

V. Item A

MAY 21, 2025 - MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting: Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization for the Gainesville Urbanized Area Meeting

Group: Technical Advisory Committee

Location and Gainesville RTS

Time 2nd Floor Conference Room

Regional Transit System (RTS) Building, 34 SE 13th Road, Gainesville, Florida

2:00 PM

	Agenda Item	Leistner	Moss	Hall	Cullen		Wood	McInnis	Simmons	Pass/Fail
1811	Call to Order and Chair Announcements									
Ш	Roll Call and Quorum	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	Quorum
	Notes:									
IV	Agenda Review and Approval	□ M □ S □ Y	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y	□ M □ S □ Y	□ M □ S □ Y	□ M □ S □ Y	□ Pass □ Fail □ Unanimous
	Notes:								<u> </u>	
V.	Approval of Minutes	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ Pass □ Fail □ Unanimous



	Notes: Moss — item was duplicated Moved to approve moss, Jeremiah second									
VI.	Consent Agenda: None	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M□ S□ Y□ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y	☐ Pass ☐ Fail ☐ Unanimous
	Notes:	1	1			I	1		1	
VII.A.	Action Item: FY2025/26 through FY2029/30 Transportation Improvement Program Provide recommendations for full board consideration. Staff will present the TIP update followed by a period for public comment.	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	⋈ M□ S□ Y□ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	☐ Pass☐ Fail☐ Unanimous
	 Notes: 1. Overview provided by Brad. 2. Construction Funding Concerns Moss raised a question about construction funding be spent in that year, potentially rolling over into subseq Achia clarified that the TIP, as adopted, represents the Moss pointed out that no construction is programme Brad explained that construction funding levels natura 3. Construction Project #2 Moss asked for clarification on the specific improvement Brad responded that he would need to review the pro- 	uent ye e currer d for F' ally fluc	ears. nt plan Y2028, v ctuate y	but is so which so ear to y in Cons	ubject t eems ui ear. tructior	o chang nusual. n Projec	ge. t #2.		might i	not be fully



For the Gainesville and Alachua County Area

4. 143rd Avenue Project (County PDE)

- Moss inquired whether the Project Development and Environment (PDE) study for 143rd Avenue, discussed previously, would fall under planning.
- Achia confirmed that this project is included in the 2027–2031 Strategic Urban (SU) Plan draft. The draft will be presented to the board on July 1 for adoption, pending consensus on the proposed concept.

5. University Lighting Project

- Hall noted that while the PDE was identified, construction funding for the project doesn't appear until FY2029 (refer to Table 15).
- Achia confirmed that construction is programmed for FY2029–2030.
- Hall observed that some funding seemed to be allocated in prior fiscal years.

6. Motion

• A motion to approve the TIP was made by Moss and seconded by Seth.

Next Steps:

- Brad to review and confirm the scope of Construction Project #2.
- Finalization of SU Plan draft and preparation for board adoption on July 1.

VII.B.	Action Item: Long Range Transportation Plan - Needs Plan	□М	□М	$\boxtimes M$	□М	□М	□М	□ M	□М	☐ Pass
	Motion: Approval of the LRTP Needs Plan for inclusion in the	\square S	□S	□S	□S	□S	□S	□S	□S	☐ Fail
	LRTP update to be adopted in August	□ Y	□ Y	□ Y	□ Y	□ Y	□ Y	□ Y	□ Y	☐ Unanimous
	LKTP update to be daopted in August	\square N	\square N	\square N	\square N	\square N	\square N	\square N	\square N	
	N 1 - 4									

Notes:

1. Long Range Transportation Plan

• . Overview of Transportation Projects



For the Gainesville and Alachua County Area

• Siren provided an overview of the current transportation projects and their status.

2. Clarifications and Questions Regarding Project Scenarios

- Debbie asked whether the highway scenarios are carried over into the next project scenario.
- Siren confirmed that the highway scenarios are indeed carried over.
- Debbie clarified that some agency projects are funded, while others are not. She also mentioned a correction to 39th Avenue, which should be second on the composite list.
- Leei confirmed that the updates would be made
- Wright expressed that the table in the appendix is difficult to interpret due to new streets not being clearly identified. He suggested adding descriptors for better clarity.

3. Connectivity and Scoring Metrics

- Leei explained that the current connectivity measures are limited to direct connections to activity centers or freight hubs. Other
 connectivity considerations, such as parallel roads or roads with higher connectivity, could also be taken into account if cities or
 counties have suggestions.
- Siren agreed and mentioned that agency rankings could be incorporated into the scoring.

4. Safety Concerns and Prioritization

- Hal/Cullen raised a concern about prioritizing safety, particularly on context streets around the university. He asked if there is a way to prioritize safety aspects, not just trip needs, in project scoring.
- Siren confirmed that performance measures could include a safety index to quantify safety-related projects. Multimodal projects with sidewalks and bike lanes would also contribute to safety and be highlighted.
- Cullen asked if the safety aspects are already incorporated.
- Siren confirmed that safety is one of the goals, and the criteria are already included in the project scoring.
- Leei emphasized that safety projects are ranked separately from other project categories to avoid competition between them.
- Hal/Cullen asked if the safety measures align with the overall direction of the plan.
- Jeremiah clarified that PTAC is an advisory committee, not one that sets specific direction for this project.
- Cullen emphasized the need to include these considerations in the analysis.

5. Connectivity Priorities and Campus Projects



For the Gainesville and Alachua County Area

- Jeremiah pointed out that campus connectivity is a priority for the university.
- Moss suggested implementing a more transparent metric to compare safety benefits across projects, rather than breaking them out separately.
- Siren agreed and noted that safety measures are included in multimodal scoring. They will consider adding a column to show safety benefits more clearly.

6. Modifications to E+C Projects

- Debbie referred to Appendix A, noting that agency projects are funded up to a certain degree but not for construction.
- Leei clarified that projects on the E+C network should be excluded if they are not going to be constructed.
- Siren agreed that if a project is up in the air regarding funding, it should be removed from the E+C list.
- Moss expressed that some projects on the list should be removed due to lack of funding or support for construction.
- Debbie noted that some of these projects are aspirational for the future.
- Siren confirmed that such projects can be part of the needs plan, but not included in the committed (E+C) list.
- Moss suggested that if projects are not funded or supported, they should be taken off the E+C list, and many of these projects should be removed from the plan.
- Cullen clarified that projects like 83rd Street (dedicated transit lane) are still on the list despite no support for widening. He suggested these projects be moved to multimodal consideration.

7. Addressing Aspirational Projects and Future Needs

- Moss indicated that several projects on the list, such as Archer Road widening, may not be feasible in the next 5 years and should be removed from the E+C list.
- Debbie pointed out that some of these projects have been identified in previous plans but are no longer county priorities.
- Siren confirmed that projects carried over from previous plans without support could be removed, but some projects are still supported.

8. Discussion of the Cost Feasible Plan (CFP)

• Debbie emphasized that while some projects in the CFP have been completed (e.g., Projects 3 and 5), others are still aspirational and will need reevaluation.



For the Gainesville and Alachua County Area

• Siren agreed, noting that only one of the cost-feasible projects has been implemented so far and that the plan should focus on projects with ongoing county support.

9. Finalization of the Needs List

- Moss indicated that there are about 20 projects that need to be removed from the E+C list, including:
- NW 83rd Street
- NW 53rd Avenue
- N. Main Street
- NE 16th Avenue
- SW 62nd Avenue
- SW 20th Avenue
- Widening on Interstate
- Project 7 (pg. 12)
- Fort Clarke Blvd.
- Cullen suggested that the county cluster line and urban boundary should be clarified.
- Leei agreed to double-check the urban area boundary and make necessary adjustments.

10. Next Steps and Deadlines

- Brad confirmed that the TAC meeting will take place on July 16. He asked if that timeline will be sufficient for the updates.
- Siren confirmed the updates can be made in time for the June board meeting.
- Debbie suggested forming a working group within the TAC to review the changes before the board meeting.
- Leei noted that updates will be sent out by the end of the week or early next week for review.

11. Motion

- Moss moved to conditionally approve the changes to the E+C list and appoint a subcommittee to meet next week to review the
 revised list.
- Hall seconded the motion.



	Approval of the plan for suballocation of urban area funding under the Surface Transportation Block Grant program Brad provides overview.	□ S □ Y □ N	□ S □ Y □ N	⊠ S □ Y □ N	□ S □ Y □ N	□ S □ Y □ N	□ S □ Y □ N	□ S □ Y □ N	□ S □ Y □ N	☐ Fail ☐ Unanimous
	Hall questioned – are these for this year? Achaia responded they are for next year. Achaia stated a few years Chris requested pedestrian upgrades and we did a study 3 ped crossings can be included – read the locations. Debbie - University Ave study. Achaia - Review the projects. Cullen, Hall approved									
VII.D.	Action Item: Intergovernmental Coordination and Review (ICAR) Agreement Motion: Approval of ICAR Agreement	□ M□ S□ Y□ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M□ S□ Y□ N	□ M□ S□ Y□ N	□ M□ S□ Y□ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	☐ Pass☐ Fail☐ Unanimous
	Notes:									
	Notes:									
VII.E.	Action Item: Transportation Improvement Program Amendment – SR20 (East University Ave) from SR24 (NE Waldo Ave) to SR26 (East University Ave) Motion: Amendment to MTPO Fiscal Years 2024-25 to 2028- 29 Transportation Improvement Program to include funding in FY2026 for the resurfacing of SR 20 (East University Ave) from SR24 (NE Waldo Ave) to SR26 (East University Ave).	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	⋈ M□ S□ Y□ N	□ M ⋈ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ M □ S □ Y □ N	□ Pass □ Fail □ Unanimous
	Notes: Brad provides overview. These are so you can start advertising now for these projects.									



	Achaia will find out about the funding .									
	These will be two separate allocations.									
	Moss, Hall approved		1			1		1	1	
VII.F.	Action Item: Transportation Improvement Program	\square M	$\boxtimes M$	□M	□М	□M	□М	□M	\square M	⊠ Pass
	Amendment – SR26 (West University Ave) from Gale	\square S	□S	□S	□S	□S	□S	\Box S	□S	☐ Fail
	Lemerand Drive to SR24 (NE Waldo Ave)	\square Y	□ Y	□ Y	□ Y	□ Y	□ Y	□ Y	□ Y	☐ Unanimous
	Motion: Amendment to MTPO Fiscal Years 2024-25 to 2028-	\square N	□N	□N	□N	□N	□N	\square N	□N	
	29 Transportation Improvement Program to include funding									
	in FY2026 for the resurfacing of SR 26 (West University Ave)									
	from Gale Lemerand Drive to SR24 (NE Waldo Ave).									
	Notes:									
	Debbie - These are design?									
	FDOT - they are PE, no plans or concepts yet. Some sidewalk re	pairs a	nd ADA	upgrad	des.					
	Debbie - Can we add new crossings as part of this?									
	Achaia - We will ask the project manager.									
	Moss approved with condition to consider additional crossings, Debbie will send the areas for the crossings									
	.,				-		J			
VIII.A.	Information Item - Establishment Interlocal Agreement									
	Updated Establishment Interlocal Agreement for review and comments. Interlocal Agreement will be enacted by all members of the MTPO						rs of the MTPO			
	for the Gainesville Alachua County Area			3						•
	,									
	Notes:									
VIII.B.	Information Item: MTPO Bylaws									
	MTPO Bylaws will be adopted once the Interlocal Agreement is	enacte	d							
	Notes: Item was presented as information.									
VIII.C.	Information Item: Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Update									
	The City of Gainesville is currently updating their bicycle/pedes	trian pl	an. The	Existing	g Condi	tions re	port is p	rovided	for rev	iew.
	Notes:									
XI	Member Comments									



	New Business	
XII	Public Comments	
Name	Notes	S