
PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Date: Thursday, May 10, 2007, 5:30to 7:30 pm **Project #:** 03-0313.000

Project: Alfred Street Corridor Study from SR 19 to Bay Road

Subject: Public Meeting – Study Update Workshop

Meeting Location: Tavares City Hall, 201 E. Main St. Tavares, FL 32778

Attendance Summary:

- 89 Members of the public
- 7 Agency & Elected Officials
 - City Council – Sandy Gamble, Lori Pfister,
 - City Staff – John Dury, Jacques Skutt, Nancy Barnett
 - County Staff – Noble Olasimbo
 - Lake Sumter MPO Staff – TJ Fish
- 4 Consultant Project Team Staff
 - Ralph Bove, Greg Moore, Vasu Persaud, Karen Bove

100 TOTAL ATTENDEES

Comments Summary: (See also attached Comment Forms and Related Correspondence)

- 3 Comment forms received at the Public Meeting on May 10.
- 9 Comment forms received via regular mail.
- 11 Comments/inquires received via e-mail/telephone.
- 24 Comments and question received orally during meeting

47 TOTAL COMMENTS RECEIVED AS OF MAY 29, 2007

MEETING SUMMARY

The Alfred Street Corridor Study Update Public Meeting in Lake County was held from 5:30 to 7:30 pm in the Tavares City Hall. Participants were asked to sign in upon entering and comment forms and an overview handout were distributed to each attendee as they registered. The format for the meeting was an informal open-house with staff from the consultant project team available to answer questions and discuss the project with the participants. An audio/ visual presentation was then given by the project team to provide an overview of the study and alternatives under evaluation. Following this questions and comments were fielded from participants and recorded.

The materials presented at the meeting included the project alternatives under consideration displayed over large scale aerial photography. In addition to the footprints for the proposed project alternatives, other details on the displays included street names and property lines. The exhibits on display included:

- Large Scale Displays of the alternatives under evaluation which included:
 - One-Way Pair alternative
 - Three-Lane alternative
 - Raised median/ Brick texture alternative
- Typical Section Matrix showing the various typical sections being considered for each section
- Project schedule summary board
- Study schedule summary board
- Production Schedule Display to identify project phases

The meeting ended at approximately 7:30 pm. The peak attendance occurred just after 6:00 with a crowd of approximately 70 people. The majority of participants had left the meeting by about 7:00 pm.

COMMENT SPECIFICS

The following is a summary of the written and verbal comments received. These have been compiled by the staff from the consultant project team that facilitated the meeting. Comments have been organized by the various issues to which they pertain. Comments requiring follow-up and the responsible staff involved in follow-up activities have been noted in the “Action Items” section of this summary.

Alternative Preference

- As of May 29, 2007, nineteen (19) comments were received concerning alternative/ typical section preference. A summary is provided below.

| Alternative | Downtown | Central | Eastern | Total |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1-Way Pair | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Median | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| 3-Lane | 10 | 11 | 13 | 34 |
| No-Build | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Not Specified | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| Total | 19 | 19 | 19 | 57 |

Traffic Operations

- Concern was expressed by residents about the additional traffic that would be placed on Caroline Street if the One-Way Pair is implemented.
- Concern was expressed about the need for signal retiming of the downtown signals along Alfred Street in order to provide better gaps for left turning traffic.
- Several comments were received with regards to how traffic would be reduced on Alfred Street as result of the widening of US 441, also called NEW US 441, located to the north of Alfred Street.
- Comments were received with regards to how the Alfred Street project would help to reduce traffic on Dora Avenue.
- Concern was expressed about the noise level on Alfred Street. It was suggested that the speed limit be reduced and noise barriers be added.
- Concern was expressed about the One-Way Pair low turning speed.
- Concern was expressed about speed reduction that would occur as a result of using a raised median.
- It was suggested that that for the One-Way Pair alternative the side streets be one-wayed in the downtown section.

Pedestrians and Safety

- Concern was expressed about the need for a traffic signal and roadway lighting at the David Walker Drive intersection.
- Several comments were received about the need for a pedestrian crossing at the New Hampshire Avenue intersection which is currently unsignalized.
- Concern was expressed about the need for children to safely cross Caroline Street while going to and from the High school and the Library.

Access Management

- Numerous business owners expressed concerned about access to their business. There was concern in particular about access to the Fire Station.
- Concern was expressed about the ability of large trucks to make turns.

Maintenance of Traffic

- Concern was expressed about the detours that would occur during construction and how this would be handled.
- Concern was expressed about how driveway access would be maintained during construction and the possible effect on business.
- Concern was expressed about the amount dust during construction.

General

- Questions were asked about how storm water will be controlled.
- Questions were asked about what will happened to the wetlands area or “jelly muck” located in the Central section along Alfred Street. Concern was expressed in particular about the cost of construction.

- Concern was expressed about the potential for business closure along Alfred Street if the One-Way Pair alternative was implemented.
- It was suggested that Maud Street be considered instead of Caroline Street for the One-Way Pair alternative.
- It was suggested that a sign be installed to request and encourage the concept of driver friendliness.

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

The following is an identification of the items requiring follow-up. These have been compiled from the comments and discussion resulting from the Alternatives Public Meeting. In order to track the progress of these follow-up items, the responsible staff should provide progress updates to the consultant team as various issues are resolved.

| Subject / Issue | Staff Name | Action Required |
|--------------------|-----------------|---|
| Question/ Concerns | Consultant Team | Address in upcoming Alternatives Selection Workshop |
| Misc. Coordination | Consultant Team | Correspondence by e-mail, phone, and postal mail. |