

**AGENDA ITEM 4B**  
**CONNECTIONS 2040 REGIONAL MOBILITY PLAN (RMP)**  
**FINAL NEEDS PLAN AND DRAFT COST FEASIBLE PLAN**

**TAC and CMAC Comments and CRTPA Staff Responses**

**Project Team response to TAC and CMAC Comments**

The following comments on the Draft Cost Feasible Plan were discussed at the April 14, 2015 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting and Citizen Multimodal Advisory Committee (CMAC) meetings.

**Quincy Bypass**

Concerns were raised that the Quincy Loop South is not scheduled for further action until Tier 4, and the Quincy Loop North is not scheduled for further action in the Draft Cost Feasible Plan when both projects have Project Development and Environment (PD&E) studies scheduled for FY 2016.

**Staff Response**

At this time CRTPA staff feels that the currently programmed PD&E studies will help determine the feasibility of the project at a more detailed level. The completion of the PD&E study will coincide with the development of the next regional mobility plan which will provide better data for a CRTPA Board decision.

**Recommendation:**

- 1. Proceed with the Project Development and Environment Studies for the North Quincy Loop and South Quincy Loop to provide the future direction of the projects.**
- 

**Meridian Road at Fairbanks Ferry Road Intersection Realignment Project**

The TAC requested to restore this project to the Draft Cost Feasible Plan due to flooding that occurs on Fairbanks Ferry Road and on CR 12 (not at the intersection).

**Staff Response**

There are many local intersections in the CRTPA region that have a wide-range of issues and there will never be enough funds to address local issues as compared to those on the arterial roadway system. Preserving the arterial system is a major directive for the CRTPA and the local intersection improvements will not rank high enough to be competitive against major roadways and intersection improvements.

**Recommendation:**

- 1. Do not reintroduce the Meridian Road at Fairbanks Ferry Road intersection realignment into the Draft Cost Feasible Plan.**

**Proctor Road**

The TAC requested that Proctor Road (Thomasville Road to Centerville Road) be reconsidered for inclusion in the Draft Cost Feasible Plan.

**Staff Response**

A portion of the project is included in the Leon County Sales Tax extension project list (Northeast Park). Therefore, Proctor Road from Thomasville Road into the Northeast Park will be paved, however, beyond the park, the portion to Centerville Road will remain a dirt road. CRTPA staff is unsure if this project is eligible for funds given that the road is already in place with a predetermined route. Typically, this would be addressed in a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study and therefore staff will contact FDOT and FHWA to determine eligibility.

Additionally, if this project is added back into consideration for funding it will establish a precedent to include similar projects (region-wide) for funding consideration. The project received 130 points out of 495 and is unlikely to be funded in the Cost Feasible Plan unless it is moved by CRTPA Board members.

**Recommendation:**

- 1. Do not reintroduce the Proctor Road (Thomasville Road to Centerville Road) project into the Draft Cost Feasible Plan.**
- 

**Sidewalk Costs**

The TAC questioned the sidewalk costs per mile that were utilized by the Project Team to develop the Draft Cost Feasible Plan.

**Staff Response**

To remain consistent with the application of costs, the Project Team relied on the Estimated Transportation Costs provided by FDOT, shown as **Attachment 2** in Agenda Item 4B in the CRTPA agenda.

---

**Universal Accessibility**

The TAC and CMAC felt that bike lanes should get some points for the Universal Accessibility criteria.

**Staff Response**

Staff reiterates the response as stated in CRTPA Board Agenda Item 4B:

## Agenda Item 4B – Draft Cost Feasible Plan

“The Universal Accessibility Evaluation Criteria was intended to evaluate a facility against how many user types (bike, pedestrian, handicapped, elderly, etc...) could use that facility. Originally, bike lanes were given 60 points because the facility provided another “mode” along a corridor. However, a bike lane is not intended to provide for pedestrian, handicapped, or elderly access, although it could be used for any of those users. In terms of a hierarchical approach to accommodate users, a shared-use path has the highest level and would be provided 60 points if it is connecting to at least one existing sidewalk or another shared-use path. A total of 40 points would be provided to shared-use paths with no external connections to existing shared-use paths or sidewalks, and bike lanes would be provided 0 points for Universal Accessibility.”

Should CRTPA members decide it is appropriate to add points for bike lanes, staff recommends that they not be more than the points assigned to sidewalks.

### **Recommendation:**

- 1. Do not provide points to bike lanes for “Universal Accessibility”.**
- 

### **Bike Lane Removal from Draft Cost Feasible Plan**

The TAC and CMAC felt that the removal of the bike lanes from the Draft Cost Feasible Plan was a bit extreme. During the discussion of these projects with the TAC, members had concerns about these projects since it may take lane removal and on-street parking removal for the bike lane to be constructed. These issues raised concern from Growth Management and Public Works from the perspective that lane and on-street parking removal in addition to topography issues may not make these projects viable due to capacity or concurrency related deficiencies.

### **Staff Response**

Staff reiterates the response as stated in CRTPA Board Agenda Item 4B:

“Technically, adding a bike lane can minimally consist of paint, however; when there isn’t enough “road” to make a bike lane, the cost is difficult to determine. **Attachment 2** contains an estimated per mile cost for bike lanes (both sides of the road) at \$176,814. However, there are an even wider range of costs that would potentially have to be included in adding a bike lane such as tearing out curb and gutter, tearing out existing drainage, piping ditches, moving utilities, purchasing right-of-way, reducing the number of lanes to make a bike lane (not a CRTPA decision), tearing out existing sidewalks, rebuilding curb and gutter, repaving the road, etc...

These are a few of the issues that have to be considered when adding a bike lane. Some estimates, depending on location could exceed \$10,000,000 a mile.

## Agenda Item 4B – Draft Cost Feasible Plan

Based on the difficulty of determining a cost for adding a bike lane, the Project Team is recommending that the bike lane projects be removed from consideration as projects in the Cost Feasible Plan. Further study should be conducted to determine where bike lanes are needed and what the costs are associated with those projects. There is simply not enough time in the Regional Mobility Plan project window to complete this process.”

Given the response from Growth Management and Public Works regarding the local road bike lanes, the Project Team, in discussions after the TAC and CMAC meetings, feels that the bike lane projects on the state road system can be addressed through the FDOT District 3 Safety Team and CRTPA staff is working with FDOT for a response on the issue. However, for bike lanes on local roads there are issues beyond the CRTPA’s responsibility that have to be addressed first and need to be vetted through the local government process before being considered in the CRTPA’s project list.

Based on these discussions, after the TAC and CMAC meetings the following are the Project Team’s recommendation.

### **Recommendations:**

- 1. Direct staff to work with FDOT to determine a course of action to address bike lanes on state roads.**
- 2. Direct staff to work with governments in the CRTPA region to determine the course of action necessary to provide bike lanes on local roads.**

If the CRTPA Board feels it is more appropriate to study all of the bike lane options as discussed at the TAC and CMAC committee meetings then CRTPA staff is ready to pursue that option. If this is the direction that the CRTPA Board wishes to pursue then the following is the action that the Board should take:

### **Recommendations:**

- 1. Pursue the development of a study to analyze the addition of bike lanes on state and local roads in the CRTPA region.**

**Weems Road Bike Lane**

The TAC felt that the Weems Road project should be added back into the Needs Plan for consideration because it is a shared-use path project.

**Staff Response**

The Weems Road Bike Lane project was introduced in the process by a citizen specifically as a bike lane project.

**Recommendations:**

- 1. Do not reintroduce Weems Road Bike Lane for Draft Cost Feasible Plan consideration.**
- 

**Tennessee Street**

The Tennessee Street/US 90 Traffic Mobility and Alternatives Study (Ocala Road to Monroe Street) was presented to the CRTPA at the January CRTPA Board meeting. This project had several recommendations that could be implemented for the corridor. The TAC requested that the FDOT present the study to the City Long Range Transportation Initiative (LRTI) group.

**Staff Response**

CRTPA staff is working with FDOT to provide a presentation to the LRTI.

---

**Florida Arts Trail**

The CMAC requested further details on the cost of the design phase for the Florida Arts Trail project.

**Staff Response**

CRTPA staff is working with the consultant to provide the estimated design phase cost for the project.