



**LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY
OLD LEE COUNTY COURTHOUSE
2120 MAIN STREET, FORT MYERS, FL 33901
BOARD CHAMBERS
MONDAY, MARCH 24, 2014
8:30 AM**

AGENDA

1. Call to Order/Review of Affidavit of Publication/Pledge of Allegiance
2. Public Forum
3. Approval of Minutes – February 24, 2014
4. New Horizon 2035: Plan Amendments
 - A. [CPA2011-00013 Transportation Element](#) (Continued)
 - B. [CPA2011-00008 Future Land Use Element](#)
5. Other Business
6. Adjournment – Next Meeting Dates: Monday, April 28, 2014 and Monday, May 19, 2014 (moved due to Memorial Day).

A verbatim record of the proceeding will be necessary to appeal a decision made at this hearing. Contact the Lee County Division of Planning at 239-533-8585 for further information on obtaining a record. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, reasonable accommodations will be made upon request. Contact Janet Miller at 239-533-8583.

www.LeeCountyTownHall.com



Share your ideas at Lee County
Government's virtual public forum today!

DIVISION OF PLANNING

MEMORANDUM



LEE COUNTY

S O U T H W E S T F L O R I D A

to: Local Planning Agency

from: Brandon Dunn, Senior Planner
Andy Getch, LCDOT Planning Manager

subject: **Proposed Transportation Element
Summary of Comments and Changes**

date: March 13, 2014

Staff presented the Transportation Element to the LPA at the February 24, 2014 meeting. At that meeting, comments were made by members of the LPA, representatives of the Horizon Council Business Issues Task Force, the Community Sustainability Advisory Committee and members of the public. The LPA made a motion requesting that staff bring back revisions to address the comments that were made at the February 24th meeting.

The following attachment updates the February 14, 2014 Transportation Element, Attachment 1, that was included in your February LPA packet. The attachment shows staff's recommended changes in accordance with those comments in red underlined text.

Staff Recommended Transportation Element, Attachment 1 Revisions
March 24, 2014 LPA Hearing

POLICY 1.1.3: Create safe, affordable, accessible mobility and physical activity opportunities for all people by promoting the integration of land uses that encourage people to walk, ride bikes, and use transit as part of their daily routines. A target for the total bike and walk percentage of trips to work is 5 percent. A target for the total bike, walk and transit percentage of trips to work is 25 percent by:

- a. Prioritizing the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders in areas where the county desires to promote walkable communities are desired;
- b. Implementing pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities where shops, services, employment centers, parks, public facilities, and civic areas are within a $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of residential neighborhoods; and
- c. ~~Reducing~~ ~~Evaluating~~ the size number of motor vehicle lanes, lane widths and operating speeds of streets in urban and mixed-use areas.
- d. Adding ten to twenty miles of bicycle and pedestrian facilities per year.

POLICY 1.1.5: Utilize transportation demand management (TDM) strategies that further reduce or redistribute single occupancy vehicle demand as measured by the drive alone percentage of journey to work. A target is to reduce the drive alone percentage ~~from 77 percent in 2012~~ to 70 percent by 2020 and 60 percent by 2035. Strategies include:

- a. Signing, marking, and other design improvements to increase awareness that roadways operate as shared bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities;
- b. Automatic detection and bike boxes at traffic signals that improve pedestrian and bicycle crossing;
- c. Pedestrian facility improvements in urban areas such as mid-block crossings;
- d. Ride sharing programs such as carpooling, vanpooling, multiple occupancy vehicle lanes, designated parking spaces, and other techniques;
- e. Employer-based incentives and programs to increase the use of TDM strategies in place of single-occupant motor vehicle travel;
- f. Park-and-ride or commuter lots;
- g. Variable work hours and teleworking; and
- h. Motor vehicle parking, tolls and congestion pricing.

POLICY 1.2.4: Utilize TSM and ~~transportation demand management (TDM)~~ strategies that promote better utilization of the county's transportation resources (roadways, pedestrian pathways, bikeways, transit services, air facilities, railways, and ports) and allow for better movement of people and goods. Strategies include:

- a. Traffic signal progression programs (including synchronization);
- b. ~~Improved transit premium service facilities such as exclusive bus lanes, high occupancy vehicle lanes, or signal priority for transit vehicles;~~
- c. ~~Implement automated vehicle location systems on transit vehicles, including real-time arrival signage, and information kiosks at transfer facilities and human service agencies;~~
- d. Monitoring and improving signals, signs, street lighting, and lane markings for all users on all roadways;

- e. ~~Restricting~~ Appropriate spacing of median cuts and driveways in accordance with standards in land development regulations;
- f. Adequately funding maintenance programs;
- g. Maintaining existing highway facilities or reconstruction of existing intersections where feasible, including the use of roundabouts;
- h. Development of a traffic signal system that improves transit route efficiency;
- i. ~~Signing, marking, and other design improvements to increase awareness that roadways operate as shared bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities;~~
- j. ~~Automatic detection and bike boxes at traffic signals that improve pedestrian and bicycle crossing;~~
- k. ~~Pedestrian facility improvements in urban areas such as mid-block crossings;~~
- l. ~~Ride sharing programs such as carpooling, vanpooling, multiple occupancy vehicle lanes, designated parking spaces, and other techniques;~~
- m. ~~Employer based incentives and programs to increase the use of TDM strategies in place of single occupant motor vehicle travel;~~
- n. ~~Park and ride or commuter lots;~~
- o. ~~Variable work hours and teleworking; and~~
- p. ~~parking and road pricing.~~

POLICY 1.2.5: Ensure the county's transportation system is able to efficiently respond to the evacuation and emergency transportation needs of the community during an emergency event through:

- a. Development and maintenance of special roadway signalization, intersection design, direction, design technology, and clearing plan;
- b. Establishment of alternative emergency routes;
- c. Coordination of evacuation planning and response with the county's emergency management, policy, and fire services; and
- d. Designated transit stop and shelters to ensure efficient evacuation of the transit dependent population.

POLICY 1.3.4: Support ~~economic land uses~~ Economic and Job Center land use categories by requiring development proposals to demonstrate compatibility with existing or proposed ports, aviation, rail and other commodity movement facilities and suggest mitigation measures for potential adverse impacts during the rezoning and DRI process.

POLICY 1.3.5: Encourage and participate in discussions ~~between with the Florida High Speed Rail Commission state and regional authorities~~, and local groups on the location of high-speed passenger rail facilities in the county.

POLICY 1.3.6: Maximize through capacity of principal arterials ~~(limited access facilities, expressways, controlled access facilities, and designated truck routes)~~ outside of designated mixed-use centers using the following measures:

- a. Design limited access facilities, expressways, controlled access facilities, State Highways, and designated truck routes ~~with identifying~~ heavy trucks (as defined ~~in~~ by Florida statute) as the design vehicle;

- b. Promote intermodal terminal transfer points to support Economic and Job Center Land Use Categories at Luckett Road, Daniels Parkway, and Alico Road;
- c. Regulate access ~~to the extent permitted by state law~~ in accordance with standards adopted through land development regulations;
- d. Provide sufficient distance between land access and expressway/freeway interchanges;
- e. Synchronize and space signalized intersections on arterials and collectors for efficient traffic signal operation;
- f. Prohibit on-street parking;
- g. Develop a connected transportation network of streets, access or frontage roads with wayfinding signage, transit, and dedicated and separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities to provide system capacity and a preferred route for shorter trips; and
- h. Require access to meet forecasted use needs, including turn lanes, acceleration and deceleration lanes, and funding for future signalization.

OBJECTIVE 1.4: Rail Corridor. Protect the entire CSX Transportation Inc. rail corridor for future transportation purposes through direct public involvement in its property ownership and/or long-term lease.

POLICY 1.4.1: The rail corridor, as shown on Transportation Map 3E and the Future Land Use Map, is hereby designated as a strategic regional transportation corridor. This designation has been recommended by the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization as a means for cities and counties along the rail corridor to recognize the regional nature of this asset and jointly commit to efforts to protect it in its entirety. This designation includes the designation of the rail corridor as a “transportation corridor” pursuant to F.S. 337.273. The following policies implement this designation.

POLICY 1.4.2: Encourage Florida DOT to purchase the real estate interests in the entire rail corridor from Arcadia to north Naples.

POLICY 1.4.3: Support efforts of the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization to enhance freight capability for the entire rail corridor and to add capability for commuter rail, light rail, rails with trails, or bus rapid transit in Lee County and northern Collier County.

POLICY 1.4.4: Future Land Use Policies 4.1.10 and 4.1.11 demonstrate Lee County’s commitment to transit-oriented development around future stations for commuter rail, light rail, or bus rapid transit.

POLICY 1.4.5: Lee County will formally oppose any attempts at abandonment of the rail corridor before the U.S. Surface Transportation Board, and will support use of federal rails-to-trails authority to railbank the corridor, if abandonment ever succeeds, in order to preserve the corridor for possible future rail service.

<u>Land Use Categories</u>	<u>Urban land use categories and mixed-use centers with an adopted regulating plan</u>	<u>Suburban and Economic and Job Center land use categories</u>	<u>Rural land use categories</u>
<u>Mode Priorities (1-4)</u>	<u>1. Transit Pedestrian</u> <u>2. Pedestrian Transit</u> <u>3. Bicycle</u> <u>4. Motor Vehicle</u>	<u>1. Motor Vehicle</u> <u>2. Transit</u> <u>3. Bicycle</u> <u>4. Pedestrian</u>	<u>1. Motor Vehicle</u> <u>2. Bicycle</u> <u>3. Transit</u> <u>4. Pedestrian</u>

POLICY 2.1.6: ~~Until an alternative multimodal methodology is developed in cooperation with the MPO or by 2016, use the current Highway Capacity Manual and FDOT Quality LOS Handbook and other best practices to calculate levels of service, service volumes, and volume-to-capacity ratios, until an alternative multi-modal methodology with performance measures is developed in cooperation with the MPO or staff initiates an alternative methodology by 2016. This will promote a multi-modal transportation network, diversity of land uses, and a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Until the alternative multi-modal methodology is developed~~ Based on the Handbook, transit mode LOS will be determined based on the average time between scheduled weekday bus stops (headway) and presence of pedestrian facilities. Bicycle mode LOS will be determined based on the characteristics of bicycle facilities and the motor vehicle traffic characteristics. Pedestrian modes LOS will be determined based on the characteristics of pedestrian facilities and the motor vehicle traffic characteristics. The multimodal LOS calculation will be weighted by the numbered priorities listed in Table 1 for the corresponding functional classification and land use category as further specified in the LDC and Administrative Codes. Where designated, the multimodal LOS calculation may also be calculated on an areawide basis.

POLICY 2.2.1: ~~An A Potential Multimodal Operational Improvements Program is established for the constrained roads identified in Table 2(a) are identified in Table 2(b). The program identifies These include operational and capacity enhancing improvements capable of implementation within the context of a constrained system. Operational and capacity enhancing improvements may include adding transit facilities, bicycle lanes, paved shoulders, sidewalks, and motor vehicle turn lanes. The Potential Multimodal Operational Improvement Program for constrained roads is identified in Table 2(b).~~

POLICY 2.4.1: Implement planning and development strategies and practices to address concerns related to mixed-use form, multimodal transportation design, and walkable communities through:

- Long-term strategies regarding multimodal alternatives, traffic calming, safe streets, urban design, land use mixes, and appropriate intensity and density standards;
- Area wide LOS standards not dependent on any single road segment function;
- Reduced transportation-related development fees to promote development within infill, redevelopment, mixed-use, and urban areas; multimodal transportation districts; or for affordable or workforce housing;

- d. Prioritization of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities in areas designed for walkability, mixed-use, and community connectivity;
- e. Multimodal connections to existing and planned transit facilities; and
- f. Context-oriented transportation requirements based on specific geographic locations and community character place types.
- g. Incorporate design features for stormwater attenuation and groundwater recharge enhancement within rights-of-way when possible.

POLICY 2.4.5: Implement LDC regulations that ensure adequate fire and rescue access. ~~New development with greater than ten residential parcels will provide a minimum of two access points to the development.~~

POLICY 2.4.6: ~~By 2013, d~~ Develop or participate in a pedestrian and bicycle safety action plan to identify and evaluate road corridors, segments and intersections with recurring pedestrian and bicycle ~~accident~~ crash patterns. Identify contributing factors, safety improvements, and transportation practices that would reduce the number and severity of crashes. The target is to reduce bicycle and pedestrian crashes by 20 percent in successive five-year periods, consistent with the Lee MPO adopted vision of a zero-fatality transportation system for pedestrians and bicyclists throughout Lee County.

POLICY 3.1.3: ~~Improve the county's character, f~~ Facilitate the development of mixed-use areas, and promote the redevelopment of older development areas through transportation projects that:

- a. Support the character and improve the connectivity of the surrounding community;
- b. Better link land uses between arterials and major collectors;
- c. Expand multimodal system alternatives and improve existing transportation facilities;
- d. Improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists and accessibility needs of all people consistent with the Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines;
- e. Improve the grid network by improving connections and bridging gaps within transportation infrastructure systems;
- f. Minimize the number of displaced businesses and residences and purchases of entire parcels;
- g. Incorporate stormwater facilities into community amenities; and
- h. Avoid the alignment of new arterials or expressways that penetrate or divide established residential neighborhoods ~~with high bicycle and pedestrian use~~ except where no feasible alternative exists.

POLICY 3.2.5: Establish a capital improvements program (CIP) that assists in the budgeting and implementation of transit, pedestrian, bicycle, ~~and~~ motor vehicle improvement, and complete street projects. CIP priorities will be analyzed, reviewed and determined based upon input received from advisory committees, stakeholders, and interdepartmental staff based upon the project ability to improve the overall function of the county's transportation system and to:

- a. Provide a variety of transportation options and improve connectivity throughout the county;

- b. Implement established local community planning priorities and community identified projects. Community funded projects (e.g.: grants, private contributions, MSTU/MSBU, and other sources) may be assigned a higher priority;
- c. Improve high-hazard crash locations and structural and non-structural improvements to mitigate hazards that reduce the number and severity of all crashes;
- d. Fund the Traffic Signal/Intersection Improvement program to make the transportation system safer and more efficient; and
- e. Fund transportation improvements related to traffic calming, transit stops, trails and greenways, pedestrian facilities, bicycle facilities, complete street initiatives, roadway access, and other transportation needs.

POLICY 3.2.10: Roadway and intersection improvements mandated by development orders will be determined on the basis of demonstrated need resulting in part or in total from the impacts of that development. These improvements will be based on roadway and intersection improvement needs resulting from new development and will not be limited by jurisdictional responsibility for specific road segments. ~~The use of Road Impact Fee revenues~~ Mobility fees, impact fees or similar mechanisms that include the state highway system in their calculation methodology, may be used to improve state roads ~~is an acceptable application of those funds.~~

POLICY 3.2.13: Review on a regular basis and update all user fee revenue sources, such as tolls, ~~mobility fees~~, and roads impact fees. As an alternative to roads impact fees, evaluate a mobility fee structure, including a mobility plan, by the year 2016. Include an evaluation of reduction in fees to provide incentives for urban redevelopment and infill. Adopt the programs that reflect travel characteristics, construction and right-of-way costs. Determine if capital impacts and maintenance costs are met by the fees and if the fees are economically sustainable and applied fairly.

OBJECTIVE 3.3: Environmental Impacts. Diminish the negative impacts transportation facilities and systems have on natural environments by maximizing existing transportation facilities, promoting clean transportation alternatives, optimizing stormwater attenuation and groundwater recharge, and utilizing TDM strategies to effectively manage transportation systems and resources.

POLICY 3.3.1: Develop and maintain an environmentally sensitive transportation system including consideration of the following practices:

- a. Alternative transportation modes that diminish the need for increased road capacity and vehicular trips. Coordinate the development of such facilities with the Lee County Bikeways/Walkways Facilities Plan, The Transit Development Plan, and Lee County Greenways Master Plan.
- b. Promotion of alternative fuel vehicles, mixed-use developments, walkable and bikeable communities, and transit to conserve energy, reduce air pollution, and manage natural resources;
- c. Transportation infrastructure that utilizes sustainable or recycled materials, uses innovative design techniques and technologies, such as green infrastructure,

- stormwater areas as community amenities; and energy efficient components such as street lighting, traffic signals, and roundabouts;
- d. Reduce heat island effects by ~~minimizing~~ addressing paved surface areas and maximizing planting areas with native canopy trees and other vegetation on county-maintained roadways;
 - e. TDM strategies to effectively manage transportation systems and resources, minimize system delays, reduce vehicle miles-traveled, and ~~contain greenhouse gas~~ reduced vehicle emissions;
 - f. Conversion of transit vehicles from diesel propulsion systems to alternative fuels or hybrid propulsion systems;
 - g. Location of archaeological sites, which will not be destroyed unless full recovery of data and artifacts is included in the process; and
 - h. Protection of natural habitats and protected or listed species.
 - i. Utilize stormwater attenuation and groundwater recharge techniques for protection and improvement of water resources.

POLICY 3.3.2: New ~~roads~~ or ~~expansion of existing~~ expanded county motor vehicle facilities will not be ~~extended through constructed in environmentally critical areas of ecological concern~~ except in instances of overriding public interest and unless:

- a. It is the only feasible route within mixed-use and urban areas;
- b. The crossing is culverted or bridged ~~to the greatest degree possible~~, maintaining predevelopment volume, direction, distribution, and surface water hydroperiod consistent with county standards, and providing adequate wildlife corridors; and
- c. Equivalent mitigation is provided ~~in basin and in jurisdiction as the first preferred option.~~

POLICY 3.4.4: Encourage municipalities to maintain a roads impact fee, mobility fee or similar ~~program~~ mechanism, or to participate in the county's program.

Community Sustainability Advisory Committee

Transportation; Communities; and Community Safety & Wellbeing Recommendations

February 19, 2014

Transportation

Recommendation 1: In POLICY 1.1.3 (b), change number from ¼ mile to ½ mile, as it is well documented to support multi-modal transportation. In (c) change tense of the word.

POLICY 1.1.3: Create safe, affordable, accessible mobility and physical activity opportunities for all people by promoting the integration of land uses that encourage people to walk, ride bikes, and use transit as part of their daily routines. A target for the total bike and walk percentage of trips to work is 5 percent. A target for the total bike, walk and transit percentage of trips to work is 25 percent by:

(b) Implementing pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities where shops, services, employment centers, parks, public facilities, and civic areas are within a ~~¼-mile~~ ½ mile of residential neighborhoods; and

(c) ~~Reducing~~ Evaluate Evaluating the ~~size~~ number of motor vehicle lanes, lane widths and operating speeds of streets in urban and mixed-use areas.

Recommendation 2: In POLICY 1.1.5 add current percentages from the United State Census Bureau survey.

POLICY 1.1.5: Utilize transportation demand management (TDM) strategies that further reduce or redistribute single occupancy vehicle demand as measured by the drive alone percentage of journey to work. A target is to reduce the drive alone percentage from 77.5% in 2011, as measured by the United States Census Bureau American Community Survey (Journey to Work), to 70 percent by 2020 and 60 percent by 2035. Strategies include:

Recommendation 3: In POLICY 1.2.5 (a) add ‘intersection design’ and ‘design technology’ to aid in the efficiency of evacuation and emergency transportation needs during an emergency event.

POLICY 1.2.5: Ensure the county’s transportation system is able to efficiently respond to the evacuation and emergency transportation needs of the community during an emergency event through:

a. Development and maintenance of special roadway signalization, intersection design, direction, design technology and clearing plan;

Recommendation 4: In POLICY 1.3.5, broaden the policy to include any authority group (if the Florida High Speed Rail Commission is not an active group), and remove ‘high-speed’ and replace to ‘passenger’ as to not limit the feasibility of potential projects.

POLICY 1.3.5: Encourage discussions between the ~~Florida High-Speed-Rail-Commission~~ state and regional authority, and local groups on the location of ~~high-speed~~ passenger rail facilities in the county.

Recommendation 5: In POLICY 1.3.6 (b) include ‘intermodal’ to terminal transfer points to continue to expand options for passengers in a mixed-use center. In (g) include ‘frontage roads’.

POLICY 1.3.6: Maximize through capacity of principal arterials (~~limited access facilities, expressways,~~ controlled access facilities, and designated truck routes) outside of designated mixed-use centers using the following measures:

(b): Promote intermodal terminal transfer points to support Economic and Job Center Land Use Categories at Luckett Road, Daniels Parkway, and Alico Road;

(g): Develop a connected transportation network of streets, access or frontage roads with wayfinding signage, transit, and dedicated and separated frontage roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities to provide system capacity and a preferred route for shorter trips; and

Recommendation 6: Support the recommendation adopted by the MPO to create a POLICY 1.4:

NEW OBJECTIVE 1.4: Rail Corridor. Protect the entire Seminole Gulf rail corridor for future transportation purposes through direct public involvement in its property ownership and/or long-term lease.

NEW POLICY 1.4.1: The Seminole Gulf rail corridor, as shown on Transportation Map 3E and the Future Land Use Map, is hereby designated as a strategic regional transportation corridor. This designation has been recommended by the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization as a means for cities and counties along the rail corridor to recognize the regional nature of this asset and jointly commit to efforts to protect it in its entirety. This designation includes the designation of the rail corridor as a “transportation corridor” pursuant to F.S. 337.273. The following policies implement this designation.

NEW POLICY 1.4.2: Encourage Florida DOT to purchase the real estate interests in the entire rail corridor from Arcadia to north Naples from its current owner, CSX Transportation Inc.

NEW POLICY 1.4.3: Support efforts of the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization to enhance freight capability for the entire rail corridor and to add capability for commuter rail, light rail, or bus rapid transit in Lee County and northern Collier County.

NEW POLICY 1.4.4: Future Land Use Policies 4.1.10 and 4.1.11 demonstrate Lee County’s commitment to transit-oriented development around future stations for commuter rail, light rail, or bus rapid transit.

NEW POLICY 1.4.5: Lee County will formally oppose any attempts at abandonment of the rail corridor before the U.S. Surface Transportation Board, and will support use of federal rails-to-trails authority to railbank the corridor, if abandonment ever succeeds, in order to preserve the corridor for possible future rail service.

Recommendation 7: In POLICY 2.1.2, change dates from 2015, to 2016 to reflect relevant deadlines.

Recommendation 8: Table 1: Transportation Modes for LOS Determination and Priorities: change priority sequence to ‘Pedestrian’ and ‘Transit’ mode priorities. The group also recommends ‘Pedestrian’ and ‘Transit’ be weighed the same (50% and 50%). Staff advised percentages will be added in the Land Development Code.

<u>Land Use Categories</u>	<u>Urban land use categories and mixed-</u>	<u>Suburban and Economic and Job</u>	<u>Rural land use categories</u>
----------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------

	<u>use centers with an adopted regulating plan</u>	<u>Center land use categories</u>	
<u>Mode Priorities (1-4)</u>	<u>1. Transit Pedestrian</u> <u>2. Pedestrian-Transit</u> <u>3. Bicycle</u> <u>4. Motor Vehicle</u>	<u>1. Motor Vehicle</u> <u>2. Transit</u> <u>3. Bicycle</u> <u>4. Pedestrian</u>	<u>1. Motor Vehicle</u> <u>2. Bicycle</u> <u>3. Transit</u> <u>4. Pedestrian</u>

Recommendation 9: In POLICY 2.1.6, add the recommendation from CSAC 2012 review to insert the goals of the alternative multimodal methodology. Below is the proposed language be added [Note: objective description is based on CA recent policy (required by state statute) to replace LOS: "Preliminary evaluation of alternative methods of transportation analysis", Dec. 30, 2013].

POLICY 2.1.6: ~~Until an alternative multimodal methodology is developed in cooperation with the MPO or by 2016, u~~Use the current Highway Capacity Manual and FDOT Quality LOS Handbook and other sanctioned sources such as NATCO's Urban Street Design Guide to calculate levels of service, service volumes, and volume-to-capacity ratios. ~~until an alternative multimodal methodology is developed in cooperation with the MPO or by 2016. The objectives of the alternative methodology are to move to a more comprehensive and multi-modal evaluation of transportation system performance that promotes the development of multimodal transportation networks, diversity of land uses, and reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in anticipation of improved environmental outcomes, fiscal efficiencies, health, and social equity through increased access to destinations. Performance measures are to be developed in collaboration with the Lee County MPO.~~

~~Until the alternative multi-modal methodology is developed, Based on the Handbook,~~ transit mode LOS will be determined based on the average time between scheduled weekday bus stops (headway) and presence of pedestrian facilities. Bicycle mode LOS will be determined based on the characteristics of bicycle facilities and the motor vehicle traffic characteristics. Pedestrian modes LOS will be determined based on the characteristics of pedestrian facilities and the motor vehicle traffic characteristics. The multimodal LOS calculation will be weighted by the numbered priorities listed in Table 1 for the corresponding functional classification and land use category as further specified in the LDC and Administrative Codes. Where designated, the multimodal LOS calculation may also be calculated on an areawide basis.

Recommendation 10: In POLICY 2.2.1 keep consistent with the title of table 2(b) to 'Potential Multimodal Operational Improvements on Constrained Roads'.

POLICY 2.2.1: A ~~Potential Multimodal Operational Improvement Program~~ Potential Multimodal Operational Improvements on Constrained Roads is established for the constrained roads identified in Table 2(a). The program identifies operational and capacity enhancing improvements capable of implementation within the context of a constrained system. Operational and capacity enhancing improvements may include adding transit facilities, bicycle lanes, paved shoulders, sidewalks, and motor vehicle turn lanes. The ~~Potential Multimodal Operational Improvement Program for constrained roads~~ Potential Multimodal Operational Improvements on Constrained Roads is identified in Table 2(b).

Recommendation 11: In POLICY 2.4.6 for consistency with the MPO adopted Bicycle Pedestrian Safety Action Plan and in OBJECTIVE 1.2: Safe Travel System, reinstate the target of zero crash related fatalities:

POLICY 2.4.6: ~~By 2013, d-~~Develop or participate in a pedestrian and bicycle safety action plan to identify and evaluate road corridors, segments and intersections with recurring pedestrian and bicycle ~~accident crash~~ patterns. Identify contributing factors, safety improvements, and transportation practices that would reduce the number and severity of crashes. The target is to reduce bicycle and pedestrian crashes by 20 percent in successive five-year periods, consistent with the Lee MPO adopted vision of a zero-fatality transportation system for pedestrians and bicyclists throughout Lee County.

Recommendation 12: In POLICY 2.4.11 (c) add, 'including proper and timely pruning' to support up-to-date landscape practice and procedures

POLICY 2.4.11: Enhance the multimodal transportation system and consider both roadside and median plantings through landscape practice and procedures adopted as part of the LeeScape Master Plan and LDC. The county's landscape practices and procedure will provide for:

(c) Increased emphasis of roadside landscape development and maintenance, including proper and timely pruning, in urban, suburban, and mixed-use areas;

Recommendation 13: In POLICY 3.2.5, reinstate previous CSAC recommendation from 2012 to, 'Review/analyze existing CIP projects for the new vision and complete streets.'

POLICY 3.2.5: Establish a capital improvements program (CIP) that assists in the budgeting and implementation of transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and motor vehicle improvement projects, consistent with the new transportation paradigm envisioned in the complete street concept. CIP priorities will be analyzed, reviewed and determined based upon input received from advisory committees, stakeholders, and interdepartmental staff based upon the project ability to improve the overall function of the county's transportation system and to:

Recommendation 14: In POLICY 3.2.10, use the phrase in Policy 3.2.9 throughout: "implement an effective and fair system of mobility fees, impact fees or similar mechanisms" for consistency.

POLICY 3.2.10: ~~Roadway and intersection~~ **Mobility** improvements mandated by development orders will be determined on the basis of demonstrated need resulting in part or in total from the impacts of that development. These improvements will be based on ~~roadway and intersection~~ mobility needs improvement needs resulting from new development and will not be limited by jurisdictional responsibility ~~for specific road segments.~~ The use of Road Impact Fee revenues, An acceptable application of funds from mobility fees, impact fees or similar mechanisms will be used to improve state roads, ~~is an acceptable application of those funds.~~

Recommendation 15: In POLICY 3.2.13, include an evaluation of a tiered fee structure program.

POLICY 3.2.13: Review on a regular basis and update all user fee revenue sources, such as tolls, ~~mobility fees~~, and roads impact fees. As an alternative to roads impact fees, evaluate a mobility fee structure, including a mobility plan, by the year 2016. Include an evaluation of reduction in fees to Evaluate a tiered fee structure program to provide incentives for urban redevelopment. Adopt the programs that reflect travel characteristics, construction and right-of-way costs. Determine if capital

impacts and maintenance costs are met by the fees and if the fees are economically sustainable and applied fairly.

Recommendation 16: In POLICY 3.3.1 include ‘green infrastructure’ as an innovative design and technology, and add, ‘co-use of community amenities for storm water management’.

Additionally, the Committee recommends the term, ‘Green Infrastructure’ be defined in the glossary. This also supports and allows for collaboration between DOT and Natural Resources.

POLICY 3.3.1: Develop and maintain an environmentally sensitive transportation system including consideration of the following practices:

(c.) Transportation infrastructure that utilizes sustainable or recycled materials, uses innovative design ~~techniques and~~ technologies, such as Green Infrastructure, stormwater areas as community amenities, and co-use of community amenities for stormwater management; and energy efficient components such as street lighting, traffic signals, and roundabouts;

Recommendation 17: In POLICY 3.4.4, consistent with comments in #14 above, change the wording as follows:

POLICY 3.4.4: Encourage municipalities to maintain ~~the use of a roads impact fee~~, road impact fee, mobility fee, or similar ~~program mechanisms, or~~ to participate in the county's program.

Recommendation 18: In POLICY 4.3.3, reinstate former language suggested by CSAC in 2012, to add multi-modal access:

POLICY 4.3.3: The Port Authority will continue to expand existing and proposed aviation facilities such as the terminal building, airport aprons, cargo facilities, roadways and parking, and expand multi-modal access, in order to meet the forecasted demand.

Communities Element

Recommendation 1: The new policy 1.2.2 is a fundamental shift away from Lee County’s previous responsibility to provide documents to a document clearinghouse. Further, for those communities that do have the capacity to search for documents, it places an unfair burden on the community. In addition, those communities that do not have a public library are even further disadvantaged, such as North Captiva.

POLICY 1.2.2: ~~The communities listed below will~~ Lee County will work with the following communities to establish an online document clearinghouse in their community, where copies of selected zoning submittal documents, staff reports, Hearing Examiner recommendations, and resolutions will be provided for public inspection. The county’s failure to provide or to timely provide documents to the online document clearing house, or failure of the online document clearing house to receive documents, will not constitute a defect in notice or bar a public hearing from occurring as scheduled.

These communities are: Boca Grande, Caloosahatchee Shores, Captiva, North Captiva, Estero, North Olga, and North Fort Myers. (New Policy)

Recommendation 2: In POLICY 19.5.7, support the ‘Community Alternative Language’ listed below:

Community Alternative Language: POLICY 19.5.7 Lee County will work with the communities along Ortiz Avenue to implement an improved 2 lane cross section of Ortiz north of Ballard to Palm Beach Boulevard that is designed as a “complete street” with sidewalks and bike lanes, pedestrian crossings, transit pull out areas and parallel parking. Ortiz Avenue north from Ballard to Palm Beach Boulevard will be designed for safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access. In the future, Ortiz Avenue north of Ballard may only be widened to a maximum of three lanes.

Recommendation 3: In POLICY 19.5.8, support the ‘Community Alternative Language’ listed below:

Community Alternative Language: POLICY 19.5.8 The Tice community will work with Lee County to evaluate, design and build a greenway on the west side of Ortiz Avenue. The greenway should include a bioswale detention system and should also include shade trees, a meandering multiuse path, benches and other outdoor furniture and displays to highlight and improve the character of the area.

Recommendation 4: Add new policy: POLICY 19.5.XX

19.5.XX: Lee County will work with the Tice Historic Community to accommodate circulation throughout the planning area by expanding a grid network of interconnected streets. These streets include Palm Beach Boulevard, Ortiz Avenue, Tice Street, Lexington Avenue, Miramar Road, and Nuna Avenue as well as neighborhood connectors between the Alabama Groves, Russell Park, and Morse Shores consistent with Map XXX.

Community Safety & Wellbeing

The Committee recommends accepting the changes written by staff.

2-19-2014
RPA

Transportation

It is the intent of the updated Lee Plan Transportation Element to: (1) address travel modes throughout the county by providing for the needs of all users and modes including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and drivers; (2) address principles and standards for complete streets and context-sensitive design and form of roadways and multi-modal facilities; (3) support a strong economy through an intermodal system that allows for the effective movement of goods via roadway, air, rail, or water; (4) connects transportation needs and demands to other plan elements in order to promote more compact patterns of development and increased connectivity; and (5) conserve energy through efficient transportation practices.

GOAL 1: MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION. Provide for a comprehensive multimodal transportation system that ~~efficiently transports~~ moves people and goods ~~through and within the county via a variety of~~ with safe and interconnected transportation options.

OBJECTIVE 1.1: Land Use - Transportation Connections. Develop a system that provides pedestrian pathways, bikeways, transit routes and facilities, and roadways to connect a variety of places and meet the diverse needs of all community members, business people, and visitors.

POLICY 1.1.1: By the year 2035, establish a multimodal transportation infrastructure system in support of the development of mixed-use ~~places-centers~~ and urban, suburban, and rural communities.

POLICY 1.1.2: Encourage development practices that promote walkable communities, transit-oriented development, and active living, improve accessibility to amenities and vital services, and connect people to activity centers.

POLICY 1.1.3: Create safe, affordable, accessible mobility and physical activity opportunities for all people by promoting the integration of land uses that encourage people to walk, ride bikes, and use transit as part of their daily routines. A target for the total bike and walk percentage of trips to work is 5 percent. A target for the total bike, walk and transit percentage of trips to work is 25 percent by:

- a. Prioritizing the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders in areas where ~~the county desires to promote~~ walkable communities are desired;
- b. Implementing pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities where shops, services, employment centers, parks, public facilities, and civic areas are within a ¼ mile of residential neighborhoods; and
- c. ~~Reducing~~ Evaluate the size number of motor vehicle lanes, lane widths and operating speeds of streets in urban and mixed-use areas.
- d. Adding ten to twenty miles of bicycle and pedestrian facilities per year.

POLICY 1.1.4: Improve access and use of transit services to increase the annual unlinked passenger trips from 3,000,000 recorded in FY 2011 to 5,000,000 by 2025 through:

- a. Transit service accessibility for all—particularly youth, elderly, persons with disabilities, disadvantaged populations, and residents with special needs;
- b. Improved transit services ~~that decrease and~~ headways ~~on designated routes~~, improve connections within the system, and promote intermodal opportunities;
- c. Bus rapid transit routes to link higher ~~density and intensity~~ trip generators, mixed-use, and transit oriented developments;
- d. Strategically located park-and-ride facilities;
- e. Passenger incentives through local businesses, ~~discount coupons~~, and employer funded programs;
- f. Technology, internet service, and mobile internet tools that disseminate information about transit scheduling and service;
- g. Education and advertising campaigns targeted to community members and businesses that promote transit as a cost-effective and efficient transportation alternative; and
- h. Provision of inter-county transit services, in collaboration with adjacent counties.
- i. Improved transit premium service facilities such as bus rapid transit, queue jumps, exclusive bus lanes, high occupancy vehicle lanes, or signal priority for transit vehicles;
- j. Automated vehicle location systems on transit vehicles, including real-time arrival signage, and information kiosks at transfer facilities and human service agencies;

POLICY 1.1.5: Utilize transportation demand management (TDM) strategies that further reduce or redistribute single occupancy vehicle demand as measured by the drive alone percentage of journey to work. A target is to reduce the drive alone percentage to 70 percent by 2020 and 60 percent by 2035. Strategies include:

- a. Signing, marking, and other design improvements to increase awareness that roadways operate as shared bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities;
- b. Automatic detection and bike boxes at traffic signals that improve pedestrian and bicycle crossing;
- c. Pedestrian facility improvements in urban areas such as mid-block crossings;
- d. Ride sharing programs such as carpooling, vanpooling, multiple occupancy vehicle lanes, designated parking spaces, and other techniques;
- e. Employer-based incentives and programs to increase the use of TDM strategies in place of single-occupant motor vehicle travel;
- f. Park-and-ride or commuter lots;
- g. Variable work hours and teleworking; and
- h. Motor vehicle parking, tolls and congestion pricing.

In this objective some changes were made based on CSAC and Horizon Council comments. Changes were made to reflect CSAC comments on Goal 1, “reflect mobility & accessibility”; Objective 1.1 “Identify mode shift parameters/goals.” and “Add accessibility and utilization”; Policy 1.1.3.c “Clarify “size.”; Policy 1.1.4.a “Clarify or delete “on designated routes.”; and Policy 1.1.4.c “Replace “Density and Intensities” with “Trip generators””. Changes were not

made to Policy 1.1.4(g) to reflect the CSAC comment to add “budgeting for education, marketing and advertising”. Staff recommends that specific budget items are not part of a plan policy. Budgeting is part of the CIP which is another component of the plan. Policy 1.1.5 was added to split TDM strategies moved from TDM strategies in Policy 1.2.4. The TDM strategies also reflect the Horizon Council comments to incentivize urban redevelopment by “improvements to mass transit”.

OBJECTIVE 1.2: Safe Travel System. Protect the health, safety, and welfare of all users of the transportation system. Provide an efficient system through best practices, effective traffic regulations, public education, and other methods to create a culture of safe travel. The target is to have zero crash related fatalities.

POLICY 1.2.1: Consider the diverse needs, demands, and safety concerns of system users when conducting transportation planning and engineering studies. Balance concerns and conflicts to achieve an effective and efficient multimodal transportation system through:

- a. Facilities based on location and needs in mixed-use, urban, suburban, and rural areas;
- b. Safe bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities which may include lighting, landscaping, and shade, preferred or exclusive use lanes, and traffic calming;
- c. Block size and connectivity; and
- d. Meeting the needs of a multi-generational community and providing accessibility for persons with disabilities.

POLICY 1.2.2: Maximize safety, capacity, and operational ability of all modes of travel along county-maintained roadways through the enforcement of traffic control; motor vehicle access control to private property; and reallocation of right-of-way to increase transit, bicycle, and pedestrian use.

POLICY 1.2.3: Maintain a Transportation System Management (TSM) program to identify high-hazard crash locations as well as structural and non-structural improvements that would mitigate hazards.

POLICY 1.2.4: Utilize TSM and ~~transportation demand management (TDM)~~ strategies that promote better utilization of the county’s transportation resources (roadways, pedestrian pathways, bikeways, transit services, air facilities, railways, and ports) and allow for better movement of people and goods. Strategies include:

- a. Traffic signal progression programs (including synchronization);
- b. ~~Improved transit premium service facilities such as exclusive bus lanes, high occupancy vehicle lanes, or signal priority for transit vehicles;~~
- c. ~~Implement automated vehicle location systems on transit vehicles, including real-time arrival signage, and information kiosks at transfer facilities and human service agencies;~~
- d. Monitoring and improving signals, signs, street lighting, and lane markings for all users on all roadways;
- e. Restricting Appropriate spacing of median cuts and driveways in accordance with standards established in land development regulations;
- f. Adequately funding maintenance programs;

Formatted: Strikethrough

- g. Maintaining existing highway facilities or reconstruction of existing intersections including the use of roundabouts, ~~where feasible~~;
- h. Development of a traffic signal system that improves transit route efficiency;
- i. ~~Signing, marking, and other design improvements to increase awareness that roadways operate as shared bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities;~~
- j. ~~Automatic detection and bike boxes at traffic signals that improve pedestrian and bicycle crossing;~~
- k. ~~Pedestrian facility improvements in urban areas such as mid-block crossings;~~
- l. ~~Ride sharing programs such as carpooling, vanpooling, multiple occupancy vehicle lanes, designated parking spaces, and other techniques;~~
- m. ~~Employer-based incentives and programs to increase the use of TDM strategies in place of single-occupant motor vehicle travel;~~
- n. ~~Park-and-ride or commuter lots;~~
- o. ~~Variable work hours and teleworking; and~~
- i. Parking and road pricing.

POLICY 1.2.5: Ensure the county's transportation system is able to efficiently respond to the evacuation and emergency transportation needs of the community during an emergency event through:

- a. Development and maintenance of special roadway signalization, direction, and clearing plan;
- b. Establishment of alternative emergency routes;
- c. Coordination of evacuation planning and response with the county's emergency management, policy, and fire services; and
- d. Designated transit stop and shelters to ensure efficient evacuation of the transit dependent population.

In this objective some changes were made based on CSAC comments. Staff recommends that adding a reference to ADA based on the CSAC comment on Policy 1.2.1.d., "ADA Specific ADA reference?" is not necessary since ADA is part of the Federal law. However, the phrase "providing accessibility was added to address the comment "Review to ensure accessibility is covered and addressed". In (Policy 1.2.4) "Move to Objective 1.1. Separate policies for TSM and for TDM, include transit. Clarify what road pricing means." In this draft, the reference to road pricing was deleted and the related language changed to "congestion pricing" in Policy 1.1.5(h).

OBJECTIVE 1.3: Intermodal Transportation System. Promote a diverse regional economy by developing and maintaining a coordinated system of intermodal roadways, railways, aviation facilities, and ports to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of commerce.

POLICY 1.3.1: Facilitate the development of economic and employment centers by locating industrial, research, and logistic based land uses (e.g.: warehouses, cargo handling facilities, and transfer/break of bulk points) in close proximity to railways, roadway interchanges, sea ports, and aviation facilities.

POLICY 1.3.2: Ensure access routes to roadways, railways, aviation facilities, and ports are properly integrated with other means of transportation by working to make certain that those facilities are managed in close cooperation with one another as well as other public transportation related service providers such as the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), West Coast Inland Navigation District, Army Corps of Engineers, and others.

POLICY 1.3.3: Foster the development of a strong logistic, freight, and transportation business sector through:

- a. Location of intermodal facilities close to major transportation facilities—e.g.: rail lines, airport facilities, and ports;
- b. Encouragement of private investors to develop and use rail, roadway, aviation, and port freight facilities by promoting expansion and maintenance of existing facilities;
- c. Maintain and improve Lee County's rail link, interstate connectors, aviation facilities, and ports; and
- d. Coordinated intermodal transportation management programs for surface water, rail, roadway, and air transportation.

POLICY 1.3.4: Support economic land uses [comment: does the term "economic land uses" need to be defined? by requiring development proposals to demonstrate compatibility with existing or proposed ports, aviation, rail and other commodity movement facilities and suggest mitigation measures for potential adverse impacts during the rezoning and DRI process.

POLICY 1.3.5: Encourage discussions between the Florida High Speed Rail Commission and local groups on the location of high speed rail facilities in the county.

POLICY 1.3.6: Maximize through capacity of principal arterials—~~(limited access facilities, expressways, controlled access facilities, and designated truck routes)~~ outside of designated mixed-use centers using the following measures:

- a. Design limited access facilities, expressways, controlled access facilities, State Highways, and designated truck routes ~~with identifying~~ heavy trucks (as defined in by Florida statute) as the design vehicle;
- b. Promote terminal transfer points to support Economic and Job Center Land Use Categories at Luckett Road, Daniels Parkway, and Alico Road;
- c. Regulate access in accordance with standards adopted through land development regulations to the extent permitted by state law;
- d. Provide sufficient distance between land access and expressway/freeway interchanges;
- e. Synchronize and space signalized intersections on arterials and collectors for efficient traffic signal operation;
- f. Prohibit on-street parking;

Formatted: Strikethrough

- g. Develop a connected transportation network of streets, access or frontage roads with wayfinding signage, transit, and dedicated and separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities to provide system capacity and a preferred route for shorter trips; and
- h. Require access to meet forecasted use needs, including turn lanes, acceleration and deceleration lanes, and funding for future signalization.

POLICY 1.3.7: Monitor the maintenance of support facility and service systems of existing ports through:

- a. Coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on the timing of maintenance dredging on federally maintained channels;
- b. Assessment of the possibility of instituting a private channel maintenance assessment on properties benefiting from the channels; and
- c. Examination of dredging needs on a rotating five year cycle beginning in 2013.

POLICY 1.3.8: Private ports, in cooperation with the U.S. Coast Guard and the state, will be prepared to contain spills of petroleum and other toxic materials. Petroleum ports will have containment devices on site. Evaluate the adequacy of proposed containment measures during the rezoning or DRI process.

In this objective changes were made based on CSAC comments on Policy 1.3.6. "How do we identify designated truck routes, did staff consider the research diamond?" Principal arterials definition by FHWA includes limited access and expressways, not all controlled access arterials are designated as principal arterials. There are currently no designated truck routes in Lee County. In the research diamond comment, I-75 is limited access, Daniels Parkway, Ben Hill Griffin Parkway and Treeline Avenue from Alico Road to Daniels are controlled access. Since the other routes in the research diamond are included based on functional classification, Alico Road is identified in 1.3.6.b. relating to Economic and Job Center Land Use categories in Policy 1.3.6.b. Currently, truck routes are part of the maps and studies created by the MPO, which includes Alico Road. AC-11-3 is anticipated to be the appropriate tool for truck route designation and may need to be amended.

GOAL 2: TRANSPORTATION STANDARDS AND ~~REGULATORY~~ FRAMEWORK

Establish and maintain specified transportation multimodal level of service (LOS) standards and ~~regulatory~~ framework, including non-regulatory LOS standards, land development regulations, and transportation maps, to optimize quality of life and to ensure that transportation infrastructure will be available for the existing and planned population. LOS standards established pursuant to this Goal are non-regulatory, and compliance with these standards is not a requirement or consideration for development permitting, including rezoning. [Comment: This clarification was a very important part of one of the Horizon Council's adopted policy recommendations.]

OBJECTIVE 2.1: General Standards. Establish non-regulatory multimodal LOS standards on county and state transportation facilities within Lee County. Cooperate with

municipalities on the facilities maintained by Lee County within the municipalities and with FDOT on state transportation facilities.

POLICY 2.1.1: LOS “E” is the minimum acceptable LOS for principal and minor arterials, and major collectors on county-maintained transportation facilities. Level of service standards for the State Highway System during peak travel hours are “D” in urbanized areas and “C” outside urbanized areas. Meeting the standard will be determined in an inventory of county-maintained arterials and major collectors. The LOS determination will be reported in an inventory through an ~~assessment~~ evaluation of all transportation modes including transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and motor vehicle. [Comment: The following sentences were NOT a part of the draft element that the Horizon Council reviewed and are troubling. They are essentially non-regulatory regulatory LOS requirements. It is unclear how these requirements will be applied at zoning and DO stages, and they shift to the private sector the responsibility for monitoring and reporting. For how long? To what extent? At what cost? The responsibility for site-related improvements is already established in the Plan and LDRs. I would suggest that the following two sentences be deleted.]Land development regulations for private development may include non-regulatory LOS reporting requirements for monitoring, planning and capital improvement processes. Land Development Regulations may require site-related improvements based on LOS analysis. ~~The minimum acceptable LOS on Pine Island Road between Burnt Store Road and Stringfellow Road is “D” on annual average peak hour and “E” on a peak season, peak hour basis.~~

POLICY 2.1.2: The measurement of LOS will be based on the priority of travel modes indicated in Table 1 based on the transportation facility functional classification and whether the street-corridor, segment or intersection is identified in a land use category on the Future Land Use Map ~~as a mixed-use, urban, economic and job center, suburban, or rural area.~~ By 2015, evaluate an alternative multimodal level of service LOS methodology that relies primarily on non-vehicular modes of transportation in designated areas in cooperation with the MPO as part of the Long Range Transportation Plan Update.

Table 1: Transportation Modes for LOS Determination and Priorities

	Mixed-Use centers with an adopted regulating plan	Urban land use categories	Suburban and Economic Development land use categories	Rural land use categories
Principal Arterials (Interstate, Limited Access, Expressway)	Transit Motor Vehicle	Transit Motor Vehicle	Transit Motor Vehicle	Motor Vehicle
Principal	Transit	Transit	Transit	Motor Vehicle

Arterials (State Roads, BoCC Controlled Access)	Motor Vehicle Pedestrian Bicycle	Motor Vehicle	Motor Vehicle	
Minor Arterials	Transit Pedestrian Bicycle Motor Vehicle	Transit Pedestrian Bicycle Motor Vehicle	Transit Motor Vehicle Bicycle Pedestrian	Motor Vehicle
Major Collector	Transit Pedestrian Bicycle Motor Vehicle	Transit Pedestrian Bicycle Motor Vehicle	Bicycle Transit Motor Vehicle Pedestrian	Motor Vehicle
Minor Collector	Transit Pedestrian Bicycle Motor Vehicle	Pedestrian Bicycle Motor Vehicle	Bicycle Pedestrian Motor Vehicle	Motor Vehicle
Local Street	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Deleted: ¶
¶

Table 1: Transportation Modes for LOS Determination and Priorities

[Comment: The table below was not included in the draft element that the Horizon Council reviewed. I am not sure how the "priority" preferences are to be applied for LOS. Does the priority affect funding priorities for improvements in any way? If so, the priority assigned to motor vehicle in the Urban land category may merit discussion.]

Land Use Categories	Urban land use categories and mixed-use centers with an adopted regulating plan	Suburban and Economic and Job Center land use categories	Rural land use categories
Mode Priorities (1-4)	1. Transit 2. Pedestrian 3. Bicycle 4. Motor Vehicle	1. Motor Vehicle 2. Transit 3. Bicycle 4. Pedestrian	1. Motor Vehicle 2. Bicycle 3. Transit 4. Pedestrian

- (1) The motor vehicle mode will have first priority and transit will have second priority on Interstate 75 and limited access arterials where bicycles and pedestrians are prohibited

POLICY 2.1.3: The measurement of LOS For for the motor vehicle mode will continue to be determined by motor vehicle traffic volumes on the transportation facility on an interim basis until (an alternative multimodal methodology is developed in cooperation with the MPO or by) 2016,. Motor vehicle traffic volumes will be measured based on the

peak season, peak hour, peak direction condition of the transportation facility. The peak season, peak hour, peak direction condition will be defined as the 100th highest volume hour of the year in the predominant traffic flow direction. The 100th highest hour approximates the typical peak hour during the peak season. Peak season, peak hour, peak direction conditions will be calculated using K-100 factors and "D" factors from the county permanent traffic count station identified by Lee County Department of Transportation (LCDOT). The motor vehicle mode LOS calculation will be one component of the multimodal LOS calculation as further defined in the LDC and Administrative Code. [In this Policy and in Policy 2.1.6 below, I am uncertain what happens if 2016 rolls around and there is not an alternate methodology developed with the MPO.]

POLICY 2.1.4: Develop multimodal link-specific service volumes (capacities) for arterials and major collector roadways based on specific conditions, for determination of the motor vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian LOS of transportation facilities. These link-specific service volumes are only for short-term analyses (five years or less, as measured from the date of the last update of those service volumes). Develop generalized service volumes for future year analyses. LCDOT will be responsible for maintaining up to date service volumes. Preparers of Traffic Impact Statements for DRIs, rezonings, development orders, and other transportation analyses must use the service volumes, recommended by LCDOT.

POLICY 2.1.5: Maintain permanent and periodic traffic count program, and collection of transit, bicycle and pedestrian data, on county arterials and collectors in Lee County. Use data developed by FDOT for state highways, as the basis for determining existing transportation facility conditions.

POLICY 2.1.6: [See earlier comment under Policy 2.1.3] Until an alternative multimodal methodology is developed in cooperation with the MPO or by 2016, use the current Highway Capacity Manual and FDOT Quality LOS Handbook to calculate levels of service, service volumes, and volume-to-capacity ratios. Based on the Handbook, transit mode LOS will be determined based on the average time between scheduled weekday bus stops (headway) and presence of pedestrian facilities. Bicycle mode LOS will be determined based on the characteristics of bicycle facilities and the motor vehicle traffic characteristics. Pedestrian modes LOS will be determined based on the characteristics of pedestrian facilities and the motor vehicle traffic characteristics. The multimodal LOS calculation will be weighted by the numbered priorities listed in Table 1 for the corresponding functional classification and land use category as further specified in the LDC and Administrative Codes. Where designated, the multimodal LOS calculation may also be calculated on an areawide basis.

POLICY 2.1.7: Base connection separation standards on the functional classification of the transportation facility, mode of transportation, ~~the community context~~ and the land use categories abutting the transportation facility. Outline the standards for connection separation in the LDC. Designate by Board action, certain roadways in the LDC as

“controlled access,” to which permanent access points are restricted to locations established and set by a specific access plan adopted by the Board by resolution.

POLICY 2.1.8: Maintain motor vehicle connection separation standards, using a combination of the following: through streets, access roads, multimodal interconnections between developments, cross-access easements, reverse access, access from a lower functional classification/rear or side street and other methods. Specify these methods and exceptions hereto in the Land Development Code (LDC). Maintain an Access Road Location Map to identify where access streets are the preferred method of maintaining the connection separation standards. Public and through street connections will be given preference over private driveways in order to develop networks with a block size of 660 feet or less as indicated in Mixed-Use centers adopted regulating plans and with a block size of 660 feet or less in Urban areas and use categories.

TRANSPORTATION CONCURRENCY OPTION

~~If transportation concurrency is not retained, as recommended by staff, the following objectives and policies in italics should not be transmitted. If transportation concurrency is retained the objectives and policies in italics below should be transmitted and the remaining objectives and policies in Goal 2 will be renumbered accordingly.~~

~~**OBJECTIVE 2.2:** *Transportation Concurrency Management System. Utilize a transportation concurrency management system consistent with the requirements of Chapter 163.3180(5), F.S.*~~

~~**POLICY 2.2.1:** *Identify facilities in the Capital Improvements Element that are necessary to meet adopted levels of service during a five year period.*~~

~~**POLICY 2.2.2:** *Consult with FDOT when proposed plan amendments affect facilities on the strategic intermodal system.*~~

~~**POLICY 2.2.3:** *Exempt public transit facilities from concurrency. For the purposes of this subparagraph, public transit facilities include transit stations and terminals; transit station parking; park and ride lots; intermodal public transit connection or transfer facilities; fixed bus, guideway, and rail stations; and airport passenger terminals and concourses, air cargo facilities, and hangars for the assembly, manufacture, maintenance, or storage of aircraft. The terms “terminals” and “transit facilities” do not include seaports or commercial or residential development constructed in conjunction with a public transit facility.*~~

~~**POLICY 2.2.4:** *Allow developments of regional impact development orders, rezonings, or other land use development permits to satisfy the transportation concurrency when applicable, if it a proportionate share contribution is provided consistent with Objective 3.5.*~~

~~**POLICY 2.2.5:** Lee County will measure concurrency on all roads on a roadway segment by segment basis, except for constrained roads or where alternatives are established pursuant to this Objective and Chapter 163.3180, F.S. Transportation concurrency for Pine Island will be governed by the policies under Objective 14.2 of this comprehensive plan.~~

~~**POLICY 2.2.6:** Identify roadway conditions and available capacity on major roadways as part of an annual concurrency management report. The report will identify existing and projected LOS. Existing LOS will be determined based on the most recent available data. Projected levels of service will include estimated increases in motor vehicle traffic volume, changes in transit service, programmed transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and motor vehicle transportation facility improvements and approved, but unbuilt, development during a five year period.~~

~~**POLICY 2.2.7:** All proposed development activity (local development order requests), except activity that affects constrained transportation facilities and transportation facilities subject to concurrency alternatives, will be reviewed against the available capacity identified in the annual concurrency report based on existing conditions and for a five year period. If capacity is available no further analysis is required, otherwise a proportionate share contribution must be calculated based consistent with the formula in 163.3180(5)(h)(3), c(II)(A) in order for a concurrency certificate to be issued.~~

~~**OBJECTIVE 2.3: Transportation Concurrency Alternatives.** Pursue the adoption of an areawide LOS not dependent on any single road segment function consistent with the requirements of Chapter 163.3180, F.S..~~

~~**POLICY 2.3.1:** Explore the development of policy guidelines and techniques to address potential negative impacts on future development:~~

- ~~1. In urban infill and redevelopment, and urban service areas.~~
- ~~2. With special part time demands on the transportation system.~~
- ~~3. With de minimis impacts.~~
- ~~4. On community desired types of development, such as redevelopment, or job creation projects.~~

~~**POLICY 2.3.2:** Explore the use of tools and techniques to complement the application of transportation concurrency such as:~~

- ~~1. Adoption of long-term strategies to facilitate development patterns that support multimodal solutions, including urban design, land use mixes, intensity and density.~~
- ~~2. Adoption of an areawide LOS not dependent on the function of a single road segment.~~
- ~~3. Exempting or discounting impacts of locally desired development, such as development in urban areas, redevelopment, job creation, and mixed use.~~
- ~~4. Assigning secondary priority to vehicle mobility and primary priority to ensuring a safe, comfortable, and attractive pedestrian environment, with convenient interconnection to transit.~~

- ~~5. Establishing multimodal LOS standards that rely primarily on non-vehicular modes of transportation where existing or planned community design will provide adequate levels of mobility.~~
- ~~6. Reducing impact fees or local access fees to promote development within urban areas, multimodal transportation districts, and a balance of mixed-use development in certain areas or districts.~~

~~**POLICY 2.3.3:** Coordinate with adjacent local governments for the purpose of using common methodologies for measuring impacts for transportation facilities.~~

~~**POLICY 2.3.4:** Based on the Mixed Use Places and Urban Core, Central Places and Village Centers identified on Map __, investigate the creation of areawide LOS or multimodal transportation districts by 2017.~~

~~**POLICY 2.3.5:** Grant concurrency vesting (i.e., a long-term concurrency certificate) to DRIs under limited circumstances, including up to a 10-year time limitation, a limitation on changes to the DRI development parameters over time, and the execution of a local government development agreement where developers agree to pay the proportionate share/impact fee obligation up front.~~

~~**POLICY 2.3.6:** Lee County will continue to explore an area-wide LOS transportation concurrency approach for areas identified on Map 1 as Mixed Use, Urban and along existing or planned transit routes identified on Map 3C.~~

~~**OBJECTIVE 2.4: Proportionate Fair Share Program.** Implement a Transportation Proportionate Fair Share Program by 2013, consistent with the requirements of Subsection 163.3180(5)(h)(3), F.S., that provides a method by which the impacts of development on transportation facilities can be mitigated by the cooperative efforts of the public and private sectors.~~

~~**POLICY 2.4.1:** Allow applicants of DRI development orders, rezonings, or other land use development permits to satisfy the transportation concurrency requirements of the local comprehensive plan, the local government's concurrency management system, and F.S. 380.06, when applicable, if:~~

- ~~a. The applicant enters into a binding agreement to pay for or construct the proportionate share of required improvements.~~
- ~~b. The proportionate share contribution or construction is sufficient to accomplish one or more mobility improvements that benefits a regionally significant transportation facility.~~
- ~~c. (1) The landowner will be assessed a proportionate share of the cost of providing the transportation facilities necessary to serve the proposed development. Applicant's are not responsible for the additional cost of reducing or eliminating deficiencies.~~

~~(H) An applicant will not be required to pay or construct transportation facilities whose costs are greater than a development's proportionate share of the improvements necessary to mitigate the development's impacts.~~

~~(A) The proportionate share contribution will be calculated based upon the number of trips from the proposed development expected to reach roadways during the peak hour from the stage or phase to be approved, divided by the change in the peak hour maximum service volume of roadways resulting from construction of an improvement necessary to maintain or achieve the adopted LOS, multiplied by the construction cost, at the time of development payment, of the improvement necessary to maintain or achieve the adopted LOS.~~

~~(B) In using the proportionate share formula provided in this subparagraph, the traffic analysis must identify the roads or facilities that have a transportation deficiency as defined in the glossary. The proportionate share formula in this subparagraph will be applied only to those facilities determined to be significantly impacted by the project traffic under review. If any road is determined to be deficient without the project traffic under review, the costs of correcting that deficiency will be removed from the proportionate share calculation and the necessary transportation improvements to correct the deficiency will be considered in place for purposes of the proportionate share calculation. The improvement necessary to correct the transportation deficiency will be the funding responsibility of the entity that has maintenance responsibility for the facility. The development's proportionate share will be calculated only for the needed transportation improvements that are greater than the identified deficiency.~~

~~(C) When the provisions of this subparagraph have been satisfied for a particular stage or phase of development, all transportation impacts from that stage or phase for which mitigation was required and provided will be deemed fully mitigated in the transportation analysis for a subsequent stages or phases of development. Trips from previous stages or phases that did not result in impacts for which mitigation was required or provided may be cumulatively analyzed with trips from a subsequent stages or phases to determine whether an impact requires mitigation for the subsequent stage or phase.~~

~~(D) In projecting the number of trips to be generated by the development under review, any trips assigned to a toll financed facility will be eliminated from the analysis.~~

~~(E) The applicant will receive a credit on a dollar for dollar basis for impact fees, mobility fees, and other transportation concurrency mitigation requirements paid or payable in the future for the project. The credit shall be reduced up to 20 percent by the percentage share that the project's traffic represents of the added capacity of the selected improvement, or by the amount specified by the LDC, whichever yields the greater credit.~~

~~**POLICY 2.4.2:** The Proportionate Fair Share Program does not apply until a deficiency has been identified through the County's Concurrency Report.~~

~~**POLICY 2.4.3:** Amend the LDC to include methodologies for the calculation of proportionate fair share contributions to enable developers to satisfy transportation concurrency requirements.~~

~~**POLICY 2.4.4:** Annually review and update, as necessary, the Capital Improvement Element to reflect proportionate fair share contributions received pursuant to the program.~~

~~**TRANSPORTATION CONCURRENCY OPTION—END**~~

In this objective, changes were made based on the following comments. LPA commented to clarify development regulation levels and applicability to concurrency and enhance coordination with the MPO and FDOT on level of service. CSAC commented to base multimodal level of service on a existing model in another jurisdiction (the City of Jacksonville mode priorities by area), general recommendations to eliminate the transportation concurrency option and outline a joint county-MPO process to develop transportation performance standards and a mobility plan. Horizon Council comment to eliminate transportation regulatory level of service and concurrency. CSAC also had a general recommendation to remove or amend this objective and articulate goals for a replacement approach. Staff does not agree with removing this objective. FS 163.3177(3)(a)(3) requires level of service standards for public facilities. The staff recommended language provides for an interim use of the transportation multimodal level of service consistent with current guidance and similar to systems currently in use by Pasco County, the City of Jacksonville and Gainesville while a replacement approach can be developed in coordination with the MPO and FDOT.

OBJECTIVE 2.2: Constrained Roads. Certain roadway segments will be deemed “constrained” due to scenic, historic, environmental, aesthetic, and right-of-way characteristics and considerations and will not be widened to increase motor vehicle capacity. Reduced motor vehicle peak hour LOS will be accepted on those constrained roads as a trade-off for the preservation of the scenic, historic, environmental, and aesthetic character of the community. Constrained roads are identified in Table 2(a).

POLICY 2.2.1: ~~An~~ A Potential Multimodal Operational Improvement Program is established for the constrained roads identified in Table 2(a). The program identifies operational and capacity enhancing improvements capable of implementation within the context of a constrained system. Operational and capacity enhancing improvements may include adding transit facilities, bicycle lanes, paved shoulders, sidewalks, and motor vehicle turn lanes. The Potential Multimodal Operational Improvement Program for constrained roads is identified in Table 2(b).

POLICY 2.2.2: Develop a list of deficient roadways identifying roadway segments (transportation facilities) existing or projected to operate below the adopted LOS.

In this objective, the referenced Tables 2(a) and 2(b) were not part of the changes presented in the 20-12/2013 review. The tables have been updated to add road segments and identify options for each transportation mode. Staff recommends changing the title of Table 2b as noted.

OBJECTIVE 2.3: Transportation Maps. Maintain and implement an integrated series of maps that provide a graphical depiction of the policies and programs for transportation facilities in this plan.

POLICY 2.3.1: Review the adopted Transportation Map Series every two years, and amend maps as necessary.

POLICY 2.3.2: Construction of new and improved transportation facilities will be based on a prioritized list of the improvements needed to create the network depicted in the Transportation Map series. Develop and update the list annually consistent with the policies in Capital Improvements Program.

POLICY 2.3.3: Incorporate by reference, the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan Map (LRTP), Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP) series, and FDOT Transportation Plan, as most recently amended, into the Lee Plan. The current adopted version of the following LRTP and BPMP Maps are included in this plan:

Deleted: and

- a. The Transit Needs Network (LRTP Figure 8-1);
- b. The Cost Feasible Transit Network (LRTP Figure 12-4);
- c. Lee County Highway Needs Plan (LRTP Figure 10-1);
- d. The Cost Feasible Needs Network (LRTP Figure 12-3, most recently amended);
- e. The Feasible Pathways Network (LRTP Figure 12-5);
- f. Primary Network Needs Map (BPMP Exhibit WW);
- g. Secondary Network Needs Map (BPMP Exhibit ~~WWXX~~);
- h. Pedestrian Priority Needs Map (BPMP Exhibit ZZ);
- i. Bicycle Priority Needs Map (BPMP Exhibit AAA); and
- j. Prioritized Needs Plan Table (BPMP Exhibit BBB);
- k. FDOT Transportation Improvement Plan; and
- l. FDOT Strategic Intermodal System Plan.

POLICY 2.3.4: Include a Future Functional Classification Map in the Transportation Map series to identify the future functional classification of transportation facilities in county land development regulations. Identify the existing classification of transportation facilities further in an Administrative Code consistent with the existing functional classification structure adopted by FDOT and coordinated through the MPO.

POLICY 2.3.5: Incorporate the Cost Feasible Transit Plan Map from the Transit Development Plan and the future mass transit facilities from the Transit Vision Plan in the Future Transportation Map series.

POLICY 2.3.6: Develop an interconnected pedestrian and bicycle system through the development of facilities consistent with the Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities map series and the Greenways Multi-Purpose Recreational Trails Master Plan. Implementation of the system reflected in the transportation map series will include the incorporation of bicycle/pedestrian facilities into: 1) projects identified in the transportation and transit capital improvements plan (CIP); 2) requirements for new development to install facilities; 3) federal and state grant applications; and 4) annual county funding of improvements.

In this objective, changes were made based on further refining language to include MPO and FDOT plans and maps by reference and coordination of functional classification with the MPO and FDOT.

OBJECTIVE 2.4: Planning and Development Tools. Establish a set of planning and development tools—including the LDC, plans and studies, and development practices—to achieve the county’s goal of establishing a comprehensive, multimodal transportation network.

POLICY 2.4.1: Implement planning and development strategies, incentives, and practices to address concerns related to mixed-use form, multimodal transportation design, and walkable communities through:

- a. Long-term strategies and incentives regarding multimodal alternatives, traffic calming, safe streets, urban design, land use mixes, and appropriate intensity and density standards;
- b. Area wide LOS standards not dependent on any single road segment function;
- c. Reduced transportation-related development fees and provide incentives to promote development within infill, redevelopment, mixed-use, and urban areas; multimodal transportation districts; or for affordable or workforce housing;
- d. Prioritization and incentivization of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities in areas designed for walkability, mixed-use, and community connectivity;
- e. Multimodal connections to existing and planned transit facilities; and
- f. Context-oriented transportation requirements based on specific geographic locations and community character place types.

POLICY 2.4.2: Require the interconnection of adjacent developments in the LDC. Where a developer proposes private local streets with access control, an alternate means of interconnection may be proposed provided the means does not require all local traffic to use the arterial network. Design interconnections to implement traffic calming.

POLICY 2.4.3: Establish and implement parking regulations in the LDC that ~~consider~~ include motor vehicle and bicycle parking requirements. Regulations may consider the

land use category, mixture of uses, shared parking, available multimodal facilities and other alternative means of travel. In urban land use categories, mixed-use centers and public facilities, regulations may also include flexibility to consider available on-street parking and off-site public parking, and may establish maximums for at-grade on-site parking the context of the community when determining parking needs. Motor vehicle and bicycle parking will be specified in the LDC for:

- a. ~~Urban and mixed-use centers: options including on-street parking, shared parking, off-site public parking, and on-site parking up to a maximum;~~
- b. ~~Suburban areas: on-site parking standards with minimum and maximum parking amounts with reductions for shared and bicycle parking, transit connections, and pedestrian access;~~
- c. ~~Rural areas: on-site parking meeting minimum standards.~~

POLICY 2.4.4: Implement land development regulations that require developers to provide and maintain the following multimodal features, as needed:

- a. Safe and accessible pedestrian facility connections;
- b. Bicycle storage areas and facilities;
- c. Bus shelters with route information displays; and
- d. Bus accommodations such as dedicated transfer/loading areas, adequate lane widths and turnarounds.

POLICY 2.4.5: Implement LDC regulations that ensure adequate fire and rescue access. New development with greater than ten residential parcels will provide a minimum of two access points to the development. Two Comments: (1) use of "ten residential parcels" could mean anywhere from 10 du to 1000+ du. Wouldn't it be better to use a numerical threshold for number of du rather than parcels? (2) How do you interpret 2 access points? Can one of the access points be emergency access only, since the intent of this policy appears to be adequate fire and rescue service? This is a common issue and subject of frequent deviations in the zoning process. Would it be better to simply delete everything after the 1st sentence and leave the particulars to the LDRs?

Formatted: Superscript

POLICY 2.4.6: ~~By 2013, d-~~Develop or participate in a pedestrian and bicycle safety action plan to identify and evaluate road corridors, segments and intersections with recurring pedestrian and bicycle accident patterns. Identify contributing factors, safety improvements, and transportation practices that would reduce the number and severity of crashes. The target is to reduce bicycle and pedestrian crashes by 20 percent in successive five-year periods.

POLICY 2.4.7: Incorporate innovative safety-oriented transportation measures and design features into planning documents, the LDC, and facility designs to improve safety conditions on all travel modes for all users. Development regulations for design will focus on safety.

POLICY 2.4.8: Through the zoning process, direct high-intensity land uses to parcels that abut designated future transit corridors identified in the transportation map series.

POLICY 2.4.9: Utilize the Lee County Transit Development Plan to enhance and improve the county's transit system so that it becomes a highly valued transit system that attracts a variety of users through the following practices:

- a. Evaluate enhancements to existing fixed route services;
- b. Develop fixed route service alternatives such as Flex Routes, Circulator Routes, High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes, Dedicated Transit Lanes, and Bus Rapid Transit;
- c. Transit ridership surveys that assess and identify changes in ridership profiles preferences and needs;
- d. Conduct a route and stop by stop analysis to determine functionality and adequacy of meeting transit customer needs; and
- e. Assess existing problems and needs.

POLICY 2.4.10: Complete a Comprehensive Operations Analysis every ten years to provide a complete understanding of existing transit service, its customers, and their needs.

POLICY 2.4.11: Enhance the multimodal transportation system and consider both roadside and median plantings through landscape practice and procedures adopted as part of the LeeScope Master Plan and LDC. The county's landscape practices and procedure will provide for:

- a. Median plantings that emphasize tree canopy, high visibility, shade, and an overall foundation for site design;
- b. Roadside plantings with a primary purpose of providing a fifty percent tree canopy in urban and mixed-use areas by 2035, to provide shade for transit riders, bicyclists and pedestrians;
- c. Increased emphasis of roadside landscape development and maintenance in urban, suburban, and mixed-use areas;
- d. Landscaping levels that will include a "core level" and enhanced options that may be added to projects over time; and
- e. Road cross-sections that consider safety, beauty, and Florida-Friendly design that minimizes maintenance burdens.

In this objective, changes were made based on specific CSAC policy comments for Policy 2.4.3) "In LDC amendments, make distinctions in parking requirements in different types of character places in mixed use, urban, suburban and rural areas"; and (Policy 2.4.6) "Revise the "2013" date and add "corridors" for identification and evaluation".

OBJECTIVE 2.5: Babcock Ranch Community. Minimize the development impacts of the Babcock Ranch Community (BRC) in Charlotte County on the Lee County transportation system, with the goal of protecting the rural nature of northeastern Lee County, and to assure the transportation impacts in Lee County, generated by the Babcock Ranch Community

(BRC) approved in Charlotte County, are funded entirely by the BRC Independent Service District (ISD) or other BRC related funding mechanism. In addition, to provide a process by which these identified improvements are added to the Lee Plan Transportation Map Series and the Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

POLICY 2.5.1: Lee County views as a priority the proposed East-West Connector roadway and related interstate interchange and any other transportation/mobility improvements that will minimize the impacts in Lee County from the development of the BRC in Charlotte County. Support the use of the Lee County and Charlotte County MPO plan update processes in a comprehensive, coordinated, cooperative fashion to consider the need for, and location of, an East-West Connector roadway and related interstate interchange, as well as evaluation of transportation alternatives that might serve the projected need related to development of the BRC while minimizing the impacts to the rural nature of northeast Lee County. Upon inclusion in the MPO plan(s), funding for the East-West Connector roadway or transportation/mobility alternatives will be allocated in accordance with Policy 2.5.3(c) below.

POLICY 2.5.2: The comprehensive transportation analysis of the BRC has identified the potential need for numerous transportation/mobility improvements in Lee County. In order to address the impacts of the development of the BRC in Charlotte County, additions to the Lee Plan Transportation Map Series and the CIP may be necessary.

- a. Lee County does not have the responsibility to fund the capital transportation/mobility improvements required by the development of the BRC in Charlotte County; and
- b. As contemplated in the Interlocal Planning Agreement dated March 13, 2006, and the Babcock Ranch Community Road Planning Agreement dated May 23, 2006, the capital transportation/mobility improvements required by the development of the BRC will be funded entirely by the BRC Independent Service District (ISD) or other BRC related funding mechanism (hereinafter the Developer).

POLICY 2.5.3: Analysis of the development of the Babcock Ranch Community in Charlotte County identified potential transportation/mobility improvements beyond the financially feasible improvements currently reflected in the Lee Plan Transportation Map Series; therefore future amendments to the Lee Plan Transportation Map Series related to the BRC will be consistent with the procedures set forth below:

- a. The funding necessary to construct the transportation/mobility improvements resulting from BRC development may exceed the proportionate share contribution anticipated from the BRC DRI increments. Developer contributions exceeding the DRI proportionate share assessment for a given increment may be necessary to satisfy the financially feasible standard required to support an amendment to the Lee Plan Transportation Map Series, as well as future amendments to the CIP.
- b. Prior to Lee County amending the Lee Plan Transportation Map Series and the CIP to include specific BRC-related transportation/mobility improvements, the ISD, or other BRC-related funding mechanism, will have to commit to fully funding these

- improvements if the proportionate share assessment does not fully fund these identified improvements.
- c. Developer contributions in excess of its DRI proportionate share assessment may be applied directly toward identified improvements through pipelining. The funding necessary to justify inclusion in the Lee Plan will be delivered via development agreements, interlocal agreements, or other mechanisms acceptable to Lee County, which mechanisms will coincide with each increment of the BRC. Upon execution of a development agreement, interlocal agreement, or other mechanism acceptable to Lee County providing for full funding of the identified transportation/mobility improvement, the County will include the transportation/mobility improvement on the Lee Plan Transportation Map Series and the transportation/mobility improvements will be included in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) as funded by developer contributions.
 - d. Failure of the developer of the BRC to fully fund the transportation/mobility improvements necessary to serve the BRC will prevent the inclusion of those transportation/mobility improvements as amendments to the Lee Plan Transportation Map Series and the CIP.

POLICY 2.5.4: In recognition of the environmentally sensitive nature of the area, any transportation/mobility improvements in Lee County or within two miles of the Lee County border must include an analysis of the location and design of wildlife crossings. The wildlife crossings must be coordinated with federal, state and local agencies including: South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD), Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC), Charlotte County, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and Lee County Division of Environmental Sciences.

In this objective staff does not recommend any changes from the current plan policies. CSAC in Policy 2.5.3 recommended "That "transportation/mobility improvements" should include transit". Mobility improvements include transit by definition.

GOAL 3: TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEM. Establish a comprehensive multimodal transportation system that is well-managed, funded, and planned.

OBJECTIVE 3.1: Infrastructure Demands and Priorities. Ensure that site location, functional design, and services of future infrastructure projects address environmental, financial, and community development concerns of all users and all modes.

POLICY 3.1.1: Provide for the infrastructure and service needs and demands of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motor vehicle users by addressing the demands and priorities regarding the use, function, and operations of the county's transportation system. Consistent with the transportation map series, future transportation infrastructure will focus on:

- a. Improved connectivity and integration of transportation facilities;
- b. Development of diverse and interconnected public spaces that improve access and connectivity within local neighborhoods, economic centers, and civic areas;
- c. Improvements to the right-of-way for transit, bicycling and walking;
- d. Equitable distribution of transportation infrastructure, amenities and services to ensure local community needs are met and county-wide connectivity is improved;
- e. Infill and redevelopment of established transportation corridors and public resources;
- f. Improved roadways by directing vehicular access to interconnections, shared driveways and adjacent streets, and minimizing direct arterial connections;
- g. Traffic calming measures that improve roadway conditions, safety, and accessibility;
- h. Increased use of transit, bicycle, and walking for all trip types as well as reduced dependency upon vehicles for local commutes, errands, and social trips based upon estimates of latent demand for facilities; and
- i. Providing alternative transportation services within existing right-of-ways.

POLICY 3.1.2: Evaluate future infrastructure improvements including the following considerations:

- a. Need and demand for expansion of existing facilities;
- b. Expansion of other transportation alternatives and available system capacity;
- c. Allowance of peak period congestion; and
- d. Alternative improvements as part of a “no build option”.

POLICY 3.1.3: Improve the county’s character [comment: not sure what "character" means in this context], facilitate the development of mixed-use areas, and promote provide incentives for the redevelopment of older development areas through transportation projects that:

Formatted: Strikethrough

- a. Support the character and improve the connectivity of the surrounding community;
- b. Better link land uses between arterials and major collectors;
- c. Expand multimodal system alternatives and improve existing transportation facilities;
- d. Improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists and accessibility needs of all people consistent with the Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines;
- e. Improve the grid network by improving connections and bridging gaps within transportation infrastructure systems;
- f. Minimize the number of displaced businesses and residences and purchases of entire parcels;
- g. Incorporate stormwater facilities into community amenities; and
- h. Avoid the alignment of new arterials or expressways that penetrate or divide established residential neighborhoods ~~with high bicycle and pedestrian use~~ except where no feasible alternative exists.

POLICY 3.1.4: Promote increased transportation connections throughout the county by implementing a system of parallel-reliever network of transportation facilities for use by local traffic in order to protect the inter-regional and intrastate travel functions of ~~I-75~~ principal arterials.

POLICY 3.1.5: Construction of a new road or street may only be implemented by the county in suburban or rural areas when:

- a. Providing improved connectivity to or between designated future urban areas and it is specifically identified in the transportation map series;
- b. Specifically identified in a LDC Chapter 32 regulating plan street network; or
- c. Total project costs are fully reimbursed by MSTU/MSBUs or a similar funding mechanism initiated by property owners.

POLICY 3.1.6: Implement a landscaping program for county maintained roadways utilizing the guidelines for design implementation and long term maintenance set forth in the Roadway Landscape (LeeScape) Master Plan and Lee County LDC.

POLICY 3.1.7: Prioritize bicycle and pedestrian improvements by improving connectivity to transit stops. Encourage the construction of pedestrian facilities within ½ mile walking distance of a transit stop and bicycle facilities within 1 mile of a transit stop. Prioritize connections to premium transit service such as intermodal transfer stations, BRT, and fixed routes utilized as transfer locations between routes.

POLICY 3.1.8: By the year 2025, expand fixed-route service and frequencies to develop and maintain headways of 15 minutes or less for public transit for regional mixed-use centers, 20 minutes or less for urban areas such as central Fort Myers and Cape Coral, and 40 minutes or less for other major centers of employment, airports, shopping, medical, educational, and recreation centers.

POLICY 3.1.9: Promote the use of transit by improving services and linkages between outlying suburban communities and large employment and economic centers through the development and expansion of:

- a. Park and ride lots;
- b. Multimodal transfer facilities;
- c. Various ridesharing techniques;
- d. Inter-county transit services;
- e. Convenient transit schedule; and
- f. Para-transit service.

POLICY 3.1.10: Increase transit services through scheduled service improvements that accommodate high-use populations including college students, elderly, persons with disabilities, and others. Coordinate transit services with local, regional, and state public and private agencies that serve such persons in order to ensure the appropriate services are put in place to serve targeted populations.

This objective was changed to address the CSAC comments for Policy 3.1.3.f "to add "and purchases of entire parcels""; Policy 3.1.3.h "delete "with high bicycle and pedestrian use""; Policy 3.1.4 and "I-75 is now 6 lanes, why is this policy still relevant? Why limit to I-75, include other principal arterials?". Staff does not recommend a policy change for the CSAC comment (Policy 3.1.2) "Change "evaluate" to strengthen the policy. Is there an opportunity to prevent flyovers, evaluate the network capacity first, especially in mixed-use and also urban areas? Strengthen to change business as usual and force a new way of thinking. Is there an opportunity to limit widening to 4 lanes?". The evaluation of projects for system-wide decision-making occurs at the state level through the MPO process. Other policies address coordination with the MPO and FDOT.

OBJECTIVE 3.2: Fiscally Sound Transportation Infrastructure System. Establish a well-managed and operated multimodal transportation system by establishing objective, predictable, and fiscally sound transportation budgeting, planning, and development practices.

POLICY 3.2.1: Develop and implement a transportation funding strategy that uses a variety of new and existing funding resources, options, and programs (e.g.: Capital Improvement Program, user fees and tolls, private financing and developer contributions, grants, and other transportation funding mechanisms) to construct, operate and maintain current and future transportation infrastructure components through their life cycle (e.g. street reconstruction, bridge replacement).

POLICY 3.2.2: Ensure that transportation revenue sources are economically stable by developing and maintaining a long-term transportation funding strategy to implement the following transportation priorities:

- a. Provision of complete streets that include a variety of pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicular facilities;
- b. Protection of community and neighborhood integrity through context-oriented transportation services, functions, and design;
- c. Increased connections and improved linkages between different community areas;

- d. Promotion of physical activity, healthy lifestyles, and safe streets;
- e. Development of better integrated mixed-use and urban areas; and
- f. Implementation of the transit development plan.

POLICY 3.2.3: Provide the transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities identified on the transportation map series through capital and privately initiated improvements including street and road extensions, additional lanes and turn lanes, new connections, street reconstruction, and resurfacing.

POLICY 3.2.4: Support the development of a well-functioning and funded intra-state transportation system, to connect people and goods to other people, places, and markets within the county, region, and state by participating in the funding and planning of improvements to state roads.

POLICY 3.2.5: Establish a capital improvements program (CIP) that assists in the budgeting and implementation of transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and motor vehicle improvement projects. CIP priorities will be analyzed, reviewed and determined based upon input received from advisory committees, stakeholders, and interdepartmental staff based upon the project ability to improve the overall function of the county's transportation system and to:

- a. Provide a variety of transportation options and improve connectivity throughout the county;
- b. Implement established local community planning priorities and community identified projects. Community funded projects (e.g.: grants, private contributions, MSTU/MSBU, and other sources) may be assigned a higher priority;
- c. Improve high-hazard crash locations and structural and non-structural improvements to mitigate hazards that reduce the number and severity of all crashes;
- d. Fund the Traffic Signal/Intersection Improvement program to make the transportation system safer and more efficient; and
- e. Fund transportation improvements related to traffic calming, transit stops, trails and greenways, pedestrian facilities, bicycle facilities, complete street initiatives, roadway access, and other transportation needs.

POLICY 3.2.6: Further direct transportation infrastructure improvements and maintenance with priorities based on ~~CIP policy~~ the Capital Improvement Element and the following hierarchy of evacuation routes and the ~~future~~ land use map or equivalent municipality comprehensive plan land use designation:

- a. Hurricane evacuation routes on Map 3 (old 3H);
- b. Urban Core Land Use Category mixed-use centers with an adopted regulating plan

- c. Mixed-use centers with an adopted regulating plan;
- d. Economic and Job Center Land Use Categories;
- e. Urban Core Land Use Category;
- f. Urban Places Land Use Category;
- g. Urban Neighborhood Land Use Category;
- h. Suburban Land Use Categories~~mixed-use areas;~~ and
- i. Rural Land Use Categories~~mixed-use areas;~~
- j. ~~Suburban areas; and~~
- k. ~~Rural areas.~~

POLICY 3.2.7: Ensure that private development contributes to a comprehensive multimodal system that meets the travel needs of the entire county and mitigates the impacts their development has on the county's transportation infrastructure system.

POLICY 3.2.8: Develop and maintain standards, criteria, and fees to equitably define developers' obligations and costs associated with the development for necessary site-related and off-site improvements, and to provide incentives for infill development and redevelopment of older developed areas. Lee County policy guidelines and techniques to address potential impacts of development will address:

- a. Site-related impacts on the public road system must be funded by new development. The site-related improvements are not eligible for credit against the proportionate share payment of transportation impacts;
- b. Provisions that allow development agreements with developers and landowners who commit to provide improvements to public facilities beyond those required by the Lee Plan and other county regulations, and to provide incentives for infill and redevelopment;
- c. Protection of existing and planned transportation corridors to meet state standards for future multimodal improvements consistent with the Transportation Map series;
- d. Requirements to provide access to existing or planned public transportation facilities and connections to adjacent existing or planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities; and
- e. Need to ensure proposed development within municipalities construct or pay for improvements to access county maintained transportation facilities as a condition of permit approval. Improvements may also include transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities along their frontage.

POLICY 3.2.9: Implement an effective and fair system of mobility fees, impact fees, or similar mechanisms to ensure that development creating impacts on transportation facilities pays a fair share of the costs to mitigate its (off-site) impacts. This may include evaluation of a tiered system of fees for urban, suburban and rural areas as an incentive

for urban redevelopment. Issue credits against future fees consistent with county development practices and procedures.

POLICY 3.2.10: Roadway and intersection improvements mandated by development orders will be determined on the basis of demonstrated need resulting in part or in total from the impacts of that development. These improvements will be based on roadway and intersection improvement needs resulting from new development and will not be limited by jurisdictional responsibility for specific road segments. The use of Road Impact Fee revenues to improve state roads is an acceptable application of those funds.

POLICY 3.2.11: In order to acquire rights-of-way and complete the construction of the transportation facilities designated on the Transportation Map series, adopt regulations to encourage voluntary dedications of land and construction by developers as described below:

- a. Encourage voluntary dedication of rights-of-way necessary for streets, transit facilities, bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and landscaping installations that are proposed to be county maintained;
- b. Encourage voluntary construction of transportation facilities that lie within or abut the development; and
- c. Grant Mobility, Park, or Roads Impact Fee credits consistent with the provisions of the Lee County LDC.

POLICY 3.2.12: Establish MSTUs/MSBUs to implement, operate and maintain transportation facilities through innovative means to fund complete streets improvements for transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, ~~or maintain transportation facilities above the established LOS.~~ Establish MSTUs/MSBUs to correct deficiencies in specific areas or neighborhoods. Regularly review MSTUs/MSBUs to determine whether existing units can be eliminated or new units should be created.

POLICY 3.2.13: Review on a regular basis and update all user fee revenue sources, such as tolls, ~~mobility fees,~~ and roads impact fees. As an alternative to roads impact fees, evaluate a mobility fee structure, including a mobility plan, by the year 2016. Include an evaluation of reduction in fees to provide incentives for urban redevelopment and infill. [Comment: This is a good example of providing for incentives for urban redevelopment and should be expanded to infill. This should be expanded to other policies as noted.] Adopt the programs that reflect travel characteristics, construction and right-of-way costs. Determine if capital impacts and maintenance costs are met by the fees and if the fees are economically sustainable and applied fairly.

POLICY 3.2.14: Designate various transportation facilities (e.g.: causeways, expressways, bridges, arterials, and major collectors) as toll facilities and utilize toll revenues for operation and construction of those facilities. Employ efficiency measures such as the institution of automated toll collection and the Variable Pricing Program to encourage reduced-peak usage of toll facilities.

POLICY 3.2.15: Seek out new and innovative funding to supplement public funding for transit operations and cooperate with the private sector to increase privately funded transit service, especially in areas with large seasonal populations.

POLICY 3.2.16: Promote street connectivity by discouraging the use of dead-end streets that create inefficiencies in the transportation network by preventing the development of a connected, grid street network. Utilize the following practices to discourage the development of dead-end streets:

- a. Include connectivity criteria as a requirement for acceptance of private roads for county maintenance;
- b. Place a low priority on resurfacing and maintenance of dead-end local streets and encourage adjacent property owners to take on the maintenance responsibility;
- c. Implement reduced design standards, such as reduced width, for very low volume dead-end local streets; and
- d. Resurface and repair dead-end local streets to the reduced design standard or where feasible, connect to other transportation facilities.

POLICY 3.2.17: Explore joint funding mechanisms (such as an MSTU/MSBU) to pay for the widening of Alico Road east of Ben Hill Griffin Parkway to encourage economic development in the Alico Road area. Require properties that generate traffic on the segment of Alico Road east of Ben Hill Griffin Parkway that have not already fully mitigated traffic impacts to participate in the funding mechanism. Participation will be creditable against future road impact fees or DRI proportionate share obligations consistent with County regulations. Property that was subject to CPA2009-01 agreed to donate 75 feet of right-of-way along the entire frontage of Alico Road without compensation. The donation of right-of-way along Alico Road from that property will not be creditable against road impact fees or DRI proportionate share obligations. To facilitate large truck movement and volumes, consider designation of Alico Road east of I-75 as a controlled access facility.

Changes were made to this objective to reflect the CSAC comments on Objective 3.1 "Add a policy to do life-cycle costs analysis."; Policy 3.2.5 "Review/analyze existing CIP projects for the new vision and complete streets."; Policy 3.2.6 "replace CIP policy with the Capital Improvement Element"; Policy 3.2.12 "Clarify what "LOS" means in this context to refer to infrastructure or maintenance levels. It shouldn't allow for roadway

Deleted: (

Deleted: :

expansion.”; and (Policy 3.2.16) “Delete “the development of”, add language to connect gaps.” Staff addressed the Horizon Council comment “incentive urban redevelopment by a reduction in impact fees” by changes to Policy 3.2.9 and Policy 3.2.13. The category references in Policy 3.2.6 were updated based on coordination with the draft Land Use element.

OBJECTIVE 3.3: Environmental Impacts. Diminish the negative impacts transportation facilities and systems have on natural environments by maximizing existing transportation facilities, promoting and incentivizing infill and urban redevelopment, promoting clean transportation alternatives, and utilizing TDM strategies to effectively manage transportation systems and resources.

POLICY 3.3.1: Develop and maintain an environmentally sensitive transportation system including consideration of the following practices:

- a. Alternative transportation modes that diminish the need for increased road capacity and vehicular trips. Coordinate the development of such facilities with the Lee County Bikeways/Walkways Facilities Plan, The Transit Development Plan, and Lee County Greenways Master Plan.
- b. Promotion of alternative fuel vehicles, mixed-use developments, walkable and bikeable communities, and transit to conserve energy, reduce air pollution, and manage natural resources;
- c. Transportation infrastructure that utilizes sustainable or recycled materials, uses innovative design techniques and technologies, stormwater areas as community amenities; and energy efficient components such as street lighting, traffic signals, and roundabouts;
- d. Reduce heat island effects by ~~minimizing~~ addressing paved surface areas and maximizing planting areas with native canopy trees and other vegetation on county-maintained roadways;
- e. TDM strategies to effectively manage transportation systems and resources, minimize system delays, reduce vehicle miles-traveled, and ~~contain greenhouse gas~~ reduced vehicle emissions;
- f. Conversion of transit vehicles from diesel propulsion systems to alternative fuels or hybrid propulsion systems;
- g. Location of archaeological sites, which will not be destroyed unless full recovery of data and artifacts is included in the process; and
- h. Protection of natural habitats and protected or listed species.

POLICY 3.3.2: New roads or expansion of existing facilities will not be extended through ~~environmentally critical areas~~ areas of ecological concern except in instances of overriding public interest and unless:

- a. It is the only feasible route within mixed-use and urban areas;
- b. The crossing is culverted or bridged ~~so as to maintain to the greatest degree possible, maintaining predevelopment volume, direction, distribution, and surface water hydroperiod consistent with county standards and providing adequate wildlife corridors; and~~
- c. Equivalent mitigation is provided ~~in basin and in jurisdiction as the first preferred option.~~

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

POLICY 3.3.3: Include an environmental impact assessment (EIA) in the design phase of new or improved arterial and collector roads that affect protected or listed species habitat, wetland systems, or estuarine water bodies. Ensure an EIA addresses impacts on historic structures, archaeological resources, and environmentally critical areas.

POLICY 3.3.4: Consider the safe passage of wildlife across new or reconstructed county roads.

POLICY 3.3.5: Support low-carbon and high resource-efficiency transportation options through the development of supporting infrastructure, fuel purchasing, and local fuel production.

Changes were made to this objective to reflect the CSAC comments on Policy 3.3.1.d “Add electric vehicle charging stations and bike sharing.”; and Policy 3.3.1.e “replace “contain greenhouse gas” with “reduced vehicle”. In Policy 3.3.2, the reference to environmentally critical areas was updated to the current language in the Coastal and Conservation Element “areas of ecological concern”. Staff deleted the reference in the comment on Policy 3.3.2.c “Clarify “in basin and in jurisdiction” to mean “in same basin and jurisdiction”.

OBJECTIVE 3.4: Intergovernmental Coordination. Utilize intergovernmental partnerships to provide well-coordinated transportation services that meet the needs of all users and all modes. In particular, the county will work with the Lee County Port Authority, Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council (SWFRPC), Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), United States Department of Transportation (USDOT), surrounding counties, and the cities of Sanibel, Cape Coral, Fort Myers Beach, Bonita Springs, and Fort Myers, and higher education facilities.

POLICY 3.4.1: Coordinate land use decisions and permitting processes affecting county and state transportation facilities with municipalities and FDOT.

POLICY 3.4.2: Promote non-motorized transportation greenway and blueway projects throughout the county. Coordinate multi-use trail projects whenever feasible with LCDOT and other agencies with jurisdiction over facilities identified in the transportation map series and the Greenways Master Plan (Map 22).

POLICY 3.4.3: Work with the MPO to plan, manage, and fund the development of a multimodal transportation system. ~~Implement the efforts that result for this collaborative effort through the:~~

- a. Consideration of improvements identified through the MPO's Congestion Management System (CMS); and
- b. ~~Amendment-Incorporation of the~~MPO Plan amendments ~~Lee Plan map series are incorporated into the Lee Plan map series~~ MPO Plan so that the two plans remain consistent.

POLICY 3.4.4: Encourage municipalities to maintain a roads impact fee, mobility fee or similar program or to participate in the county's program.

POLICY 3.4.5: Improve transit services and provide for the needs of specific, targeted transit rider populations by coordinating transit services with the Lee County Port Authority, School District of Lee County, ~~Florida Gulf Coast University~~higher education facilities, ~~Edison College~~, Lee County Government, MPO, FDOT, Federal Transit Administration, and local employers, public service entities, and local governments.

Changes were made to this objective to reflect the CSAC comment "Add FGCU and Edison". Staff recommendation is to add the phrase "higher education facilities". Changes were made to Policy 3.4.3 to clean up the language.

Portions of Goal 4: Aviation, are also being reviewed as a separate Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA2011-00022, Hazardous Wildlife Attractant Update). Any revisions to goals, objectives, and policies will be reflected in this document following transmittal of CPA2011-00022.

GOAL 4: AVIATION. Develop and maintain a coordinated system of aviation facilities to facilitate the safe, cost-effective, and efficient movement of commerce consistent with community values and economic objectives.

Objective 4.1. Southwest Florida International Airport. SWFIA is the only commercial Service Airport in Lee County and is a major economic driver in the region. Given the

valuable role the airport plays it is imperative to provide protections for the development and expansion of aviation and non-aviation related uses at SWFIA while ensuring surrounding development is compatible with growing demand of aviation in Lee County.

POLICY 4.1.1: SWFIA includes airport and airport-related development as well as non-aviation land uses. This mix of uses is intended to support the continued development of the SWFIA. The intensity of the proposed aviation and non-aviation land uses at SWFIA must be consistent with the Airport Layout Plan (Map 3F) and Lee Plan Table 5(a). Map 3F depicts the planned expansion of the SWFIA through 2020.

POLICY 4.1.2: Future airport expansion or development of aviation-related and non-aviation uses at SWFIA will offset environmental impacts through the Airport Mitigation Lands Overlay (Map 3M) or other mitigation.

POLICY 4.1.3: The SWFIA Master Plan and Airport Layout Plan will be updated as required by the FAA, or as determined by the Lee County Port Authority. If the airport master planning process precipitates a substantive change to the Airport Layout Plan (Map 3F), then the Port Authority must amend Map 3F, prior to obtaining local development approval. The non-aviation related development areas have been depicted on the approved Airport Layout Plan sheets (Maps 3F). These uses will be constructed upon Airport lands with long term leases.

POLICY 4.1.4: Development within the non-aviation area, as designated on Map 3F, is limited to a maximum of 300 acres north of runway 6-24 and approximately 52 acres within the midfield terminal area. All development must be in compliance with Map 3F and the intensities outlined in Table 5(a). Development of additional acreage will require prior Lee Plan amendment approval.

POLICY 4.1.5: Future airport expansion or development of aviation-related or non-aviation related uses will provide buffer areas, as determined by Lee County, for the protection of groundwater resources in the Southeast and Northeast quadrants of the airport property.

POLICY 4.1.6: Design wetland mitigation for future expansion of aviation or non-aviation uses on Airport Lands so that it does not create wildlife hazards. Development and land management practices on airport property will be in accordance with FAA directives and other agency approvals.

Staff does not recommend changes to this Objective. Staff recommends that the CSAC comment “Add multimodal access here or in Policy 4.3.3.” is addressed in Policy 4.8.4 which identifies coordination with other transportation interests and establishing multimodal transfer facilities.

OBJECTIVE 4.2: Page Field General Aviation Airport. Page Field General Aviation Airport plays a vital role as a reliever airport facility to SWFIA. In its role as a reliever

airport, Page Field reduces general aviation traffic from SWFIA, thereby increasing the capacity and efficiency of SWFIA. This designation should include adequate land to accommodate the projected growth needs of Page Field General Aviation Airport in its continued role as an airport reliever, including the industrial, commercial and office uses necessary to continue viable aviation activity through 2025.

POLICY 4.2.1: In order to create the revenue source necessary to maintain Page Field General Aviation Airport as a viable aviation operation and reliever to SWFIA, the Port Authority seeks to establish non-aviation uses on the Page Field General Aviation Airport property. Suitable locations for these non-aviation uses are designated on the Page Field Airport Layout Plan adopted as Lee Plan Map 3G. The Page Field Airport Layout Plan sheet (Map 3G) was adopted by the FAA as part of the 2002 Page Field Airport Master Plan Update. This update and documents comprising the 2002 Master Plan approval are incorporated into the Lee Plan by reference as support for adoption of Map 3G and Table 5(b).

POLICY 4.2.2: Page Field General Aviation Airport includes airport and airport-related development as well as non-aviation land uses. This mix of uses is intended to support the continued development of Page Field General Aviation Airport. The intensity of the proposed aviation and non-aviation land uses must be consistent with the Airport Layout Plan (Map 3G) and Lee Plan Table 5(b) and will be required to comply with the Lee County LDC regulations, including, but not limited to, the impact fee regulations. Map 3G depicts the planned expansion of the SWFIA through 2020.

POLICY 4.2.3: If the Port Authority determines expansion of the Page Field General Aviation Airport boundaries is necessary in order to provide continued viability to Page Field as a reliever to SWFIA, then the Port Authority will submit to the BOCC the application and support documentation to amend Map 3G Table 5(b) and the Future Land Use Map to reflect the land added to Page Field General Aviation Airport.

POLICY 4.2.4: Environmental mitigation deemed necessary to support development of Page Field General Aviation Airport property will be addressed separately by each development project and is not entitled to claim a benefit from the Airport Mitigation Lands Overlay area (Map 3M).

POLICY 4.2.5: The Page Field Airport Master Plan and Airport Layout Plan will be updated as required by the FAA, or as determined by the Lee County Port Authority. A comprehensive plan amendment will be submitted by the Port Authority to update Map 3G and Table 5(b) to reflect the updated Page Field Master Plan as approved. The planning horizon used for the master plan update should be consistent with the Lee Plan Horizon, which can be verified by Lee County as part of the Master Plan Update process. Lee County staff will be included in the Master plan update process as required under the terms of the existing memorandum of understanding regarding airport development.

POLICY 4.2.6: If the airport master planning process precipitates a substantive change to the Airport Layout Plan (Map 3G), then the Port Authority must amend Map 3G prior to obtaining local development approval. The non-aviation related development areas have been depicted on the approved Airport Layout Plan sheets (Map 3G). These uses will be constructed upon Airport lands with long term leases.

OBJECTIVE 4.3: Economic Growth. To aid in the diversification of the county's economic growth the capacity and long term development of the SWFIA and Page Field General Aviation Airport will be expanded in compliance with Maps 3F and 3G, and Table 5(a) and 5(b). Specific project implementation and approval of the proposed development will be coordinated through the annual Capital Improvement Program process and be consistent with the Airport Layout Plans (Map 3F and 3G). These expansions will be funded through user fees, airline contributions, and other funding sources not involving general county tax dollars. The Port Authority will strive to minimize impacts to surrounding land uses while maintaining a safe and efficient facility for airport operations.

POLICY 4.3.1: The Port Authority will coordinate the implementation of scheduled infrastructure and facility improvements for the SWFIA and Page Field General Aviation Airport consistent with the approved Airport Layout Plan sheets (Map 3F and Map 3G, respectively) and the Development Schedules (Table 5(a) and (b), respectively).

POLICY 4.3.2: The development potential of SWFIA will continue to be protected by the acquisition of additional land for runway and taxiway, road access, storm water management, and environmental mitigation use, consistent with the adopted Airport Master Plan and the Port Authority's Capital Improvement Program.

POLICY 4.3.3: The Port Authority will continue to expand existing and proposed aviation facilities such as the terminal building, airport aprons, cargo facilities, roadways and parking in order to meet the forecasted demand.

POLICY 4.3.4: The Port Authority will continue to investigate commercial and industrial potentials at Page Field General Aviation Airport and at SWFIA through market surveys and the solicitation and receipt of acceptable proposals for land lease at fair market value as well as efforts to cultivate public/private partnerships in pursuing this potential.

POLICY 4.3.5: The Port Authority will capitalize on its Port of Entry and Foreign Trade Zone status to encourage economic diversification. This will be accomplished by actively: (1) seeking to increase international commerce movement; (2) implementing an international marketing program designed to increase tourist activity; (3) continuing planning efforts to ensure availability of adequate airport facilities to accommodate increases in international air traffic; and, (4) pursuing development of international corporate activity.

Staff does not recommend changes to this Objective. Staff recommends that the CSAC comment “Add multimodal access here or in Policy 4.3.3.” is addressed in Policy 4.8.4 which identifies coordination with other transportation interests and establishing multimodal transfer facilities.

OBJECTIVE 4.4: Development Compatibility. Together with the Port Authority, evaluate development proposals for property located within the vicinity of existing aviation facilities to ensure land use compatibility, to preclude obstructions to aircraft operations, and to protect airport capacities.

POLICY 4.4.1: The safety of aircraft operators, aircraft passengers, and persons on the ground will guide the Port Authority in the operation of county airports, and hazardous wildlife attractants on or near the airports will be avoided.

POLICY 4.4.2: Coordinate with the Port Authority to ensure that regulations in the Lee County LDC restrict land uses in areas covered by the Airport Noise Zones (ANZ) to those uses that are compatible with the operation of the airport.

POLICY 4.4.3: Future updates of the Page Field General Aviation Airport and SWFIA Master Plans will monitor and incorporate development of non-aviation uses at the airports and suggest aviation-related uses.

POLICY 4.4.4: To the greatest extent possible, future airport master plans will retain the long term aviation expansion capability and capacity at both Page Field General Aviation Airport and the SWFIA.

POLICY 4.4.5: Future aviation and non-aviation development at Page Field General Aviation Airport must comply with the provisions of the Educational Restriction Zone established under Florida Statutes, section 333.03 and the School Zone Map adopted as part of the Lee County LDC.

POLICY 4.4.6: The Port Authority will seek to eliminate or modify existing uses on the Page Field property deemed incompatible with existing aviation activity or causing a diminution in the Page Field Airport capacity. In order to protect Page Field as a SWFIA reliever, the Port Authority will use its capacity/authority as a reviewing entity to influence land-use decisions and approvals with respect to development of the lands surrounding Page Field in order to promote development that is compatible with the aviation activity at Page Field General Aviation Airport.

POLICY 4.4.7: Utilize the approved Airport Master Plans and FAR Part 150 Study, including updates, as a basis to amend the comprehensive land use plan and the LDC to prohibit development that is incompatible with the SWFIA or Page Field General Aviation Airport; and, to ensure future economic enhancement consistent with Objective 4.6.2.

POLICY 4.4.8: Maintain the tall structure permitting process to ensure that proponents of potential structural hazards to aviation coordinate with the Port Authority and the FAA to properly place, mark and light potential obstructions as necessary.

POLICY 4.4.9: Through an interlocal agreement, the Port Authority and the City of Fort Myers will continue to coordinate the review of new land uses that have the potential to create tall structure obstructions to aviation and to ensure compatibility with aviation within the City of Fort Myers.

POLICY 4.4.10: In the interest of the safety of air commerce, the county will not approve a temporary or permanent structure that exceeds the height limitation standards, or does not comply with placement, lighting and marking standards, established by the Port Authority, Florida Statutes, or the FAA rules and regulations.

POLICY 4.4.11: Consider land use compatibility when reviewing development proposals within the vicinity of existing or proposed aviation facilities.

POLICY 4.4.12: Coordinate with private investors by reviewing plans and otherwise providing technical assistance in the development of aviation facilities to ensure land use, airspace, and environmental compatibility.

POLICY 4.4.13: Protect existing and proposed aviation facilities from the encroachment of incompatible land uses by updating the Future Land Use Map as needed to achieve consistency with revisions to the respective FAR Part 150 Studies (if applicable), and Airport Layout Plans for SWFIA and Page Field General Aviation, as proposed by the Port Authority.

POLICY 4.4.14: In cooperation with local, state and federal regulatory agencies, the Port Authority will work to minimize and correct any wildlife hazards arising from existing wetlands located on or near airport property. Site improvements on airport property will be designed to minimize attractiveness to wildlife of natural areas and man-made features on airport property such as detention and retention ponds, landscaping, and wetlands, which can provide wildlife with the ideal locations for feeding, loafing, reproduction and escape.

OBJECTIVE 4.5: Future Demands. The Lee County Port Authority will continually evaluate the projected demands for public aviation facilities and ensure their adequate provision.

POLICY 4.5.1: Efficient use of airport facilities should be ensured before expanding or developing new facilities.

POLICY 4.5.2: If the FAA/FDOT mandate navigational improvements (NAVAIDS) or require improvements related to Airport security or safety at SWFIA or Page Field General Aviation Airport, then the Port Authority may pursue installation of the

improvement even though the improvement is not specifically identified on Table 5(a) or Table 5(b). However, the Port Authority must obtain all appropriate approvals and permits prior to installation, including approval from Lee County. If these improvements precipitate a substantive change to Table 5(a), Table 5(b), Map 3F, or Map 3G, then the Port Authority must pursue a Lee Plan amendment incorporating the changes in the next available amendment cycle.

POLICY 4.5.3: The Port Authority will plan to accommodate growth at the existing facilities and provide for the development of future aviation facilities as warranted.

OBJECTIVE 4.6: Access. The SWFIA is an intermodal facility of significant value to the regional, state and federal transportation systems. Protecting this resource requires the provision of adequate landside and airside capacity.

POLICY 4.6.1: Access from Interstate 75 to the SWFIA is designated as a priority intermodal connector in the National Highway Plan and Florida Intrastate Highway System Plan. Together with the Port Authority, the county will work with the MPO, FDOT and the Federal Highway Administration to ensure that this access receives funding and is developed compatibly with the intermodal access needs of the region.

POLICY 4.6.2: Map 3F, as currently incorporated into the Lee Plan, includes transportation improvements that exceed those shown on the balance of the Transportation Map Series maps. The direct access improvements to I-75 depicted on Map 3F, which are being pursued by the Port Authority to benefit the midfield terminal, include an interchange at I-75 and grade separation at Treeline Avenue/Ben Hill Griffin Parkway. These future improvements are the Port Authority's desired access to the airport. The Port Authority will be responsible for achieving consistency between Map 3F and the balance of the Transportation Map Series concerning access to I-75. The Port Authority will serve as the lead agency for achieving direct access to I-75.

POLICY 4.6.3: The County and Port Authority recognize the significance and value of the SWFIA. The Lee County Port Authority will aggressively pursue Federal and State funding for access roadway improvements as identified on the Airport Layout Plan.

POLICY 4.6.4: Development of non-aviation related uses on airport property will be required to meet concurrency standards set forth in the Lee County LDC.

OBJECTIVE 4.7: Coordinated Commerce Movement. The Port Authority will provide facilities that are economically feasible and compatible with adjacent land uses, environmental standards and public safety, and that also meet the needs of commerce movement enterprises and facilities.

POLICY 4.7.1: The Port Authority will continue to coordinate plans for existing and proposed aviation facilities with transportation agencies such as the FAA, the

Transportation Security Administration, the Lee County MPO, the FDOT, Lee Tran and the Lee County Department of Transportation.

POLICY 4.7.2: The county will monitor roads leading to Page Field General Aviation Airport and the SWFIA in order to facilitate efficient and convenient access for airport users.

POLICY 4.7.3: Locations adjacent to or near aviation facilities are identified in the Future Land Use Map as suitable for commerce movement support facilities such as warehouses, cargo handling facilities, and other transfer points, and will be periodically reviewed and updated.

POLICY 4.7.4: The Port Authority will encourage cargo and freight development at the SWFIA by implementing domestic and international cargo marketing programs and by expanding airport facilities, as needed, in order to accommodate large domestic and international cargo carriers.

POLICY 4.7.5: The county will encourage the provision of warehouses, cargo handling facilities, and freight transfer points at aviation facilities needed for the movement of commerce by local industries, trade, and commercial enterprises.

OBJECTIVE 4.8: Aviation Coordination. Ensure that existing and future air system needs can be met safely and with a minimum of land use conflict by coordinating aviation facility plans with federal, state, regional, and local review and permitting agencies.

POLICY 4.8.1: The Port Authority will coordinate and obtain approval for airport development from the County through the annual capital improvement planning and programming process; local permitting process; Airport Master Plan Update process; and, the Lee Plan amendment process to ensure compatibility with other County programs. The Port Authority will provide Lee County copies of the annual Capital Improvement Plan or other similar document for the SWFIA and Page Field General Aviation Airport. Airport development will remain consistent with the MPO LRTP and will support the provision of regional transportation facilities for the efficient use and operation of the transportation system and airports. Additional specific coordination requirements are contained in Objective 151.4 and subsequent policies.

POLICY 4.8.2: While airport facilities will be operated in conformance with applicable state and federal regulations, the Port Authority will strive to ensure that Lee County environmental and other regulations are also implemented to the greatest extent possible.

POLICY 4.8.3: The Port Authority will develop plans for aviation in the county that are consistent with the Continuing Florida Aviation System Planning Process and the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems.

POLICY 4.8.4: The Port Authority will coordinate efforts with aviation and other transportation interests at the SWFIA to establish multimodal transfer facilities.

POLICY 4.8.5: The Port Authority Executive Director will coordinate all expansion plans contained in approved airport master plans with the FAA and the FDOT to ensure that projects of interest to the Port Authority are included in the federal and state funding programs.

POLICY 4.8.6: The County and Port Authority will coordinate aviation facility expansion costs and demand, consistent with the Airport Layout Plan and approved Port Authority Capital Improvement Program, through the County's annual Capital Improvement Program in conjunction with regular briefings by Port Authority staff to County staff.

POLICY 4.8.7: Ensure that adverse structural and non-structural impacts of aviation facilities upon natural resources and wildlife are mitigated consistent with FAA policies and procedures and in coordination with federal, state, regional and local environmental agencies.

POLICY 4.8.8: The Port Authority will abide by all other relevant parts of this comprehensive plan in the construction and operation of Page Field General Aviation Airport and the SWFIA.

POLICY 4.8.9: The Port Authority will coordinate surface transportation planning for Page Field and the SWFIA with the Lee County MPO, the county Department of Transportation, Lee Tran, and the FDOT to ensure adequate access to the airports.