North Central Florida Regional Planning Council

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

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

July 29, 2019

TO: Technical Advisory Committee
Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: Scott R. Koons, AICP, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Meeting Announcement and Agenda

On August 7, 2019, the Technical Advisory Committee will meet at 2:00 p.m. in the **Gainesville Regional Utilities Multipurpose Room, 301 SE 4th Avenue.** Also, on August 7, 2019 the Citizens Advisory Committee will meet at 7:00 p.m. in the **Charles F. Justice Conference Room, North Central Florida Regional Planning Council, 2009 NW 67th Place.**[#] Times shown on this agenda are for the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting.

			STAFF RECOMMENDATION
7:00 p.m.	**I.**	**Introductions (if needed)***	
Page #1 **7:05 p.m.**	**II.**	**Approval of Meeting Agenda**	**APPROVE AGENDA**
Page #3 **7:10 p.m.**	**III.**	**Approval of Committee Minutes**	**APPROVE MINUTES**
Page #11 **7:15 p.m.**	**IV.**	**Transportation Improvement Program Amendment - Roll Forward Projects** The Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization needs to approve the Transportation Improvement Program Amendment to roll forward projects in order for these funds to spent within the Gainesville Metropolitan Area.	**APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
Page #23 **7:25 p.m.**	**V.**	**Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan Update Referral** The Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization referred the development of scoping and funding mechanism recommendations for updating the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan to its advisory committees.	**DEVELOP SCOPING RECOMMENDATIONS**

[#] Due to construction at the Alachua County Administration Building

Page #97 **VI.** **U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) Design Workshop** **DEVELOP DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS**
7:45 p.m.

A Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization member suggested a workshop concerning a redesign of U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) and a referral to its advisory committees for recommendations.

VII. Information Items

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

Page #183 A. Advisory Committee Attendance Records
Page #185 B. Meeting Calendar - 2019
Page #187 C. Regional Transit System Transit Development Plan - Status Report

*No handout included with the enclosed agenda item.

MINUTES

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

Gainesville Regional Utilities Administration Building
301 SE 4th Avenue
Gainesville, Florida

June 5, 2019
2:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	OTHERS PRESENT	STAFF PRESENT
Dekova Batey	Aaron Carver	None	Michael Escalante
Linda Dixon	Yaima Droese		Scott Koons
Ronald Fuller, Vice-Chair	Mari Schwabacher		
Jeffrey Hays			
Deborah Leistner, Chair			
Jason Simmons			
Brian Singleton			

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Deborah Leistner, City of Gainesville Transportation Planning Manager, called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

There were no introductions.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MEETING AGENDA

Chair Leistner asked for approval of the agenda as amended to defer discussion of item VII. Bylaws Amendment - Technical Advisory Committee Membership Composition.

Michael Escalante, Senior Planner, stated there was a correction of the description for item VIII. U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) Charrette Implementation - Status Report.

MOTION: Brian Singleton moved to approve the meeting agenda as amended to:

1. **Defer discussion of item VII. Bylaws Amendment - Technical Advisory Committee Membership Composition; and**

2. **Correct the description for item VIII. U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) Charrette Implementation - Status Report.**

Jeffrey Hays seconded; motion passed unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MINUTES

Chair Leistner stated that the April 3, 2019 minutes were ready for consideration of approval by the Technical Advisory Committee.

MOTION: Brian Singleton moved to approve the April 3, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee minutes. Linda Dixon seconded; motion passed unanimously.

IV. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018-19 TO 2022-23

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 and state 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.

MOTION: Jeffrey Hays moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization:

1. **Approve the Fiscal Years 2019-20 to 2023-24 Transportation Improvement Program as modified to incorporate review agency comments; and**

2. **Request that the Florida Department of Transportation revise its Work Program and/or amend its State Transportation Improvement Program to advance the construction phase of the State Road 24 (Archer Road) at SW 23rd Terrace traffic signal update project [4343961] from Fiscal Year 2022-23 to Fiscal Year 2019-20 to coincide with the extension of Research Drive on the University of Florida campus south to State Road 24 (Archer Road).**

Ron Fuller seconded; motion passed unanimously.

V. 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 adopted Year 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan and from local agency recommendations. He discussed the draft List of Priority Projects and answered questions.

Several members discussed inclusion of an update of the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan.

MOTION: Linda Dixon moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approve the Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25 List of Priority Projects Table 1 Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities as revised to include an update of the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan as new priority 4. Brian Singleton seconded; motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Linda Dixon moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approve the Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25 List of Priority Projects Table 2 Other Arterials/Right-of-Way Priorities as revised to:

- **Move priority 2 to priority 1; and**
- **Delete "and implementation" from the new priority 2.**

Brian Singleton seconded; motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Linda Dixon moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approve the Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25 List of Priority Projects Table 3 Transit Priorities as presented. Brian Singleton seconded; motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Linda Dixon moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approve the Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25 List of Priority Projects Table D-1 Long-Range Transportation Planning Priorities as revised to remove blank rows. Brian Singleton seconded; motion passed unanimously.

Brian Singleton, Alachua County Public Works Assistant Director, discussed the need for bus bays on four-lane roadways, including priorities 11 and 12, and whether some projects, particularly priorities 3, 5 and 8, have been completed from Table D-2 Supplemental Transit Priorities.

MOTION: Linda Dixon moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approve the Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25 List of Priority Projects Table D-2 Supplemental Transit Priorities as revised to:

- **Remove priorities 11 and 12; and**
- **Have staff verify whether any of the other priorities have been programmed and if so, also remove them.**

Brian Singleton seconded; motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Linda Dixon moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approve the Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25 List of Priority Projects Table D-3 Highway Safety Fund Priorities as revised to add:

- **Installation of enhanced pedestrian crossings on State Road 26 (West University Avenue) at the NW 16th Avenue, NW 17th Avenue and NW 19th Avenue intersections as the new priority 2; and**
- **Midblock pedestrian-actuated crossings on State Road 24 (Archer Road) from State Road 121 (SW 34 Street) to State Road 226 (SW 16th Avenue) as the new priority 4.**

Brian Singleton seconded; motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Jeffrey Hays moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approve the Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25 List of Priority Projects as revised by the previous motions. Brian Singleton seconded; motion passed unanimously.

VI. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN UPDATE (Citizens Advisory Committee Only)

VII. BYLAWS AMENDMENT - TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP COMPOSITION

This item was deferred.

VIII. U.S. HIGHWAY 441 (SW 13TH STREET) CHARRETTE IMPLEMENTATION STATUS REPORT

Mr. Escalante stated that the staff received a request to provide a status report on the implementation of the SW 13th Street Charrette recommendations. He reported the Florida Department of Transportation response.

IX. UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Mr. Escalante stated that the University of Florida staff requested an opportunity for Technical Advisory Committee review and comment on campus transportation projects.

Ms. Linda Dixon, University of Florida Planning Director, discussed campus transportation projects and answered questions.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

There was no discussion of the information items.

XI. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CENTER TOUR (Citizens Advisory Committee Only)

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

_____ _____

Date Deborah Leistner, Chair

MINUTES

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

Gainesville Traffic Management Center
405 NW 39th Avenue
Gainesville, Florida

June 5, 2019
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	OTHERS PRESENT	STAFF PRESENT
Thomas Bolduc	Craig Brashier		Michael Escalante
Alyssa Brown	Nelle Bullock	Dekova Batey	Scott Koons
Mary Ann DeMatas	James Samec	Emmanuel Posadas	
Jan Frentzen	Paul Thur de Koos		
Gilbert Levy	Luke Tia		
Chandler Otis, Vice-Chair			
John Pickett			
Ruth Steiner, Chair			
Chris Towne			
Joshua Williams			

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ruth Steiner called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Steiner introduced herself and asked others to introduce themselves.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MEETING AGENDA

Chair Steiner asked for approval of the agenda.

Michael Escalante, Senior Planner, asked for an amendment to the agenda to defer item VII. Bylaws Amendment - Technical Advisory Committee Membership Composition and to correct the description for item VIII. U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) Charrette Implementation - Status Report.

MOTION: Thomas Bolduc moved to approve the meeting agenda as amended to:

1. **Defer discussion of item VII. Bylaws Amendment - Technical Advisory Committee Membership Composition; and**

2. **Correct the description for item VIII. U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) Charrette Implementation - Status Report.**

Alyssa Brown seconded; motion passed unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MINUTES

Chair Steiner asked for approval of the April 3, 2019 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting minutes.

MOTION: John Pickett moved to approve the April 3, 2019 Citizens Advisory Committee minutes. Jan Frentzen seconded; motion passed unanimously.

IV. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018-19 TO 2022-23

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 and state 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.

MOTION: Chandler Otis moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization:

1. **Approve the Fiscal Years 2019-20 to 2023-24 Transportation Improvement Program as modified to incorporate review agency comments; and**

2. **Request that the Florida Department of Transportation revise its Work Program and/or amend its State Transportation Improvement Program to advance the construction phase of the State Road 24 (Archer Road) at SW 23rd Terrace traffic signal update project [4343961] from Fiscal Year 2022-23 to Fiscal Year 2019-20 to coincide with the extension of Research Drive on the University of Florida campus south to State Road 24 (Archer Road).**

Chris Towne seconded; motion passed unanimously.

V. 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 adopted Year 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan and from local agency recommendations. He discussed the draft list of Priority Projects and answered questions. He reported the following Technical Advisory Committee recommendations to revise the List of Priority Projects:

Table 1 Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities revised to include an update of the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan as new priority 4.

Table 2 Other Arterials/Right-of-Way Priorities revised to:

- Move priority 2 to priority 1; and
- Delete "and implementation" from new priority 2.

Table D-1 Long-Range Transportation Planning Priorities revised to remove blank rows.

Table D-2 Supplemental Transit Priorities revised to:

- Remove priorities 11 and 12; and
- Have staff verify whether any of the other priorities have been programmed and if so, also remove them.

Table D-3 Highway Safety Fund Priorities revised to add:

- Installation of enhanced pedestrian crossings on State Road 26 (West University Avenue) at the NW 16th Avenue, NW 17th Avenue and NW 19th Avenue intersections as the new priority 2; and
- Midblock pedestrian-actuated crossings on State Road 24 (Archer Road) from State Road 121 (SW 34 Street) to State Road 226 (SW 16th Avenue) as the new priority 4.

Emmanuel Posadas, City of Gainesville Traffic Management Center Director, discussed pedestrian crossing activity at the State Road 26 (West University Avenue) and U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) intersection and answered questions.

Dekova Batey, Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board Coordinator, discussed the Downtown Connector Trail crossing at State Road 331 (Williston Road) and answered questions.

MOTION: Thomas Bolduc moved to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approve the Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25 List of Priority Projects with the following revisions:

Table 1 Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities revised to include an update of the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan as new priority 4.

Table 2 Other Arterials/Right-of-Way Priorities revised to:

- **Move priority 2 to priority 1; and**
- **Delete "and implementation" from the new priority 2.**

Table D-1 Long-Range Transportation Planning Priorities revised to remove blank rows.

Table D-2 Supplemental Transit Priorities revised to:

- **Remove priorities 11 and 12; and**
- **Have staff verify whether any of the other priorities have been programmed and if so, also remove them.**

Table D-3 Highway Safety Fund Priorities revised to add:

- **Installation of enhanced pedestrian crossings on State Road 26 (West University Avenue) at the NW 16th Avenue, NW 17th Avenue and NW 19th Avenue intersections as the new priority 2; and**
- **Midblock pedestrian-actuated crossings on State Road 24 (Archer Road) from State Road 121 (SW 34 Street) to State Road 226 (SW 16th Avenue) as the new priority 4.**

Jan Frentzen seconded; motion passed unanimously.

VI. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN UPDATE (Citizens Advisory Committee Only)

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

VII. BYLAWS AMENDMENT - TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP COMPOSITION

This item was deferred.

VIII. U.S. HIGHWAY 441 (SW 13TH STREET) CHARRETTE IMPLEMENTATION STATUS REPORT

Mr. Escalante stated that the staff received a request to provide a status report on the implementation of the SW 13th Street Charrette recommendations. He reported the Florida Department of Transportation response.

IX. UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS (Technical Advisory Committee Only)

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

There was no discussion of the information items.

XI. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CENTER TOUR

Mr. Posadas conducted a tour of the Traffic Management Center and answered questions.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

_____ _____

Date Ruth Steiner, Chair

North Central Florida Regional Planning Council

IV

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

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

August 19, 2019

TO: Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area

FROM: Scott R. Koons, AICP, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Transportation Improvement Program Amendment- Roll Forward Projects

JOINT RECOMMENDATION

The Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board, Citizens Advisory Committee, Technical Advisory Committee and staff recommend amending the Transportation Improvement Program to roll forward funding into Fiscal Year 2019-20 for the projects within the Gainesville Metropolitan Area identified in Exhibit 1.

BACKGROUND

The Florida Department of Transportation is requesting that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization amend its Transportation Improvement Program to roll forward funding from Fiscal Year 2018-19 to Fiscal Year 2019-20 for the projects shown in Exhibit 1. This amendment is needed because funds for these projects were not committed by June 30, 2019 - the end of the state fiscal year. Roll forward projects within the Gainesville Metropolitan Area include:

- Interstate 75 Interchange Modification at State Road 24 (Archer Road) [4230714];
- State Road 222 (NW 39 Avenue) at NW 10 Street Special Survey [4286821];
- Interstate 75 Resurfacing from South of State Road 222 to North of U.S. Highway 441 [4288031];
- SW 27 Street Bike Path/Trail from State Road 331 (Williston Road) to SW 35th Place [4339891];
- State Road 24 (Archer Road) Four-Laning Project Development Environmental Study [4345591];
- State Road 26 (Newberry Road) Add Turnlanes from Tower Road to NW 69th Terrace [4373541];
- State Road 226 (SW 16 Avenue) Streetlighting from State Road 24 (Archer Road) to SW 6 Street [4398071];
- Alachua Countywide Intelligent Transportation System Devices at various locations [4408981];
- Regional Transit System Section 5307 Formula Grant Operating Assistance [2155461];
- Regional Transit System Section 5307 Formula Grant Capital Assistance [4040261];
- Regional Transit System Service Development [4330761];
- Regional Transit System Section 5339 Operating Assistance [4415201]; and
- Regional Transit System Section 5339(c) No-Lo Emissions Vehicle Purchases [4428871].

Each year, funds for some federally-funded projects are rolled forward into the next fiscal year because of the difference between the federal and state fiscal years. The federal fiscal year is from October 1st to September 30th each year, while the state fiscal year is from July 1st to June 30th.

Attachment

t:\scott\sk20\mtpo\memo\tipamend_rollover_mtpo_aug19.docx

EXHIBIT 1

Florida Department of Transportation

RON DESANTIS
GOVERNOR

2198 Edison Avenue MS 2806
Jacksonville, FL 32204-2730

KEVIN THIBAULT
SECRETARY

July 10, 2019

Scott R. Koons, AICP
Executive Director
Gainesville MTPO
2009 NW 67th Place
Gainesville, FL 32653

SUBJECT: FDOT Request: Roll Forward Amendment to the Gainesville MPTO Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) FY 2019/20 – 2023/2024

Dear Mr. Koons,

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Requests a Roll Forward Amendment of the FY 2019/20 – 2023/24 TIP.

The Roll Forward Amendment represents those projects, or phases of projects, that were approved in the FY 2018/19 – 2022/23 TIP that were not authorized or begun prior to the beginning of the new fiscal year on July 1, 2019. These projects then "Roll Forward" into the first year of the new FY 2019/20 – 2023/24 TIP. The attached list (Exhibit A) contains the projects included in the Roll Forward Amendment. The highlighted projects are those located within the MTPO boundary.

Please place the Roll Forward TIP amendment request on the agendas for the MTPO and the committees for the August meetings.

Sincerely,

Mari Schwabacher
Gainesville MTPO Liaison

cc: Karen Taulbee, FDOT Urban Planning Manager
Mike Escalante, AICP, Senior Transportation Planner

EXHIBIT A

GAINESVILLE MTPO

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF WORK PROGRAM
MPO ROLLFORWARD REPORT
==========
HIGHWAYS
==========

DATE RUN: 07/05/2019
TIME RUN: 07.32.35
MBRMPOTP

ITEM NUMBER:207798 6 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR45/US27/US41 *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:RIGHT OF WAY ACTIVITIES
ROADWAY ID:26030000 PROJECT LENGTH: 1.073MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: RIGHT OF WAY / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DIH	0	500	0	0	0	0	0	500
LF	90,819	0	0	0	0	0	0	90,819
SN	0	1,546	0	0	0	0	0	1,546
TOTAL 207798 6	**90,819**	**2,046**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**92,865**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**90,819**	**2,046**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**92,865**

ITEM NUMBER:423071 4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:I-75(SR93)@ SR24(ARCHER RD) *SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES
ROADWAY ID:26260000 PROJECT LENGTH: .386MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 6/ 6/ 1

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: P D & E / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DIH	0	1,001	0	0	0	0	0	1,001
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DI	1,239,381	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,239,381
DIH	54,585	1,475	0	0	0	0	0	56,060
DS	37,116	0	0	0	0	0	0	37,116
PHASE: RIGHT OF WAY / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DIH	3,484	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,484
DS	1,032	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,032
PHASE: RAILROAD & UTILITIES / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
ACFP	104,994	0	0	0	0	0	0	104,994
DDR	78,250	0	0	0	0	0	0	78,250
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
ACFP	7,210,708	125,650	0	0	0	0	0	7,336,358
DDR	106,628	0	0	0	0	0	0	106,628
DI	77,042	0	0	0	0	0	0	77,042
DS	579,080	0	0	0	0	0	0	579,080
NFP	189,190	0	0	0	0	0	0	189,190
TOTAL 423071 4	**9,681,490**	**128,126**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9,809,616**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**9,681,490**	**128,126**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9,809,616**

ITEM NUMBER:426838 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR121 FROM: NW 169 PL TO: NW 177 AVE *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:SPECIAL SURVEYS
ROADWAY ID:26100000 PROJECT LENGTH: .430MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DIH	243	1,001	0	0	0	0	0	1,244
DS	6,651	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,651
TOTAL 426838 1	**6,894**	**1,001**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7,895**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**6,894**	**1,001**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7,895**

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF WORK PROGRAM
MPO ROLLFORWARD REPORT
==========
HIGHWAYS
==========

ITEM NUMBER:428682 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR222(NW 39 AVE) FROM: 100'W OF NW 10 ST TO: 100' E OF NW 10 ST *SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:SPECIAL SURVEYS
ROADWAY ID:26005000 PROJECT LENGTH: .040MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 4/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DIH	0	2,151	0	0	0	0	0	2,151
DS	7,294	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,294
TOTAL 428682 1	**7,294**	**2,151**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9,445**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**7,294**	**2,151**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9,445**

ITEM NUMBER:428803 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:I-75 (SR 93) FROM S. OF SR 222 TO N. OF SR 25/US 441 *SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:RESURFACING
ROADWAY ID:26260000 PROJECT LENGTH: 11.421MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 6/ 6/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
ACNP	0	109,120	0	0	0	0	0	109,120
DDR	98,629	0	0	0	0	0	0	98,629
DIH	19,983	0	0	0	0	0	0	19,983
DS	9,378	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,378
IM	1,015,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,015,100
NHPP	210,630	0	0	0	0	0	0	210,630
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DDR	486,533	0	0	0	0	0	0	486,533
DI	748,506	0	0	0	0	0	0	748,506
DIH	189,798	0	0	0	0	0	0	189,798
DS	99,008	0	0	0	0	0	0	99,008
NHPP	7,950,919	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,950,919
SAAN	11,972,459	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,972,459
TOTAL 428803 1	**22,800,943**	**109,120**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**22,910,063**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**22,800,943**	**109,120**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**22,910,063**

ITEM NUMBER:432311 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR200(US301) FROM RAILROAD OVERPASS TO BRADFORD C/L *SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:RESURFACING
ROADWAY ID:26060000 PROJECT LENGTH: 3.431MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 4/ 4/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DIH	89,643	0	0	0	0	0	0	89,643
DS	7,126	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,126
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DDR	1,041,090	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,041,090
DIH	67,327	3,331	0	0	0	0	0	70,658
DS	23,840	0	0	0	0	0	0	23,840
NHRE	3,237,193	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,237,193
TOTAL 432311 1	**4,466,219**	**3,331**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4,469,550**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**4,466,219**	**3,331**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4,469,550**

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF WORK PROGRAM
MPO ROLLFORWARD REPORT

HIGHWAYS

ITEM NUMBER:433357 1 — PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SW 170TH STREET FROM: S OF SW 147TH AVE TO: SW 128TH PLACE — *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 — COUNTY:ALACHUA — TYPE OF WORK:SIDEWALK
ROADWAY ID:26620000 — PROJECT LENGTH: 1.180MI — LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
ACTA	11,980	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,980
TALT	350,052	4,209	0	0	0	0	0	354,261
PHASE: ENVIRONMENTAL / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
TALT	12,390	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,390
TOTAL 433357 1	**374,422**	**4,209**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**378,631**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**374,422**	**4,209**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**378,631**

ITEM NUMBER:433890 1 — PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR20 OVERPASS @ US301 — *SIS*
DISTRICT:02 — COUNTY:ALACHUA — TYPE OF WORK:LANDSCAPING
ROADWAY ID:26080000 — PROJECT LENGTH: .587MI — LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 4/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DIH	1,847	2,102	0	0	0	0	0	3,949
TOTAL 433890 1	**1,847**	**2,102**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3,949**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**1,847**	**2,102**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3,949**

ITEM NUMBER:433989 1 — PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SW 27TH STREET FROM: SW WILLISTON RD TO: SW 35TH PLACE — *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 — COUNTY:ALACHUA — TYPE OF WORK:BIKE PATH/TRAIL
ROADWAY ID:26900003 — PROJECT LENGTH: .696MI — LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY CITY OF GAINESVILLE								
TALL	104,461	0	0	0	0	0	0	104,461
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
TALL	1,106	1,765	0	0	0	0	0	2,871
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY CITY OF GAINESVILLE								
SA	27,804	0	0	0	0	0	0	27,804
TALL	74,911	0	0	0	0	0	0	74,911
TALT	341,308	0	0	0	0	0	0	341,308
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
TALL	3,413	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	8,413
TALT	381	2,869	0	0	0	0	0	3,250
TOTAL 433989 1	**553,384**	**9,634**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**563,018**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**553,384**	**9,634**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**563,018**

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF WORK PROGRAM
MPO ROLLFORWARD REPORT
==========
HIGHWAYS
==========

ITEM NUMBER:433990 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:POE SPRINGS ROAD FROM: POE SPRINGS TO: US27(MAIN STREET) *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:BIKE PATH/TRAIL
ROADWAY ID:26511000 PROJECT LENGTH: 3.462MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
TALT	0	500	0	0	0	0	0	500
TOTAL 433990 1	**0**	**500**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**500**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**0**	**500**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**500**

ITEM NUMBER:434321 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR20(NW 1ST AVE) FROM NW 9TH STREET TO US441 *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:RESURFACING
ROADWAY ID:26020064 PROJECT LENGTH: 1.188MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ 2/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DIH	62,136	0	0	0	0	0	0	62,136
DS	45,851	0	0	0	0	0	0	45,851
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DDR	801,342	0	0	0	0	0	0	801,342
DIH	1,335	17,618	0	0	0	0	0	18,953
DS	5,613	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,613
TOTAL 434321 1	**916,277**	**17,618**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**933,895**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**916,277**	**17,618**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**933,895**

ITEM NUMBER:434322 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR20(US27) FROM COLUMBIA C/L TO NW 9TH STREET *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:RESURFACING
ROADWAY ID:26040000 PROJECT LENGTH: 1.675MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ 2/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DIH	95,457	0	0	0	0	0	0	95,457
DS	58,002	0	0	0	0	0	0	58,002
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DDR	1,087,291	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,087,291
DIH	3,336	26,702	0	0	0	0	0	30,038
DS	33,474	0	0	0	0	0	0	33,474
TOTAL 434322 1	**1,277,560**	**26,702**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,304,262**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**1,277,560**	**26,702**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,304,262**

ITEM NUMBER:434559 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR24(ARCHER RD) FROM US27A/BRONSON TO SW 75TH ST/TOWER RD *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
ROADWAY ID:26090000 PROJECT LENGTH: 10.188MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ 2/ 2

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: P D & E / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DDR	80,058	0	0	0	0	0	0	80,058
DIH	18,817	14,182	0	0	0	0	0	32,999

DS	7,021	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,021
TOTAL 434559 1	**105,896**	**14,182**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**120,078**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**105,896**	**14,182**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**120,078**

ITEM NUMBER:437354 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR26(NEWBERRY RD) FROM NW 75TH ST TO NW 69TH TERRACE *SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:ADD TURN LANE(S)
ROADWAY ID:26070000 PROJECT LENGTH: .568MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 3/ 3/ 1

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
ACSA	0	116	0	0	0	0	0	116
DS	63,790	0	0	0	0	0	0	63,790
HSP	588,493	0	0	0	0	0	0	588,493
SA	32,209	791	0	0	0	0	0	33,000
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
ACSS	2,669,320	7,614	0	0	0	0	0	2,676,934
DDR	140,365	0	0	0	0	0	0	140,365
DS	8,297	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,297
TOTAL 437354 1	**3,502,474**	**8,521**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3,510,995**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**3,502,474**	**8,521**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3,510,995**

ITEM NUMBER:439807 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR226 FROM: SR24 TO: SW 6TH STREET *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:LIGHTING
ROADWAY ID:26004000 PROJECT LENGTH: 1.494MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 3/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
ACSS	0	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,000
DS	7,470	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,470
HSP	33,060	0	0	0	0	0	0	33,060
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DS	8,707	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,707
TOTAL 439807 1	**49,237**	**1,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**50,237**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**49,237**	**1,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**50,237**

ITEM NUMBER:440898 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:INSTALLATION OF VARIOUS ITS DEVICES IN ALACHUA COUNTY *SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:TRAFFIC SIGNAL UPDATE
ROADWAY ID:26010000 PROJECT LENGTH: 44.977MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 4/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
ACFP	367,051	37,443	0	0	0	0	0	404,494
DITS	168,825	0	0	0	0	0	0	168,825
DS	35,650	0	0	0	0	0	0	35,650
NFP	494,949	0	0	0	0	0	0	494,949
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
ACFP	1,287,983	1,748,242	0	0	0	0	0	3,036,225
DDR	71,028	0	0	0	0	0	0	71,028
TOTAL 440898 1	**2,425,486**	**1,785,685**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4,211,171**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**2,425,486**	**1,785,685**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4,211,171**

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF WORK PROGRAM
MPO ROLLFORWARD REPORT
==========
HIGHWAYS
==========

DATE RUN: 07/05/2019
TIME RUN: 07.32.35
MBRMPOTP

ITEM NUMBER:443489 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:I-75(SR93) THROUGH PAYNES PRAIRIE *SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:GUARDRAIL
ROADWAY ID:26260000 PROJECT LENGTH: 2.353MI LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 6/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DIH	9,679	4,321	0	0	0	0	0	14,000
SA	0	11,000	0	0	0	0	0	11,000
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
ACSA	0	19,461	0	0	0	0	0	19,461
ACSS	0	1,381,337	0	0	0	0	0	1,381,337
DS	4,896	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,896
TOTAL 443489 1	**14,575**	**1,416,119**	**0**	**0**	0	**0**	**0**	**1,430,694**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**14,575**	**1,416,119**	**0**	**0**	0	**0**	**0**	**1,430,694**
TOTAL DIST: 02	**46,274,817**	**3,532,047**	**0**	**0**	0	**0**	**0**	**49,806,864**
TOTAL HIGHWAYS	**46,274,817**	**3,532,047**	**0**	**0**	0	**0**	**0**	**49,806,864**

ITEM NUMBER:215546 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:GAINESVILLE RTS SECT 5307 FORMULA GRANT OPERATING ASSISTANCE *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:OPERATING FOR FIXED ROUTE
ROADWAY ID: PROJECT LENGTH: .000 LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: OPERATIONS / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY GAINESVILLE								
DS	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
FTA	3,800,000	3,600,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	0	14,600,000
LF	3,800,000	3,600,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	0	14,600,000
TOTAL 215546 1	**7,600,001**	**7,200,000**	**3,600,000**	**3,600,000**	**3,600,000**	**3,600,000**	**0**	**29,200,001**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**7,600,001**	**7,200,000**	**3,600,000**	**3,600,000**	**3,600,000**	**3,600,000**	**0**	**29,200,001**

ITEM NUMBER:404026 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:GAINESVILLE RTS SEC 5307 FORMULA GRANT MISC CAPITAL PURCHASES *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:CAPITAL FOR FIXED ROUTE
ROADWAY ID: PROJECT LENGTH: .000 LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: CAPITAL / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY GAINESVILLE								
FTA	4,700,000	5,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	0	19,700,000
LF	1,175,000	1,250,000	625,000	625,000	625,000	625,000	0	4,925,000
TOTAL 404026 1	**5,875,000**	**6,250,000**	**3,125,000**	**3,125,000**	**3,125,000**	**3,125,000**	**0**	**24,625,000**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**5,875,000**	**6,250,000**	**3,125,000**	**3,125,000**	**3,125,000**	**3,125,000**	**0**	**24,625,000**

ITEM NUMBER:433076 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:ALACHUA CO GAINESVILLE RTS SERVICE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:TRANSIT SERVICE DEMONSTRATION
ROADWAY ID: PROJECT LENGTH: .000 LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: OPERATIONS / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY GAINESVILLE								
DDR	57,915	0	0	0	0	0	0	57,915
DPTO	768,530	1,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,768,530
DS	20,803	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,803
LF	113,915	0	0	0	0	0	0	113,915
TOTAL 433076 1	**961,163**	**1,000,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,961,163**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**961,163**	**1,000,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,961,163**

ITEM NUMBER:441520 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:ALACHUA CO 5339 RTS TRANSIT IMPROVEMENT *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:OPERATING/ADMIN. ASSISTANCE
ROADWAY ID: PROJECT LENGTH: .000 LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: CAPITAL / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY ALACHUA COUNTY								
FTA	0	728,002	364,001	364,001	364,001	364,001	0	2,184,006
LF	0	182,000	91,000	91,000	91,000	91,000	0	546,000
TOTAL 441520 1	**0**	**910,002**	**455,001**	**455,001**	**455,001**	**455,001**	**0**	**2,730,006**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**0**	**910,002**	**455,001**	**455,001**	**455,001**	**455,001**	**0**	**2,730,006**

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF WORK PROGRAM
MPO ROLLFORWARD REPORT
==========
TRANSIT
==========

ITEM NUMBER:442887 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:GAINESVILLE RTS LO-NO EMISSIONS PURCHASE ELECTRIC BUSES/CHARGERS *NON-SIS*
DISTRICT:02 COUNTY:ALACHUA TYPE OF WORK:PURCHASE VEHICLES/EQUIPMENT
ROADWAY ID: PROJECT LENGTH: .000 LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	GREATER THAN 2024	ALL YEARS
PHASE: CAPITAL / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY GAINESVILLE								
FTA	0	1,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,000,000
LF	0	410,000	0	0	0	0	0	410,000
TOTAL 442887 1	**0**	**1,410,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,410,000**
TOTAL PROJECT:	**0**	**1,410,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,410,000**
TOTAL DIST: 02	**14,436,164**	**16,770,002**	**7,180,001**	**7,180,001**	**7,180,001**	**7,180,001**	**0**	**59,926,170**
TOTAL TRANSIT	**14,436,164**	**16,770,002**	**7,180,001**	**7,180,001**	**7,180,001**	**7,180,001**	**0**	**59,926,170**
GRAND TOTAL	60,710,981	20,302,049	7,180,001	7,180,001	7,180,001	7,180,001	0	109,733,034

North Central Florida Regional Planning Council

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

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

July 29, 2019

TO: Technical Advisory Committee
Citizens Advisory Committee
Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board

FROM: Scott R. Koons, AICP, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan Update Referral

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Develop scoping and funding mechanisms to update Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan.

BACKGROUND

At its April 22, 2019 meeting, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization received a request from the Alachua County Board of County Commissioners to consider updating the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan (Exhibit 1). During its discussion, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approved a motion:

> *to refer scoping and funding mechanisms to update the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan to its advisory committees.*

Exhibit 2 is an Alachua County staff report on the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan that includes a recommendation to update the plan. Exhibit 3 is an Alachua County staff report concerning the implementation of the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan.

At its June 24, 2019 meeting, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approved the List of Priority Projects. The List of Priority Projects includes an update of the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan as priority number 4 (Exhibit 4).

The Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan was completed in 2001. The Transporting Ecologies addendum was completed in 2004. This document aggregated various corridors into "braids." The Archer Braid document was completed in 2008. Below are links to these documents:

http://ncfrpc.org/mtpo/publications/BMP_Update/GainesvilleBicycleMasterPlan.pdf

http://ncfrpc.org/mtpo/publications/BMP/Report_Addendum_Final.pdf

http://ncfrpc.org/mtpo/publications/Archer_Braid/Archer_Braid_Final_Report_Web.pdf

Additional attachments include:

Exhibit 5 - Scope of the 2001 Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan;
Exhibit 6 - Scope of the Jacksonville Bridge Connections Study for the North Florida Transportation Planning Organization Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan;
Exhibit 7 - Suggestions for scoping the update by the authors of the 2001 Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan; and
Exhibit 8 - Technical Advisory Committee Working Group recommendations.

Attachments

EXHIBIT 1

North Central Florida
Regional Planning Council

Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan

Final Report
June, 2001

Prepared by:

Sprinkle Consulting, Inc.

SCI

Washington-Baltimore • Tampa
(813) 949-7449 • (301) 362-1600

T:\data\00\8022-00\8022-00 cover.cdr

Executive Summary

The *Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan* provides a blueprint for the expanded development of a countywide system of on-road and off-road bicycle facilities and programs that will serve the transportation and recreational needs of residents and visitors to Alachua County well into the 21st Century. The *Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan* is the result of a project completed in June 2001 for the Gainesville Urbanized Area Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization (MTPO). This study was conducted as part of the MTPO's *2020 Long Range Transportation Plan*. The focus of the *Plan* is fourfold:

- Expand the **on-road network** of bicycle facilities,
- Expand the **off-road network** of trails,
- **Improve safety** conditions for bicyclists through various safety education programs and by improving existing bicycling conditions, and
- Effect a **mode shift** to bicycling through the implementation of innovative policies and the provision of bicycle facilities and amenities

Central to the achievement of each of these four Goals is the development of a countywide bicycle network. Alachua County and the City of Gainesville have a long history of accommodating bicyclists in their transportation networks. The*Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan* builds upon that history with a call to action that includes: innovative retrofitting of roadways with bicycle facilities; the continued inclusion of bicycle facilities with all new construction and reconstruction of roadways; the continuation and expansion of safety and mode shift incentive initiatives; and the institution of several new and innovative

policies for local, regional, and state government and agencies. This recommended course of action will help create a balanced transportation system that will improve the quality of life for the residents and visitors of Alachua County and continue to make it a desirable place to live.

Why is Bicycling Important to Alachua County?

Why should we accommodate bicycling? Beyond the fact that bicycles are legally considered to be vehicles with the right to use the roadway system, there are some other very good reasons:

Bicycling preserves the character and quality of life for the residents of and visitors to Alachua County.

- Bicycling is an important activity for Alachua County residents, many of whom already enjoy riding for both recreation and transportation.

- Bicycling contributes to Alachua County's image as a friendly, welcoming community.

- Bicycling, along with walking and transit, provides residents and visitors with multiple transportation choices that increase their mobility and reduces traffic congestion.

Bicycling is a necessary part of Alachua County's transportation system.

- Bicycle facilities are needed to form important connections

among the City of Gainesville, the University of Florida, and adjacent jurisdictions.

Bicycling preserves the character and quality of life in Alachua County.

- Bicycling is an affordable option when compared to the expense of owning and operating an automobile ($120/year for bicycles compared to over $5,000/year for autos). This is an important factor in Alachua County where there are over 50,000 community college and university students.

- Many trips made each day in Alachua Count y, and in particular the City of Gainesville, are short enough to be made by bicycle.

- Residents of Alachua County will be more likely to use the bicycle for transportation if there are safe places to ride: a 1990 Harris Poll found that 40% of U.S. adults say they would commute by bike if bike lanes and pathways were available.

Alachua County is home to the University of Florida, which generates a high volume of concentrated bicycle usage.

- The University of Florida, with over 40,000 students, is a major economic engine in Alachua Count y. A 1993 Board of Regents study revealed that about 12% of UF students, faculty, and staff bicycle to campus each day (a number that is substantially higher than all other Universities in the State University System combined). This amounts to several thousand commuters a day riding to campus.

- Providing adequate and safe bicycle connections from the surrounding community to the University can increase the number of bicyclists that ride to the campus and safely accommodate the thousands of bicyclists riding to campus toda In turn this can help relieve traffic congestion on the major corridors into campus and support the University's parking policies.

- The areas surrounding the campus feature high residential densities and a mixture of land uses that makes travel by bicycling a viable transportation mode.

How this Master Plan was Developed

This project was conducted by consultant Sprinkle Consulting, Inc. (SCI) under the direction of the Gainesville Urbanized Area Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization and a Project Steering Committee comprised of planners, engineers, and representatives of various stakeholder groups and implementing agencies. In addition to the individuals on the Steering Committee (listed on page 3), numerous other individuals and organizations actively participated in Steering Committee meetings and work groups including representatives of the following:

- North Central Florida Regional Planning Council
- Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area
- The City of Gainesville
- Alachua County

- Florida Department of Transportation
- The University of Florida
- The Regional Transit System
- The Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Board
- The Citizens Advisory Committee
- The Technical Advisory Committee
- Paynes Prairie State Park
- San Felasco State Park
- Suwannee River Water Management District
- St. Johns River Water Management District
- Gainesville Regional Utilities
- Gainesville Police Department
- City of High Springs
- FDOT District Two Rail Office
- Sustainable Alachua County

Draft plan materials and Steering Committee meeting notifications were also submitted to mayors of each incorporated town in Alachua County.

Two of the *Plan's* primary goals are to expand both the on-road bicycle network and the off-road (trail) network. In order to achieve this within a context of limited financial resources, the study network segments have been prioritized for bicycle facility construction. The ranking process is a five-step process (see Figure 1). The first step is to define and establish the **ranking criteria**. The second step is to determine the **evaluation methodology** that is used for each of the study segments according to the established criteria. The third step is to **define the data needs** for the evaluations. The fourth step, **data collection**, was undertaken to support the other steps of the process. Finally, the fifth step involves **evaluation of the study**

segments for bicycle facility retrofit funding **prioritization.**

Figure 1 Ranking Process



The study network for which the ranking was performed includes all of the arterial and collector roads in the Count y, including several local roads within the University of Florida Campus, and numerous potential off-road trail corridors. There is a total of 1,185 miles of roadways and trails in the study network, of which the on-road network comprises 823 miles. Approximately 229 miles of the on-road network have paved shoulders or bike lanes. The 362 miles of trails in the study network includes 58 miles of existing trails. Thus, 287 miles (or 24%) of the entire study network presently have bicycle facilities (bike lane, trail, or paved shoulder).

While Gainesville and Alachua County may lead Florida and perhaps the Nation in providing good bicycle accommodations, the majority

(58%) of the study network mileage does not currently provide good bicycling conditions. Based on a scientific grading scale that reports bicycling conditions on an"A" through "F" academic styled scale (with "A" being the best and "F" the worst), the current bicycling conditions for the study network are a "C ". Furthermore, according to the recently adopted *Gainesville Metropolitan Area 2020 Transportation Plan,* the network's bicycling conditions for the study network will fall to a "D" unless action is taken beyond what is currently being done. Thus, there is a pressing need for Alachua County and its jurisdictions to improve those roadways that do not presently accommodate bicyclists. This must be done to build upon and enhance the existing bicycle network and to ensure that bicycling remains a viable, safe, and popular mode of transportation.

The provision of roads with good bicycling conditions plays an important role in the Master Plan's prioritization process.

The primary ranking criteria used to prioritize the study network segments include: an evaluation of **bicycling conditions**, an analysis of the potentia**bicycle travel demand**, quantification of **public desire** for facility location, recommended **facility** and facility (unit) **construction cost**. The evaluation methodologies associated with each of these criteria are briefly described below.

Bicycle Quality of Service (QOS)

The bicycling conditions ranking criteria was evaluated using the *Bicycle Level of Service (LOS) Model.* The *Model* is the statistically reliable method of evaluating the bicycling conditions of a shared

roadway environment. It uses the same measurable traffic and roadway factors that transportation planners and engineer's use for other travel modes. With statistical precision, the*Model* clearly reflects the effect on bicycling suitability or "compatibility" due to factors such as roadway width, bike lane widths and striping combinations, traffic volume, pavement surface conditions, motor vehicles' speed and type, and on-street parking.

The *Bicycle Level of Service Model* is based on the proven research documented in *Transportation Research Record 1578* [3], published by the Transportation Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences. It has been applied to over 100,000 miles of evaluated urban, suburban, and rural roads and streets across North America. It is established by the Florida Department of Transportation as the recommended standard methodology for determining existing and anticipated bicycling conditions throughout Florida.

Latent Demand Method

The bicycle travel demand analysis was performed using the *Latent Demand Method*. This analysis is an essential component of the prioritization process. The *Latent Demand Method* determines *potential* bicycle trip activity within a corridor quantifying the potential trip interchange between trip origins and destinations. This method is used in lieu of bicycle counts as a determinant of bicycle demand. The reason bicycle counts were not used is that they only indicate *revealed* demand. Revealed demand fails to account for the bicycle trips that do not occur due to impediments in the bicycle transportation network. Thus a surrogate measure of demand must be used to account for these *latent* bicycle trips.

[3] Landis, Bruce W. "Real-Time Human Perceptions: Toward a Bicycle Level of Service" *Transportation Research Record 1578*, Transportation Research Board, Washington DC 1997

The *Latent Demand Method* quantifies the potential latent bicycle trips for each study segment corridor by assuming that the impediments to bicycle travel are eliminated throughout the study network. It is a probabilistic gravity model that uses readily available demographic data and employs simplified GIS geocoding and data input for spreadsheet-based gravity model computations. The*Latent Demand Method* estimates the relative probability of bicycle travel on an individual corridor segment; it is based upon the proximit y, frequency, and magnitude of adjacent trip generators and/or attractors. It quantifies latent bicycle travel demand by excluding the effect of all travel impedances except that of distance. The datasets of the adopted *Gainesville Metropolitan Area 2020 Transportation Plan* Preferred Alternative were used in the *Latent Demand Method* analysis.

Public Input

Public input is an important criterion in the formation of this *Plan*, specifically in the identification of the potential off-road trail network and in helping to further prioritize the analytically ranked network segments for bicycle facility retrofit funding. Pubic input in the development of the *Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan* was achieved through two rounds of public workshops.

The 1st round of public workshops was held principally to identify the locations of potential trail corridors throughout Alachua Count y. In addition to identifying potential trail corridors, workshop participants also ranked the draft Goals for the *Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan.* Each attendee was given a questionnaire that allowed them to rank, in order of importance, the four Goal categories that had been established by the *Plan's* Steering Committee. The participants ranked the continued development of an on-road bicycle network as

the top goal, with the development of an off-road network of trails ranking a close second. The goals and objectives are further discussed in Section 1 of this *Plan*.

The establishment of a minimum Bicycle Quality of Service (QOS) standard (or standards) is an essential component of this *Plan*. The attendees were provided with a questionnaire that asked them to vote for a minimum standard. The questionnaire described the existing average countywide bicycle quality of service ("C"). They were also provided with a general time frame and cost of achieving the different target standards. The Steering Committee used the public input from the 1st workshop to establish a target Bicycle QOS of "B" for non-state roads and "C" for state roads.

The purpose of the 2nd round of public workshops was to present the draft prioritization results and latent demand results. A significant feature of this round of workshops was the ability of participants to review draft work products and recommendations, and to vote for where they wanted bicycle facilities built, for either on-road facilities or trails. A detailed account of public input and participation is provided in Section 3.3 of this *Plan*. Appendix "A" contains copies of the questionnaires used in the workshops as well as completed attendance sheets.

Facility Recommendation and Cost

Selecting the appropriate bicycle facility to construct is an important function of the prioritization process. The selection process for the general type of improvement needed for individual roadway segments, along with the associated estimated per mile construction cost, is illustrated in Figure 7, the *Bicycle Facility Selection & Cost Decision Tree,* in Section 4.3.

Since cost is always a determining factor in infrastructure investment decisions, per mile construction costs based on each segment's construction level of difficulty have been integrated into the prioritization process. These general costs are associated with typical roadway cross-sectional conditions and the resultant necessary general improvements. The per mile cost of right-of-way acquisition is also used in determining the (total) facilities construction cost.

Benefit-Cost Ratio

Each of the primary ranking criteria is combined into a benefit-cost ratio (or specifically an Index) to prioritize roadways and trails for construction. Benefit-Cost ratios are tools classically used in infrastructure investment planning and programming. They provide an indication of the relative value of improving a transportation facility with respect to other (candidate) transportation facilities. The individual terms of the Benefit-Cost factor are the ranking criteria evaluation methods. Those in the numerator(ΔBicycle QOS, Demand, and Public Input) are the "benefits"; the denominator is the "cost (per mile)". The "ΔBicycle QOS" term is the numeric difference between the existing bicycle level of service and the target bicycle level of service recommended in this *Plan*.

The results of the benefit-cost ratio are used to develop a prioritization list (needs ranking) for roadway and trail segments. The resulting prioritization list (needs ranking) is included in Appendix A & B. This prioritization list represents the final*needs* ranking, but not necessarily the construction order/schedule that bicycle facilities or trails will be programmed for construction. This final needs ranking provides an objective basis for Count y, MTPO, and local jurisdiction staff to select and schedule roadway and trail segment projects for bicycle retrofit improvements. Other deciding factors in construction orders/

schedule include opportunities to implement these bicycle projects in conjunction with roadway construction or special funding opportunities such as grants or partnerships.

Summary of Recommendations

The focus of the *Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan* is the development of a countywide bicycle transportation network of on-road and off-road bicycle facilities as well as the expansion of programs to support bicyclist safety and effect a mode shift. These facilities and programs will serve both the transportation and recreational needs of the community. A crucial element of this *Bicycle Master Plan's* Action Plan is the establishment of target Bicycle quality of service standards for roadways. Based on input from the first public workshop, the Steering Committee's recommendation is that all new and retrofit construction on County and City roads and streets should achieve a Bicycle Quality of Service standard of "B", whereas state roads should achieve a "C" (on a scale of "A" through "F", with "A" being the highest quality bicycling environment, and "F" being the worst).

Using these Bicycle QOS standards, the percentage of the (on-road) network with bike lanes and paved shoulders would increase from 28 percent to 71 percent (an additional 353 miles of bikeways) if all of the recommended facilities were constructed. As the remainder of the report demonstrates, much of this expansion of the on-road bicycle network will be achieved through minimal cost approaches using techniques such as re-striping during repaving projects or constructing paved bike shoulders on roads with buildable shoulders.

The existing bicycle network is identified on Maps 4A & 4B at the end of this *Plan.* The maps also depict the identified and prioritized study segments that currently fall below the County's target Bicycle Quality

of Service standards. The aforementioned evaluation criteria ***(Bicycle Quality of Service, Latent Demand,* Public Input**, and per mile construction **costs)**, provide a rational and objective basis for the prioritization and retrofit construction of roadway and trail corridor improvements recommended in this *Plan*.

Map 1A
Alachua Countywide Bicycle Facility Inventory & Quality of Service Evaluation



North Central Florida Regional Planning Council

N
W E
S

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Miles

LEGEND

Existing Bicycle Network
- Existing Bike Lane/Trail/Paved Shoulder
- Programmed Improvements
- Bicycle QOS A/B/C
- Final study network
- Limited access road
- Schools
- University

Parks
- Major
- Staffed
- Minor

Background Street Network
Water bodies
Conservation
Municipalities
MTPO Boundary

Sprinkle Consulting Inc.

Planners and Engineers


Map 1B
Alachua Countywide
Bicycle Facility Inventory &
Quality of Service Evaluation
North Central Florida
Regional Planning Council
N
W
E
S
LEGEND
Existing Bicycle Network
Existing Bike Lane/Trail/Paved Shoulder
Programmed Improvements
Bicycle QOS A/B/C
Final study network
Limited access road
Schools
University
Parks
Major
Staffed
Minor
Background Street Network
Water bodies
Conservation
Municipalities
MTPO Boundary
0 0.5 1 1.5 2 2.5 3 3.5 Miles
Sprinkle Consulting Inc.
SCI
Planners and Engineers



Map 2A
Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan
Bicycle Crash Locations

North Central Florida Regional Planning Council

N
W E
S

LEGEND
- Bicycle Crashes
- Study Network
- Limited access road
- Background Street Network
- Water bodies
- Conservation
- Municipalities
- MTPO Boundary

Sprinkle Consulting Inc.

SCI technology and innovation

Planners and Engineers


Map 2B
Alachua Countywide
Bicycle Master Plan
Bicycle Crash Locations
North Central Florida
Regional Planning Council
N
W
E
S
0
0.5
1
1.5 Miles
LEGEND
Bicycle Crashes
Study Network
Limited access road
Background Street Network
Water bodies
Conservation
Municipalities
MTPO Boundary
Sprinkle Consulting Inc.
SCI
Technology and Innovation
Planners and Engineers

MAP 3
REGIONAL TRAIL MAP




Map 4A
Alachua Countywide
Bicycle Master Plan
Prioritization
North Central Florida
Regional Planning Council
N
W
E
S
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Miles
See Map Inset
LEGEND
Study Network
Existing Bike Lane/Trail/Paved Shoulders
Programmed Improvements
Bicycle LOS A/B/C
Priority I Roads
Priority II Roads
Priority III Roads
Priority I Trails
Priority II Trails
Priority III Trails
UF Campus Roads
Detailed Corridor Study Needed
No Data
Limited Access Road
Schools
University
Parks
Major
Stated
Minor
Background Street Network
Water Bodies
Conservation
Municipalities
MTPO Boundary
Sprinkle Consulting Inc.
Planners and Engineers


Map 4B
Alachua Countywide
Bicycle Master Plan
Prioritization
North Central Florida
Regional Planning Council
N
W
E
S
LEGEND
Study Network
Existing Bike Lane/Trail/Paved Shoulders
Programmed Improvements
Bicycle QOS A/B/C
Priority I Roads
Priority II Roads
Priority III Roads
Priority I Trails
Priority II Trails
Priority III Trails
UF Campus Roads
Detailed Corridor Study Needed
No Data
Limited Access Road
Schools
University
Parks
Major
Staffed
Minor
Background Street Network
Water Bodies
Conservation
Municipalities
MTPO Boundary
0 0.5 1 1.5 2 2.5 3 3.5 4 Miles
Sprinkle Consulting Inc.
SCI
Planners and Engineers

EXHIBIT 2

Mike Escalante

From: Jeffrey L. Hays [jhays@alachuacounty.us]
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2019 11:47 AM
To: Scott Koons
Cc: Mike Escalante; Deborah Leistner (leistnerdl@cityofgainesville.org); McCreedy, Malisa A; Chris Dawson
Subject: County Commission Referrals to MTPO

Scott,

The County Commission wishes to refer two items to a future MTPO meeting:

1) Request the MTPO consider an update to the Countywide Bicycle Master Plan.
2) Request a FDOT presentation on how they systematically approach safety and capacity investments for I-75 and US 441 in Alachua County.

Give me a call if you want to discuss. You can also speak with MTPO Board Chair Cornell as he was involved in both discussions.

Thanks. -Jeff

Jeffrey L Hays, AICP
Transportation Planning Manager
Alachua County Growth Management
jhays@alachuacounty.us
phone: 352-374-5249
fax: 352-338-3224

EXHIBIT 3

Braid Implementation Update

Alachua County Board of County Commissioners

Chris Dawson, AICP

9/25/18 Board Direction

1. Approve the proposed project list from staff moving #2 to #6 (return with site specific information requested by Commissioner Pinkoson for that project).
2. Change the name for the #3 project to "Kincaid Loop" project and evaluate if a wider, one-side of the road facility, is more beneficial, in discussion with user/stakeholder groups.
3. Staff to propose a plan of action for our community building the next high priority braid project as defined by the master plan and the study (determine highest priority project and what we would do if we did it ourselves, not relying on a grant.)

Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan

- Prepared by the MTPO in 2001
- Included over 900 segments and identified potential bicycle facilities for each one
- Also prioritized the individual segments

Transporting Ecologies

- Published in 2004 by the MTPO
- Presented as an Addendum to the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan
- Provided the original Braid ideas, as well as the concepts of Loops and Nets

Nets – Neighborhood Connectivity

- Characterize the street grid system and networks of neighborhood streets
- Strategies promote short-cut bicycle/pedestrian-only routes
- Analysis Factors:
  - Opportunities for neighborhood connectivity
  - Safe routes to school — Alachua County "neighborhood schools"
  - Travel distance reductions within destination logics
  - Potential for local bicycle travel "off" arterial connectors (1 to 3 miles)

Braids – Local Connectivity

- The arterial linkages that included existing streets, roads and paths (green spaces and recovered utility corridors) linking residential areas with commercial and employment destinations.
- Promote routinized cycle commuting as the most direct routes and need to be continuous between key destinations in Gainesville
- Recommendation strategies utilize existing right-of-way or easements from roads, rail, or utility corridors to achieve a highly connected network optimizing high use destinations such as the University of Florida

Braids – Local Connectivity

- Analysis Factors:
  - Streets, lanes, paths & green way path types (braided threads)
  - Destination analysis & prioritization (centripetal linkages)
  - Segment cost benefit ratio analysis (2001 data)
  - Cycling barriers analysis (Identify difficult topographic & geographic obstacles)
  - Quality of Service (QOS) analysis (existing inventory & QOS visualization)
  - Hydrology matrix (watersheds & riparian corridors)

Loops – Rural Connectivity

- Rural cycle routes that provide connectivity to the natural areas, parks and adjacent communities typically used as competition and recreational circuits
- Preferred existing and potential new routes to focus resources toward enhanced infrastructure and potential expansion

Loops – Rural Connectivity

- Analysis Factors:
  - Identification and map existing use (formalized rides & routes)
  - Evaluate new Loop potentials
  - Identify potential for extended regional connectivity
  - Identify natural capital potentials
  - Loop multiplicity (support varied user levels)

Transporting Ecologies Braid Priorities

Priority (highest to lowest)	Braid Designation	Public (low score highest priority)	Cost Benefit (100 best)	Latent Demand (100 best)	Funds
1	Archer (Hull Rd ext)	1	98	70	partial
2	Alachua	2	100	81	initial
3	University	3	91	78	no
4	Hawthorne (6th St. rail-trail)	4	98	92	partial
5	Bivens	6	92	68	no
6	Westside	8	100	80	no
7	Millhopper	5	87	79	no
8	Glen Springs	7	75	82	no

Archer Braid



- Largely Completed except
  - Veteran's Park to Celebration Pointe - $3,000,000
  - SW 34th Street grade-separated crossing @ Hull Road - $2,000,000
- Extended to go all the way to Archer

Alachua Braid

- Largely Completed except
  - Bicycle Lane gap from SW Archer Rd. to NW 23rd Avenue – partially implemented by Bicycle Boulevard

University Braid



- Required significant Corridor Studies to implement
- Constrained roadways
- State can/will implement bike lanes east of Waldo with resurfacing

Hawthorne Braid

- Completion of last segments requires railroad abandonment and environmental remediation
  - next section happening now

Bivens Braid

- County could implement large portion of remaining section in Serenola Forest

Westside Braid

- Remaining Section from Newberry Road to NW 16th Boulevard
  - $3,000,000 implementation cost

Millhopper Braid

- Section from NW 51st Street to NW 83rd Street to be completed with NW 23rd Avenue improvement
- Section from NW 13th Street to North Main
  - Approximately $3,000,000

Glen Springs Braid

- NW 23rd Avenue is a State-maintained facility that is constrained and curb-and-gutter
- NW 23rd Boulevard implementation could occur in-road or sidepath

Recommendations

- Complete Braids as resurfacing/reconstruction allows, and identify bicycle boulevards as appropriate alternative routes

- Refer to the MTPO a request to update the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan with specific focus on facilities within the municipalities and an implementation plan for inter-city routes

REVIEW OF BRAIDS IDENTIFIED IN TRANSPORTING ECOLOGIES

Prepared for:

Alachua County Board of County Commissioners

Prepared by:

Alachua County Growth Management Department

In Conjunction With:

City of Gainesville Public Works Department

Gainesville Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization

University of Florida Planning, Design & Construction Division

Originally Produced May 1, 2014

Updated January 25, 2019

BACKGROUND

The Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan was adopted in 2001. The document, produced by Sprinkle Consulting, Inc. for the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization (MTPO), reviewed bicycle facilities for nearly all roadways within Alachua County and provided a Benefit-Cost Analysis for needed improvements and a prioritization of each segment. The study provided a ranking of more than 900 segments of facilities in the County. The study recommended one of several types of facilities that would be proposed for a given segment. The types of facilities included both in-road (bike lane or paved shoulder) or off-road (sidepath, off-road trail). For some facilities where no specific improvement could be identified, segments were identified as requiring a corridor study.

One issue with the Bicycle Master Plan was that the large amount of segmentation made implementation difficult. As a follow up, an Addendum was produced. Titled "Transporting Ecologies" and produced in 2004 by the School of Architecture at the University of Florida, the study attempted to combine tiers of longer facilities from the segments included in the original Bicycle Master Plan. Based upon the characteristics of the segments identified, the study consolidated and named eight "Braids" intended to serve as main routes for bicycle transportation. Each of the Braids included several segments and, taken together, form the spine for bicycle mobility within the Gainesville urbanized area. These Braids did not extend past the edge of the County's Urban Cluster.

This review was originally presented to the Board of County Commissioners in 2014. The Review has been updated per Board direction given on September 25, 2018. The following is a review of each of the identified Braids and their current status.

ARCHER

The Archer Braid was identified as the highest priority of the Braids. Running generally from Southwest 91st Street in the west to the intersection of Northeast 39th Avenue and Waldo Road in the east, the Archer Braid could be considered as the main Braid linking each of the other Braids together. Although a specific alignment was identified in Transporting Ecologies, during attempts to implement the Braid a different alignment was determined. Through a combination of funding sources, this Braid has been nearly completed. The County has completed portions of the Braid from Southwest 91st Street and Archer road north to Southwest 46th Boulevard, east along Southwest 46th Boulevard to Tower Road, north along Tower Road to Southwest 41st Place, and east along Southwest 41st Place to Southwest 71st Terrace. The next section of the Braid, which will bring it across Lake Kanapaha and I-75 is being funded as part of the Developer's Agreement with Celebration Pointe Transit Oriented Development. Celebration Pointe has already constructed the portion within their development area and across the I-75 overpass. The County continues to work with Celebration Pointe on funding the portion across Kanapaha Prairie.

Butler Plaza, as part of development of Butler Plaza North, has constructed the segment running from I-75 through its development and up to Southwest 24th Avenue. The Braid continues north along Southwest 38th Terrace to Southwest 20th Avenue. The Braid was constructed as a requirement of the Village Point development, to Southwest 34th Street. A grade-separated crossing of Southwest 34th Street is identified in the MTPO's list of priority projects. However, challenges exist with cost and ownership issues as it traverses multiple properties.

The Braid continues across the University of Florida campus on the Cross Campus Greenway, which was constructed by the University of Florida. The Cross Campus Greenway connects to the intersection of Newell Drive and Archer Road, providing access to the existing multi-use path on the south side of Archer Road. From here, the Braid continues on the old rail bridge across Southwest 13th Street and onto the Depot Road Rail-Trail. The Depot Avenue Trail has been improved through a recently completed construction project by the City of Gainesville. This connects to the Downtown Connector and then to the existing Waldo Road Greenway to Northeast 39th Avenue and the end of the Braid. Effectively, with the exception of the grade-separated crossings of SW 34th Street and Kanapha Prairie, the entire Braid as identified in Transporting Ecologies has been constructed. Staff can identify no additional projects for this Braid.

ALACHUA

The second priority Braid in Transporting Ecologies is the Alachua Braid. This Braid encompasses the West 13th Street corridor from Williston Road on the south end to Northwest 23rd Street on the north end. Transporting Ecologies identifies in-street bike lanes as an appropriate solution for moving cyclists on this Braid. Some portions of the Braid are complete. The segment from Williston Road to Archer Road includes bike lanes that are buffered north of Southwest 25th Place. From just north of Archer Road to Northwest 23rd Avenue there is no dedicated bicycle facility in the 5-lane urban section. This also includes the bridge over Northwest 8th Avenue. Beginning just north of Northwest 23rd Avenue, bike lanes continue to the intersection with Northwest 6th Street. As part of a repaving project, the Florida Department of Transportation will be striping the existing paved shoulder as a bike lane to and past the end of the Braid at Northwest 23rd Street, where the new Wal-Mart has been constructed.

That portion of the Braid where no facility exists is right-of-way constrained which limits opportunities for either in-street or off-street facility improvements. However, the City of Gainesville has taken an alternate approach in constructing a "bike boulevard" parallel to the corridor. Utilizing Northwest 12th Street, the bike boulevard includes enhanced signage and striping to facilitate efficient bicycle flow on an alternative route extending from Depot Avenue to the intersection of Northwest 13th Street and Northwest 19th Place. This is a cost-effective solution which provides a convenient alternative to the West 13th Street corridor.

UNIVERSITY

The University Braid is the major east-west cycle route envisioned by Transporting Ecologies. The Braid follows State Road 26 from West 122nd Street in the west to the point where SR 26 bends north, just east of Newnan's Lake. University Braid links numerous residential, commercial and educational areas, but also has areas of constrained right-of-way that limit the implementation of bicycle supporting infrastructure.

Bike lanes are present from West 122nd Street to West 109th Drive. However, from this point until east of Northwest 8th Avenue intersection there are no bicycle facilities. There are sidewalks on both sides, but there are also numerous side streets. This area, which includes I-75 and the Oaks Mall, is right-of-way constrained. Staff recommends that a dedicated Corridor Study be utilized to identify an appropriate bicycle network implementation in this area. However, as this facility is on the Strategic Intermodal System, it is unclear what alternatives the Florida Department of Transportation will allow to be implemented within the right-of-way. Staff recommends that, if the Board wishes to proceed with projects, a consultant be hire to work with the various agencies to identify solutions.

Bicycle lanes continue to the east to Gale Lemerand Drive, except between West 43rd Street and West 38th Street, where on-street parking is located. At this point, the bike lanes again drop. However, on the south side of the road is a wide sidewalk that can be used for cycling. However, there is also significant pedestrian traffic in the area limiting quick progress by bikes. On-street parking on alternating sides of the road in the area also limits the ability of bicyclists to safely travel in vehicle lanes. Although on-street parking drops east of West 6th Street, there are no bicycle lanes east through to the end of the Braid.

The City of Gainesville is currently working to implement a "bike boulevard" parallel to University Avenue. The boulevard runs along Northwest 3rd Avenue from Northwest 21st Street to Northwest 6th Street. At Northwest 6th Street the bike boulevard transitions to North 2nd Avenue to Northeast Boulevard and finally to Northeast 5th Avenue to Waldo Road. This project is funded and will commence after completion of the West 12th Street bike boulevard. In addition to the northern bike boulevard, the City is enhancing bike lanes on Southwest 2nd Avenue between Southwest 13th Street and Southwest 6th Street to enhance visibility of bicyclists in a high usage corridor.

A multi-modal corridor study was completed in 2016 for the Gale Lemerand to Hawthorne Road segment. Several improvements were identified in the study. However, to date, none of the projects have been funded. Most of the projects related specifically to pedestrian safety enhancements.

HAWTHORNE (6TH ST. RAIL-TRAIL)

The Hawthorne Braid was ranked in Transporting Ecologies as the #4 Immediate Priority. This Braid includes those segments identified as the Downtown Connector and the 6th Street Rail-Trail. It runs, generally, from Northeast 23rd Avenue south and east to the Gainesville-Hawthorne Trail at Boulware Springs. The Braid is made up almost exclusively of former rail corridors and is envisioned as an off-road facility.

The Hawthorne Braid is largely completed. The northernmost section, from Northwest 16th Avenue to Northeast 23rd Avenue is currently unfunded, but is listed on the City's needed bicycle facilities list. CSX continues to maintain ownership although the tracks have been removed. The segment from Northwest 16th Avenue to Northwest 10th Avenue has been finished for some time. The portion between Northwest 10th Avenue and Southwest 2nd Avenue was finished in 2015. From Southwest 2nd Avenue to Depot Avenue is fully constructed. The Downtown Connector, which runs in the old railroad right-of-way is constructed from Depot Avenue to Boulware Springs, the end point of the Braid. Although not required for the implementation of the Braid, Staff from the City and County have identified a potential improvement that utilizes a grade-separated crossing at Williston Road.

BIVENS

The Bivens Braid was envisioned to run from the north-central University of Florida campus south to Rocky Point Road. The Braid would have included both off-road and in-road facilities. The Braid is largely finished.

That portion of the Braid that is within the University of Florida campus runs along Gale Lemerand Drive and is composed of bike lanes. At its intersection with Archer Road, the Braid was conceptually envisioned to include a segment that ran generally south to Bivens Arm. This conceptual segment was called the 23rd Road Trail in the original 2001 Bicycle Master Plan. However, the alignment shown on the map included with the study has this segment running through what are today buildings, into Bivens Arm and finally to the SW 23 Terrace Trail. However, as an alternative, this segment of the Braid can now run west on Archer Road on a multi-use path (with a short gap where SW 16th Ave and Archer Split, where there is a sidewalk) then south on the SW 23 Terrace Trail.

The SW 23 Terrace Trail continues south to Williston Road (SR 331). The Transporting Ecologies study also proposed for Bivens Braid to continue south from Williston Road along a Duke Energy power line easement slightly west of the intersection of Southwest 23rd Terrace and Williston Road. This easement on private property runs approximately halfway to Southwest 63rd Avenue (Rocky Point Road). This property is currently in the process of being acquired for the Alachua County Forever program. However, the easement for the power lines will continue to be controlled by Duke Energy.

The property south of the power line easement is also in private control and is within the Idylwild/Serenola Special Area Study with a maximum density of 2 dwelling units per acre. Additionally, Rocky Point Road does not currently have bicycle facilities. This southern segment of the Braid, therefore, may be best addressed as future development occurs in the area. Especially given the potential future low density development of this area and the existing agricultural uses in the area, Staff would not recommend active pursuit of corridor for an off-road trail at this time.

WESTSIDE

The Westside Braid would follow West 34th Street from Williston Road to Northwest 53rd Avenue. According to Transporting Ecologies, the appropriate facility for this Braid is an in-street bike lane. Currently, bike lanes exist from Williston Road to just north of University Avenue. Between University Avenue and Northwest 16th Blvd there is no cycling facility (there are sidewalks on both sides of the road, but they are not of sufficient width to be designated cycling facilities). North of Northwest 16th Blvd. bike lanes pick up again. These bike lanes continue to Northwest 53rd Avenue.

The section that is missing is a constrained facility. This is a three lane section with curb and gutter with residential driveways located on both sides of the roadway. Each lane is 12' wide. Providing bike lanes on this section of road will likely require moving the curb line and, potentially, reducing lane widths. Based upon FDOT cost estimates, adding bike lanes to this section will cost approximately $5,000,000.

MILLHOPPER

The Millhopper Braid runs, generally, from Santa Fe College in the west to Waldo Road along Northwest 23rd Avenue, Northwest 16th Boulevard and North 16th Avenue. Although Transporting Ecologies does not provide much detail about facility selection, several parts of the Braid have been implemented. A multi-use path on Northwest 83rd Street from Santa Fe College to Northwest 23rd Avenue is constructed. When the Northwest 23rd Avenue project is funded by Alachua County, both bike lanes and a multi-use path are planned. The section of this Braid from Northwest 55th Street to Northwest 13th Street is completed and includes in-street bicycle lanes, as identified in the Bicycle Master Plan. Beginning at Northwest 13th Street, Northwest 16th Avenue becomes a three lane facility. From Northwest 13th Street to Main Street there is no dedicated bicycle facility but sidewalks are located on both sides of the road. At Main Street the road becomes two lanes and there are bike lanes to Waldo Road. As part of the upcoming resurfacing project, these bicycle lanes will be upgraded.

The section missing a bicycle facility, from Northwest 13th Street to North Main Street, has curb and gutter with three 12-foot lanes. Within the existing curb there is not room to add a bike lane. It may be possible to widen the sidewalk on the south side of the road to

become a multi-use path. Adding bike lanes to this segment would cost approximately $5,000,000.

GLEN SPRINGS

The Glen Springs Braid was ranked last in Transporting Ecologies and has had the least amount of work done for completion. The Braid runs from Northwest 34th Street east along Glen Springs Road to Northwest 13th Street. From there, it follows North 23rd Avenue to Waldo Road. In addition, the City of Gainesville has proposed extending this Braid to Northwest 53rd Avenue along Northwest 34th Street.

Although there is an existing sidewalk along the Glen Springs Road, it is need of repair and is not a dedicated bicycle facility. The roadway here does not have a shoulder or bike lane. The City of Gainesville has identified this section for a multi-use path that ties into the bike boulevard system at Northwest 16th Terrace. From Northwest 13th Street east is a State maintained four lane urban facility. Providing bicycle lanes would require moving the curb and narrowing lanes. The estimated cost for installing bicycle lanes for this entire section would be approximately $12,000,000.

IDENTIFIED PROJECTS

Braid	Project	Estimated Cost
Archer	Kanapaha Prairie Crossing	$3,000,000
Archer	Grade Separated Crossing at SW 34th Street	$2,000,000
Hawthorne	Grade Separated Crossing at Williston Road	$2,000,000
Bivens	Multi-use Path south of Williston Road	$600,000
Westside	In-street bicycle lanes on NW 34th Street from University Avenue to NW 16th Blvd	$5,000,000
Millhopper	In-street bicycle lanes on NW 16th Ave from NW 13th Street to Main Street	$4,500,000
Glen Springs	In-street bicycle lanes on NW 23rd Avenue from NW 13th Street to Waldo Road	$12,000,000

Bicycle Master Plan Addendum Braid Map



Legend

BRAID

- Alachua
- Archer
- Bivens
- Glen Springs
- Hawthorne
- Millhopper
- University
- Westside

N

S

Prepared by Alachua County
Growth Management Department
April 2014
Data Valid for
Display Purposes Only

0 0.5 1 2 Miles





Archer Braid Implementation Map

Archer Braid TE

Section Status

COMPLETE

FUNDED

Prepared by Alachua County Growth Management Department
October 2018
Data Valid for Display Purposes Only

0 0.5 1 2 Miles

N

S



Alachua Braid TE

Section Status

COMPLETE

GAP

Alachua Braid Implementation Map

Prepared by Alachua County Growth Management Department
October 2018
Data Valid for Display Purposes Only

N

S

0 0.5 1 2 Miles



University Braid TE

Section Status

- COMPLETE
- FUNDED
- PLANNED
- GAP

University Braid Implementation Map

Prepared by Alachua County Growth Management Department
October 2018
Data Valid for Display Purposes Only

N

S

0 1 2 4 Miles



Hawthorne Braid Implementation Map

Hawthorne Braid TE

Section Status

- COMPLETE
- PLANNED

Prepared by Alachua County Growth Management Department
October 2018
Data Valid for Display Purposes Only

N

0 0.275 0.55 1.1 Miles



Bivens Braid Implementation Map

Bivens Braid TE

Section Status

COMPLETE

FUTURE

Prepared by Alachua County Growth Management Department
October 2018
Data Valid for Display Purposes Only

N

0 0.3 0.6 1.2 Miles

Westside Braid TE

Section Status

COMPLETE

GAP

Westside Braid Implementation Map

Prepared by Alachua County
Growth Management Department
October 2018
Data Valid for
Display Purposes Only

N

S

0 0.5 1 2 Miles



Millhopper Braid TE

Section Status

- COMPLETE
- PLANNED
- GAP

Millhopper Braid Implementation Map

Prepared by Alachua County
Growth Management Department
October 2018
Data Valid for
Display Purposes Only

0 0.5 1 2 Miles

N

S



Glen Springs Braid TE

Section Status

- COMPLETE
- PLANNED
- GAP

Glen Springs Braid Implementation Map

Prepared by Alachua County
Growth Management Department
October 2018
Data Valid for
Display Purposes Only

N

0 0.375 0.75 1.5 Miles

A. Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities

Table 1 identifies bicycle/pedestrian project priorities - state Safe Routes to School funds and SUNTrail funds and federal Transportation Alternatives Program funds for the Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25 Transportation Improvement Program.

Table 1
Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities
Gainesville Metropolitan Area
Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25

Number	Project	Location	Description
1	Americans with Disabilities Act Modifications	AT: Gainesville Metropolitan Areawide	Modifications to Deficient Sidewalks, Ramps and Transit Stops
2	Archer Road [SR 24]	FM: SW 34 Street [SR 121] TO: SW 16 Avenue [SR 226]	Add Midblock Pedestrian-Actuated Crossings
3	Williston Road [SR 331] @ Downtown Connector Rail-Trail	FM: SE 4 Street TO: SE 12 Avenue	*1. Conduct a speed zone study on from SE 12th Avenue south to SE 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;* 4. Increase visibility of both motorists and trail users; and 5. Analyze options for traffic calming at the crossing. [22,500 AADT]
4	Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan	AT: Countywide	Update Bicycle Master Plan
5	Glen Springs Braid	FM: Gainesville High School TO: NW 34 Street [SR 121]	Construct Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail
6	Gainesville Regional Utilities Right-Of-Way	FM: Depot Park TO: Williston Road [SR 331]	Construct Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail
7	NE 27 Avenue	FM: State Road 222 TO: State Road 26	Construct 8-Foot Multiuse Path on North Side of Roadway
8	Williston Road [SR 331]	FM: Sweetwater Wetlands Park TO: Gainesville-Hawthorne Rail/Trail Connector	Construct Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail
9	SE 8 Avenue	FM: Williston Road [SR 331] TO: Hawthorne Road [SR 20]	Construct Sidewalk
10	NW 143 Street	FM: Newberry Road [SR 26] TO: NW 39 Avenue [SR 222]	Complete Sidewalk Network
11	NW 6 Street Rail/Trail Extension	FM: NW 16 Avenue TO: NW 39 Avenue [SR 222]	Extend the Rail/Trail North to NW 39 Avenue

Table 1 (Continued)
Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities
Gainesville Metropolitan Area
Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25

Number	Project	Location	Description
12	NW 42 Avenue	FM: NW 13 Street TO: NW 6 Street	Construct Sidewalk
13	SE 43 Street	FM: Hawthorne Road TO: University Avenue	Pedestrian Modifications
14	SW 24 Avenue	FM: SW 87 Way TO: SW 77 Street	Construct Multi-use Path
15	NW 45 Avenue	FM: NW 34 Street TO: NW 24 Boulevard	Construct Multi-use Path
16	Gainesville-Hawthorne Trail	FM: La Chua Trail Entrance TO: Depot Park	Resurface Trail
17	Downtown Connector Rail-Trail Crossing	AT: Williston Road [SR 331]	Construct Grade-Separated Crossing
18	Hull Road	AT: SW 34 Street [SR 121]	Construct Grade-Separated Crossing
19	SW 43 Street	FM: SW 24 Avenue TO: SW 20 Avenue	Construct sidewalks to fill sidewalk gaps
20	NW 23 Avenue	FM: NW 88 Street TO: Interstate 75 Bridge	Construct sidewalk to fill sidewalk gap on south side

Notes: Projects in shaded text are partially funded, as shown in the Transportation Improvement Program.
Project components in *italics* have been completed.

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

Initial Transportation Alternatives Program Priorities were developed by a Technical Advisory Committee and Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board.

EXHIBIT 5

Gainesville-Alachua County

County-wide Bicycle Master Plan

Final Scope of Services

The Gainesville Urban Area MTPO is making major strides in planning for a fully integrated transportation system. Known throughout Florida and the United States for their progressive planning, they are explicitly evaluating bicycling and walking conditions for both the current and future traffic scenarios as part of their long range transportation plan. Within the context of the *Long Range Transportation Plan Update* and the federal *Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program Grant*, extensive data is being collected and compiled for in-depth evaluation of how well the transportation network accommodates the modes. Innovative transportation modeling is being used to analyze the latent demand for bicycle and pedestrian travel. Furthermore, the Florida DOT's central planning office has selected the Gainesville urbanized area as a test site to develop their areawide multi-modal level of service planning method tools.

A unique opportunity exists to build upon these current planning initiatives. The *Bicycle Level of Service* and *Latent Demand* study activities of the Long Range Plan Update and the TCSP Program Grant will provide a foundation for developing a *comprehensive* bicycle transportation master plan for the Gainesville-Alachua region. Additional planning activities that are needed include: specific community visioning for an integrated bicycle urban trail & transit transportation system; identification and corridor evaluation for a regional off-road trail system; bicycle and pedestrian crash analysis; roadway bike & pedestrian facilities prioritization; and a funding and implementation action plan. These activities will culminate in the *County-wide Bicycle Plan*, which, when accomplished in tandem with the bicycle planning work of the long range transportation plan, will ensure that the Gainesville-Alachua County area will have a fully-integrated transportation system with connectivity to adjoining counties .

Outlined below is a general description of the anticipated tasks. Outlined in the accompanying *Lump Sum Cost Estimate* are the subtask details, costs, and needed participation by the MTPO (staff) and/or its assigns.

Chester J. Justice, Chief Staff Official
Metropolitan Transportation Planning
Organization for the

Metropolitan Transportation Planning
Organization for the

Task 1: Identify Community Transportation Needs & Values

This important first task will include: Forming a multi-agency steering committee and hold a project kick-off meeting; Developing a corridors evaluation and prioritization methodology; Holding community workshops with the specific purpose of obtaining input for on-road bicycle facility location needs (for both utilitarian and recreational travel), urban trail corridor location ideas, transit linkage focus areas, and etc.; Identifying adjoining counties' existing and programmed bicycle and trail facilities; Determining, through a community workshop questionnaire, the community's performance expectations for bicycle accommodation within public rights-of-way; and preparing documentation of the community's transportation needs and values. (See attached *Lump Sum Cost Estimate* for subtask details and cost).

Task 2: Evaluate Existing Conditions and Profile Trends

This task primarily consists of integrating several of the evaluations and analyses from the *2020 Transportation Plan* with a bicycle and pedestrian crash analysis and an area-wide transit system linkage assessment. The evaluations and analyses from the *2020 Plan* will be expanded (particularly the *Latent Demand Score Analysis*) to include the preliminarily-identified off-road trail network from Task 1 to estimate the trail corridors' potential to serve utilitarian travel and travel to recreational destinations (parks and trails). Evaluation of the linkage potential between public transit, off-road trails, and on-road bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be accomplished in a similar manner. Documentation will summarize the results of these studies and profile the current transportation system. (See attached *Lump Sum Cost Estimate* for subtask details and cost).

Task 3: Establish the Framework for the Bicycle Transportation System Needs Plan

The framework for the bicycle transportation network will be developed using the technical results of Task 2, input from a second round of community workshops, and recommendations from the advisory committees. The framework is anticipated to

include an on-road bicycle network and a viable off-road trail system integrated with the existing and committed (E+C) pedestrian and public transit system. Existing programs and policies will be evaluated for effectiveness and funding adequacy. (See attached *Lump Sum Cost Estimate* for subtask details and cost).

Task 4: Develop Action Plan

Implementation of the County-wide Bicycle Master Plan will be developed during this task. The physical bicycle network will be prioritized using criteria developed with the advisory committees during Tasks 1 and 3. Funding sources will be identified and recommendations will be made for enhanced revenue streams. Essential policies & programs will be outlined to ensure that the transportation network will be effectively built and utilized. Policy recommendations will be made including roadway cross-sectional design performance standards (as opposed to rigid cross-sectional standards) for bicycling conditions. Included will be an outline of essential programs with objective targets and schedules: mode shift incentive programs such as bicycle parking, transit linkage, and land development credits; safety enhancement programs such as educational initiatives and law enforcement; and local government Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations modifications with an emphasis on developer incentives. (See attached *Lump Sum Cost Estimate* for subtask details and cost).

Task 5: Compile Final Document & Maps

The format for the *Gainesville-Alachua County-wide Bicycle Master Plan* will be an easy-to-read, single bound document with attendant GIS-based map inserts and a separately bound *Technical Appendix.* An electronic version of the document, maps and appendix will be provided for easy reproduction, distribution, and updating. It is anticipated that the MTPO and Alachua County will be the adopting agencies. Up to four meetings are anticipated within the budget for this task. (See attached *Lump Sum Cost Estimate* for subtask details and cost).

Background

A pedestrian and bicycle bridge is proposed to cross the St. Johns River between the Riverside and San Marco neighborhoods. The primary goal of this project is to identify potential non-motorized connections and potential improvements to the transportation network in the neighborhoods surrounding the landside connections of the new bridge. This project is intended to help maximize non-motorized access to the new bridge and thus maximize its usefulness to the public.

Scope of Services

Task 1 Establish Goals and Objectives

Task 1.1 Kickoff meeting. A kickoff conference call/web meeting will be held with the NORTH FLORIDA TPO Project Manager and individuals she identifies for the Project Management Team (PMT). The purpose of this meeting will be to review the plans for the new bridge with respect to the surrounding neighborhoods. The PMT will preliminarily identify key origins and destinations for users of the bridge. This will form the basis of the route review and improvement recommendations to be conducted through the subsequent tasks. Another objective of this meeting will be to determine if it is advisable to create an Advisory Committee for this project and if so, develop a list of potential members.

1.2 Initial site review. The consultants (with members of the PMT if they choose to participate) will conduct an initial review of the study areas, roads, and potential connections to the identified origins and destinations.

Task 1.2 Establish the Advisory Group and meeting 1. This meeting will be to discuss the and potentially expand upon the origins and destinations identified by the PMT. Additionally, potential routes to the origins and destinations may be recommended by members of the Advisory Group.

Task 2. Initial Identification of Connection

Task 2.1 Prepare preliminary area map and routes. Based upon input received during Task 1, the consultant will develop a preliminary map of the study area and potential routes to be evaluated and send it to the PMT for approval. Based upon the PMT's comments this map will be revised.

Task 2.2 Public input opportunities. Two events will be held or attended to stimulate public input. It is anticipated these events will be community events not specific to this project. However, project specific meetings could be held. These events will provide opportunities for immediate input into potential routes and destinations as well as information about web based input opportunities.

The same input materials provided at the public outreach events will also be provided to the NFTPO for posting on the internet. We anticipate allowing two weeks for input prior to finalizing the preliminary study corridors.

2.3 Compile and summarize public feedback. Information obtained at the public meeting will be summarized and plotted on thematic displays. These summaries will be submitted to the Project Management Team and then to the Advisory Group for review and comment then revised as appropriate

2.4 Submit study route maps for review and approval. Finalized study route maps will be submitted to the NFTPO PMT for review and approval. A web conference will be held to review the maps.

Task 3 Field Data Collection

Task 3.1 Preliminary field reviews. The Consultant will conduct a windshield survey of proposed study routes. This review will be to determine if any fatal flaws which would disqualify specific roadways on the routes from development into access routes for the bridge. If such fatal flaws are identified, potential alternatives will be evaluated.

3.2 PMT meeting. A PMT meeting will be held to discuss the findings of the preliminary field reviews to discuss any remaining concerns prior to detailed corridor reviews.

3.3 Corridor reviews. This review will include detailed audits of the routes identified during the previous tasks. This review will include identification of specific operational and geometric improvements that may be desirable to promote the connectivity of origins and destinations to the bridge termini and potential signing to inform pedestrians and bicyclists of preferred routes to the bridge termini. Additionally, the Consultant will look at potential alternative routes where appropriate. Observational notes on the behaviors of pedestrians and bicyclists will also be made during this field review.

Task 3.4 Compiling additional data as needed and reduction of field data. Additional data to evaluate the feasibility of proposed improvements will be researched by the consultant. The

resulting recommendations from the field review informed by the additional data obtained will be reduced and compiled into a preliminary report and submitted to the PMT for review and comment. The task report will be revised as appropriate.

Task 3.5 PMT and AG meetings. The preliminary report will be presented to the PMT, and recommended revisions noted. The preliminary report noting recommended revisions will be presented to the AG.

3.6 Public meeting. The results of this project will be presented at public meeting. This presentation may occur at a meeting not specifically held for this project.

3.7 Additional Meetings. It is anticipated that the results of this project will be presented and the NFTPO Bike Ped Advisory Group Meeting, and to the NFTPO Board. Additionally, two additional meetings are anticipated.

Mike Escalante **EXHIBIT 7**

From: Theo Petritsch [tap@landisevans.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2019 4:02 PM
To: Mike Escalante
Subject: RE: Bicycle Master Plan Scope Query
Attachments: Gainesville scope 2000.pdf; Jax Bridge Connections Study.docx

Mike - Our original scope is attached, but I think an update of the previous plans would be a mistake.

I would update stats on the quality of the network, miles of facilities, crash data, volume data and such. This makes sense because it allows you to chart where you have come from and provides some insight into where you may wish to go. But doing a full systemwide facility plan may not be the best approach for Gainesville. You've got a network, you should focus you efforts to maximize that network.

I think a plan that leads directly to implementable solutions is the way to go. We've done a few of these and the idea is that you make improvements to nodes of activity or high potential activity, then you connect the nodes.
Example scope items could be as follows:

1. Do your trends analysis as described above, it provides continuity to previous efforts.
2. Identify nodes of potential activity. This could be the downtown, areas around the campus, out by the mall, on the north side of town, out on the east side, wherever. Maybe you split the city into half a dozen sections.
3. Conduct intense mobility/routing audits in the activity nodes – and connections to nearby nodes
    - identify key roadways and routes that lead from origins to destinations. We've done this by first looking at a map and coming up with our best guess of origins and destinations, an then routes around the activity zone. Following that we met with the locals (at a local festival, charity run, farmers market, and usually at least one regular public meeting) and asked people who do not normally attend public meetings where they bike, where they'd like to bike, and what routes they currently use. We've also used Strava data to supplement this data.
    - Do a quick field review of proposed routes to look for fatal flaws
    - Confirm routes with project advisory group
    - Audit routes – on bike.
4. Document recommendations. Our documentation of recommendations has been evolving since we started this plan format in 2009. Of course we have maps, and a report (although given our client's preferences, the reports have been very nuts and bolts, minimal effort on fancy layouts). Our route recommendations have changed from narrative format to tables. A copy of a table representing one link of a route is provided below my signature.
5. The recommendations assume the routes will be formalized and possibly signed. They include things like
    - prioritize street for sweeping
    - provide share lane markings and bike friendly traffic calming; this could include speed cushions and mini circles at intersections
    - reverse priority at stop controlled intersections to facilitate better bike through movements
    - restripe for bike lanes
    - trim palmetto bushes that are overhanging bike lane
    - improve intersection (with sketches – these are typically simple marking, signing, signal improvements, not full reconstruction) – drawing below my signature
    - consider a road diet (recommendation made after evaluating traffic volumes)

    The thing about the recommendations is that they are generally low budget, or at least not big ticket items (okay, some big ticket items are recommended, but interim recommendation that are not big ticket are included as well). The intent is to quickly enhance the quality of the network for biking. These usually include route signing recommendations to encourage cycling as well.

What we did for North Florida TPO was create a plan identifying the activity nodes. Then we did a pilot focus area study in St. Augustine – recommendations were being implemented prior to adoption of the final report. They then asked us to do Amelia Island, the Beaches, and San Marco/Riverside. The San Marco/Riverside scope is attached.

I am going to be up in your area next week. Could we possibly schedule a drop-in at your office?

- Theo

Theo Petritsch, P.E., PTOE
Director of Transportation Services

Landis Evans + Partners
formerly Sprinkle Consulting
d: 813.527.9486
p: 888.462.3514
m: 813.493.0453
www.landisevans.com

Index #	Road:	From:	To:	Length (+/-):
RS 3.1	Water St	S Pearl St	Park St	2,350 ft

Existing Facility Type:	Shared Lane			
Recommended Change:	SLMs			
Wayfinding:	Yes			
Sidewalk Condition:	Left:	Right:	Map Label:	
Coverage:	100%	100%	Composite	
Condition:	Good	Good		
Shade:	Partial Low	Partial Low		

Notes:	Photo #
See special intersections RS 3.1a and 3.1b for Broad St and Riverside/Jefferson and Acosta Bridge Ramps on Water St	
Install SLMs to help promote better positioning by bicyclists and more generous passing clearance by motorists.	
Prioritize for sweeping and pavement maintenance.	
Sidewalk: Curb ramps present.	

Intersections of note:		
Road:	S Pearl St	
Existing Traffic Control:	Signal	
Proposed Traffic Control:	-same-	
Wayfinding:	NB: -none-	
	SB: Northbank Riverwalk(right)	
Road:	Broad St(Riverside and Acosta Off Ramps)	
Existing Traffic Control:	Signal	
Proposed Traffic Control:	- See special intersection RS 3.1a	
Wayfinding:	NB: San Marco, Riverside(straight)	
	SB: Downtown, Northbank Riverwalk(straight)	
Road:	Jefferson St(Riverside and Acosta On Ramps)	
Existing Traffic Control:	Signal	
Proposed Traffic Control:	See special intersection RS 3.1b	
Wayfinding:	NB: Riverside(via Park St)(straight); San Marco, Riverside(via Riverside Ave Bridge)(left)	
	SB: Downtown(straight); San Marco, Riverside(via Riverside Ave Bridge)(right)	
Road:	Park St	
Existing Traffic Control:	Signal	
Proposed Traffic Control:	-same-	
Wayfinding:	NB: Riverside, Johnson Park and Community Center(left)	
	SB: -none-	

From: Mike Escalante <escalante@ncfrpc.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2019 1:38 PM
To: Theo Petritsch <tap@landisevans.com>
Subject: Bicycle Master Plan Scope Query

Theo,

Gainesville MTPO has asked its advisory committee for recommendations for scoping an update to the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan.

Do you have any scoping information from the 2001 Sprinkle BMP [links below]:

http://ncfrpc.org/mtpo/publications/BMP_Update/GainesvilleBicycleMasterPlan.pdf

http://ncfrpc.org/mtpo/publications/BMP_Update/BicycleLOS.pdf

http://ncfrpc.org/mtpo/publications/BMP_Update/BicycleTLD.pdf

Two UF College of Design, Planning & Construction studios produced the following implementation planning documents.

http://ncfrpc.org/mtpo/publications/BMP/Report_Addendum_Final.pdf

http://ncfrpc.org/mtpo/publications/Archer_Braid/Archer_Braid_Final_Report_Web.pdf

The Archer Braid corridor is nearly complete.

I am not sure of the magnitude of the update. But any scoping suggestions would help. Thanks,

mike

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

EXHIBIT 8

Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan Update
Scoping and Funding Mechanisms Suggestions and Recommendations

A Technical Advisory Committee Working Group met on July 22, 2019 to discuss a referral from the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization to develop scoping and funding mechanisms to update the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan. During its discussion, the Working Group noted that:

- Consultant should be contracted to develop the update;
- Estimated $100,000 budget for update;
- Development of a separate University of Florida Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan;
- Coordination among Alachua County, all the municipalities with Alachua County, Florida Department of Transportation and the University of Florida.

At the conclusion of discussion, the Working Group approved a motion to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization:

- *Appoint an Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan update Project Steering Committee;*
- *Identify joint funding resources (request funding participation) from Alachua County, City of Gainesville and Florida Department of Transportation; and*
- *Include in the Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan update a focus on bicycle facility gap assessment and prioritization of future bicycle facilities.*

t:\scott\sk20\mtpo\memo\bike_master_plan_referral_x8_comms_aug7.docx

North Central Florida Regional Planning Council

VI

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

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

July 29, 2019

TO: Technical Advisory Committee
Citizens Advisory Committee
Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board

FROM: Scott R. Koons AICP, Executive Director

SUBJECT: U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) Design Workshop

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Develop design recommendations for the U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) corridor between State Road 331 (Williston Road) and State Road 26 (West University Avenue).

BACKGROUND

At its June 24, 2019 meeting, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization:

- *Approved the List of Priority Projects that included the extension of the U.S. Highway 441 (West 13th Street) Multimodal Emphasis Corridor study to be from State Road 331 (Williston Road) to NW 23rd Avenue (Exhibit 1); and*
- *Received a status report concerning the implementation of the SW 13th Street Charrette recommendations.*

In addition, a member suggested a workshop concerning a redesign of the U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) corridor.

At its August 27, 2018 meeting, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization received an update on the scoping of the U.S. Highway 441 resurfacing project between the Marion County line and State Road 331 (Williston Road). The Florida Department of Transportation is currently coordinating with Alachua County for the implementation of a linear park on the Paynes Prairie corridor. The Florida Department of Transportation intends to follow the elements of the Florida Design Manual 2018 and other criteria specified in the letter.

At its meeting on February 26, 2018, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area discussed the 2002 SW 13th Street Charrette implementation between Paynes Prairie and State Road 24 (Archer Road). Subsequent to the discussion, the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization approved a motion to:

Request that the Florida Department of Transportation implement its Context Classification criteria from the Florida Design Manual along this corridor with a focus on:

- *Reduction in speed limits;*
- *Reduction in visual clutter by eliminating some highway signs or collocating signs on poles;*

- *Provide designated multiple midblock pedestrian crossings along the corridor*
- *Increase lighting at median openings and signalized intersections; and*
- *Provide bus bays;*

Or explain why it will not complete these modifications.

Exhibit 2 includes information provided by City of Gainesville staff concerning the implementation of U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) Charrette recommendations. Exhibit 3 includes information provided by Florida Department of Transportation staff concerning the implementation of U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) Charrette recommendations. Exhibit 4 is a copy of the SW 13th Street Charrette report. Exhibit 5 shows U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) context classifications assigned by the Florida Department of Transportation. Exhibit 6 is a copy to the Florida Department of Transportation Context Classification document. Exhibit 7 includes the Technical Advisory Committee Working Group recommendations.

Attachments

B. Other Arterial Construction/ Right-Of-Way Priorities

Table 2 identifies project priorities for construction, modifications and associated right-of-way on the State Highway System roadways not designated as part of the Strategic Intermodal System and federal aid-eligible designated local facilities for the Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25 Transportation Improvement Program. This table also indentifies project priorities for local assistance programs such as Transportation Regional Incentive Program and County Incentive Grant Program.

Table 2
Other Arterial Construction/Right-Of-Way Priorities
Gainesville Metropolitan Area
Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25

Number	Project	Location	Description
1	W University Avenue [SR 26]	AT: NW 16 Street AT: NW 17 Street AT: NW 19 Street	Multimodal Emphasis Corridor Study Implementation - Install Enhanced Pedestrian Crossings [29,000 AADT]
2	U.S. Highway 441	FM: Williston Road [SR 331] TO: NW 23 Avenue	Multimodal Emphasis Corridor Study
3	W University Avenue [SR 26]	FM: Gale Lemerand Drive TO: W 13 Street [SR 25]	Multimodal Emphasis Corridor Study Implementation - Construct Bikeway/Sidewalk [29,000 AADT]
4	E University Avenue [SR 26]	AT: Waldo Road [SR 24]	Multimodal Emphasis Corridor Study Implementation - Pedestrian-Oriented Intersection Design [18,700 AADT]
5	E University Avenue [SR 26]	FM: E 7 Street TO: E 10 Street	Multimodal Emphasis Corridor Study Implementation - Construct Raised Median [20,500 AADT]
6	SW 13 Street [U.S. HWY 441]	AT: Archer Road [SR 24]	Removal of Sliplanes
7	University Avenue [SR 26]	AT: Corridorwide	Multimodal Emphasis Corridor Study Implementation - Install Transit Shelters and Benches [29,000 AADT]
8	E University Avenue [SR 26]	FM: E 1 Street TO: E 3 Street	Multimodal Emphasis Corridor Study Implementation - Construct Midblock Pedestrian Crossings [20,500 AADT]
9	University Avenue [SR 26]	AT: Corridorwide	Multimodal Emphasis Corridor Study Implementation - Install Bicycle Striping and Signal Detection [29,000 AADT]
10	Newberry Road [SR 26]	FM: NW 59 Street TO: NW 34 Street [SR 121]	1. Restripe the pavement to 11-foot general purpose travel lanes with protected bikelanes between NW 52 Terrace and NW 34th Street (State Road 121) without loss of the westbound right turnlane at NW 43 Street; 2. Conduct a speed zone study between NW 59th Street and NW 40 Drive; 3. Prioritize this project for State Highway System funding; and 4. Provide information regarding any Thermoplast treatment related to the West Newberry Road (State Road 26) resurfacing project [36,500 AADT]

Table 2 (Continued)
Other Arterial Construction/Right-Of-Way Priorities
Gainesville Metropolitan Area
Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2024-25

Number	Project	Location	Description
11	Williston Road/Waldo Road [SR 24/331]	FM: SE 16 Avenue TO: NE 39 Avenue	Pedestrian Safety Modifications
12	NW 34 Street [SR 121]	FM: NW 16 Avenue U.S. Highway 441	Safety and Capacity Enhancements Designed and Constructed as a Complete Street with Protected Bikelanes
13	Archer Road [SR 24]	FM: SW 122 Street TO: Tower Road	Widen to Four Lanes
14	SW 62 Boulevard Extension	FM: Butler Plaza TO: SW 20 Avenue	Four-Lane Extension as a Complete Street with Protected Bikelanes
15	SW 62 Boulevard	FM: SW 20 Avenue TO: Newberry Road [SR 26]	Widen to Four Lanes as a Complete Street with Protected Bikelanes
16	County Road Resurfacing	AT: Gainesville Metropolitan Areawide	Resurface County Roads According to Priorities Established by the Alachua County Board of County Commissioners
17	City Road Resurfacing	AT: City of Gainesville	Resurface City Roads According to Priorities Established by the Gainesville City Commission

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

@ = at; ADA = Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; I = Interstate PD&E = Project Design and Environment Study; RTS = Regional Transit System; SIB = State Infrastructure Bank; SR = State Road; TDP = Transit Development Plan; UF = University of Florida; US = United States
MTPO = Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area

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

* Block Grant program is an annual formula program with funds provided by State legislation.

Initial Other Arterial/Right-of-Way Priorities were derived from the Year 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan Cost Feasible Plan.

Mike Escalante **EXHIBIT 2**

From: Gomez, Jesus M. [gomezjm@cityofgainesville.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2019 7:58 AM
To: Leistner, Deborah L.; Mike Escalante
Cc: Scott Koons; Taulbee, Karen; Ochia, Krys
Subject: RE: SW 13th Street Charrette Implementation

Mike:

In terms of bus bay placements, our planning staff usually works with FDOT to identify locations based on passenger boardings and provides recommendations. If it is only the segment between Paynes Praire and Williston road, we probably need bus bays in front of Meridian and across street, and improve the existing bus bays in front of Cottage Grove apartments and at former One Stop Career Center.

Thanks,

Gainesville.
Citizen centered
People empowered

Jesus Gomez | Transit Director
Regional Transit System
Phone: (352) 393-7860
Email: gomezjm@cityofgainesville.org

From: Leistner, Deborah L.
Sent: Monday, June 03, 2019 12:37 PM
To: Mike Escalante <escalante@ncfrpc.org>; Gomez, Jesus M. <gomezjm@cityofgainesville.org>
Cc: Scott Koons <koons@ncfrpc.org>; Taulbee, Karen <Karen.Taulbee@dot.state.fl.us>
Subject: Re: SW 13th Street Charrette Implementation

Mike - the segment in question (between Paynes Praire and Williston Rd) is outside of City limits... there is only one RTS route that serves the area, Route 13, which has the last stop just to the south of SW 51st Ave. I'd think the location of midblock crossing(s) would be primarily associated with the lookout areas, the potential addition of a trail, and the location of potential parking areas along the segment, so it may be too early to determine exact locations at this point. As for placement of bus bays I'll defer to Jesus. Regards, Debbie

---

From: Mike Escalante <escalante@ncfrpc.org>
Sent: Monday, June 3, 2019 11:39:09 AM
To: Leistner, Deborah L.; Gomez, Jesus M.
Cc: Scott Koons; Taulbee, Karen
Subject: SW 13th Street Charrette Implementation

Debbie/Jesus,

FDOT has been asked to update the MTPO concerning SW 13th Street Charrette implementation. Attached is an old FDOT letter that Karen Taulbee has highlighted issues that FDOT needs information in order to develop a response to the MTPO. The 3rd and 5th bullets concern Dept of Mobility, paraphrased below:

- Has the City of Gainesville identified locations for midblock crossings on SW 13th Street?
- Has the City of Gainesville identified locations for bus bays on SW 13th Street?

Please let me know as soon as possible or at the TAC meeting.

The MTPO has a signage policy in its Urban Design Policy Manual which I will forward to FDOT.

Note that FDOT staff will not be attending the TAC meeting.

Thanks,

mike

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

EXHIBIT 3

Taulbee, Karen

From: Bennett, James
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2007 5:02 PM
To: d.forkel@cox.net
Cc: lpinkoson@alachuacounty.us; Taulbee, Karen
Subject: FW: 13th Street Corridor
Attachments: 13th Street Corridor.doc

Dear Ms. Forkel,

This email responds to your request of November 7, 2007, concerning the 13th Street Corridor.

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) completed a resurfacing project on US 441 (SW 13th Street) from SR 331 to SR 24 in Fiscal Years 2003/2004. Then-Secretary Aage Schroeder and other FDOT staff met with the SW 13th Street Business Association at the invitation of the Association to discuss the resurfacing project (#2078497). Incorporated in the resurfacing project were elements requested by the MTPO and the Committees that support both the Special Area Plan for SW 13th Corridor and the Final SW13th Street Charette document.

These elements included:

- reducing the travel lanes to 11.5 feet
- adding a five-foot marked bicycle lane in both directions
- incorporate the MTPO approved stamped specialty crosswalks at the signalized intersections
- improve the sidewalk on the east side of the road to bring into compliance with FDOT and ADA standards
- add a new sidewalk to the west side of the road in the section of the resurfacing project that has curb

In addition, FDOT was asked to provide curbing to the extent feasible under this resurfacing project, to allow for future landscape of the median. The Department did add curbing to some of the medians in the project limits.

The Department encouraged either the City of Gainesville and/or Alachua County, or any other entity that wanted to participate, to develop a landscape project for review and permitting along this corridor. At one time, Alachua County was going to apply for an FDOT Highway Beautification Grant as a result of the community interest and the recent SW 13th Street Charette. However, our records indicate the application was not made to the District. The District Highway Beautification Grant program is no longer funded and, in fact, has not been funded for the past few years.

Under the Special Area Plan, landscaping is required in certain areas (with a permit by the Department) when a new building or business develops. I have no indication that there are maintenance agreements in place for any other entity that has provided landscaping for this corridor through the Department.

In February, 2004, the FDOT Traffic Operations Department conducted a speed limit study at the request of the SW 13th Street Business Association. The limits of the study were just south of SR 331 to approximately SR 120 to the north. The Department recommended no change to the posted speeds.

The last project the Department has undertaken along this corridor is Project #207849-8, the resurfacing of US 441 from the Marion County Line north to the City Limits (US 331). At the request of the MTPO and

committees, the Department extended the bike lane south to CR 234 (Colokka Blvd.). This project began Ma 2007.

At this time, the FDOT does not have any projects in the Five Year Work Program for the SW 13th Street (US 441) corridor.

Should you have any questions or need further information, please contact me.

Respectfully

James G. Bennett, P.E.
Urban Area Transportation Development Engineer
District Planning Manager
904-360-5646

From: Lee Pinkoson <lpinkoson@alachuacounty.us>
Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2007 3:12 PM
To: <james.bennett@dot.state.fl.us>
Subject: FW: 13th Street Corridor

Dear Mr. Bennett,
Would you be so kind as to respond to this email? I remember we approved the plans for the 13th st. corridor, but I do r remember specifically what was to be done on the road to make it more aesthetically pleasing. I thought I rememberec modifications being included in the plans to spruce up the area. Thank you, Lee

---

EXHIBIT 4

SW 13th Street Charrette



Prepared by:
THE CORRADINO GROUP

Prepared for:
The City of Gainesville
Alachua County

SW 13th Street Charrette

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Team:
Joseph M. Corradino
Rolando Llanes
Ruth Steiner
Julio Guillen
Roberto Barrero
Nicole Corradino
Melissa Lober Hege
Pablo Verez

Special Thanks to:
Dean Mimms
Steven Lachnicht
John Wachtel

Omission of any person who participated in any part of the charrette process is inadvertent.

Charrette Participants (signed in):
John Barrow
Wayne Bowers
Jane Burman-Holton
Sandy Burnett
Tom Bussing
Ray Carr
Dorothy Cassiu
Chuck Chestnut
Reverend Jose Cuevas
Missy Daniels
George Dekle
Dian Deevey
Bruce DeLaney
Tony Domenech
Rick Drummond
Barbara Fearnay
Malic Thurm Firsts
Mae Lee Foster
Pegeen Hanrahan
Anita Heard
Carol Higman
James Higman
Ralph Hilliard
Robert Hutchinson
Helen Keifer
Noel Lake
Carolina Leid
Deborah Leistner
Michael Lucas
Debbie Martinez
Ernest Martinez
Providence Nagy
Warren Nielsen
Kathleen W. Pagan
Mrs. E. Pall
Paula Rausch
David Richardson
Mark Robinson
Harold Saive
Erick Smith
John Stockwell
John Sung
Margaret Sung
Tom Saunders
Dion Weely
Priscilla West
Penny Wheat
Danny Williams
Richard Williams
Ken Zeichner

Introduction

The Corradino Group was hired jointly by the City of Gainesville and Alachua County to perform the SW 13th Street Charrette. This charrette was designed to be a comprehensive and interactive process to build consensus on a vision and an implementation strategy for SW 13th Street.

Goals of the process included:

- Prepare the ground work for a Special Area Plan
- Develop design options for improving the corridor in order to assure that new development promotes a walkable, "village like" character with a pleasant public realm
- Develop an open space system
- Prepare the ground work for specifications including
  - Building Typology
  - Site Planning
  - Land Use
  - Transportation / Parking

As part of this process the consultant studied various areas and issues that blended together to create a special character for SW 13th Street. Sidewalks, traffic signals, utilities, linkages, transit, landscaping, design standards, codes, land uses, economics, lighting, mobility, bike lanes, roadways, and signage were all considered in developing recommendations for SW 13th Street.

The five-day interactive public forum was held on the corridor. Participants included the public, City and County staff, elected officials and other interested parties.

The first day included an introduction to the charrette process and approach. It initiated the public dialogue that was a major component of the planning process. Participants discussed and prioritized the major issues and reviewed the previous planning efforts in the area. This was followed by a bus tour of the corridor where issues were discussed further and more thoroughly prioritized.

The second day was spent discussing preferred uses to ultimately develop a "project bank" to organize preferences and recommendations.

During the next three days, the consultant researched and studied the issues and worked with the public to determine the best solutions that would yield public support and consensus. Public and political support is essential for any successful project. During this process, presentation graphics were drawn to help charrette participants visualize the recommended concepts and solutions. These were all presented on the fifth day.

The charrette process

To focus the planning efforts, the consultant developed four categories of issues that describe the corridor. Individual projects were fit into the following categories:

- **Transportation**
- **Land Use**
- **Beautification**
- **Environment**

Essentially these categories transcend this diverse corridor, which has several fundamental components. The Corradino Group's holistic approach to the planning effort began by initially examining the corridor in a broad context and increasing the focus to the neighborhood, block and building levels.

SW 13th Street is a very diverse corridor which includes a spectrum of both rural and urban development. Traveling from south to north draws one through several distinct areas that merge and blend at their boundaries. The *primeval nature* of the natural area of Payne's Prairie is a relatively pristine natural setting. Perfect for naturalists, bicyclists or casual recreation, Payne's Prairie has been left relatively undisturbed over the years. Further north, the *rural character* of the corridor occurs between Payne's Prairie and Williston Road. This area is characterized by a divided road, natural vegetation, low density and intensity uses, and essentially functions as a passage way. The corridor becomes more *town-like* north of Williston Road to 16th Avenue. Here the median narrows, more urban components such as sidewalks, curb, and gutter which bound the road in the northern section, and the land uses become more intense.

The charrette process

Illustration of the corridor's changing character

The Williston Road SW 13th Street intersection acts as a *town gateway*. At Biven's Arm and at Tumblin Creek, one gets a window into nature. North of 16th Avenue the corridor takes on the look and feel of the *city*, with more dense and increasingly urban land uses, sidewalks close to the travel lanes, and higher traffic volumes. North of 16th Avenue the area is appropriate for an urban village. The northern threshold is bounded by the rails to trails bridge at Archer Road.

Using the project bank involving the identified categories of Beautification, Land Use, Transportation, and the Environment, several Case Studies have been developed which capture the essence of the recommendations for improvements. These combine to create visual images of what such improvements might look like over time.

All images and concepts developed during the charrette and described in this document were presented at a joint meeting of City and County Commissioners on June 13, 2002. The following report explains the approach, process, issues, projects, and case studies in detail.

View of 13th St. facing North to Archer Rd. (AFTER ENHANCEMENT)

The charrette process

The charrette process

The SW 13th Street Charrette was designed within the corridor to develop a community consensus. The items presented in this report reflect the consensus of the community.

View of 13th St. facing North to Archer Rd. (BEFORE ENHANCEMENT)

Design Approach



Case studies

The Corradino Group's approach to planning is holistic. This begins by examining the corridor from the regional perspective, narrowing the focus to examine the corridor itself, and finally studying the blocks, streets and buildings.

Examining the corridor from the regional perspective helps to create the context for healthy neighborhoods, which combine to create healthy and functional communities. Each neighborhood within a region is defined either by topography, natural features, parks, transportation facilities, or political boundaries. Although many times the issues transcend these boundaries and affect the region, it is important not to let development patterns remove these boundaries or edges. This is because the boundaries and edges define and organize the neighborhoods. Similarly, it is important to control growth on the regional level to assist in building these functional communities. These neighborhoods and corridors are the essential components to a community's development.



Existing conditions

The consensus of the Charrette was to encourage the compact development of mixed uses along the corridor. That development pattern can create a pedestrian friendly environment. The environment is fairly diverse and provides a variety of options for transportation, shopping and living.

As the corridor is treated at the block, building, and street level, a neighborhood character may be developed. This basic block level addresses both public and private space. The most essential aspect of this is the definition of the codes, which dictate the look, feel and function of an area. Urban design components of open space, edges and gateways are developed here and often, with the use of appropriate codes, can determine the long-term viability of the corridor.



Conceptual illustration

Process



Conceptual illustration

Members of the Corradino project team visited the project area several weeks prior to the charrette to meet with interested parties as well as City and County staff to gain initial insight into the issues. An intensive schedule was developed that focused on exploring the major issues, discussing solutions, providing time to present solutions graphically and finally developing a project bank.

The charrette began with an explanation of the process and approach to the project. A discussion of major issues followed, to confirm the planning efforts of the past. After a short break the consultants and charrette participants took a bus tour of the corridor and prioritized the major issues. This included a land use discussion and strategies for building consensus. After a thorough debate, participants found common ground and agreement on most points of concern. Subsequently, the group discussed potential projects that could become part of the project bank.

By the end of day two, participants had reached consensus on what needed to be done. Days three through five were primarily spent refining the concepts and projects as well as developing accompanying graphics. During this three-day period, the public was invited to further discuss the effort in an informal setting. The doors were open to the public at all times during this phase.

Issues

After a lengthy discussion, several issues came to the forefront. Most pressing on the minds of many participants was the issue of undesirable uses and activities, particularly prostitution, and sexually oriented businesses. The issues that surfaced as most important included:

- Undesirable Uses
- Land Use
- Transportation
- Visual Clutter
- Pedestrians/Bicyclists
- Safety
- Fragmented Landscaping

These issues were summarized into the four categories used for the project bank: Transportation, Land Use, Beautification, Environment.

Undesirable Uses

Participants wanted to develop strategies for encouraging desired uses. One issue of primary concern was sexually-oriented businesses. This use could be difficult to exclude because legally, it must be provided the opportunity to exist somewhere. The County could resolve the issue by writing a separation distance ordinance which would prohibit such uses within certain radii of churches, schools, etc. The City was generally bound to let its current concern sunset over the next several years, at which time the use would have to make fundamental changes.

Another concern was of student and clusters of off-campus student housing. The prohibition of such a group was also found difficult. It is not within the planner's purview to exclude types of people.

As the Charrette participants discussed, the negative aspects of such uses of sexually oriented businesses, prostitution



Corridor issues

and single use clusters of student housing are all symptoms of the greater issue of corridor neglect. Over the years, SW 13th Street truly has become forgotten and has not received the attention that other areas of the community have. As a U.S. highway (U.S. 441), it once served as a main transportation route into Gainesville, but began to lose its importance during the 1960's with the completion of I-75. Development patterns began to shift to I-75 interchange locations, such as Archer

Road. Over time, different uses found their niche along SW 13th Street. Poorer quality construction and a deteriorating physical environment have made the corridor less desirable for housing, thus landlords cannot command premium rents. Charrette participants concluded that with care, attention and new land development regulations encouraging quality development, these issues could be mitigated and eventually disappear.

The opportunities and assets that exist in the corridor are enormous, starting with the people that live there care what their community is and what it will become. And the corridor's location close to the university and to the hospital make it a convenient and potentially attractive location for people to live and work.

The following is a list of desired and undesired uses as stated during the charrette:

Desired Uses

- Restaurants
- Hotels
- Retail
- Residential
- Office (medical/professional)
- Grocery
- Religious
- Cultural
- Day Care
- Automotive Repair
- Parks

Undesired Uses

- Sexually Oriented Businesses
- Crematoria
- Halfway Houses
- RV Parks / Camp Sites
- Rehab Centers
- Social Service Centers
- Car Washes
- Used Car Lots

Land Use

Many land use issues can be solved with a thorough reexamination of the codes. A brief examination found that while both comprehensive plans had goals, objectives, and policies that encouraged the type of development being sought, the land development regulations prohibited such development. For example, the current LDRs would prevent a developer from building a three-story mixed use building with a ten-foot setback. Current LDRs require that buildings be setback 30 feet or ten feet for each story. Such codes represent a very suburban and strip mall approach, which is not what participants in the Charrette participants envision for the corridor.

Transportation / Pedestrians / Bicycles / Safety

The ROW in the corridor is ample. The road is wide and speeds are relatively high. Although SW 13th Street no longer holds a prominent position as a main artery into and out of Gainesville, it does experience congestion as part of overflow of the overall transportation network. Therefore, eliminating lanes may not be appropriate. The corridor has been built as a transportation corridor and still functions as one. Therefore, it is appropriate that it remain as one. Re-configuring certain aspects of the street cross section, may be necessary for pedestrian and bicycle safety. Often students are dropped off across the street from their apartments, and attempt to cross mid-block.

Project Bank

Visual Clutter / Fragmented Landscape

The look and feel of SW 13th Street belies the fact that it has essentially been forgotten over the past several decades. Lack of attention and care is evident. Repetitive and unregulated signs create noticeable visual clutter. This, combined with multiple curb cuts, overhead utilities, and poor landscaping, creates the feeling of neglect. Often the clutter is accentuated by violations of the ROW. Instead, on nearly every block the ROW is encroached upon by private landscaping, automobile dealerships, signs, newspaper boxes, etc. Additionally, landscaping is in need of enhancement to create the appropriate character of a natural shaded area.

Illustration of the corridor's changing character

After an intensive collaborative process geared towards creating consensus, projects were grouped and a "project bank" was created. The project bank is the culmination of all issues discussed during the first three days of the Charrette. This project bank is a list of projects that, if implemented, will help improve the major areas of concern facing the corridor. Such projects represent the four major areas that span the entire length of the corridor: Environment; Transportation; Codes; and Landscape Beautification.

As discussed, the SW 13th Street corridor is not monolithic in nature and can be stratified into four geographic areas that reflect its diverse character.

As the character of the corridor changes along this continuum, so do the issues. Projects are prepared for the entire length of the corridor, but vary in application from one area to the next.

From south to north these changes are categorized as:

- Nature (Payne's Prairie)
- Rural/Town (Payne's Prairie – Williston Road)
- Town Gateway/Transition/Threshold (Williston Activity Center, Biven's Arm)
- City (25th Avenue to Archer)

The discussion that follows describes issues, projects, and project implementation as they relate to each project area. A bullet list of each project and its sub-tasks is provided, as well as a sequence of events that will lead towards implementation.

Transportation

The SW 13th Street Corridor was designed and built as a transportation corridor. Its character is still that today. Although traffic volume on the corridor was under capacity (it is generally operating at LOS B), there are some congested periods during the AM and PM peaks. Therefore, it may not be appropriate to reduce the number of lanes, but rather to reconfigure or narrow the lanes. The ample ROW ranges from approximately 80' to 135'. Travel lanes are 12'-13'. Bike lanes are present, but inconsistent. Fortunately, there is enough area in the unpaved swales to expand bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The character of the facility is more urban with curb and gutter between Archer Road and 25th Place. It becomes more rural with drainage swales, south of 25th Place.

A major issue addressed during the SW 13th Street Charrette included poor lane configuration that has led to vehicular and pedestrian conflicts. For example, bike lanes and sidewalks are inconsistent, many intersections have movement conflicts, east/west pedestrian mobility at intersections is seen as unsafe, and transit stop locations are generally inadequate, poorly located, and encourage mid-block crossings.

A core issue is the road's ownership by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). Any corridor changes must be coordinated and approved by FDOT. In order to change or recreate the character of the facility it is recommended that a combined City/County/FDOT Corridor Analysis / Mobility Study should be undertaken. This effort would be administered by project managers from the City of Gainesville, Alachua County, and FDOT who would develop a study methodology. FDOT does have Livable Community Initiatives which promote many of the principles initiated for the SW 13th Street corridor. Therefore, FDOT should be able to develop a methodology based on these principles. Furthermore, the community has adopted the MTPO 2020 Livable Communities Reinvestment Plan. Frequent coordination during the process would aid in cooperative efforts. Implementation would occur with approval from the City and County, and MTPO, and prioritization on an implementation plan by FDOT. Implementation could be 7 to 10 years in the future. As always, implementation of many of the issues discussed will be determined by available funding. Local funding will probably be required for certain aspects of long-term development and maintenance. Currently FDOT and MTPO have coordinated a rumble strip project through Payne's Prairie. This is both funded and budgeted.

This effort would have several sub-tasks as described below. Aside from coordination with FDOT, MTPO, the University of Florida, Regional Transit System (RTS) and Gainesville Regional Utilities (GRU) should be included in the process because each has issues and potential projects that will effect the use of the corridor.

Coordinated Corridor Analysis / Mobility Study

- Uniform Bike Paths, Sidewalks, Pedestrian Paths
  - *ROW Survey*
- Lane Narrowing / Reconfiguration
  - *Develop Alternatives*
  - *Examine Issues Dealing with Curbing Medians*
  - *Traffic Counts*
  - *Level of Services Analysis*
  - *FSUTMS/Syncro/Corsim*

- *Speed/Time and Delay Study*
- Redesign Intersections, 16th / Williston
  - *Develop Alternatives*
  - *Roundabout, Lane Configuration*
  - *Provide Colored and Textured Crosswalks*
  - *Examine Signal Timing*
- Transit
  - *Create Bus Bays*
  - *Implement Improved, Sheltered Bus Stops*
  - *Study Relocation of Bus Stops Closer to Intersections*
  - *Study Alternatives for Mid-Block Pedestrian Crossings at Bus Stops*
  - *Pedestrian Actuated Signals*

Pedestrian Accessibility Study

- Develop Alternatives Between 16th Avenue and Shands Hospital

ROW Recommendations

The corridor has four general ROW widths: 80', 121', 145', 160 which are illustrated on the following pages.. These are the area north of 16th Avenue, the area between 16th Avenue and the Gainesville Sun, the area between the Gainesville Sun and Williston Road, and the area between Williston Road and Payne's Prairie. The corridor has a ROW of between 80' and 135' measured from utility pole to utility pole, (a survey would be needed to determine exact dimensions). Generally the corridor consist of two 13' lanes in each direction. South of 16th Avenue it is divided by a median of between 28' to 30' in width. Bike lanes and sidewalks are present, but not consistently.



Traffic issues

The goal is to narrow the travel lanes, provide for consistent and ample bike lanes and sidewalks, and provide for appropriate landscaping. All of these enhancements would make it easier for automobiles, bicyclists and pedestrians to coexist on the facility, while providing ample access and opportunity for each. In addition this would help calm traffic and moderate speeds to the design speed of between 30 and 35 mph. The following illustrations provide recommendations for streetscape changes.

North of 16th Avenue

Here the existing condition features an approximate 80' ROW of curb and gutter consisting of:

- 5' sidewalk
- 3' swale/planting strip
- 6' bike lane
- Two 13' travel lanes (in each direction)
- No median
- 6' bike lane
- 3' swale and curb
- 5' sidewalk

The new configuration would consist of:

- Widen sidewalk to 7'
- Widen planting strip to 5'
- Retain 6' bike lane
- Reduce travel lanes to 11' lanes (in each direction)
- Retain 6' bike lane
- Widen planting strip to 5' (appropriately landscaped)
- Widen sidewalk to 7'



SW 13th St South from 16th Ave

Between 16th Avenue and The Gainesville Sun

Here, the existing condition features an approximate 80' ROW of curb and gutter consisting of:

- 18' swale/planting strip
- no sidewalk
- 6' bike lane
- Two 12' to 12.5' travel lanes (in each direction)
- 31' median
- 6' bike lane
- 5' swale and curb
- 5' sidewalk
- 5' planting strip

The new configuration would consist of:

- Narrow swale/planting strip to 6'
- Create sidewalk to 7'
- Create 5' planting strip (appropriately landscaped)
- Widen bike lane to 8'
- Reduce travel lanes to 11'- 11.5' lanes (in each direction)
- Maintain 31' median (appropriately landscaped)
- Widen bike lane to 8'
- Maintain 5' planting strip (appropriately landscaped)
- Maintain 5' sidewalk
- Maintain 5' planting strip



SW 13th St @ The Gainesville Sun

Between The Gainesville Sun and Williston Road

Here the existing condition features an approximate 121' ROW of no curb and gutter consisting of:

- 19' swale/planting strip
- no sidewalk
- 4' bike lane
- Two 12' travel lanes (in each direction)
- 30' median
- 4' bike lane
- 6' swale
- 5' sidewalk
- 5' planting strip

The new configuration would consist of:

- Narrow swale/planting strip to 6'
- Create sidewalk to 7'
- Create 5' planting strip (appropriately landscaped)
- Widen bike lane to 8'
- Reduce travel lanes to 11' lanes (in each direction)
- Maintain 30' median (appropriately landscaped)
- Widen bike lane to 8'
- Reduce planting strip to 5' appropriately landscaped
- Create sidewalk to 7'
- Reduce planting strip to 4'



Between Williston Road and Payne's Prairie

Here the existing condition features an approximate 160' ROW of no curb and gutter consisting of:

- 50' swale/planting strip
- No sidewalk
- 4' bike lane
- Two 12' travel lanes (in each direction)
- 26' median
- 4' bike lane
- No sidewalk
- 27' swale

The new configuration would consist of:

- Reduce swale to 48'
- Create sidewalk/bike path to 10' (20' off edge of pavement, which meanders slightly through appropriately landscaped swale area)
- Widen bike lane to 8'
- Reduce travel lanes to 11' lanes (in each direction)
- Maintain 26' median (appropriately landscaped)
- Widen bike lane to 8'
- Reduce planting strip to 25' appropriately landscaped
- Create 10-foot-wide sidewalk



Through Payne's Prairie

Here the existing condition features an approximate 145' ROW with no curb and gutter bound by two elevated retaining walls consisting of:

- 30' swale
- No sidewalk
- 4' bike lane
- Two 12' travel lanes (in each direction)
- 26' median
- 4' bike lane
- No sidewalk
- 33' swale

The new configuration would consist of:

- Reduce swale to 28'
- Create sidewalk/bike path to 10' (10' off edge of pavement, which proceeds straight through the non-landscaped swale area)
- Widen bike lane to 6'
- Create 2' rumble strip
- Reduce travel lanes to 11' lanes (in each direction)
- Maintain 26' median (non-landscaped)
- Create 2' rumble strip
- Widen bike lane to 6'
- Reduce swale to 28' (non-landscaped)
- Create sidewalk/ bike path to 10'



Proposed transportation network

Beautification

One of the major issues addressed in the corridor is its look and feel. Currently, the corridor has landscaping that is inconsistent, out of character and in need of improvement. The poor edge conditions are a direct result of: unattractive above-ground utilities; ROW violations and encroachments by property owners' landscape treatments, automobiles, newspaper boxes and signs; the lack of pedestrian lighting; and inconsistent pedestrian and bicycle facilities. In general, there is a lack of uniformity particularly in the northern section of the corridor.

The City has written an FDOT Beautification Grant to make corridor improvements, though it has not been submitted. If the application is approved by FDOT, the agency will require that curbs be added to the median for trees greater than a certain size.

Fortunately, there are examples of beautification efforts by the private sector. Tree-lined street edges, for example, outside the public ROW, are a positive influence on the corridor and should be maintained.

Beautification can be accomplished through a combination of landscaping, undergrounding utilities, preventing ROW encroachments and providing appropriate style lighting. Coordinating of issues dealing with ROW encroachments should be initiated immediately with the property owners along the corridor. The general approach to landscaping would be formal edges and medians with large-scale canopy trees along the more urban portion of the roadway, medians with smaller-scale canopy trees along the more rural portion of the roadway from 25th Place to Williston Road, medians with lower hedges between Williston Road and Payne's Prairie, and no changes through the Prairie.



Proposed beautification enhancements

Landscaping

- Approve and Submit Beautification Grant
  - *Shade Tees Along Edges and Median (City)*
  - *Smaller Native Trees in Median, Existing Edge Condition (Transitional)*
  - *Native Vegetation Protecting Pedestrian/bike Path (Rural/Town/Nature)*
- Coordinate with FDOT Prior to Submittal

Enforce Codes

- Coordinate with Property Owners to Prevent ROW Encroachment

Underground Utilities

- Assess Useful Life of Existing Utilities
  - *North of Biven's (+,- 25 yr Life Span Remaining)*
  - *South of Biven's (+,-10-15 yr Life Span Remaining)*
  - *Seek Partners in Funding*

Sign Ordinance

- Single Sign, Out of ROW, Height/Material/Colors
  - *Needs to Be Reviewed by Staff*

Lighting

- Pedestrian Scale
  - *Acorn Lights*
  - *60' On Center*
  - *Needs to Be Confirmed by Staff*

Environmental Issues

Land Use

An additional aspect to the overall improvement of the SW 13th Street Corridor is the development, design and implementation of appropriate land use codes for the study area. The corridor is currently under a development moratorium, which will end by late November 2002. This aspect of the project is the most logical next step in the entire process because land use is almost completely in the control of both the City and County. Generally this type of effort can be done relatively quickly. It is recommended that the community undertake a Special Area Plan to address the recommendations of this charrette.

Through the interactive public involvement process, several uses were considered desirable or undesirable. Additionally, the desired uses should be applied in a manner that encourages development to focus on limiting the "strip" character that currently exists and promotes a mix of uses and higher densities for residential areas. The following recommendations will help further this effort. This should be schedule and added or otherwise ammended through the special area plan:

- Designate the Area Around Tumblin Creek a Conservation Area.
- Change the Area Surrounding the Corridor Between 21st Avenue and 25th Avenue from Commercial Medium Intensity to Mixed Use Low Intensity.
- Preserve the Current Large Single Family PD Area on the East side of SW 13th adjacent to Payne's Prairie for the County.
- Change the Williston Activity Center From Residential Low Intensity to Mixed Use Low Intensity.
- Create formal access to Bivins Arm as quality open space along the corridor.

Although several uses are undesired, particularly Sexually Oriented Businesses, there is a legal reason that they exist somewhere in the community. The location of such uses is seen as symptomatic of neglect. An overall change in the Corridor, implemented through recommendations in this report, will mitigate this use.



GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE (ADOPTED)

The Special Area Plan should examine acceptable uses for the corridor. This may require changes or amendments to the City and County Comprehensive plans or the Land Development Codes, or be able to be addressed through an overlay. Additionally, the codes should be revisited to limit undesirable uses, and permit more integrated mixed uses.

The Comprehensive Plans' Goals, Objectives and Policies encourage quality development that favors aesthetically pleasing, pedestrian friendly, sustainable development as opposed to strip development. However, this is not reflected in the land development regulations, which have specific requirements restricting setbacks, light angles, heights, and other requirements. The Land Development code should be changed to reflect these pedestrian friendly qualities. Additionally, Design Standards for specific developments should encourage quality development, and emphasize the importance of public space and the public realm.

The Policies, LDR's and Design Standards will apply corridor wide to all properties fronting SW 13th Street. Since the corridor includes both City and County jurisdictions, each government will need to enact the appropiate changes.The effect of these standards will be to provide potential developers with a clear understanding of what is necessary in order to develop property in the corridor, thus, making it much easier and inviting to occur. If a developer cannot meet the standards set by the Special Area Plan, they may have the opportunity to undergo the planned development process.

The issue of banning uses has been addressed. It may not be appropriate or legal to prohibit certain uses. The answer may lie in limiting these uses, developing around them and thereby diluting them. Enhancements of codes, beautification and right of way improvements can accomplish this.



GENERALIZED RECOMMENDED LAND USE

The process for implementation is as follows.

Special Area Plan

- Redefine Mixed Use
  - *Integrate, Uses that Relate, Vertical as Well as Horizontal*
- Redefine or Remove Business Tourism Category
- Redefine all other use categories
  - *Eliminate Undesired Uses (to the Extent Possible)*
- Study Removal of PD from Zoning Map for the County
- Focus on Mixed Commercial Areas
- Provide for More Residential Character in the Area South of the Williston Activity Center
- Create Policies that Promote redevelopment
- Examine Appropriate Locations for Mixed use, Commercial and Higher Density Residential
  - *Focus Densities in Activity centers, (16th Avenue, Williston)*
- Create Policies that Facilitate Desirable Development
- Create Design Standards
- Examine Partnerships with Business Community
- Write a Sexually Oriented Business Separation Distance Ordinance (County)

Consider a Market Analysis Study

- SW 13th Street in Regional Market Context
- Market Profile
- Explore Ability, Desire and Cost of Land Assembly
- Examine Solicitation of Developers Through RFP Process
- Examine Public / Private Development Opportunities
- Explore Development Incentives

Coordinate with University of Florida

- Examine Possibility of Archer Road modifications
- Explore Possibility and Feasibility of Higher Density Mixed-Use Residential Development in the Ghandy Neighborhood

Approve Special Area Plan

- Both City and County Commissions
- By December 2002

Modify Comprehensive Plans and LDR's

- Either as Comprehensive Plan Amendments or as LDR Amendments

Environment

The unifying characteristic of the SW 13th Street Corridor is its position in the natural environment and how that environment meshes with the various degrees of developments. Charrette participants agreed that access to the environment needed to be improved.

The corridor is situated on a continuum where one passes from an area of primeval nature in Payne's Prairie through controlled nature to a gateway to the built environment at Williston Road. Biven's Arm and Tumblin Creek serve as windows into nature. Improvements here will improve the quality and health of the natural environment, improving the general quality of life of those who live in the community, and economic development opportunities. Four projects have been recommended to help accomplish these goals.

Payne's Prairie Observation Area

- Create a Covered Observation Deck on the South Bound Northern Quadrant of the Prairie.
- Create Parking Amenities for the Observation Deck
  - *Bicycle racks*
  - *Drinking water*

Biven's Arm Access

- Implement Bridge Improvements Over the Area
  - *Pedestrian access*
  - *Textured / Colored Bridge Treatment*
  - *Replace Guard Rails with more Aesthetically Pleasing Treatment*
- Develop Boardwalk, Pier and Observation Area on East Side
- Examine Opportunities to Access the Property to the South of the Lake



Environmental issues

- Promote Environmental, Educational, Dining and Recreation uses

Tumblin Creek Enhancement

- Coordinate with Water Quality and Environmental Planning Efforts
- Examine De-channelization of Creek
- Examine Restoration to Natural Path
- Enhance Pedestrian Amenities Across and Beside the Creek

Stormwater Master Plan

- Examine the Corridor's Drainage, Flooding Issues
- Provide Conceptual Costs for Mitigation or Improvements
- Coordinate on a Regional Basis

Case Studies



In many cases the efforts described above will ultimately combine to form the creation of a new corridor, with a character, look, feel and function all its own. The projects that have examined the corridor in the regional, neighborhood and block context will have defined SW 13th Street as an area with several distinct parts. In a way, SW 13th Street is a living organism. The results of subtle changes will be represented slowly over time. To represent what the projects suggested here may look like in the future, several case studies have been created. These include:

- Payne's Prairie: Primeval Nature
- The Williston Road Gateway
- Biven's Arm Crossing: A Moment To Celebrate
- 25th Place to Tumblin Creek
- Tumblin Creek Restoration
- The Archer Road: Urban Village

Payne's Prairie: Primeval Nature

Payne's Prairie is a naturally beautiful environment that needs little enhancement. The addition of one more observation deck and beautification of the existing one with shade and water will add enormous value. Adequate bike paths and pedestrian amenities will make utilization of this facility easier and more rewarding.

Enhanced viewing area

Existing condition

The Williston Road Gateway

This area will redefine the activity center, changing to a Mixed Use, Low Intensity designation. Building will become closer to the ROW and uses will be integrated vertically. Design standards will enable gas stations to fit seamlessly into the environment while maintaining their function. An entry feature will act as a gateway and a reconfigured intersection will create a pedestrian friendly area, by which people can utilize the many uses and recreation area, which will have more amenities.



Biven's Arm Crossing: A Moment To Celebrate

Biven's Arm is one of the most underutilized areas along the corridor. This wonderful amenity needs to be opened up for all to appreciate. The view can be enhanced and pedestrian access can be provided to the waters edge. The area south of the bridge is a potential site for an environmental center with dining and educational uses. Environmental concerns can be served through a stormwater master plan.



25th Place to Tumblin Creek

This area can be reconfigured with quality town homes and small-scale local retail with buildings set far off of the ROW. The mix of uses could be vertical in nature, and incentives could be provided for developers to assemble property and build vertically for additional floor area ratio. The maintenance of the pocket park north of the Gainesville Sun is of particular importance.

Photo Rendering AFTER

Photo Rendering BEFORE

Tumblin Creek Restoration

This is primarily a beautification project that restores one of the Corridor's hidden assets. Unattractive structures will be removed and adequate and attractive lighting will be placed. The concrete culvert can be removed and the creek can be de-channelized or landscaped as a more natural creek. Through this project the environment will be cleaned and a linear park can be created on the north edge of Biven's Arm Lake, with connections to pedestrian paths to the campus.



Photo Rendering AFTER

Photo Rendering BEFORE

The Archer Road: Urban Village

As the corridor becomes more urban this area can be characterized by mixed use retail. Pedestrian needs will be accommodated with adequate sidewalks and crossings. Residential opportunities will be enhanced through transit oriented development, landscape features, bus shelters and access to the hospital and campus.

Conceptual Perspective




FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT TWO
FDOT
Context Classification
Map Legend
Location Search
EXHIBIT 5
D2 LOS Report
D2 Bike/Ped LOS
Login
C4
C4-SD
C5
C3R
C3C
C3C-SD
C1
C2
LA
Museum Rd
University of Florida
Hull Rd
Mowry Rd
SW 23rd Ter
Bivens Lake
SW 35th Pl
SW 56th Ave
SW 21st Ave
SW 4th Ave
SE 2nd Ave
SE 4th Ave
Alachua
Idylwild School
U of F Foundation Inc
State of Florida IIF
329

FDOT Context Classification

August 2017

Completing FLORIDA'S STREETS


FDOT
Completing
FLORIDA'S
STREETS

FDOT Context Classification

FDOT will routinely plan, design, construct, reconstruct and operate a context-sensitive system of Complete Streets. To this end, a context classification system comprising eight context classifications has been adopted. The context classification of a roadway, together with its transportation characteristics, will provide information about who the users are along the roadway, the regional and local travel demand of the roadway, and the challenges and opportunities of each roadway user (see Figure 1). The context classification and transportation characteristics of a roadway will determine key design criteria for all non-limited-access state roadways.

This document describes the measures to be used to determine the context classification of a roadway.

FIGURE 1 CONTEXT CLASSIFICATION AND TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS



CONTEXT CLASSIFICATION

The context classification system broadly identifies the various built environments existing in Florida, as illustrated in Figure 2. State roadways will extend through a variety of context classifications. Figure 2 should not be taken literally to imply all roadways will have every context classification or that context classifications occur in the sequence shown. FDOT's context classification system describes the general characteristics of the land use, development patterns, and roadway connectivity along a roadway, providing cues as to the types of uses and user groups that will likely utilize the roadway. The context classification of a roadway will inform FDOT's planning, PD&E, design, construction, and maintenance approaches to ensure that state roadways are supportive of safe and comfortable travel for their anticipated users. Identifying the context classification is a step in planning and design, as different context classifications will have different design criteria and standards.

The use of context classifications to determine criteria for roadway design elements is consistent with national best practices and direction, including the National Cooperative Highway Research Program

FIGURE 2 FDOT CONTEXT CLASSIFICATIONS



C1-Natural
Lands preserved in a natural or wilderness condition, including lands unsuitable for settlement due to natural conditions.

C2-Rural
Sparsely settled lands; may include agricultural land, grassland, woodland, and wetlands.

C2T-Rural Town
Small concentrations of developed areas immediately surrounded by rural and natural areas; includes many historic towns.

C3R-Suburban Residential
Mostly residential uses within large blocks and a disconnected or sparse roadway network.

(NCHRP) that informs Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidance. ***NCHRP Report 855: An Expanded Functional Classification System for Highways and Streets*** proposes a similar context-based approach to design that incorporates context, user needs, and transportation functions into the design process. This research was born out of a need to better define contexts beyond urban and rural classifications, and to incorporate multimodal needs into the existing functional classification system.

This document outlines the steps to determine a roadway's context classification. Measures used to determine the context classification are presented, and a process to define the context classification is outlined for:

- All projects on existing roadways and for projects that propose new roadways and are in the PD&E or design phases
- Projects evaluating new roadways in the planning and ETDM screening phases



C3C-Suburban Commercial
Mostly non-residential uses with large building footprints and large parking lots within large blocks and a disconnected or sparse roadway network.

C4-Urban General
Mix of uses set within small blocks with a well-connected roadway network. May extend long distances. The roadway network usually connects to residential neighborhoods immediately along the corridor or behind the uses fronting the roadway.

C5-Urban Center
Mix of uses set within small blocks with a well-connected roadway network. Typically concentrated around a few blocks and identified as part of a civic or economic center of a community, town, or city.

C6-Urban Core
Areas with the highest densities and building heights, and within FDOT classified Large Urbanized Areas (population >1,000,000). Many are regional centers and destinations. Buildings have mixed uses, are built up to the roadway, and are within a well-connected roadway network.

CONTEXT CLASSIFICATION MATRIX

Table 1 Context Classification Matrix presents a framework to determine the context classifications along state roadways. This Context Classification Matrix outlines (1) distinguishing characteristics, (2) primary measures, and (3) secondary measures.

The distinguishing characteristics give a broad description of the land use types and street patterns found within each context classification. The primary and secondary measures provide more detailed assessments of the existing or future conditions along the roadway. These measures can be evaluated through a combination of a field visit, internet-based

TABLE 1 CONTEXT CLASSIFICATION MATRIX

		(2) Primary Measures		
		Land Use	Building Height	Building Placement
Context Classification	(1) Distinguishing Characteristics	Description	Floor Levels	Description
C1-Natural	Lands preserved in a natural or wilderness condition, including lands unsuitable for settlement due to natural conditions.	Conservation Land, Open Space, or Park	N/A	N/A
C2-Rural	Sparsely settled lands; may include agricultural land, grassland, woodland, and wetlands.	Agricultural or Single-Family Residential	1 to 2	Detached buildings with no consistent pattern of setbacks
C2T-Rural Town	Small concentrations of developed areas immediately surrounded by rural and natural areas; includes many historic towns.	Retail, Office, Single-Family or Multi-Family Residential, Institutional, or Industrial	1 to 2	Both detached and attached buildings with no or shallow (<20') front setbacks
C3R-Suburban Residential	Mostly residential uses within large blocks and a disconnected or sparse roadway network.	Single-Family or Multi-Family Residential	1 to 2, with some 3	Detached buildings with medium (20' to 75') front setbacks
C3C-Suburban Commercial	Mostly non-residential uses with large building footprints and large parking lots within large blocks and a disconnected or sparse roadway network.	Retail, Office, Multi-Family Residential, Institutional, or Industrial	1 (retail uses) and 1 to 4 (office uses)	Detached buildings with large (>75') setbacks on all sides
C4-Urban General	Mix of uses set within small blocks with a well-connected roadway network. May extend long distances. The roadway network usually connects to residential neighborhoods immediately along the corridor or behind the uses fronting the roadway.	Single-Family or Multi-Family Residential, Institutional, Neighborhood Scale Retail, or Office	1 to 3, with some taller buildings	Both detached and attached buildings with no setbacks or up to medium (<75') front setbacks
C5-Urban Center	Mix of uses set within small blocks with a well-connected roadway network. Typically concentrated around a few blocks and identified as part of a civic or economic center of a community, town, or city.	Retail, Office, Single-Family or Multi-Family Residential, Institutional, or Light Industrial	1 to 5, with some taller buildings	Both detached and attached buildings with no or shallow (<20') front setbacks
C6-Urban Core	Areas with the highest densities and building heights, and within FDOT classified Large Urbanized Areas (population >1,000,000). Many are regional centers and destinations. Buildings have mixed uses, are built up to the roadway, and are within a well-connected roadway network.	Retail, Office, Institutional, or Multi-Family Residential	>4, with some shorter buildings	Mostly attached buildings with no or minimal (<10') front setbacks

More information on measures with undefined thresholds (N/As) are included in Appendix B. The thresholds presented in Table 1 are based on the following sources, with modifications made based on Florida case studies:

1) *2008 Smart Transportation Guidebook: Planning and Designing Highways and Streets that Support Sustainable and Livable Communities*, New Jersey Department of Transportation and Pennsylvania Department of Transportation;

aerial and street view imagery, map analysis, and review of existing or future land use or existing zoning information. The Context Classification Matrix presents the primary and secondary measures thresholds for the eight context classifications.

Appendix A illustrates the eight FDOT context classifications through case studies. These case studies present examples of real-world values for the primary and secondary measures that determine a roadway's context classification.

					(3) Secondary Measures			
		Roadway Connectivity						
Fronting Uses	Location of Off-street Parking	Intersection Density	Block Perimeters	Block Length	Allowed Residential Density	Allowed Office/ Retail Density	Population Density	Employment Density
Yes/No	Description	Intersections/ Square Mile	Feet	Feet	Dwelling Units/ Acre	Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)	Persons/Acre	Jobs/Acre
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
No	N/A	<20	N/A	N/A	<1	N/A	<2	N/A
Yes	Mostly on side or rear; occasionally in front	>100	<3,000	<500	>4	>0.25	N/A	>2
No	Mostly in front; occasionally in rear or side	<100	N/A	N/A	1 to 8	N/A	N/A	N/A
No	Mostly in front; occasionally in rear or side	<100	>3,000	>660	N/A	<0.75	N/A	N/A
Yes	Mostly on side or rear; occasionally in front	>100	<3,000	<500	>4	N/A	>5	>5
Yes	Mostly on side or rear; occasionally in front, or in shared off-site parking facilities	>100	<2,500	<500	>8	>0.75	>10	>20
Yes	Side or rear; often in shared off-site garage parking	>100	<2,500	<660	>16	>2	>20	>45

2) 2012 Florida TOD Guidebook, Florida Department of Transportation;
3) 2009 SmartCode Version 9.2, Duany, Andres, Sandy Sorlien, and William Wright; and
4) 2010 Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach, Institute of Transportation Engineers and Congress for the New Urbanism.

DETERMINING CONTEXT CLASSIFICATION

The distinguishing characteristics and primary and secondary measures provide analytical measurements to evaluate land use characteristics, development patterns, and roadway connectivity and to determine context classification. The data available to characterize existing and future contexts will vary depending on the specificity of the roadway alignments being considered. Many projects conducted by FDOT occur along existing corridors where a single alignment is being considered. The range of alternatives for new roadways also narrows to a single alignment alternative as projects proceed from planning through PD&E and design. In planning and ETDM screening for existing roadways, and in PD&E and design for new roadways, it is possible to analyze both the existing and future conditions to determine or update context classification of a roadway. For projects involving new roadways in planning and ETDM screening, multiple alternative alignments may be considered over larger areas. For these latter type of projects, a broader understanding of the context classification will be used to inform the planning process and development of alternatives.

Context Classification Database:

Projects will be assigned a context classification to utilize context-based criteria in the ***FDM***. FDOT will develop a database of context classification for all state roadways. Initially, districts will evaluate and map context classification as projects occur, while working to complete a statewide database of context classification. The context classification evaluations completed for the statewide database will utilize available data and information on existing built conditions. As FDOT projects are conducted, these initial evaluations will be updated or confirmed based on current data, as well as future conditions, as discussed later in this document. FDOT districts may choose to prioritize the evaluation of context classifications for roadway segments with planned and programmed projects. Each FDOT district's Planning or Modal Development office, as deemed appropriate by each district, will take the lead on evaluating and determining context classification on state roadways. FDOT's context classification database may eventually be stored in an integrated roadway asset identification system, such as the FDOT Enterprise Application RCI, as well as the straightline diagram and the typical section data sheet.

The context classification will be updated or confirmed at the beginning of each project phase, including planning, PD&E, and design. Each district can assign staff who will oversee the determination of context classification. It is recommended that an interdisciplinary team within each district help determine the context classification. For projects where FDOT currently coordinates with local governments, FDOT will coordinate with those local governments to confirm context classification. The final determination of context classification will be made by FDOT district staff. For smaller projects, such as traffic operations push-button projects, the context classification may be determined without additional local coordination (see Chapter 3 for more information). Refer to the ***Public Involvement Handbook***, ***FDM***, ***PD&E Manual***, and ***Project Management Handbook*** for guidance on local government coordination.

Steps for Determining Context Classification

The steps for determining the context classification include:

1. Identify Major Changes in Context

Use the distinguishing characteristics based on the Context Classification Matrix to determine if multiple context classifications are necessary due to significant changes in the type or intensity of uses located along the roadway. Where a block structure is present, a context classification segment may be as short as two blocks in length. Where there is no defined block structure, a context classification segment may be as short as a quarter-mile in length.

2. Evaluate the Primary Measures

A roadway segment must meet a majority of the primary measures defined for a context classification in order to be assigned that context classification. Table 2 describes the primary measures, methodology, and data sources associated with each measure. For the primary measures, two measurement areas — the block and the parcel — are used, as explained in Figures 3 and 4. The measurement areas used for each measure are identified in Table 2. Figure 5 through Figure 9 provide guidance for evaluating some of the primary measures.

FDOT evaluation of each segment identified in Step 1 can be done using the primary measures based on

existing conditions or updated with future context if needed. Qualifying projects in all phases for existing roadways will be evaluated using the future context of the primary measures. The future context should be clearly documented in a well-defined, community-supported and implementation-focused plan or in policies such as the land use element of the local comprehensive plan, zoning overlays, form-based codes, community redevelopment plans, or permitted development plans.

Qualifying Projects:

Roadway project types that qualify for ETDM screening, per the ***ETDM Manual*** Section 2.3.1 include:

- Additional through lanes which add capacity to an existing road
- A new roadway, freeway or expressway
- A highway which provides new access to an area
- A new or reconstructed arterial highway (e.g., realignment)
- A new circumferential or belt highway that bypasses a community
- Addition of interchanges or major interchange modifications to a completed freeway or expressway (based on coordination with FHWA)
- A new bridge which provides new access to an area, bridge replacements

Non-qualifying Projects:

Projects that do not go through ETDM screening.

The future desired conditions should be consistently documented across all appropriate local policies and should be well-understood and accepted by local stakeholders. In short, the future conditions should be those that are predictable and that will occur over an anticipated timeframe rather than visionary plans or broad goals and ideas that do not have a clear timeline for actual implementation. Use of a form-based code is one indicator that significant community discussion occurred on a future vision, and that future development is more likely to result based on the adopted form-based code. The District Secretary will make the determination of future context classification in situations where the the future context may be in doubt.

The two photos above are from the same roadway and illustrate an example of a high volume roadway that balances the needs of freight traffic, transit, and pedestrians and bicyclists of varying abilities. The corridor includes a shared use path, bicycle lanes, bus pull-outs, bus shelters with benches, and other amenities.
Location: US 98, Polk County, FL
Source: KAI

3. Evaluate the Secondary Measures

In most cases primary measures are sufficient to understand and determine a roadway's context classification. Secondary measures can be used to further understand the context when there is no clear consensus on the context classification based on the primary measures. Secondary measures are also useful in cases where local municipalities have adopted a future vision for a place that is not consistent with the existing context classification. Table 3 describes the secondary measures and the methodology and data sources associated with each measure.

The secondary measures quantify the intensity of development. A roadway segment needs to meet only one of the two criteria, either population density or employment density, to be classified within a context classification. Zoning may show that the local municipality intends for the area to be developed into a more intense development form in the future, and therefore does not meet the existing population and employment densities, but will meet them in the future.

TABLE 2 PRIMARY MEASURES TO DEFINE CONTEXT CLASSIFICATION

Measure		Description	Methodology	Measurement Area*	Data Source**
Land Use		Land use mix for more than 50% of the fronting uses	Record based on existing or future adopted land uses.	Fronting parcels on either side of the roadway	Field review, GIS files, existing or future land use maps
Building Height		The range in height of the buildings for more than 50% of the properties	Record based on existing buildings or future permitted building height requirements based on land development regulations.	Fronting parcels on either side of the roadway	Field review, internet-based aerial and street view imagery, or land development regulations
Building Placement		Location of buildings in terms of setbacks for more than 50% of the parcels	Measure the distance from the building to the property line or future required building placement based on land development regulations (see Figure 5).	Fronting parcels on either side of the roadway	Field review, internet-based aerial and street view imagery, building footprint and parcel GIS files, or land development regulations
Fronting Uses		Buildings that have front doors that can be accessed from the sidewalks along a pedestrian path for more than 50% of the parcels	Record the percentage of buildings that provide fronting uses or site design and lot layout requirements in land development regulations that require fronting uses (see Figure 6).	Fronting parcels on either side of the roadway	Field review or internet-based aerial and street view imagery, or land development regulations
Location of Off-street Parking		Location of parking in relation to the building: between the building and the roadway (in front); on the side of the building; or behind the building	Record location of off-street parking for majority of parcels or parking requirements based on land development regulations (see Figure 7).	Fronting parcels on either side of the roadway	Field review or internet-based aerial and street view imagery, or land development regulations
Roadway Connectivity	Intersection Density	Number of intersections per square mile	Calculate by dividing the total number of intersections by the area of the blocks along both sides of the street, excluding natural features and public parks; consider future roadway connectivity if an approved or permitted development plan is in place (see Figure 8).	The block on either side of the roadway; if the roadway and block structure is not complete, the evaluation area should extend 2000' on either side of the roadway	Street centerline GIS files or physical map, internet-based maps, plans showing programmed roadway projects, and permitted development plans
	Block Perimeter	Average perimeter of the blocks adjacent to the roadway on either side	Measure the block perimeter for the blocks adjacent to the roadway on either side and take the average; consider future roadway connectivity if an approved - permitted development plan is in place (see Figure 9).	The block on either side of the roadway; if the roadway and block structure are not complete, the evaluation area should extend 2000' on either side of the roadway	
	Block Length	Average distance between intersections	Measure the distance along the roadway between intersections with a public roadway, on either side, and take the average; consider future roadway connectivity if an approved or permitted development plan is in place (see Figure 9).	Roadway	

** The measurement area applies to each context classification segment. Evaluate each measure for each context classification segment. Where characteristics differ for each side of the street, use the characteristics for the side that would yield the higher context classification.*

*** Land use, zoning, streets, and other GIS data and maps are available from local government agencies, FDOT Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) Database, and regional agencies.*

FIGURE 3 MEASUREMENT AREA: THE BLOCK ON EITHER SIDE OF THE ROADWAY



Measurement area = one block on either side of project roadway or 2000 feet. if block structure is not complete. A block is defined as the smallest area that is surrounded by public roadways on all sides.

FIGURE 4 MEASUREMENT AREA: FRONTING PARCELS ON EITHER SIDE OF THE ROADWAY



Measurement area = fronting parcels on either sides of the project roadway.

FIGURE 5 BUILDING PLACEMENT



FIGURE 6 FRONTING USES



FIGURE 7 LOCATION OF OFF-STREET PARKING



FIGURE 8 INTERSECTION DENSITY



$$\textit{Intersection Density} = \frac{\text{Number of Intersections}}{\text{Total Area* of Blocks Along Both Sides of the Project Roadway}}$$

** To calculate intersection density where the block structure is not complete, the block length will be assumed to extend 2,000 feet from the right of way line of the project roadway.*

Roadway centerline
Project roadway
One block on either side of project roadway
Intersection

FIGURE 9 BLOCK PERIMETER AND BLOCK LENGTH



Perimeter of Block A = A1 + A2 + A3+ A4

$$\textit{Average Perimeter of Blocks A to F} = \frac{\sum_{A}^{F} \text{Perimeter of Each Block}}{\text{Total Number of Blocks}}$$

$$\textit{Average Block Length along the Roadway} = \frac{\text{A3 + B3 + C3}}{\text{Total Number of Intersections Along the Roadway} - 1}$$

Roadway centerline
Project roadway
One block on either side of project roadway
Intersection

TABLE 3 SECONDARY MEASURES TO DEFINE CONTEXT CLASSIFICATION

Measure	Description	Methodology	Measurement Area	Data Source
Allowed Residential Density	Maximum allowed residential density by adopted zoning	Identify which zoning district the context classification segment is within, and record maximum allowed residential density for that particular zoning district by dwelling units per acre.	Parcels along either side of the roadway	Zoning code, land development regulations
Allowed Office/ Retail Density	Maximum allowed office or retail density in terms of Floor Area Ratio (FAR), or the ratio of the total building floor area to the size of the property on which it is built	Identify which zoning district the context classification segment is within, and record allowed commercial density for that particular zoning district. In some jurisdictions, allowed commercial density might be stated based on specific regulations limiting building height and minimum setbacks. Jurisdictions also regulate minimum parcel size and building area allowed in each zoning district. Maximum allowable FAR for an area can be calculated using site design and height standards (see Appendix C for more details).	Parcels along either side of the roadway	Zoning code, land development regulations
Population Density (existing)	Population per acre based on the census block group	Download census information at the block group level. Divide the population of the census block group by the area of the block group. This area should exclude large natural features and public parks. If the roadway segment is the boundary between two block groups, average the population density of the block groups on either side of the roadway. If the roadway runs through multiple block groups, calculate the population density by the weighted average of roadway within each block group.	Census block group(s) that encompasses the roadway	US Census Bureau decennial data. If the census data is more than 5 years old, the latest American Community Survey data can be used.
Population Density (future)	Projected population per acre based on the regional travel demand model traffic analysis zone (TAZ)	Divide the population of the TAZ by the area of the TAZ. If the roadway segment is the boundary between two TAZs, average the population density of the TAZs on either side of the roadway. If the roadway runs through multiple TAZs, calculate the population density by the weighted average of roadway within each TAZ. Use 20-year forecast number from the regional travel demand model. If a regional travel demand model is not available, use University of Florida Bureau of Economic Research (BEBR) population projections.	TAZ(s) that encompasses the roadway. If TAZ population density is not available, use smallest geographic area available from BEBR projections.	Regional travel demand model from MPO, BEBR
Employment Density (existing)	Total number of jobs per acre	Use GIS to map the number of jobs within the blocks adjacent to the roadway utilizing the U.S. Census Bureau's Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) website. Sum the number of jobs within the blocks along either side of the roadway, and divide by the area of the blocks. This area should exclude large natural features and public parks. Blocks can be imported as a shapefile or can be manually drawn on the census website.	One block area adjacent to either side of the roadway. If the block structure is not complete, the evaluation area should extend 500 feet from the property line along the roadway.	U.S. Census Bureau LEHD website
Employment Density (future)	Total number of jobs per acre	Divide the number of jobs of the TAZ by the area of the TAZ. If the roadway is the boundary between two TAZs, average the employment density of the TAZs on either side of the roadway. If the roadway runs through multiple TAZs, calculate the employment density by the weighted average of roadway within each TAZ. Use 20-year forecast number from the regional travel demand model. If a regional travel demand model is not available, use BEBR employment projections.	TAZ(s) that encompasses the roadway. If TAZ employment density is not available, use smallest geographic area available from BEBR projections.	Regional travel demand model from MPO, BEBR

Proposed New Roadways in Planning or ETDM Screening

During planning and ETDM screening for new roadway alignments, a broad understanding of the context classification will be used to inform the planning process. For example, area-wide studies such as the Future Corridors studies would use more general criteria to determine the context classification as compared to a corridor study on an existing roadway for the purposes of defining a concept to be advanced into PD&E or design.

For new roadways in planning and ETDM screening that include multiple alternative alignments, future land use conditions should be used to determine the context classification. The steps for determining the context classification for new roadways in planning or ETDM screening include:

1. Identify Major Changes in Context

Utilize the distinguishing characteristics to determine if multiple context classifications are necessary based on the Context Classification Matrix due to significant changes in the type or intensity of future land uses located along the roadway. The segment lengths should be based on the change in land use or other distinguishing features. Segment lengths can vary and may be as short as two blocks or, where there is no defined block structure, longer than a mile.

2. Evaluate the Future Land Use

Evaluate the land use along the roadway based on the future land use element of the adopted local comprehensive plan using the land use description provided in Table 1.

3. Evaluate the Secondary Measures

Table 3 describes the secondary measures, and the methodology and data sources associated with each measure. Future population and employment densities can be quantified based on the data in the regional travel demand model. If no regional model is available, utilize BEBR estimates for future population and employment projections. A context classification segment only needs to meet one of the two criteria, either population density or employment density, to be classified within a context classification.

For the C3C-Suburban Commercial and C3R-Suburban Residential Context Classifications, population and employment densities vary widely throughout the State. Use the allowed residential and office/retail densities, the distinguishing characteristics, and the future land use listed in the Context Classification Matrix to determine if a roadway is within the C3C-Suburban Commercial or CR3- Suburban Residential Context Classification.

Bridges and Tunnels

The context classification of a bridge or tunnel should be based on the higher context classification of the segments on either end of the bridge or tunnel.

Special Districts

Special Districts (SD) are areas that, due to their unique characteristics and function, do not adhere to standard measures identified in the Context Classification Matrix. Examples of SDs include military bases, university campuses, airports, seaports, rail yards, theme parks and tourist districts, sports complexes, hospitals, and freight distribution centers. Due to their size, function, or configuration, SDs will attract a unique mix of users and create unique travel patterns. Planning and engineering judgment must be used to understand users and travel patterns and to determine the appropriate design controls and criteria for streets serving an SD on a case-by-case basis. If an FDOT district believes that an area does not fit within a context classification and an SD designation is required, the district should coordinate that with the State Complete Streets Program Manager.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONTEXT CLASSIFICATIONS AND CNU/SMARTCODE™ TRANSECT SYSTEM

The SmartCode™ is a form-based land development code that incorporates Smart Growth and New Urbanist principles. It is a unified development ordinance, addressing development at all scales of design, from regional planning to building signage. It is based on rural-to-urban transects, rather than separated-use zoning.

FDOT's context classifications generally align with the SmartCode™, with some critical distinctions. The SmartCode™ was developed to describe and codify desired future visions of development form by local jurisdictions. The key implementation tool for form-based codes is a regulating plan that clearly identifies different transect zones that would guide how future land use development should occur. In contrast, FDOT's context classifications are descriptive, rather than visionary, and therefore include all land areas and types found within the State of Florida, with less local specificity.

The general relationship between the zones used by the transect system and FDOT's context classification is outlined in Table 4.

TABLE 4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FDOT CONTEXT CLASSIFICATIONS AND THE SMARTCODE™ TRANSECT SYSTEM

FDOT Context Classification	SmartCode™ Transect Zone	Description of SmartCode™ Transect Zone
C1 – Natural	T1 - Natural Zone	Lands approximating wilderness conditions
C2 – Rural	T2 - Rural Zone	Sparsely settled lands in open or cultivated states
C2T – Rural Town		No corresponding transect zone; may sometimes be coded as a small T5 or T4 hamlet or village
C3R – Suburban Residential	Coded as Conventional Suburban Development (CSD)	The SmartCode™ does not provide for this type of development pattern
C3C – Suburban Commercial		
FDOT Context Classification does not address this SmartCode™ Transect Zone	T3 - Sub-urban Zone	Lower density, primarily single-family residential with very limited non-residential uses, in a limited dispersion and directly within walking distance of a higher transect. Transect Zone T3 will be considered C4-Urban General
C4 – Urban General	T4 - General Urban Zone	Mixed use but primarily residential urban fabric in a variety of housing types and densities
C5 – Urban Center	T5 - Urban Center Zone	Higher density mixed use buildings that accommodate retail, offices, rowhouses, and apartments
C6 – Urban Core	T6 - Urban Core Zone	Highest density and height, with the greatest variety of uses, and civic buildings of regional importance; some T6 areas may belong to FDOT C5 because of FDOT population requirement
SD – Special District	Special Districts	Areas that, by their intrinsic size, function, or configuration, cannot conform to the requirements of any transect zone or combination of zones

TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS

The transportation characteristics define the role of a particular non-limited-access roadway in the transportation system, including the type of access the roadway provides, the types of trips served, and the users served. The transportation characteristics take into consideration regional travel patterns, freight movement, and SIS designation. Together with context classification, they can provide information about who the users are along the roadway, the regional and local travel demand of the roadway, and the challenges and opportunities of each roadway user.

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

Functional classification defines the role that a particular roadway plays in serving the flow of vehicular traffic through the network. Roadways are assigned to one of several possible functional classifications within a hierarchy, according to the character of travel service each roadway provides (see Table 5).[1]

The ***AASHTO A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 5th Edition (2011)*** presents a discussion of highway functional classifications. ***Florida Statutes, Title XXVI, Chapters 334, 335,*** and ***336,*** give similar definitions and establish classifications for roadway design in Florida.

Complete Streets continue to recognize functional classification but also consider the context classification of the street as part of the total picture. For example, the relationship between functional classification and access needs may be less consistent in more urban context classifications where roadways serve a wider variety of purposes beyond moving motor vehicle traffic. In evolving suburban areas, retail and commercial business tend to locate along arterial roadways, requiring access and creating demands for short-distance and local trips that include vehicular trips as well as walking and bicycling trips. Transit service is also often located along arterial roadways, due to retail and commercial uses generating high demands for transit trips and the efficiency of providing higher levels of transit service along these roadways. At the same time, many state roadways travel through large and small (often historic) town centers that require multimodal mobility and access in order to thrive. Therefore, the context classification provides an important layer of information that complements functional classification in determining the transportation demand characteristics along a roadway, including typical users, trip length, and vehicular travel speeds.

TABLE 5 ROADWAY FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION AND ROLE IN THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Roadway Classification	Role in the Transportation System
Principal Arterial	Serves a large percentage of travel between cities and other activity centers, especially when minimizing travel time and distance is important.
Minor Arterial	Provides service for trips of moderate length, serves geographic areas that are smaller than their higher arterial counterparts, and offers connectivity to the higher arterial system.
Collector	Collects traffic from local streets and connects them with arterials; more access to adjacent properties compared to arterials.
Local	Any road not defined as an arterial or a collector; primarily provides access to land with little or no through movement.

* *Context Classification is not applied to limited-access facilities.*

For non-limited-access roadways, the ***FDM*** provides design criteria and standards based on both context classification and functional classification.

1 Federal Highway Administration, "Highway Functional Classification Concepts, Criteria and Procedures."

CONTEXT CLASSIFICATION AND STREET USERS

The context classification informs planners and engineers of the types of users and the intensity of use expected along the roadway. For example, in the C6-Urban Core Context Classification, there will be a higher number of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users than in a C2-Rural Context Classification. Therefore, reduced speeds, signal spacing, crossing distances, lane widths, and other design elements such as bicycle facilities, on-street parking, and wide sidewalks should be provided to increase the safety and comfort of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users. For the C2-Rural Context Classification, vehicles and freight are primary users; however, bicyclists and pedestrians are accommodated with bike lanes, paved shoulders, or sidepaths. A state roadway in C2-Rural Context Classification is expected to have higher speeds, wider lanes, and lower levels of traffic delay.

When determining the roadway typical section to be used, give appropriate consideration for all users of the roadway. Include required elements associated with the context classification of the roadway. The ***FDM*** contains criteria to be used for each context classification.

HOW TO IDENTIFY ROADWAY-SPECIFIC TRANSPORTATION TRAVEL DEMANDS

While context classification and functional classification can provide general guidelines for the type and activity level of different users, additional information can assist in obtaining a more thorough understanding of the needs of all the intended users. The anticipated users of a roadway and the travel patterns of those users should be determined well before the design phase of a project, and are best explored during the planning and design scoping phase.

The ***Traffic Forecasting Handbook*** documents data collection efforts to understand vehicular travel patterns. Table 6 provides a menu of data sources that could be useful in identifying different needs for different users. Not all of the data presented in Table 6 will be required for all projects. The data collected for a project should be tailored to the scale, purpose, and needs of a project.

Depending on the scale, purpose, and needs of the project, the following are some examples of questions that could augment the analysis to better understand transportation travel demand and needs for all users:

- **Land uses:** What pedestrian, bicycle, or transit generators are located along the roadway? Are there large shopping destinations? Large employers? Public facilities? Are there visitor destinations? How might existing land use patterns change based on approved or planned development? Is there a redevelopment plan for the area? What land use changes are planned or anticipated to occur?
- **Vehicular trip types:** What percentage of the vehicular trips are local? What is the average trip length? Is the roadway part of the SIS?
- **Travel patterns:** Are there unique travel patterns or modes served by the corridor? Will new or emerging transportation services or technologies influence trip-making characteristics (e.g., rideshares, scooters, interregional bus service, bikeshare)?
- **Safety data:** How many and what types of crashes are occurring along the roadway?
- **Types of pedestrians:** Are there generators or attractors that would suggest that younger or older pedestrians, or other special user groups, will be using the roadway (e.g., schools, parks, elderly care facilities, assisted living centers)?
- **Types of bicyclists:** Is the roadway a critical link for the local or regional bicycle network? Does the roadway connect to or cross trails or bicycle facilities? Are bicyclists using the roadway to access shopping, employment, or recreational destinations?
- **Transit:** What type of transit service exists or is planned for the area? Where are transit stops located? Can pedestrians reach these stops from either side of the street without significant diversion of their trip? Are transit stops accessible using the network of existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
- **Freight:** What is the percentage and volume of heavy trucks using the roadway? Are there destinations that require regular access by heavy trucks or other large vehicles? Is the roadway part of a designated freight corridor? Where does loading and unloading occur along the roadway?

- **Demographics:** Based on census data, are there areas of high transit, pedestrian, or bicyclist demand? These include areas overrepresented, when compared to the general population, by elderly or low-income residents, or households without access to automobiles.

The anticipated users of a roadway and the travel patterns of those users should inform the purpose and needs of a project.
Location: Fletcher Avenue, Tampa, FL
Source: FDOT

TABLE 6 EXAMPLES OF POTENTIAL DATA TO DETERMINE USER NEEDS BY MODE

Mode	Data	
Pedestrian	• Location of signalized pedestrian crossings • Location of marked or signed pedestrian crossings • Posted and operating speeds • Vehicular traffic volumes • Existing sidewalk characteristics (location, width, pavement condition, obstacles or pinch points) • Intersection ramps and alignment/Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance • Utilities location	• Existing landscape buffer and shade trees • Pedestrian counts • Crash data • Lighting levels • Existing and future land use, building form and site layout, development scale and pattern • Existing and future pedestrian generators (e.g. schools, parks)
Bicyclist	• Local and regional bicycle network • Posted and operating speeds • Vehicular traffic volumes • Number of vehicular travel lanes • Location of bicycle parking • Bicycle user type • Bicyclist counts	• Crash data • Location of destinations • Lighting levels • Pavement condition • Existing and future land use, building form and site layout, development scale and pattern
Automobile	• Design Traffic [existing and projected Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT), K-factor (K), directional distribution (D), and traffic growth projections] • Trip lengths; origin/destination patterns • Turning movement counts • Posted and operating speeds • Signal timing	• Location of parking • Crash data • Lighting levels • Pavement condition • Existing and future land use, building form and site layout, development scale and pattern
Transit	• Existing and future transit routes and stops • Transit service headways • Location and infrastructure at transit stops • Sidewalk connection to transit stops • ADA compliant transit stops • Existing and projected ridership (route or stop level)	• Existing and future transit generators and attractors • Type of transit technology • Trip lengths, origin/destination patterns
Freight	• Designated truck routes • Truck volumes • Vehicle classification counts	• Existing and future location of industrial land uses or other generators of freight trips • Freight loading areas/truck parking

STRATEGIC INTERMODAL SYSTEM AND CONTEXT CLASSIFICATION

The SIS was established in 2003 to enhance Florida's economic competitiveness by focusing state resources on the transportation facilities most critical for statewide and interregional travel. The three SIS objectives identified in the ***SIS Policy Plan*** are:

- **Interregional connectivity:** Ensure the efficiency and reliability of multimodal transportation connectivity between Florida's economic regions and between Florida and other states and nations.
- **Intermodal connectivity:** Expand transportation choices and integrate modes for interregional trips.
- **Economic development:** Provide transportation systems to support Florida as a global hub for trade, tourism, talent, innovation, business, and investment.

The SIS includes the State's largest and most significant commercial service and general aviation airports, spaceports, public seaports, intermodal freight terminals including intermodal logistics centers, interregional passenger terminals, urban fixed guideway transit corridors, rail corridors, waterways, military access facilities, and highways. The SIS includes three types of facilities: hubs, corridors, and connectors.

SIS Highway corridors and connectors traverse varying context classifications. Given the purpose and intent of the SIS, the requirements of a particular context classification may not always align with the function of the SIS highway. In the case of interstates and limited-access facilities, the function of the roadway is considered complete. For all others, there is a need to balance the safety and comfort of users who live and work along the SIS facility with interregional and interstate freight and people trips through the area. This is consistent with the intent of the ***SIS Policy Plan***, which specifically calls for the need to improve coordination with regional and local transportation and land use decisions by:

- Better reflecting the context of the human and natural environment;
- Balancing the need for efficient and reliable interregional travel with support for regional and community visions;
- Developing multimodal corridor plans that coordinate SIS investments with regional and local investments; and
- Leveraging and strengthening funding programs for regional and local mobility needs such as the Transportation Regional Incentive Program, Small County Outreach Program, and Small County Road Assistance Program.

This balance could mean that other throughput options to the SIS facility (e.g., a bypass or express lanes) are studied and considered if redesigning the currently designated roadway is needed to conform to the context classification. The ***SIS Policy Plan*** outlines that SIS improvements should consider the context, needs, and values of the communities serviced by the SIS, which may include flexibility in design and operational standards. Most importantly, communication with all parties involved is key to determining the best solution to realize the intent of both the SIS and a Complete Streets approach within a community.

The ***FDM*** provides design standards for facilities on the SIS. Roadways located on the SIS require coordination with the District SIS Coordinator during the determination, update, or confirmation of the facility's context classification.

Accommodation of freight vehicles is an important part of Complete Streets.
Location: Estero Boulevard, Fort Myers Beach, FL
Source: Rick Hall

ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS

Environmental characteristics, including the social, cultural, natural, and physical aspects of an area, play a role in the planning, design, and maintenance of transportation projects. FDOT is focused on responsible stewardship of Florida's environmental resources. The FDOT Mission states that FDOT will provide a safe transportation system that "enhances economic prosperity and preserves the quality of our environment and communities." Aligning with this mission, FDOT considers the social, cultural, natural, and physical impacts of its investments throughout the planning and design process.

Transportation projects that utilize federal transportation dollars (or that require a federal environmental permit such as wetlands or water quality) are subject to review under the ***National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)***. FDOT developed the PD&E process to address how NEPA is evaluated for federally funded transportation projects in Florida, including the identification and assessment of environmental characteristics for all projects. Public involvement and agency coordination is part of the PD&E process. Detailed information on FDOT procedures for environmental review can be found in the following documents:

- PD&E Manual
- ETDM Manual
- Public Involvement Handbook
- Sociocultural Effects Evaluation Process
- Cultural Resource Management Handbook

CONTEXT CLASSIFICATION RELATIONSHIP WITH EXISTING HANDBOOKS AND PROCESSES

The FDOT Complete Streets context-based design approach is compatible with and supported by national guidance documents. The following section describes the relationship between FDOT context classification and contexts defined in existing FDOT and national manuals and handbooks.

AASHTO A POLICY ON GEOMETRIC DESIGN OF HIGHWAYS AND STREETS

AASHTO recognizes that different places have different characteristics with regard to density and type of land use, density of street and highway networks, nature of travel patterns, and the ways in which these elements are related. ***AASHTO A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*** provides design standards based on urban and rural areas, as defined by the FHWA. FHWA identifies urban areas as those places, within boundaries set by the responsible state and local officials, having a population of 5,000 or more. Urban areas are comprised of:

- **Urbanized Areas** — designated as population of 50,000 or more by the U.S. Census Bureau.
- **Small Urban Areas** — designated as population between 5,000 and 49,999, and not within any urbanized area.

Rural encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within an urban area.

For the purpose of funding considerations and other processes and procedures, FDOT will continue to define urban and rural areas following the FHWA criteria. For design criteria and standards for non-limited-access roadways, FDOT utilizes context classification in the ***FDM***. There is no direct relationship between context classification and FHWA's definition of urban and rural. In general, C4-Urban General, C5-Urban Center, and C6-Urban Core will be located in the FHWA urban areas. C1-Natural and C2-Rural will be primarily located in the FHWA rural areas. C2T-Rural Town, C3C-Suburban Commercial, and C3R-Suburban Residential may be found in FHWA-urban or rural areas.

QUALITY/LEVEL OF SERVICE HANDBOOK

The ***FDOT Quality/Level of Service Handbook (Q/LOS)*** and its accompanying software are intended to be used by engineers, planners, and decision makers in the development and review of street users' quality/level of service and capacity at generalized and conceptual planning levels. The ***Q/LOS Handbook*** recognizes that motorists have different thresholds for acceptable delay in rural versus urban areas. Four broad area-type groupings are used in ***Q/LOS Handbook*** and accompanying software:

- **Urbanized Areas** — Areas that meet FHWA's definition of Urbanized Areas. These consist of a densely settled core of census tracts and census blocks that meet minimum population density requirements, along with adjacent densely settled surrounding census blocks that together encompass a population of at least 50,000 people. The ***Q/LOS Handbook*** further identifies areas with population over 1,000,000 as **Large Urbanized Areas**.
- **Urban Areas** — Areas with a population between 5,000 and 49,999 (mostly used to distinguish developed areas that are not urbanized).
- **Transitioning Areas** — Areas generally considered as transitioning into urbanized/urban areas or areas over 5,000 population and not currently in urbanized areas. These areas can also at times be determined as areas within a Metropolitan Planning Area, but not within an urbanized area. These areas are anticipated to reach urban densities in a 20-year horizon.
- **Rural Areas** — Areas that are not urbanized, urban, or transitioning. Rural areas are further classified as rural developed areas and cities or developed areas with less than 5,000 population; and rural undeveloped areas in which there is no or minimal population or development.

A direct, one-to-one relationship does not exist between the classification system used in the ***Q/LOS Handbook*** and the context classifications, but generally C1-Natural, C2-Rural, and C2T-Rural Town areas will be identified as rural areas or transitioning areas, while C4-Urban General, C5-Urban Center, and C6-Urban Core will be identified as urban. C3C-Suburban Commercial and C3R-Suburban Residential can fall into any of the Q/LOS categories.

Future editions of the ***Q/LOS Handbook*** will be revised to be consistent with the FDOT context classification.

ROADWAY CHARACTERISTICS INVENTORY

The RCI is a database of information related to the roadway environment maintained by FDOT. The database includes information on a roadway's features and characteristics. Feature 124-Urban Classification, Feature 125-Adjacent Land Classification, Feature 145-LOS Input Data, and Feature 481-Highway Maintenance Classification describe land use contexts in different ways.

These categories are not related to the context classification system detailed in this document. FDOT is considering recording context classification information in RCI at the time when state roadways are evaluated through FDOT projects. If this occurs, RCI information may be a starting point for future projects in evaluating a roadway's context classification.

For more information on the RCI, refer to the ***RCI Features and Characteristics Handbook***.

ACCESS MANAGEMENT CLASSIFICATION

Access management classification reflects the desired access management standards to be followed for each state roadway. These are standards for restrictive medians, median opening separation, and driveway separation. The ranges are from 00-07 and 99. Class 01 reflects the highest amount of access management control (freeways), and Class 07 the lowest. Class 07 is usually found on suburban built-out roadways. Class 99 refers to a special corridor access management plan. Refer to ***Florida Administrative Code (FAC), Rule Chapter 14-97.003, Access Management Classification System and Standards*** for more information on access management classification.

No direct correlation can be made between access management classification and context classification. It can be generally stated that higher intensities of use, including C2T-Rural Town, C4-Urban General, C5-Urban Center, and C6-Urban Core, as well as roadways with established land use patterns, may require less restrictive access management. In these context classifications, frequent intersections, smaller blocks, and a higher degree of connectivity and access support the multimodal needs of the area. Beyond the context classification, the role of the roadway in the transportation system and safety considerations must also be taken into account to determine access management needs.

The Systems Planning Office is currently studying the relationship between existing access management practices and the implementation of Complete Streets. The Systems Planning Office is reviewing general recommendations to bring the access management classifications documented in ***Administrative Rule 14-97*** into a closer relationship with the FDOT context classifications. This process will take some time, as it will require an administrative rule change and review of multiple sections by FDOT, the public, and other stakeholders (such as the roadside development industry) before it can be finalized.

Appendix A

CONTEXT CLASSIFICATIONS CASE STUDIES

Context Classification System: Comprised of eight context classifications, it broadly identifies the various built environments in Florida, based on existing or future land use characteristics, development patterns, and roadway connectivity of an area. In FDOT projects, the roadway will be assigned a context classification(s). The context classification system is used to determine criteria in the ***FDM***.

The eight context classifications and their general descriptions are:

C1-Natural	Lands preserved in a natural or wilderness condition, including lands unsuitable for settlement due to natural conditions.
C2-Rural	Sparsely settled lands; may include agricultural land, grassland, woodland, and wetlands.
C2T-Rural Town	Small concentrations of developed areas immediately surrounded by rural and natural areas; includes many historic towns.
C3R-Suburban Residential	Mostly residential uses within large blocks and a disconnected/ sparse roadway network.
C3C-Suburban Commercial	Mostly non-residential uses with large building footprints and large parking lots. Buildings are within large blocks and a disconnected/ sparse roadway network.
C4-Urban General	Mix of uses set within small blocks with a well-connected roadway network. May extend long distances. The roadway network usually connects to residential neighborhoods immediately along the corridor and/or behind the uses fronting the roadway.
C5-Urban Center	Mix of uses set within small blocks with a well-connected roadway network. Typically concentrated around a few blocks and identified as part of the civic or economic center of a community, town, or city.
C6-Urban Core	Areas with the highest densities and building heights and within FDOT classified Large Urbanized Areas (population> 1,000,000). Many are regional centers and destinations. Buildings have mixed uses, are built up to the roadways, and are within a well-connected roadway network.

C1-Natural **C2-Rural** **C2T-Rural Town** **C3R-Suburban Residential** **C3C-Suburban Commercial** **C4-Urban General** **C5-Urban Center** **C6-Urban Core**

C1-NATURAL: FL 24, CEDAR KEY SCRUB STATE RESERVE, LEVY COUNTY

Primary Measures

Land Use	Building Height	Building Placement	Fronting Uses	Location of Off-street Parking	Roadway Connectivity		
					Intersection Density	Block Perimeter	Block Length
Description	Floor Levels	Description	Yes / No	Description	Intersections/ Sq Mile	Feet	Feet
Open space			Not developed				

Secondary Measures

Allowed Residential Density	Allowed Office/Retail Density	Population Density	Employment Density
DU/Acre	Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)	Persons/Acre	Jobs/Acre
Development not allowed	Development not allowed	0	0

Street View

Bird's Eye View

Open Space

Miles

0 0.5 1

N

Aerial Satellite Image



Streets and Blocks Network



Existing Land Use

C2-RURAL: SR 52, WEST OF DADE CITY, PASCO COUNTY

Primary Measures

Land Use	Building Height	Building Placement	Fronting Uses	Location of Off-street Parking	Roadway Connectivity		
					Intersection Density	Block Perimeter	Block Length
Description	Floor Levels	Description	Yes / No	Description	Intersections/ Sq Mile	Feet	Feet
Agricultural	1	Detached buildings with no consistent pattern of setbacks	No	No consistent pattern	<1	No defined block pattern	

Secondary Measures

Allowed Residential Density	Allowed Office/Retail Density	Population Density	Employment Density
DU/Acre	Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)	Persons/Acre	Jobs/Acre
0.1 (1 per 10 Acres)	Office and retail uses are not allowed	0.08	0

Street View

Bird's Eye View



Aerial Satellite Image

Streets and Blocks Network



Existing Land Use

C2T-RURAL TOWN: MAIN ST, HAVANA, GADSDEN COUNTY

Primary Measures

Land Use	Building Height	Building Placement	Fronting Uses	Location of Off-street Parking	Roadway Connectivity		
					Intersection Density	Block Perimeter	Block Length
Description	Floor Levels	Description	Yes / No	Description	Intersections/ Sq Mile	Feet	Feet
Retail and commercial	1 - 2	Mostly attached buildings with no setbacks	Yes	Mostly in rear, occasionally on side	325	1,520	330

Secondary Measures

Allowed Residential Density	Allowed Office/Retail Density	Population Density	Employment Density
DU/Acre	Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)	Persons/Acre	Jobs/Acre
27	1.2	0.3	4

Street View

Bird's Eye View

Aerial Satellite Image

Streets and Blocks Network



Future Land Use



C3R-SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL: SR 70, LAKEWOOD RANCH, MANATEE COUNTY

Primary Measures

Land Use	Building Height	Building Placement	Fronting Uses	Location of Off-street Parking	Roadway Connectivity		
					Intersection Density	Block Perimeter	Block Length
Description	Floor Levels	Description	Yes / No	Description	Intersections/ Sq Mile	Feet	Feet
Single-family residential and institutional	1 - 2	Detached buildings with medium (20' to 75') setbacks on all sides	No	Front	40	6,040	1,140

Secondary Measures

Allowed Residential Density	Allowed Office/Retail Density	Population Density	Employment Density
DU/Acre	Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)	Persons/Acre	Jobs/Acre
1	0.23	0.4	0

Street View



Bird's Eye View



Aerial Satellite Image

Streets and Blocks Network

Existing Land Use

C3C-SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL: US 441, BROWARD COUNTY

Primary Measures

Land Use	Building Height	Building Placement	Fronting Uses	Location of Off-street Parking	Roadway Connectivity		
					Intersection Density	Block Perimeter	Block Length
Description	Floor Levels	Description	Yes / No	Description	Intersections/ Sq Mile	Feet	Feet
Retail, commercial, and light industrial	1 - 2	Detached buildings with large (> 75') setbacks on all sides	No	Surrounded by parking on all sides	94	3,320	680

Secondary Measures

Allowed Residential Density	Allowed Office/Retail Density	Population Density	Employment Density
DU/Acre	Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)	Persons/Acre	Jobs/Acre
Not Applicable	0.7	8.5	7

Street View

Bird's Eye View

Aerial Satellite Image

Streets and Blocks Network



Existing Land Use



C4-GENERAL URBAN: DR. MLK JR. BLVD, EAST TAMPA, TAMPA, HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

Primary Measures

Land Use	Building Height	Building Placement	Fronting Uses	Location of Off-street Parking	Roadway Connectivity		
					Intersection Density	Block Perimeter	Block Length
Description	Floor Levels	Description	Yes / No	Description	Intersections/ Sq Mile	Feet	Feet
Single-family and multi-family residential, neighborhood-scale retail, and office	1 - 2	Detached buildings with minimal to shallow (10' to 20') front and side setbacks	Yes	Mostly in side, occasionally in rear or front	230	1,760	490

Secondary Measures

Allowed Residential Density	Allowed Office/Retail Density	Population Density	Employment Density
DU/Acre	Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)	Persons/Acre	Jobs/Acre
12	1.5	8.5	3

Street View

Bird's Eye View

Aerial Satellite Image



Streets and Blocks Network



Existing Land Use

C5-URBAN CENTER: MONROE ST, DOWNTOWN TALLAHASSEE, LEON COUNTY

Primary Measures

Land Use	Building Height	Building Placement	Fronting Uses	Location of Off-street Parking	Roadway Connectivity		
					Intersection Density	Block Perimeter	Block Length
Description	Floor Levels	Description	Yes / No	Description	Intersections/ Sq Mile	Feet	Feet
Retail, office, institutional, commercial	1 - 5 with some taller buildings	Mostly attached buildings with no setbacks and a few buildings with minimal (<10') setbacks	Yes	Rear and garage	180	1,770	380

Secondary Measures

Allowed Residential Density	Allowed Office/Retail Density	Population Density	Employment Density
DU/Acre	Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)	Persons/Acre	Jobs/Acre
150	8	2.4	90

Street View

Bird's Eye View

Aerial Satellite Image

Streets and Blocks Network

Existing Land Use





C6-URBAN CORE: ORANGE AVE, DOWNTOWN ORLANDO, ORANGE COUNTY

Primary Measures

Land Use	Building Height	Building Placement	Fronting Uses	Location of Off-street Parking	Roadway Connectivity		
					Intersection Density	Block Perimeter	Block Length
Description	Floor Levels	Description	Yes / No	Description	Intersections/ Sq Mile	Feet	Feet
Retail, office, institutional, and multi-family residential	> 4 with some shorter buildings	Mostly attached buildings with no setbacks	Yes	Rear and garage	220	1,910	450

Secondary Measures

Allowed Residential Density	Allowed Office/Retail Density	Population Density	Employment Density
DU/Acre	Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)	Persons/Acre	Jobs/Acre
200	3	8.5	170

Street View

Bird's Eye View



Aerial Satellite Image



Streets and Blocks Network



Existing Land Use

Appendix B

UNDEFINED THRESHOLDS IN CONTEXT CLASSIFICATION MATRIX

Context Classification	Building Height, Building Placement, Fronting Uses	Location of Off-street Parking	Roadway Connectivity			Allowed Residential Density	Allowed Office/ Retail Density	Population Density	Employment Density
			Intersection Density	Block Perimeters	Block Length				
C1-Natural	No development along roadway		Sparse roadway network			No development along roadway			
C2-Rural		No consistent pattern of parking		Sparse roadway network			No consistent pattern of allowed office/ retail density		Some office/ retail may be present along the roadway
C2T-Rural Town								Population will vary based on mix of single- and multi-family residential	
C3R-Suburban Residential				No consistent block pattern			No consistent pattern of allowed office/ retail density	Population will vary based on mix of single- and multi-family residential	Some office/ retail may be present along the roadway
C3C-Suburban Commercial						No consistent pattern of allowed residential density		Population will vary based on presence of multi-family residential	Varies based on intensity of commercial development along the roadway
C4-Urban General							No consistent pattern of allowed office/ retail density		

Appendix C

HOW TO CALCULATE FLOOR AREA RATIO IF NOT DEFINED IN ZONING CODE

FAR can be calculated using these various site design and height standards. For example, assuming floor height of 10 feet, total number of floors can be calculated based on maximum building height measure. Based on minimum parcel size, and minimum setbacks, maximum floor plate area can be calculated. Multiplying maximum floor plate area by total number of floors will give total building floor area. Finally, dividing total building floor area by minimum parcel size will provide FAR.



Notes and Calculations

1. Approximate a square lot for calculations
   Z = area of the square lot
2. Calculate allowed maximum buildable area (Y) based on zoning required minimum setbacks and maximum lot coverage
   $Y = (\sqrt{Z} - A' - B') \times (\sqrt{Z} - C' - C')$
   or
   Y = (Maximum lot coverage area in (%) allowed by zoning code) $\times$ (Z)
   Use the smaller of the two values as Y
3. Calculate total floor levels based on zoning allowed maximum height (J)
   $\frac{H}{\text{Height of a floor level*}}$
   * Assume 12' for commercial land use or 10' for residential land use
4. Calculate Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) = $\frac{Y \times J}{Z}$

Property Lot Line

Project Roadway

Y = Maximum allowed buildable area in square feet

A = Minimum allowed front setback in feet based on zoning code

B = Minimum allowed rear setback in feet based on zoning code

C = Minimum allowed side setback in feet based on zoning code

H = Maximum allowed height allowed by zoning code in feet


FDOT
Completing
FLORIDA'S
STREETS

EXHIBIT 7

U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) Design Workshop
Suggestions and Recommendations

A Technical Advisory Committee Working Group met on July 22, 2019 to discuss a suggestion from a member of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization to develop design recommendations for U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) from State Road 331 (Williston Road) to State Road 24 (Archer Road). During its discussion, the Working Group noted that:

- The only project in the Year 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan Cost Feasible Plan is to conduct a Multimodal Emphasis Corridor Study from State Road 24 (Archer Road) to NW 23rd Avenue (not funded) and implementation of the study recommendations; and

- The recently approved list of Priority Projects recommends a Multimodal Emphasis Corridor Study from State Road 331 (Williston Road) to NW 23rd Avenue.

At the conclusion of discussion, the Working Group approved a motion to recommend that the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization ask the Florida Department of Transportation to:

- *Revisit the context classification for U.S. Highway 441 (SW 13th Street) from south of State Road 331 (Williston road) to State Road 24 (Archer Road) to change from the classification from C3C Suburban Commercial to C4 Urban General; and*

- *Consider funding the State Road 26 (University Avenue) Multimodal Emphasis Corridor projects in the Year 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan Cost Feasible Plan.*

SCHEDULED 2019 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 6	February 7	February 25 at 3:00 p.m.
APRIL	April 3 ***TAC @ NCFRPC***	April 4	April 22 at 3:00 p.m.
JUNE	June 5 ***CAC @ TMC***	June 6	June 24 at 5:00 p.m.
AUGUST	August 7 ***CAC @ NCFRPC***	August 8	August 26 at 3:00 p.m.
OCTOBER	October 2	October 3	October 28 at 3:00 p.m.
DECEMBER	November 20	November 21	December 16 at 5:00 p.m.

Note, unless otherwise scheduled:

1. Technical Advisory Committee meetings are conducted in the General Purpose Meeting Room of the Gainesville Regional Utilities Administration Building;
2. 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
TMC means City of Gainesville Traffic Management Center

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ATTENDANCE RECORD

TAC MEMBER AND ALTERNATE	ORGANIZATION	MEETING DATE 4/3/2019	MEETING DATE 6/5/2019	IN VIOLATION IF ABSENT AT NEXT MEETING?
MARIE DANIELS Alt - Jeff Hays Alt - Chris Dawson Alt - Kathleen Pagan	Alachua County Department of Growth Management Office of Planning and Development	P	P	NO
BRIAN SINGLETON Alt - Thomas Strom Alt - Ramon Gavarrete	Alachua County Public Works Department	P	P	NO
Dekova Batey Alt - Scott Wright	Alachua County/City of Gainesville/MTPO Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board	P	P	NO
JASON SIMMONS Alt - Andrew Persons	City of Gainesville Department of Doing	P	P	NO
DEBORAH LEISTNER (Chair) Alt - Jesus Gomez	City of Gainesville Department of Mobility [Operations, Planning and Transit] Department of Public Works [Engineering, Maintenance, Pavement Management]	A	P	NO
AARON CARVER Alt - Suzanne Schiemann Alt - Allan Penksa	Gainesville/Alachua County Regional Airport Authority	A	A	YES
MARI SCHWABACHER Alt - Karen Taulbee	Florida Department of Transportation	P	E	NO
YAIMA DROESE Alt - Reginald Thomas	School Board of Alachua County	A	A	YES
LINDA DIXON Alt - Erik Lewis	University of Florida Planning, Design & Construction Division	A	P	NO
RON FULLER (Vice-Chair) Alt - Scott Fox	University of Florida Transportation & Parking Services	P	P	NO

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

me\p\em19\tac\attendanceTAC_080719.xls

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 address consistent absences and is empowered to recommend corrective action for MetropolitanTransportation Planning Organization consideration.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ATTENDANCE RECORD

NAME	TERM EXPIRES	2/6/2019	4/3/2019	6/5/2019	Violation If Absent At Next Meeting 8/7/2019
Thomas Bolduc	19-Dec	A	A	P	-
Craig Brashier	20-Dec	P	P	E	-
Alyssa Brown	20-Dec	-	P	P	-
Nelle Bullock	19-Dec	P	P	A	-
Mary Ann DeMatas	18-Dec	P	P	P	-
Jan Frentzen	21-Dec	A	A	P	-
Gilbert Levy	20-Dec	E	P	P	-
Chandler Otis	21-Dec	P	P	P	-
John Pickett	19-Dec	P	P	P	-
James Samec	20-Dec	P	P	A	-
Ruth Steiner	21-Dec	P	P	P	-
Paul Thur de Koos	19-Dec	P	E	E	YES
Luke Tia	19-Dec	-	P	A	-
Chris Towne	20-Dec	P	P	P	-
Joshua Williams	21-Dec	-	A	P	-

LEGEND KEY - P-Present; E-Excused Absence; A-Unexcused Absence

t\mike\em19\cac\attd_cac0605.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.

Please note that attendance is recorded for all scheduled Citizens Advisory Committee meetings whether or not a quorum is met.

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

North Central Florida Regional Planning Council

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

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

July 29, 2019

TO: Technical Advisory Committee
Citizens Advisory Committee
Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board

FROM: Scott R. Koons, AICP, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Regional Transit System Transit Development Plan - Status Report

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

No Action Required.

BACKGROUND

The City of Gainesville Department of Mobility Regional Transit System is currently updating its transit development plan. On August 25, 2019, the Regional Transit System conducted a public workshop to enable the public to review and comment on the plan update. Exhibit 1 is a copy of the materials presented at the public workshop.

Attachment

t:\scott\sk20\mtpo\memo\rts_tdp_update_comms_aug7.docx

EXHIBIT 1


Transit Development Plan
Public Workshop
July 25, 2019 from 4:00PM to 7:00PM
Gainesville Technology Entrepreneurship Center (GTEC)
2153 SE Hawthorne Road, Gainesville FL
Conference Room GT-107
Gainesville.
MOBILITY
Tindale Oliver

What's a TDP?

- It's a Transit Development Plan!
  - It sets a strategic vision for mobility
  - Produces a 5-year and 10-year service and capital plan
  - Is required by FDOT to get state and federal funding
  - Assesses mobility needs, services, and service gaps, and
  - Is used to get community input on mobility decisions

Gainesville. MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

TDP Overview

- What is the focus of this TDP?
  - mobility demand
  - transit performance metrics
  - service gaps
  - strategies for improved transit network - high demand corridors
  - strategies for services to facilitate localized travel and connectivity
  - strategies for walk, bike, scooter, transportation network companies
  - consider policies, design standards, partnerships, funding
- Opportunity to shape mobility vision and priorities

Socioeconomic Trends



- UF Student Population
- Low Income Population
- Growing number of Seniors
- Creates High Transit Demand

- Need to improve mobility for work, school, healthcare, shopping, especially in East Gainesville and along key corridors like Archer Road and Newberry Road/University

Gainesville.
MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

Land Use

- Growth in mixed-use and higher density developments
- Creates walkable, bikeable, transit mobility options
- Low density suburban development poses obstacles for transit and walkability
- Mixed-use development is happening within the City and parts of Alachua County
- New developments and infill development should support walkable communities



Gainesville.
MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

Travel Behavior and Trends

- Most travel is within the City and County
- Travel to/from places outside the City and County is not significant
- Congestion on major roadway corridors will persist



Gainesville.
MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

Transit Ridership Trends

Figure 1-2: RTS Peer and Trend Comparison for Passenger Trips



Figure 1-6: RTS Peer and Trend Comparison for Vehicle Hours



- Transit ridership has declined nationally since 2012 due to growing economy, cheap gas, artificially low-priced TNCs
- Need to improve travel time with premium transit and more customer focused services to be competitive

Gainesville. MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

Demand Response Ridership Trends

Figure 1-27: RTS Peer and Trend Demand Response Comparison for Passenger Trips



Figure 1-29: RTS Peer and Trend Demand Response Comparison for Total Operating Expense

Figure 1-34: RTS Peer and Trend Demand Response Comparison for Operating Expense Per Passenger Trip



- Need for ADA on-demand service is growing!
- Consistent with national trend – aging boomers
- Cost of service increasing
- Need long-term solution to better serve demand

Gainesville. MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

Technology Trends

- Mobile / Electronic Pay
- Real-Time Information
- Transit Signal Priority
- Automated, CV, and Shared Vehicles
- Mobility on Demand
- Transportation Network Companies
- Shared bikes / scooters

Gainesville.
MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

Transit Demand

- Baseline Ridership Estimates – assumes same service

Service Period	2019 Baseline	2029 Estimate	Change
Weekday	12.67 million	15.95 million	25.9%
Saturday	347,830	521,666	50.0%
Sunday	135,245	180,541	33.5%

Gainesville.
MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

Survey Findings

On-board rider survey

- Most riders travel between home, work, school
- Most riders walk to/from bus stop (90%)
- Most riders ride 5 or more days a week (74%)
- Most riders would walk or catch a ride if not for bus (67%)
- Most riders are long time users, 2 plus years (51%)
- Most riders want more frequent service (32%), weekend service (22%), benches and shelters (17%)
- Most riders want a premium BRT service (60%)
- Most riders have 1 vehicle available (42%), have 2 plus (24%)

Survey Findings

Online general public survey

- Lack of transportation has negative impacts on income (94%) and access to opportunities (87%) for the person
- Lack of transportation hurts the community (89%) and economy (93%)
- We need better mobility services (85%)
- We to be better in letting folks know about services (85%)
- Need to increase service frequency (75%)
- Improve facilities for riders, bicyclist, pedestrians (54-63%)
- Invest more on transit and mobility (94%)
- Improvements in mobility should benefit all (70%)

Existing Service and Service Gaps



Gainesville.
MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

Service Alternatives – Span & Frequency



Gainesville.
MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

Service Alternatives – Realignments



Gainesville.
MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

Service Alternatives – New Services



Gainesville. MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

East Gainesville – Service Gaps



Gainesville.
MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

East Gainesville – Span & Frequency



Gainesville.
MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

East Gainesville – Realignments



Gainesville. MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

East Gainesville – New Services



Gainesville.
MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

Transit Demand - Alternatives

- Weekday Ridership Estimates – based on improvement type

Service Period	2019	2029 Estimate	Change
Weekday – No service changes	12.67 million	15.95 million	25.9%
Impacts of service improvements…			
Weekday – Span and Frequency	15,951,919	16,765,947	814,028
Weekday – Alignment Changes	15,951,919	16,557,069	605,150
Weekday – New Services	15,951,919	16,284,457	332,538

- Combined impacts will not be additive

Gainesville. MOBILITY

Tindale Oliver

Key Takeaways

- Create regional partnerships to provide high-quality transit and multimodal solutions
- Proposed route improvements will add coverage, improve service frequencies, and reduce travel times
- Premium transit services will provide reliable travel times and improve on-time service along congested corridors
- MOD services will improve local travel, connections to fixed route, and support growing paratransit demand
- Conversion of Route 7 to Microtransit will improve service and access between downtown and East Gainesville

Discussion

What are your thoughts on the following:

- Improvements to Existing Routes?
- New services proposed?
- Proposed Mobility-on-Demand Services?
- Priorities for Improvements
  - Near term (0 to 5 years)
  - Longer term (5 to 10 years)
- Other Questions?

Thank you for Attending!

Please fill out a comment card.

Randall Farwell
SR. ASSOCIATE/TRANSIT SPECIALIST
rfarwell@tindaleoliver.com

Tindale Oliver
planning | design | engineering

Jacksonville
3000 Spring Park Rd #48056
Jacksonville, FL 32247
(813) 224-8862 | Cell (904) 521-6031
www.tindaleoliver.com