

Hock, Donna

From: Noble, Matthew A.
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2008 3:04 PM
To: nealemontgomery@paveselaw.com
Cc: Loveland, David M.; Wu, Lili ; Hock, Donna
Subject: CPA2008-02 Miromar Mall Outlet

Procedures have changed here in planning. This case has been scheduled for the 1-26-09 LPA public hearing. I need to issue a staff report on 1-5-09. I will provide a sufficiency letter prior to Nov. 15. This will be the only staff sufficiency review. The case will move forward, if it is not sufficient, staff will likely recommend denial of the request. So we all need to be on top of this! Staff anticipates a BoCC hearing in April 2009. If you have questions, I will try and answer them...

Matthew A. Noble, Principal Planner
Lee County Division of Planning
P.O. Box 398
Fort Myers, Florida 33902-0398
Phone: 239-533-8548
Fax: 239-533-8319

Hock, Donna

From: Neale Montgomery [NealeMontgomery@Paveselaw.com]
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2008 3:49 PM
To: Noble, Matthew A.; Mark Gillis
Cc: Loveland, David M.; Wu, Lili ; Hock, Donna
Subject: RE: CPA2008-02 Miromar Mall Outlet

I appreciate as much time as possible. Harry alluded to a 2030 study. We weren't sure what kind of study. If any type of study needs to be done Mark needs as much time as possible to figure out what needs to be done, what methodology is required, and to actually do the study. If he only gets one shot, more time is appreciated.

Thanks

Neale Montgomery, Esq.
Pavese Law Firm

1833 Hendry Street
Fort Myers, FL 33901
Direct: (239) 336-6235
Main: (239) 334-2195
Fax: (239) 332-2243
Email: NealeMontgomery@PaveseLaw.com
Web: www.PAVESELAW.com

Confidentiality Note: The information contained in this transmission is legally privileged and confidential, intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone call to (239) 334-2195 and delete the message. Thank you.

From: Noble, Matthew A. [mailto:NOBLEMA@leegov.com]
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2008 3:45 PM
To: Neale Montgomery; Mark Gillis
Cc: Loveland, David M.; Wu, Lili ; Hock, Donna
Subject: RE: CPA2008-02 Miromar Mall Outlet

It seems that you will have 2 to 3 weeks...I will try very hard to do it before Nov. 15th to leave additional time. I know DOT is already reviewing...

From: Neale Montgomery [mailto:NealeMontgomery@Paveselaw.com]
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2008 3:39 PM
To: Noble, Matthew A.; Mark Gillis
Cc: Loveland, David M.; Wu, Lili ; Hock, Donna
Subject: RE: CPA2008-02 Miromar Mall Outlet

10/21/2008

Hi Matt,

Thanks for giving me a heads up on the procedure. Mark and I were at a meeting at Harry Campbell's office on Friday on another matter. While we were there he recommended to Mark that he meet with FDOT on this matter. Harry indicated that additional analysis needed to be done and I was perplexed. I may not have been clear in the request. The requested amendment is not a request to actually move the access point, it is a request that would permit the relocation of the access point after review and approval by the county.

As you know, Miromar has been involved in a variety of issues that relate to Corkscrew Road. While we have been discussing the other issues the County identified the need to amend the plan. I look forward to receiving your letter. When does the sufficiency response have to be provided?

Neale Montgomery, Esq.
Pavese Law Firm

1833 Hendry Street
Fort Myers, FL 33901
Direct: (239) 336-6235
Main: (239) 334-2195
Fax: (239) 332-2243
Email: NealeMontgomery@PaveseLaw.com
Web: www.PAVESELAW.com

Confidentiality Note: The information contained in this transmission is legally privileged and confidential, intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone call to (239) 334-2195 and delete the message. Thank you.

From: Noble, Matthew A. [mailto:NOBLEMA@leegov.com]
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2008 3:04 PM
To: Neale Montgomery
Cc: Loveland, David M.; Wu, Lili ; Hock, Donna
Subject: CPA2008-02 Miromar Mall Outlet

Procedures have changed here in planning. This case has been scheduled for the 1-26-09 LPA public hearing. I need to issue a staff report on 1-5-09. I will provide a sufficiency letter prior to Nov. 15. This will be the only staff sufficiency review. The case will move forward, if it is not sufficient, staff will likely recommend denial of the request. So we all need to be on top of this! Staff anticipates a BoCC hearing in April 2009. If you have questions, I will try and answer them...

Matthew A. Noble, Principal Planner
Lee County Division of Planning
P.O. Box 398
Fort Myers, Florida 33902-0398
Phone: 239-533-8548


10/21/2008

Fax: 239-533-8319



Memo

To: Paul O'Connor, Planning Director

From: David Loveland, Public Works Operations Manager, Planning 

Date: November 14, 2008

Subject: CPA 2008-02 (Miromar Outlet Mall)

The Department of Transportation has reviewed the above-referenced privately-initiated text plan amendment, to amend Policy 1.3.7 to add a footnote to the designation of Station 230+14 (Miromar Outlet Mall directional median opening) to allow for alternative access improvements in the future, if an analysis demonstrating acceptable operations is submitted to and approved by the Department of Transportation. The request is based on a concern by Miromar about operational and safety issues at their entrance and on Corkscrew Road. DOT staff has concerns about both the amendment request itself and about the various traffic analyses that were submitted in support of the amendment, and offer the following comments:

General Comments/Amendment Request

1. DOT staff does not agree with proposed amendment approach, to add a very general footnote to a very detailed access management plan that allows some unspecified modification in the future if DOT accepts an analysis. The primary study submitted in support of the amendment (Corkscrew Road Access Comprehensive Plan Amendment, dated September 12, 2008), focuses on adding a connection point 350 feet east of the existing entrance, moving the directional median opening to that new access, and keeping the existing entrance with right-in only access. In discussions with the applicant, we recognize that the applicant is unsure whether the relocated entrance/median opening is ultimately going to be approved by FDOT, but if it is not, then there will be modifications to the existing entrance that don't require a comprehensive plan amendment. Therefore the only change that warrants an amendment is the relocation, and the request should specifically modify Policy 1.3.7 to specify the station number of the addition and the movements to be allowed.
2. The amendment does not just involve a text amendment to Policy 1.3.7, there should also be a map amendment to Map 3L, Sheet 3 of 3 to reflect the requested change.
3. Having two entrances 350 feet apart, even if one is limited to right-in only movements, is contrary to the original intent of the access plan for the area around this interchange and doesn't even meet minimal arterial spacing standards. The initial emphasis was protection of the interchange movements, and suggested a driveway spacing greater than the normal 660 feet for

MEMO

TO: Paul O'Connor, Planning Director

DATE: November 14, 2008

PAGE: 2

arterials, instead proposing 880 feet. If the main entrance and directional median opening is shifted to the west (closer to the interchange ramps), the existing connection should be removed.

Analysis Issues

Corkscrew Road Access Comprehensive Plan Amendment study, Sept. 12, 2008

4. The analysis only looked at 2010 conditions, based on buildout of Miromar's site. Since this is a comprehensive plan amendment and the horizon year of the comprehensive plan is 2030, an analysis of 2030 conditions is also required.

5. It is not clear whether the 2010 analysis considers the diversionary impact of the \$35 million Estero Parkway Extension which is currently under construction and should be completed by mid-2009. The impact on traffic on Corkscrew Road should be considered in the 2010 analysis.

6. The analysis does not address delays, queues and weaving relative to the I-75 interchange in 2010. This information must be included.

7. The evaluation of all improvement scenarios in the study assume a separate westbound right-turn lane at Corkscrew Road and Ben Hill Griffin Parkway, but only some of the scenarios included the additional improvement of dual southbound right-turn lanes at that intersection. For comparative purposes, the scenarios should include the same set of assumptions for off-site improvements.

Appendix 2, Corkscrew Road Traffic Operations Assessment, Mar. 6, 2006

8. The estimated traffic and turning movements for the year 2010 in this study are based on previous studies done in a range of years from 1998 to 2005. The Corkscrew Road 4-laning east of Ben Hill Griffin Parkway by the CRSA was treated as a committed improvement even though construction of that improvement has now been put on indefinite hold. There is also some question as to whether the parameters of development in the area have been fully accounted for.

9. On page 2, the comparison on measures of effectiveness indicate that Scenario 4 (the improvement requested in the CPA with a relocated entrance and eastbound dual left turn lanes) has the lowest average speed eastbound and westbound on Corkscrew Road, approximately 5% below Scenario 1 (existing 2005 conditions): The intersection average delay is decreased by 0.1 seconds compared to 2005 conditions. Scenario 3 (signalizing the existing entrance) had the second lowest average speed on Corkscrew Road.



MEMO

TO: Paul O'Connor, Planning Director

DATE: November 14, 2008

PAGE: 3

10. Traffic Counts Appendix B - The intersection counts for this study were performed in September 2005.

11. SYNCHRO Analysis Appendix C page 1 - The signal timing data was from January 2006.

12. Arterial performance – On westbound Corkscrew Road at the I-75 NB ramps the analysis shows a 24 MPH average speed in scenarios 1, 2 & 5 (the three scenarios without an added traffic signal), 20 MPH in scenario 3 (signalize existing entrance) and 17.6 MPH in scenario 4 (relocated entrance with traffic signal). The proposed CPA request resulted in the lowest arterial speed on the segment of Corkscrew Road nearest I-75.

13. Intersection analyses – Analyzed intersections were the signalized project entrances and the intersection of Ben Hill Griffin Parkway and Corkscrew Road. This section does not include intersection analyses at the existing entrance to Corkscrew Road, or the proposed entrance to Corkscrew Road. The analyses for the Corkscrew Road and Ben Hill Griffin Parkway all include 4 movements (EBL, WBT, SBL and SBR) with a note that “95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer”. Since additional queues in a turn lane may exceed the turn lane length and impede through traffic, this would appear to affect the intersection delay calculation for each scenario.

Appendix 3, Miromar Outlets Corkscrew Road Access Evaluation, Sept. 7, 2007

14. SYNCHRO/Simtraffic analysis page 4 – Analyzed two scenarios, without and with improvement. Improvements are limited to the Miromar existing and proposed entrance on Corkscrew Road. The directional median closure scenario was not evaluated. The analysis with improvement had 1% more delay, 4.9% reduction in average speed WB (1.7% EB), with 12% fewer stops.

15. SYNCHRO Analysis sheets Appendix B – The arterial level of service summary indicates the westbound travel speed at I-75 NB ramps decreases from 27.8 to 22.2 MPH with the proposed improvements.

16. Simtraffic reports Appendix B – The queue and blocking report indicates that with the improvement, the maximum eastbound queue increases from 436 feet to 483 feet. The distance between the east bound left stop bar and the I-75 southbound ramp intersection is approximately 450 feet. The queue length exceeding the distance between ramp intersections indicates that queues and delays in the interchange may be adversely affected by the proposed CPA improvement. The analysis does not include the intersection of Corkscrew Road and the I-75

MEMO

TO: Paul O'Connor, Planning Director

DATE: November 14, 2008

PAGE: 4

ramps. A viewing of the Simtraffic simulation would be helpful to visualize the queues and possible weaving.

Besides the above comments and concerns, there may be additional concerns or questions about the above-noted studies and the Signal Warrant Study dated January 31, 2008 that was included as Appendix 4, from DOT's Traffic Section.

Please let me know if you need any additional information.

cc: Matt Noble, Lee County Planning Dept.
Rob Spickerman, Lee County Attorney's Office
Harry Campbell, Lee County DOT
Don DeBerry, Lee County DOT
Andy Getch, Lee County DOT
Neale Montgomery, Pavese Law Firm
Mark Gillis, David Plummer & Associates