TO: Williston Road [SR 331]	Trail
6-Т	NE 27 Avenue	FM: State Road 222 TO: State Road 26	Construct 8-Foot Multiuse Path on North Side of Roadway
7-T	Williston Road [SR 331]	FM: Sweetwater Wetlands Park TO: Gainesville-Hawthorne Rail/Trail Connector	Construct Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail
		FM: Williston Road [SR 331]	Construct Cidewalls
8-T	SE 8 Avenue	IU: Hawthorne Road [SR 20]	Construct Sidewalk
9-T	NW 143 Street	FM: Newberry Road [SR 26] TO: NW 39 Avenue [SR 222]	Complete Sidewalk Network
10-T	NW 6 Street Rail/Trail Extension	FM: NW 16 Avenue TO: NW 39 Avenue	Extend the Rail/Trail North to NW 39 Avenue

Note: Projects in italic text are partially funded, as shown in the Transportation Improvement Program.

ADA = Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; AADT = Average Annual Daily Traffic; E = East; FM = From; NW = Northwest; RTS = Regional Transit System; SR- State Road; SW = Southwest; UF = University of Florida; W = West

Initial Transportation Alternatives Program Priorities were developed by a Technical Advisory Committee working group.

* Blue text indicates recommended revisions to original draft List of Priority Projects presented to the Citizen Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee.

t:\scott\sk17\tac\lopptaccac_rex_may17_x1.docx

÷,

3



Serving Alachua Bradford • Columbia Dixie • Gilchrist • Hamilton Lafayette • Levy • Madison Suwannee • Taylor • Union Counties

2009 NW 67th Place, Gaineaville, FL 32653-1603 • 352.955.2200

January 31, 2018

10:	Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board Citizens Advisory Committee Technical Advisory Committee
FROM:	Scott R. Koons AICP, Executive Director
SUBJECT:	State Highway System Roundabouts

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Begin to develop a ranked list of candidate intersections for roundabouts on the State Highway System.

BACKGROUND

At its December 4, 2017 meeting, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area discussed State Highway System Roundabout policy. During this discussion, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approved a motion to:

"refer development of a ranked list candidate intersections for roundabouts on the State Highway System to its advisory committees and staff."

Exhibit 1 identifies roadways with roundabouts on the State Highway System. Exhibit 2 is a excerpt from the Florida Department of Transportation Design Manual Roundabout Evaluation. Exhibit 3 is a excerpt from the Florida Department of Transportation Design Manual Modern Roundabouts.

Attachments

t:\scott\sk18\mtpo\memo\shs_roundabout_comm.docx

100 C

EXHIBIT 1

Florida Roundabouts Roundabouts on the State Highway System

County	Community	Intersection
Hillsborough	Tampa	SR 585 at 23rd/22nd Avenue
Leon	Tallahassee	SR 371 (Gaines Street) at SR 157 (S. Woodward Avenue)
Manatee	Bradenton Beach	SR 789 at Bridge Street
Martin	Jensen Beach	SR 732/Jensen Beach Causeway at Indian River Drive
Martin	Jensen Beach	SR A1A at SR 732/Jensen Beach Causeway
Martin	Port Salerno	SR A1A (Dixie Hwy) at SE Cove Road
Martin	Stuart	SR 707 (Dixie Hwy) at 2nd St./Akron Ave/St Lucie Avenue
Martin	Stuart	SR A1A (SE Ocean Blvd) at S Colorado Avenue
Martin	Stuart	SR A1A (Dixie Hwy) at St Lucie Blvd/SE Manatee Lane
Nassau	Amelia Island	SR A1A at Beach Lagoon Road
Nassau	Amelia Island	SR A1A at Amelia Village Circle
Nassau	Amelia Island	SR A1A at David Gregory Drive/Dan Neal Road
Nassau	Amelia Island	SR A1A at Gerbing Road/Buccaneer Trail
Nassau	Fernandina Beach	SR A1A/Fletcher Av at SR 108/Sadler Road
Palm Beach	Lake Worth	SR 802/Lake Worth at A Street
Palm Beach	Palm Beach	SR A1A (Ocean Blvd) at SR 80 (Southern Blvd)
Pinellas	Clearwater	SR 60 (Causeway Boulevard) at Coronado Dr/Mandalay Ave/Poinsettia Avenue
Polk	Lake Wales	SR 17 at Hunt Brothers Road
Polk	Polk City	SR 33 at Deen Still Road
St. Johns	Riverwalk	SR 13 at River Town Boulevard
St. Lucie	Ft. Pierce	SR A1A/Seaway Drive at Harbor Isle
Suwannee	Live Oak	SR 51 at Irvin Ave/CR 136/11th Street
Volusia	DeLand	SR 44 at Grand Avenue

-16-

Topic #625-000-002	
FDOT Design Manual	January 1, 2018

116 Roundabout Evaluation

116.1 General

FDM 213 provides criteria for design of roundabouts on the SHS. These requirements are supplemented by guidance contained in the <u>National Cooperative Highway</u> <u>Research Program (NCHRP) Report 672, Roundabouts: An Informational Guide</u>.

116.2 Roundabout Evaluation

A three-step process has been established to determine if a roundabout is the appropriate control measure for a proposed intersection improvement. Following the completion of the three-step process a final determination of the intersection control to be advanced to design will be made.

For evaluation purposes, the 20-year traffic volumes may be estimated using a growth rate between 1 and 3 percent per year.

SYNCHRO and SIDRA are software packages that are often used to determine performance measures of roundabouts in compliance with the *Highway Capacity Manual*. The preferred software for evaluation and design of roundabouts on the SHS is the SIDRA standard model with environmental factor of 1.1.

116.2.1 Step 1 Screening

This step is intended to quickly assess project-specific conditions to determine the viability of the roundabout alternative. If any of the screening criteria identifies a documented deterrent to the roundabout alternative then advancing to Step 2 Benefit-to-Cost (B-C) Evaluation is optional. However, if none of the Step 1 criteria identifies a deterrent, then the roundabout option must be advanced to Step 2. Certain physical or geometric complications could make it impossible or uneconomical to construct a roundabout.

Step 1 Screening is a checklist of screening criteria that will identify site specific conditions that are inconsistent with the installation or operation of a roundabout. Document the Step 1 Screening using the standard form at the following link:

http://www.fdot.gov/roadway/FDM/

116-Roundabout Evaluation

Topic #625-000-002	
FDOT Design Manual	January 1, 2018

The screening criteria are as follows:

- (1) Unfavorable topography or physical constraints (e.g., steep grade, R/W limitations, utility and drainage conflicts,) may limit visibility, complicate construction, or preclude accommodating the design vehicle.
- (2) Major roadway AADT exceeds 90% of the total intersection AADT may cause poor operational performance due to limited gaps for minor road.
- (3) Presence of pedestrians with special needs that may have difficulty crossing the roadway. This would include areas such as schools, retirement homes, trail crossings, parks, or institutions that serve the visually impaired.
- (4) Intersections located within a coordinated signal network. In these situations, the operation of the arterial might be better served with a coordinated signalized intersection incorporated into the system.
- (5) Locations where vehicles exiting the roundabout would be interrupted by downstream conditions. This could include proximity to:
 - (a) Over-capacity signals, freeway entrance ramps, or mid-block pedestrian crossings.
 - (b) Driveways for significant traffic generators
 - (c) Traffic control preemption (e.g., fire stations, railroad tracks, drawbridges)
- (6) Proximity of historical sites, 4(f) sites, or socially significant trees, and the relocation of residences or businesses. These types of impacts would indicate that the project would not qualify as a Type 1 Categorical Exclusion (federally funded) or Non-Major State Action (state funded).

The presence of one or more of these conditions does not preclude the installation of a roundabout. However, the presence of any physical or geometric complications suggests that special attention will be necessary during the evaluation and design of the roundabout alternative.

Upon completion of the Step 1 Screening, a decision is made to either advance the roundabout to Step 2 B-C Evaluation or eliminate it from further consideration. This decision must be approved by the appropriate FDOT representative as follows:

- District Design Engineer for Design projects
- District Traffic Operations Engineer for Traffic Operations Projects

If the decision is to not advance the roundabout alternative, place the signed Step 1 Screening form in the project file. If the decision is to advance the roundabout alternative to the next evaluation step, include the signed form with Step 2 documentation.

¹¹⁶⁻Roundabout Evaluation

116.2.2 Step 2 B-C Evaluation

Step 2 B-C Evaluation is a systematic approach to comparing the benefits and costs of a roundabout alternative with a traditional intersection (stop controlled or signal controlled). Benefits are measured in the cost savings associated with a reduced frequency and severity of crashes for each alternative. Costs consider the required investment for each alternative (e.g., R/W, utilities, construction, operation, maintenance). Road user costs can also be included in the analysis if information on driver delay is available. The Step 2 B-C Evaluation spreadsheet and supporting documentation can be downloaded at:

http://www.fdot.gov/roadway/FDM/

The Step 2 spreadsheet analysis provides a B-C ratio that indicates whether or not the roundabout alternative delivers a return on investment over the traditional intersection. A B-C ratio greater than 1.0 indicates that a roundabout is economically warranted.

At the completion of Step 2 B-C Evaluation, the District Traffic Operations Engineer or District Design Engineer will approve or deny the decision to advance the roundabout alternative to Step 3 Geometric and Operational Analysis.

A summary form with signature block is included in the spreadsheet under the "Step 2 Form" tab. If the decision is to not advance the roundabout alternative, place the Step 1 and Step 2 signed forms in the project file. If the decision is to advance the roundabout alternative to the next step, include the Step 1 and Step 2 signed forms with Step 3 documentation.

116.2.3 Step 3 Geometric and Operational Analysis

The Step 3 Geometric and Operational Analysis includes a preliminary design that establishes the roundabout alignment, geometry, and lane requirements. The preliminary design must meet sight distance criteria, accommodate all turning movements of the design vehicle, and control the operating speed of entering, circulating, and exiting traffic. The Step 3 Geometric and Operational Analysis form can be downloaded at:

http://www.fdot.gov/roadway/FDM/

An operational analysis is conducted to determine if the roundabout will accommodate projected traffic volumes at an acceptable level of service (LOS). Roundabout LOS is measured in control delay consistent with other unsignalized intersections.

Required data for the analysis includes the following:

¹¹⁶⁻Roundabout Evaluation

- (1) The number and configuration of lanes on each approach
- (2) Either of the following:
 - (a) Demand volumes for each entering vehicular turning movement and each pedestrian crossing movement during the peak 15 minutes, or
 - (b) Demand volumes for each entering vehicular turning movement and each pedestrian crossing movement during the peak hour, and a peak hour factor for the hour
- (3) Percentage of trucks
- (4) Volume distribution across lanes for 2-lane entries
- (5) Length of analysis period, generally a peak 15-minute period within the peak hour

In cases where a roundabout, all-way stop, or signalized intersection would be located within a half mile of the roundabout being evaluated, a systems-level operational analysis should be completed using software specifically designed for roundabouts in a system.

116.3 Roundabout Summary Report

Document Step 3 in a Roundabout Summary Report that includes the following:

- (1) <u>Cover Sheet</u>: Describe the project purpose and need and how the roundabout alternative would address these issues. Include a summary of the results from Step 1 Screening, Step 2 B-C Evaluation, and Step 3 Geometric and Operational Analysis. The standard form also contains a check box to indicate whether or not the roundabout will be advanced to final design. The signatures of the District Traffic Operations Engineer and the District Design Engineer are required.
- (2) <u>Operational Analysis</u>: Include the results of the analysis. Present by lane group in terms of volume-to-capacity ratio, average control delay, level of service, and 95th percentile queue. Use Department-approved 20-year traffic projections for morning and afternoon peak hours for the design year analysis.
- (3) <u>Geometric Performance Checks</u>: Include documentation for sight distance, swept path, and fastest path performance checks. Indicate the selected design vehicle.
- (4) **Preliminary Roundabout Design**: Include a plan sheet of the conceptual geometric layout and alignment of the circulatory roadway and approaches using either a scaled aerial or topographic data. Label the dimensions for major geometric components, including splitter islands, circulatory roadway, truck

¹¹⁶⁻Roundabout Evaluation

aprons, center island, and bypass lanes (if required). Also include the following on the plan sheet:

- (a) Significant topographic features; e.g., buildings, driveways, drainage structures, utilities, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities.
- (b) Existing and proposed R/W lines
- (5) <u>Step 1 and Step 2 signed forms</u>: Include signed forms from Step 1 and Step 2 as well as the crash data used to complete the Step 2 evaluation.

5

¹¹⁶⁻Roundabout Evaluation

-22-

213 Modern Roundabouts

213.1 General

This chapter provides design criteria and guidance for the geometric layout of modern roundabouts. A modern roundabout is a circular intersection in which traffic travels counterclockwise around a central island, and entering traffic must yield to circulating traffic. A key design feature of the modern roundabout is the alignment of the entry lane with receiving circulatory roadway. *Figure 213.1.1* illustrates the characteristics of a single-lane modern roundabout.





Topic #625-000-002	
FDOT Design Manual	January 1, 2018

Only single-lane and two-lane modern roundabouts are to be constructed on the SHS. Partial three-lane roundabouts may be acceptable under certain conditions.

Roundabout designs must be submitted to the Central Office for review as early as practical, but no later than Phase II design submittal. See *FDM 301.4* for the roundabout review submittal requirements. The design for a roundabout on the SHS requires the approval of the State Roadway Design Engineer.

213.1.1 Roundabout Evaluation

Modification for Non-Conventional Projects:

Delete FDM 213.1.1 and see RFP for requirements.

Modern roundabouts provide substantial safety and operational benefits under a wide range of traffic conditions. FHWA has designated roundabouts as one of nine proven safety countermeasures because of their ability to substantially reduce the types of crashes that result in severe injury or loss of life. Studies show that modern roundabouts provide a higher level of safety than any other intersection type; including pedestrian and bicycle modes.

The Department is committed to installing modern roundabouts on the SHS where it makes sense to do so. A roundabout alternative must be evaluated in accordance with *FDM 116* when:

- New signalization is proposed
- Major reconstruction of an existing signalized intersection is proposed
- A change in an un-signalized intersection control is required.

An evaluation is not required for minor operational improvements such as changes to signal phasing, or for signal replacement projects where the primary purpose is to upgrade deficient equipment and installations.

To construct a modern roundabout on the SHS, one of the following must be met:

- (1) **MUTCD** traffic signal warrants 1 or 2 is met,
- (2) Documented high frequency of severe crashes,
- (3) Context appropriate operational improvement on low speed facilities, or
- (4) Need for speed management when transitioning from a high speed context classification to a lower speed context classification.

213-Modern Roundabouts

DOT Design manual	
EDOT Design Manual	January 1, 2018
Горіс #625-000-002	1 0040

While roundabouts may provide a community enhancement, they are not to be constructed on SHS solely for this purpose.

Use 20-year design traffic volumes for roundabout evaluation and design.

NCHRP 672 213.1.2

The criteria contained in the FDM are supplemented by guidance provided in the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 672, Roundabouts: An Informational Guide.

213.1.3 **Design Vehicle**

Roundabouts typically accommodate a WB-62FL design vehicle for the through movements on the SHS. A smaller design vehicle may be appropriate for turning movements connecting off-system roads. See FDM 201.5 for additional information on design vehicle.

Swept Paths 213.2

Swept path diagrams assure that there is adequate pavement to accommodate the maneuvers of design vehicle through the roundabout without over-tracking the curb. AUTOTURN is a CADD-based vehicle turning path program that is often used to determine the swept path of the design vehicle.

Provide swept path diagrams for the design vehicle for all turning movements. Develop travel paths using continuous smooth spline curve alignments representative of travel paths experienced in the field.

Provide a minimum 1.5-foot clearance between the outside edge of the design vehicle's tire track and the face of curb.

Single-Lane Roundabout 213.2.1

The swept path design vehicle is required to stay within the travel lane and is prohibited from encroaching on the outside gutter pan. The truck trailer is allowed to cross over the inside gutter pan and mount the truck apron. Exhibit 213-1 illustrates a WB-62FL design vehicle swept path for a single-lane roundabout.



213.2.2 Two-lane Roundabout

Provide adequate pavement area for the simultaneous passage of the design vehicle and a passenger vehicle through the roundabout and for turning movements. The design vehicle swept paths must stay within the travel lanes without encroaching on the inside and outside gutters, with the exception of the inside gutter of the circulatory roadway. Develop swept path diagrams for all turning movements in the following combinations:

- Design vehicle in the outside lane and passenger vehicle in the inside lane
- Design vehicle in the inside lane and passenger vehicle in the outside lane

It is acceptable for the design vehicle path to encroach on the adjacent travel lane within the circulatory roadway as long as there is sufficient space for the passenger vehicle plus two feet of clearance between the two vehicles. When truck volume is very low, consider allowing the truck-trailer to command both lanes to complete the maneuver.

213.3 Speed Control

Controlling entry, circulating, and exit speeds of vehicles as they navigate through a roundabout has a significant impact on safety and operations. Design roundabouts that limit the speed of approaching traffic and promote consistency in the relative speeds between conflicting traffic streams.

Roundabout design features that serve to control vehicular speeds include:

- (1) **Prominent landscaping in the central island:** Prominent landscaping serves to increase visibility of the central island and provide a visual queue to approaching drivers that they are entering a low speed environment. See *FDM 228* for landscape design requirements.
- (2) Raised splitter islands and roadside curb: The segment of roadway adjacent to a roundabout, characterized by the splitter island in the median with curb and gutter on the outside, provides a speed transition zone that promotes slower speeds. Lengthening this transition zone on high speed facilities can be an effective strategy for slowing down traffic prior to entering a roundabout.
- (3) **Hard Geometry:** The most effective way to control vehicular speeds at roundabouts is to introduce hard geometric features designed to slow drivers down. These features control speeds by introducing deflection and curvature into the path of the driver. Design parameters have a dramatic impact on the driver's entry, circulating, and exit speeds; e.g., inscribed circle diameter, lane width, entry width, curb locations.

²¹³⁻Modern Roundabouts

213.3.1 Fastest Path

The effectiveness of speed control within a roundabout can be determined by conducting a fastest path performance check. The fastest path is defined as the smoothest, flattest path possible for a single vehicle, in the absence of other traffic and ignoring all lane markings, traversing through the entry, around the central island, and out the exit. A detailed discussion of the fastest path performance check is provided in <u>NCHRP 672</u>.

Entry speed for a single-lane approach is restricted to 25 mph or less. Entry speed for a 2-lane approach is restricted to 30 mph or less. The relative difference between entry and exit speeds is to be no more than 10 mph.

213.4 Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation

Exhibit 213-2 includes standard details for splitter islands, pedestrian facilities, and bicycle facilities. The following requirements for bicycle and pedestrian facilities apply:

- (1) Provide sidewalks in accordance with *FDM 222* for projects with pedestrian facilities on the approach roadways.
- (2) Provide crosswalks at every approach leg when sidewalks are present.
 - (a) Provide curb ramps consistent with *FDM 222* and <u>Standard Plans</u>, Index 522-002.
 - (b) Orient crosswalks perpendicular to the roadway to minimize pedestrian crossing distance.
 - (c) At each crosswalk location provide a minimum 6-foot wide and 10-foot long pedestrian refuge area within the splitter island. Locate the refuge area approximately 20 feet from the outside edge of the circulatory roadway.
 - (d) Provide detectable warning surfaces in accordance with *FDM 222* at each curb ramp and pedestrian refuge area.
 - (e) Provide pedestrian crossing lighting in accordance with FDM 231.
- (3) For 2-lane roundabouts, terminate bicycle lanes or shoulders approximately 100 feet from the circulatory roadway and provide bail-out ramps. Installation of bicycle bail-out ramps is optional for single-lane roundabouts. When bicycle bail-out ramps are provided, the desired sidewalk width is 10 feet, but should not be less than 8 feet.

213-Modern Roundabouts

213.5 Splitter Islands

See *Exhibit 213-2* for an illustration of splitter island details. Splitter islands are to use a traffic separator or Type E curb.

Provide raised splitter islands that are a minimum 100 feet in length and a minimum of 6 feet wide at the crosswalks. An island less than 100 feet in length, but not less than 50 feet, may be considered for roundabouts located on a highway with a design speed of 35 mph or less. Provide an island at least 150 feet in length for roundabouts located on a highway with a design speed of 50 mph or greater.

Extend the splitter island beyond the end of the exit curve to discourage exiting traffic from crossing into the path of approaching traffic.

213.6 Truck Apron

Use the standard truck apron design illustrated in *Figure 213.6.1*. When circulatory lanes are concrete pavement, use red color additive to the concrete truck apron to provide a contrast.



Figure 213.6.1 Standard Truck Apron Design



213.7 Signing and Pavement Markings

Well-designed signing and pavement markings will enhance safety and traffic operations by clarifying the rules of the road and proper lane assignments to drivers as they navigate through the roundabout.

Follow the details presented in *Exhibits 213-3, 213-4,* and *213-5* when developing roundabout signing and pavement marking plans to promote consistency throughout the state.

Use the standard left-turn arrow with a circular dot on the left-most lane of the approach to multi-lane roundabouts as shown in <u>Standard Plans</u>, Index 711-001. Use standard arrows within the circulatory roadway.







-34

213.8 Lighting

Nighttime illumination of roundabouts is required. Provide a minimum 1.5 foot-candles on the roadway surface within the circulatory roadway and at least 200 feet in advance of the splitter islands.

See *FDM 231.3.3* for additional lighting requirements when pedestrian facilities are provided.

213.9 Landscaping

Create a mounded central island that slopes toward the truck apron using a 1:10 slope. Provide varying height landscaping in the central island to enhance driver recognition of the roundabout upon approach. Provide quality space above and below ground for trees and other desirable vegetation to grow. Place trees near the center of the central island and not less than 6 feet from the face of curb.

Use low-maintenance vegetation and trees. If more decorative plantings are requested by local agency or groups, a maintenance agreement should be obtained.

Additional information regarding roundabout landscaping is in Chapter 9 of <u>NCHRP 672</u>.

Coordinate the landscape design in the early stages of plans development to assure that landscaping will be fully integrated into the roundabout design and sight distance requirements will be satisfied.

213.10 Community Aesthetic Features

Communities commonly desire to place public art or other large aesthetic objects within the central island; e.g., statues, monuments, gateway features. These types of features are acceptable provided that:

- Objects are located outside the sight triangles,
- Not less than 6 feet from the inside edge of the truck apron, and
- Approval is granted through the process outlined in *FDM 127*.

Fountains, or other water spraying features are not permitted.

13

and one was if i managed a simple is because a sector of the spacetime of second of

pairs are a second

- والمراجع وموروطة بالموادة والسوائد
- والمتحد وجواريهم ويجريان ويجريان والمسولوسيلوط والتستقصات اومامر ستتقا
 - the second property of the second property in the

the second se



Serving Alachua Bradford • Columbia Dixie • Gilchrist • Hamilton Lafayette • Levy • Madison Suwannee • Taylor • Union Counties

2009 NW 67th Place, Gaineeville, FL 32653-1603 • 352.955.2200

January 31, 2018

TO:	Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board
	Citizens Advisory Committee
	Technical Advisory Committee
FROM:	Scott R. Koons AICP, Executive Director
SUBJECT:	State Road 222 (NE 39th Avenue) Crosswalk

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Request that the Florida Department of Transportation install a midblock crosswalk on State Road 222 (NE 39th Avenue) at NE 28th Drive.

BACKGROUND

At its May 2, 2016 meeting, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization discussed installation of a crosswalk on State Road 222 (NE 39th Avenue) at NE 28th Drive. At that time, the Florida Department of Transportation reported that a crosswalk was not warranted.

On January 19, 2018, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization received an email from a concerned citizen concerning pedestrian-vehicle crashes at the State Road 222 (NE 39th Avenue) at NE 28th Drive intersection. This email was forwarded to the Florida Department of Transportation District 2 Safety Engineer.

Exhibit 1 includes the email chain concerning this matter. District 2 is pursuing a variance from the Florida Department of Transportation Central Office to install a midblock crosswalk.

Attachment

t:\scott\sk18\mtpo\memo\ne39av_xwalk_comm_docx

-38-

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Scott, Jeffrey [Jeffrey.Scott@dot.state.fl.us] Monday, January 22, 2018 11:03 AM Mike Escalante Atran, Andrea; Green, James; Taulbee, Karen RE: crosswalk at NE 39th Av & NE 28th Dr, Gainesville

Mike,

Since a midblock crosswalk at this location does not meet the criteria of the Traffic Engineering Manual, we are going to pursue a variation through the FDOT Central Office in Tallahassee. That will probably take 4-6 weeks. I do not know for sure what kind of control we would install at the crossing. Possibly a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon, also known as a HAWK.

Jeff Scott, P.E. Florida Department of Transportation | District 2 District Safety Program Engineer 2198 Edison Ave. | Jacksonville, FL 32204 (904) 360-5644 Jeffrey.scott@dot.state.fl.us

From: Mike Escalante [mailto:escalante@ncfrpc.org]
Sent: Friday, January 19, 2018 5:11 PM
To: Scott, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Scott@dot.state.fl.us>; Taulbee, Karen <Karen.Taulbee@dot.state.fl.us>; Green, James
<James.Green@dot.state.fl.us>; Atran, Andrea <Andrea.Atran@dot.state.fl.us>
Subject: FW: crosswalk at NE 39th Av & NE 28th Dr, Gainesville

FYI



Michael B. Escalante, AICP Senior Planner North Central Florida Regional Planning Council 2009 NW 67th Place, Gainesville, FL 32653-1603 Voice: 352.955.2200, ext. 114 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: Mark Venzke [mailto:mark.venzke@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, January 19, 2018 4:35 PM
To: Mike Escalante
Cc: Carl Smart; Claudia Tuck; Tom Tonkovich; Sadie Darnell; Tony Jones; Teresa A Scott; Art Stockwell; Bob Gailey; Ellen
Allen; Heaven M Taylor-wynn
Subject: Re: crosswalk at NE 39th Av & NE 28th Dr, Gainesville

Mark Venzke South Bank Section C Dignity Village 3055 Northeast 28th Drive Gainesville, Florida 32609

Post Office Box 6220 Gainesville, Florida 32627-6220

<u>352-328-5615</u>

Mister Michael Escalante Senior Transportation Planner Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization North Central Florida Metropolitan Regional Planning Council 2009 NW 67th Place Gainesville, Florida 32653-1603

Mister Escalante:

Thank you for your prompt and informative reply to my request.

I note that in Mister Jeffrey Scott's reply to a locally originated request in 2016 for a pedestrian crossing at the intersection that he cited guidelines from a Florida State Highway Department manual and that the chief criterion for establishing a pedestrian crossing across a state highway is vehicle-pedestrian impacts. I can assure you that such impacts have occurred.

I mis-wrote in my last e-mail message to you. Motorists have struck and injured at least four, not two, pedestrians at the intersection:

- Julie Dietrich on or about December 6, 2015
- a male unknown to me in mid- to late-December 2017
- "Fredo" and his friend, unknown to me, and Fredo's dog in December 2017 or January 2018

Julie Dietrich

On or about December 6, 2015 at about 6:15 a.m., before sunrise and with fog in the air, Julie Dietrich, a large woman with mobility challenges who is personally known to me was slowly crossing SR 222 at the intersection with the help of her walker when the driver of a pickup truck struck her. The left-front fender and left mirror of the truck struck Julie. She sustained injuries to her neck, shoulder and back. She understands that the damage and accompanying discomfort, pain and additional mobility challenges that have arisen from those injuries are permanent. After the hospital discharged her, I saw her wearing a neck brace, so I asked her what had happened to her, and she told me. In the days that followed, I repeatedly urged her to not settle her case with any agent for the driver of the truck without the assistance of a personal injury lawyer. However, when urging her for about the fifth time not to settle, she told me about a nice man who offered to her \$10,000 to settle, which she told me she accepted. A few months later, I saw her again. She told me that she had depleted the \$10,000 by paying health care bills, rent, utilities and groceries and that she was again under-housed (homeless).

unknown man

On the night that a motorist struck the unknown male, I deboarded a bus at the intersection and had rolled in my wheelchair about thirty yards south of the intersection on NE 28 toward my home in Dignity Village. After I had heard a loud thump and and screeching tires, I returned to the intersection. Once there, I could see a male in a camel-colored overcoat motionless on the pavement in the middle of the eastbound side of SR 222 and I could smell burned rubber that the tires of the vehicle that struck the man emitted when skidding on the pavement. Apprehensive to possibly see grotesque injuries, I chose not to approach the fallen man. Instead, I chose instead to slow and direct traffic around the him. I parked my wheelchair in the middle of the eastbound lanes about twenty yards west of the man. I motioned with hand gestures for motorists to slow and swerve south of the man. Gainesville police officers arrived about ten minutes after the accident. To my surprise, they huddled in the grass median and allowed me to continue directing traffic until upple officers arrived about ten minutes after the accident.

-40 - continue directing traffic until well after the ambulances arrived about seven minutes after the officers

arrived. When officers began directing traffic, they initially diverted them south on NE 28th Dr. I positioned my wheelchair at the west entrance of the work release facility parking lot and directed motorists to drive eastward through that lot, so they could pass the accident scene, exit the lot at the east end of it and return to the eastbound lanes of SR 222. About twenty minutes after they arrived, officers closed the eastbound lanes of SR 222 at Waldo Rd, about 3/8 mile west of the accident scene.

Fredo and friend

About six days ago, I saw Fredo at the Rosa Parks Transit Plaza in downtown Gainesville. Noticing that he was uncharacteristically locomoting in a wheelchair, I asked him what had happened to him. He told me that the driver of a car had struck him, his friend and Fredo's dog at the intersection of SR 222 and NE 28th Dr. Because he was boarding a bus that due to leave shortly, I did not have time to get from him his contact information. When I asked him if he still lived in Dignity Village, he said, "I don't go there no more." He said that he was living in an apartment, but he did not tell me in which apartment he lived.

As you can read above, vehicle-pedestrian impacts have indeed occurred at the intersection since Grace Marketplace and Dignity Village opened.

Please send to me contact information for the members of the five advisory and decision-making bodies listed in your last e-mail message that will review our request or provide to me links to that contact information. I would like to inform those members directly of the severity of the safety hazard that the intersection presents to pedestrians.

May citizens present comments and information during all five of the meetings that you list in your e-mail message that you sent to me today?

Please place my e-mail address on any lists of recipients of notifications of meetings at which officials will consider my request for a pedestrian crossing at the intersection of NE 39th Av (SR 222) and NE 28th Dr.

Other advocates for a pedestrian crosswalk and I look forward to consideration of our request for the establishment of a conspicuous, traffic-slowing and motorist-alerting pedestrian crossing at the meetings of the advisory and decision-making bodies that listed in your last message.

Sincerely,



On Fri, Jan 19, 2018 at 1:32 PM, Mike Escalante < escalante@ncfrpc.org > wrote:

Mr. Venzke,

The Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization discussed crosswalk installation at this location at its May 2, 2016 meeting. Florida Department of Transportation reported that a crosswalk was not warranted at that time (see attachment).

This topic will be presented at the:

 2/7/18 @ 2:00 p.m. Technical Advisory Committee, Charles F. Justice Conference Room, <u>2009 NW 67</u>th Place, Gainesville, FL;

• 2/7/18 @ 7:00 p.m. Citizens Advisory Committee, Grace Knight Conference Room, <u>12 SE 1st Street</u>, Gainesville, FL;

2/8/18 @ 7:00 p.m. Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board, Grace Knight Conference Room, <u>12 SE 1st Street</u>, Gainesville, FL;

• 2/15/18 @ 10:00 a.m. Alachua County Traffic Safety Team, GTEC Meeting Room, 2153 SE Hawthorne Road, Gainesville, FL; and

• 2/26/18 @ 3:00 p.m. Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization, Jack Durrance Auditorium, <u>12 SE 1</u>st Street, Gainesville, FL.



Michael B. Escalante, AICP

Senior Planner

North Central Florida Regional Planning Council 2009 NW 67th Place, Gainesville, FL 32653-1603 Voice: <u>352.955.2200, ext. 114</u>

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: Mark Venzke [mailto:mark.venzke@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 18, 2018 2:00 PM
To: Mike Escalante
Cc: Heaven Taylor-wynn
Subject: crosswalk at NE 39th Av & NE 28th Dr, Gainesville

Mark Venzke

South Bank

Section C

Dignity Village

3055 Northeast 28th Drive

Gainesville, Florida 32609

Post Office Box 6220

Gainesville, Florida 32627-6220

352-328-5615

Mister Michael Escalante

Senior Transportation Planner

Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization

North Central Florida Metropolitan Regional Planning Council

2009 NW 67th Place

Gainesville, Florida 32653-1603

Mister Escalante:

Please describe to me the process that concerned citizens and their local, elected officials and their local government planning staff members can follow to have the Florida State Highway Department establish a conspicuous pedestrian crosswalk across a state highway at an intersection.

In my neighborhood is an intersection that has proven dangerous to pedestrians. It is Northeast 39th Avenue (State Road 222) and Northeast 28th Drive in Gainesville, Florida.

On the northeast and southeast corners of that intersection are transit bus stops for the Regional Transportation System (RTS) of the City Of Gainesville. very significant numbers of pedestrians--residents of my community,



Dignity Village, and of Grace Marketplace--cross Northeast 39th Avenue at that intersection to reach the bus stop for inbound (westbound) buses on the north side of 39th Avenue. Few residents of those communities have vehicles, so most of those residents use transit bus service.

During the past two years, drivers of vehicles moving on 39th Avenue have struck and seriously injured at least two residents of the above communities. About three weeks ago, a driver struck and killed a resident of Dignity Village named Travis as he attempted to cross 39th Avenue about one-quarter mile west of the above-described intersection.

I would appreciate any guidance that you could offer and would appreciate any measures that you might take that would help us establish a conspicuous crosswalk at the intersection.

Sincerely,



Mark Venzke Mark.Venzke@gmail.com

Mark Venzke Mark.Venzke@gmail.com

-44-



Serving Alachua Bradford • Columbia Dixie • Gilchrist • Hamilton Lafayette • Levy • Madison Suwannee • Taylor • Union Counties

-45-

2009 NW 67th Place, Gaineaville, FL 32653-1603 • 352.955.2200

January 31, 2018

TO: Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: Scott R. Koons, AICP, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Dr. Kermit Sigmon Citizen Participation Award- 2017

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Select a recipient for the Dr. Kermit Sigmon Citizen Participation Award for 2017.

BACKGROUND

In 1997, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area approved the annual Dr. Kermit Sigmon Citizen Participation Award. This award is presented each year to a recipient, selected by the Citizen Advisory Committee, to be recognized for their contribution to the transportation planning process of the community. Below is a listing of past recipients.

Previous Recipients					
1997-	Ruth Sigmon	2007-	Martin Gold		
1998-	Perry Maull	2008-	Mike and Susan Wright		
1999-	South West Alliance for Planning	2009-	Sharon Hawkey		
2000-	Var Heyl and Cindy Smith	2010-	Mayor Mark Goldstein		
2001-	Chandler Otis	2011-	Ed Poppell		
2002-	Gerry Dedenbach	2012-	Scott Fox		
2003-	Dr. Linda Crider	2013-	Thomas Hawkins		
2004-	Dan Burden	2014-	Ron Cunningham		
2005-	Julia Reiskind	2015-	Marlie Sanderson		
2006-	Dr. Ruth Steiner	2016-	Gainesville Citizens for Active Transportation		

t:\scott\sk18\mtpo\memo\cac_award_2017_cacrexfeb.docx



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE RECORD

TAC MEMBER AND ALTERNATE	ORGANIZATION	MEETING DATE 10/11/2017	MEETING DATE 11/15/2017	IN VIOLATION IF ABSENT AT NEXT MEETING?
STEVE LACHNICHT Alt - Jeff Hays [Chair] Alt - Chris Dawson Alt - Kathleen Pagan	Alachua County Department of Growth Management Office of Planning and Development	Р	Р	NO
BRIAN SINGLETON Alt- Thomas Strom Alt - Ramon Gavarrete	Alachua County Public Works Department	Р	Р	NO
DEKOVA BATEY	Alachua County/City of Gainesville/MTPO Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board	Р	Р	NO
ANDREW PERSONS Alt - Dean Mimms Alt - Jason Simmons	City of Gainesville Department of Doing	Р	E	NO
DEBBIE LEISTNER Alt- Phil Mann	City of Gainesville Department of Public Works	Р	А	NO
KRYS OCHIA Alt- Jesus Gomez	City of Gainesville Regional Transit System	Р	Р	NO
AARON CARVER Alt- Suzanne Schiemann Alt- Allan Penksa	Gainesville/Alachua County Regional Airport Authority	A	Р	NO
VACANT Alt - Karen Taulbee	Florida Department of Transportation		-	N/A
JAMES SPEER Alt- David Deas	School Board of Alachua County	A	А	YES
LINDA DIXON [Vice-Chair] Alt - Erik Lewis	University of Florida Planning, Design & Construction Division	Р	Р	NO
RON FULLER Alt- Scott Fox	University of Florida Transportation & Parking Services	Р	А	NO

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

me\p\em18\tac\attendanceTAC_111517_xls

* City of Gainesville Level of Service Subcommittee Member

Attendance Rule:

1. Each voting member of the Technical Advisory Committee 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 Technical Advisory Committee is expected to demonstrate his or her interest in the Technical Advisory Committee'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 that three (3) consecutive absences will be allowed by the member. The Technical Advisory Committee shall deal with consistent absences and is empowered to recommend corrective action for MetropolitanTransportation Planning Organization consideration.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ATTENDANCE RECORD

NAME	TERM EXPIRES	11/16/2016	3/15/2017	5/17/2017	Violation If Absent At Next Meeting 2/7/2018
Thomas Bolduc	10 Dec	P	D	D	
Thomas Dolude	19-Dec				
Craig Brashier	20-Dec	-		-	-
Nelle Bullock	-19-Dec	- P	Р	A	
Peter Davis	20-Dec	-	-	-	-1
Mary Ann DeMatas	18-Dec	Α	Р	Р	
Luis Diaz	19-Dec		Р	A	-
Jan Frentzen	18-Dec	Α	Р	Р	-
Delia Kradolfer	18-Dec	E	Р	Р	-
Gilbert Levy	20-Dec	Р	Р	Р	- -
Chandler Otis	18-Dec	Р	A	Р	
John Pickett	19-Dec	Р	Р	Е	
James Samec	20-Dec	Р	Р	Р	-
Ruth Steiner	18-Dec	Р	Р	Р	
VACANT	20-Dec			-	
Paul Thur de Koos	19-Dec		Р	Р	

LEGEND KEY - P-Present; E-Excused Absence; A-Unexcused Absence t\mike\em18\cac\attd_cac0207.xls

ATTENDANCE RULE

Any appointee of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization to the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be automatically removed from the committee upon filing with the Chair of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization appropriate proof that such person has had three (3) or more consecutive excused or unexcused absences. Excused absences are hereby defined to be those absences which occur from regular or special meetings after notification by such person to the Chair prior to such absence explaining the reasons therefore. All other absences are hereby defined to be unexcused.

ADDITIONAL NOTE: Members denoted in BOLD ITALICs are at risk for attendance rule violation if the next meeting is missed.



SCHEDULED 2018 MTPO AND COMMITTEE MEETING DATES AND TIMES					
PLEASE NOTE: All of the dates and times shown in this table are subject to being changed during the year.					
MTPO MEETING MONTH	TAC [At 2:00 p.m.] CAC [At 7:00 p.m.]	B/PAB [At 7:00 p.m.]	MTPO MEETING		
FEBRUARY	February 7	February 8	February 26 at 3:00 p.m.		
MAY	April 4	April 5	April 23 at 3:00 p.m.		
JUNE	June 6	June 7	June 25 at 5:00 p.m.		
AUGUST	ST August 8 Augu		August 27 at 3:00 p.m.		
OCTOBER	October 3	October 4	October 22 at 3:00 p.m.		
DECEMBER	November 28	November 29	December 17 at 5:00 p.m.		

Note, unless otherwise scheduled:

Г

- 1. Technical Advisory Committee meetings are conducted in the Charles F. Justice Conference Room of the North Central Florida Regional Planning Council Building;
- Citizens Advisory Committee meetings are conducted in the Grace Knight Conference Room of the Alachua County Administration Building; and
- 3. Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization meetings are conducted at the Jack Durrance Auditorium of the Alachua County Administration Building unless noted.
- MTPO means Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization TAC means Technical Advisory Committee CAC means Citizens Advisory Committee B/PAB means Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board NCFRPC means North Central Florida Regional Planning Council

T:\Scott\SK18\MTPO\MEET2018.doc

December 5, 2017

.

the second s

and the second se