2045 Build AM Peak 52: Narcoosse SB & Narcoosse NB

	4	X	2	F	×	ť	3	*	4	í,	*	×
Lane Group	SEL	SET	SER	NWL	NWT	NWR	NEL	NET	NER	SWL	SWT	SWR
Lane Configurations					<u> </u>						1111	
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	0	0	1915	0	0	0	0	0	1975	0
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	0	0	1915	0	0	0	0	0	1975	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	0	0	0	5085	0	0	0	0	0	6408	0
Flt Permitted												
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	0	0	0	5085	0	0	0	0	0	6408	0
Right Turn on Red			Yes	Yes		Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)												
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		250			250			250			250	
Travel Time (s)		5.7			5.7			5.7			5.7	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	0	0	2082	0	0	0	0	0	2147	0
Turn Type					NA						NA	
Protected Phases					2						43	
Permitted Phases												
Total Split (s)					88.0							
Total Lost Time (s)					6.0							
Act Effct Green (s)					82.0						86.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio					0.46						0.48	
v/c Ratio					0.90						0.70	
Control Delay					51.6						37.2	
Queue Delay					0.0						0.0	
Total Delay					51.6						37.2	
LOS					D						D	
Approach Delay					51.6						37.2	
Approach LOS					D						D	
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 180												
Actuated Cycle Length: 180												
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced t	o phase 2:1	EBR and	6:, Start o	of Green								
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.92												
Intersection Signal Delay: 44	4.3	,		In	tersection	n LOS: D						
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	tion 130.5%	0		IC	U Level	of Service	H					
Analysis Period (min) 15	nalysis Period (min) 15											
Splits and Phases: 52: Na	arcoosse SI	3 & Narco	osse NB									

#51 #52 #53 #54 #55 #56	#51 #52 #53 #54 #55 #56 2 #53 #54 #55 #56
🚗 📉 🕇 🌶 🗡 🖌 🖉 🖉 (R)	🖌 🗡 🥕 🖌 🌾 🥕 🔧 🕇 🙀 🗸
88 s	24 s 68 s

Lane Group	Ø3	Ø4
Lane Configurations		
Traffic Volume (vph)		
Future Volume (vph)		
Ideal Flow (vphpl)		
Satd. Flow (prot)		
FIt Permitted		
Satd. Flow (perm)		
Right Turn on Red		
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		
Link Speed (mph)		
Link Distance (ft)		
Travel Time (s)		
Peak Hour Factor		
Shared Lane Traffic (%)		
Lane Group Flow (vph)		
Turn Type		
Protected Phases	3	4
Permitted Phases		
Total Split (s)	24.0	68.0
Total Lost Time (s)		
Act Effct Green (s)		
Actuated g/C Ratio		
v/c Ratio		
Control Delay		
Queue Delay		
Total Delay		
LOS		
Approach Delay		
Approach LOS		
Intersection Summary		

2045 Build PM Peak 1: Boggy Creek Rd & SR 417 SB Off Ramp

10/04/2019

	٦	-	\mathbf{i}	∢	-	•	1	Ť	1	>	Ļ	4
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations				ሻሻ		1	ሻሻ	<u>††</u>			<u>††</u>	1
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	0	525	0	325	325	1290	0	0	1720	270
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	0	525	0	325	325	1290	0	0	1720	270
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	0		0	800		375	250		0	0		350
Storage Lanes	0		0	1		1	1		0	0		1
Taper Length (ft)	25		-	25			25		-	25		
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	0	0	3433	0	1583	3433	3539	0	0	3539	1583
Flt Permitted			-	0.950	-		0.044		-	-		
Satd, Flow (perm)	0	0	0	3433	0	1583	159	3539	0	0	3539	1583
Right Turn on Red	•	· ·	Yes		, The second sec	Yes			Yes	•		Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)						85						253
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			45			45	
Link Distance (ft)		1000			1004			600			1000	
Travel Time (s)		22.7			22.8			91			15.2	
Peak Hour Factor	0 95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0 95	0.95	0 95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	0	553	0	342	342	1358	0	0	1811	284
Turn Type	U	U	Ū	Perm	U	Perm	nm+nt	NA	Ū	U	NA	Perm
Protected Phases				I CIIII		T CITI	5	2			6	T OIIII
Permitted Phases				8		8	2	2			0	6
Total Solit (s)				38.2		38.2	20.0	111.8			Q1 8	Q1 8
Total Lost Time (s)				5.5		5.5	20.0	5.5			5.5	5.5
Act Effet Green (s)				32.7		32.7	106.3	106.3			86.3	86.3
Actuated a/C Ratio				0.22		0.22	0.71	0.71			0.58	00.5
v/c Patio				0.22		0.22	0.71	0.71			0.50	0.00
Control Delay				61.5		0.0J 50.7	46.8	6.2			34.5	3.2
				27.2		0.0	40.0	0.2			0.0	0.0
Total Delay				21.3		0.0 50.7	16.8	0.5			24.5	2.0
				00.0 E		59.7	40.0	0.5			04.0	J.Z
LUS Approach Dolov				Г	77 7	E	U	11 G			20.2	A
Approach LOS					//./			14.0 D			30.3	
Approach Los				260	E	240	110	202			700	10
Queue Length 50th (ft)				202		249	11Z #100	293			762	13
Queue Length 95th (II)		000		330	004	#411	#180	534			904	54
Internal Link Dist (It)		920		000	924	275	050	520			920	250
Turn bay Length (It)				000		3/3	200	0507			2026	1010
Base Capacity (vpn)				748		411	429	2507			2036	1018
Starvation Cap Reductin				0		0	0	520			0	0
Spillback Cap Reductin				211		0	0	0			0	0
Storage Cap Reductin				0		0	0	0			0	0
Reduced V/C Ratio				1.03		0.83	0.80	0.68			0.89	0.28
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 150												
Actuated Cycle Length: 15	Actuated Cycle Length: 150											
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced	Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBT, Start of Green											
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.89												
Intersection Signal Delay:	33.6			In	tersectior	n LOS: C						

Intersection Capacity Utilization 89.7%

ICU Level of Service E

Analysis Period (min) 15

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.





2045 Build PM Peak 2: Boggy Creek Rd & SR 417 NB Off Ramp

10/04/2019

	٦	→	\mathbf{r}	4	←	•	1	Ť	1	1	Ļ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻሻ		1					<u>††</u>	1	ኸኘ	<u>††</u>	
Traffic Volume (vph)	245	0	450	0	0	0	0	1370	395	340	1905	0
Future Volume (vph)	245	0	450	0	0	0	0	1370	395	340	1905	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	250		750	0		0	0		350	250		0
Storage Lanes	1		1	0		0	0		1	1		0
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Satd. Flow (prot)	3433	0	1583	0	0	0	0	3539	1583	3433	3539	0
Flt Permitted	0.950									0.130		
Satd. Flow (perm)	3433	0	1583	0	0	0	0	3539	1583	470	3539	0
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)			19						416			
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			45			45	
Link Distance (ft)		1000			1000			1200			600	
Travel Time (s)		22.7			22.7			18.2			9.1	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	258	0	474	0	0	0	0	1442	416	358	2005	0
Turn Type	Prot		Perm					NA	Perm	Perm	NA	
Protected Phases	7							2			6	
Permitted Phases			4						2	6		
Total Split (s)	43.0		43.0					107.0	107.0	107.0	107.0	
Total Lost Time (s)	5.5		5.5					5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	
Act Effct Green (s)	37.5		37.5					101.5	101.5	101.5	101.5	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.25		0.25					0.68	0.68	0.68	0.68	
v/c Ratio	0.30		1.16					0.60	0.35	1.13	0.84	
Control Delay	46.8		141.3					11.4	1.4	99.2	20.0	
Queue Delay	0.0		0.0					0.0	0.0	0.0	16.8	
Total Delay	46.8		141.3					11.4	1.4	99.2	36.7	
LOS	D		F					В	А	F	D	
Approach Delay		108.0						9.2			46.2	
Approach LOS		F						А			D	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	106		~533					278	11	~179	551	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	147		#759					330	m22	m#227	648	
Internal Link Dist (ft)		920			920			1120			520	
Turn Bay Length (ft)	250		750						350	250		
Base Capacity (vph)	858		410					2394	1205	318	2394	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0		0					0	0	0	436	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0		0					0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0		0					0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.30		1.16					0.60	0.35	1.13	1.02	
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 150												
Actuated Cycle Length: 15	0											
Offset: 107.6 (72%), Refer	enced to pha	se 2:NBT	and 6:SI	BTL, Star	t of Greer	1						
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.16												
Intersection Signal Delay:	41.4			In	tersectior	LOS: D						

2045 Build PM Peak 2: Boggy Creek Rd & SR 417 NB Off Ramp

Int	ntersection Capacity Utilization 89.7% IC	U Level of Service E							
Ar	Analysis Period (min) 15								
~	 Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. 								
	Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.								
#	# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.								
	Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.								
m	n Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signa	al.							
Sp	Splits and Phases: 2: Boggy Creek Rd & SR 417 NB Off Ramp								

f ø2 (R)	~⊳ Ø4
107 s	43 s
▼ Ø6 (R)	∕ ø 7
107 s	43 s

2045 Build PM Peak 3: Boggy Creek Rd & Lake Nona Blvd

1	0/	0	4/	2	0	1	9
---	----	---	----	---	---	---	---

	٦	→	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	•	1	Ť	1	6	Ļ	4
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻሻ	∱ ₽		ሻሻ	† †	1	۲	<u>††</u>	1	ሻሻ	††	1
Traffic Volume (vph)	210	555	135	450	630	625	130	930	475	490	1470	395
Future Volume (vph)	210	555	135	450	630	625	130	930	475	490	1470	395
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	450		0	375		500	350		275	625		625
Storage Lanes	2		0	2		1	1		1	2		1
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Satd. Flow (prot)	3433	3437	0	3433	3539	1583	1770	3539	1583	3433	3539	1583
Flt Permitted	0.950			0.950			0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	3433	3437	0	3433	3539	1583	1770	3539	1583	3433	3539	1583
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		18				58			98			98
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			45			45	
Link Distance (ft)		1000			1000			524			1200	
Travel Time (s)		22.7			22.7			7.9			18.2	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	221	726	0	474	663	658	137	979	500	516	1547	416
Turn Type	Prot	NA		Prot	NA	pm+ov	Prot	NA	pm+ov	Prot	NA	pm+ov
Protected Phases	7	4		3	8	1	5	2	3	1	6	7
Permitted Phases						8			2			6
Total Split (s)	18.5	35.2		26.7	43.4	33.6	17.6	54.5	26.7	33.6	70.5	18.5
Total Lost Time (s)	5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5
Act Effct Green (s)	13.0	29.7		21.2	37.9	71.5	12.1	49.0	75.7	28.1	65.0	83.5
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.09	0.20		0.14	0.25	0.48	0.08	0.33	0.50	0.19	0.43	0.56
v/c Ratio	0.74	1.05		0.98	0.74	0.84	0.96	0.85	0.59	0.80	1.01	0.45
Control Delay	82.5	102.3		98.9	57.4	42.3	67.8	65.8	32.2	67.0	56.6	10.4
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	82.5	102.3		98.9	57.4	42.3	67.8	65.8	32.2	67.0	56.6	10.4
LOS	F	F		F	E	D	E	E	С	E	E	В
Approach Delay		97.7			62.8			55.6			51.0	
Approach LOS		F			E			E			D	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	110	~396		241	316	513	138	445	260	238	~786	127
Queue Length 95th (ft)	#165	#530		#357	390	710	m137	m440	m256	m284	m#902	m143
Internal Link Dist (ft)		920			920			444			1120	
Turn Bay Length (ft)	450			375		500	350		275	625		625
Base Capacity (vph)	297	694		485	894	784	142	1156	847	643	1533	924
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.74	1.05		0.98	0.74	0.84	0.96	0.85	0.59	0.80	1.01	0.45
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 150												
Actuated Cycle Length: 150	Actuated Cycle Length: 150											
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced t	o phase 2:	NBT and	6:SBT, S	tart of Gre	en							
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.05												
Intersection Signal Delay: 67	1.7			In	tersectio	n LOS: E						

Intersection Capacity Utilization 98.7%

ICU Level of Service F

Analysis Period (min) 15

- Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
 Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
- # 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
- m Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

Splits and Phases: 3: Boggy Creek Rd & Lake Nona Blvd

Ø1	🖡 🚺 Ø2 (R)	€ ¶Ø3	→ Ø4
33.6 s	54.5 s	26.7 s	35.2 s
Ø5	Ø6 (R) 📮	₽ _{Ø7} •	Ø8
17.6 s 70).5 s	18.5 s 43	3.4 s

2045 Build PM Peak 4: Boggy Creek Rd & Simpson Rd

1	0/	04	12	01	9
---	----	----	----	----	---

	٦	-	\mathbf{i}	4	←	•	•	1	1	1	Ļ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ኘካ	† †	1	۲	đ₽		ኘካ	≜ †₽		<u>۲</u>	<u>†</u> †	1
Traffic Volume (vph)	780	495	475	70	455	205	485	545	190	355	705	750
Future Volume (vph)	780	495	475	70	455	205	485	545	190	355	705	750
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	750		500	500		500	475		500	500		400
Storage Lanes	2		1	1		0	2		0	1		1
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Satd. Flow (prot)	3433	3539	1583	1770	3373	0	3433	3401	0	1770	3539	1583
Flt Permitted	0.950			0.950			0.252			0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	3433	3539	1583	1770	3373	0	911	3401	0	1770	3539	1583
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)			369		43			30				58
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			45			45	
Link Distance (ft)		1005			1143			1333			1671	
Travel Time (s)		22.8			26.0			20.2			25.3	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	821	521	500	74	695	0	511	774	0	374	742	789
Turn Type	Prot	NA	Perm	Prot	NA		pm+pt	NA		Prot	NA	pm+ov
Protected Phases	7	4		3	8		5	2		1	6	. 7
Permitted Phases			4				2					6
Total Split (s)	41.3	56.6	56.6	18.3	33.6		24.0	38.0		37.1	51.1	41.3
Total Lost Time (s)	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5	5.5
Act Effct Green (s)	35.8	51.1	51.1	12.8	28.1		51.0	32.5		31.6	45.6	86.9
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.24	0.34	0.34	0.09	0.19		0.34	0.22		0.21	0.30	0.58
v/c Ratio	1.00	0.43	0.64	0.49	1.04		0.82	1.02		1.01	0.69	0.84
Control Delay	88.3	39.6	14.4	77.1	100.9		41.0	92.2		77.7	64.0	18.4
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	88.3	39.6	14.4	77.1	100.9		41.0	92.2		77.7	64.0	18.4
LOS	F	D	В	Е	F		D	F		E	E	В
Approach Delay		54.5			98.6			71.8			47.8	
Approach LOS		D			F			E			D	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	~419	207	101	70	~367		159	~407		~388	338	284
Queue Length 95th (ft)	#561	262	230	127	#498		#214	#542		m383	m336	m283
Internal Link Dist (ft)		925			1063			1253			1591	
Turn Bay Length (ft)	750		500	500			475			500		400
Base Capacity (vph)	819	1205	782	151	666		620	760		372	1075	941
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Reduced v/c Ratio	1.00	0.43	0.64	0.49	1.04		0.82	1.02		1.01	0.69	0.84
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 150												
Actuated Cycle Length: 150	ctuated Cycle Length: 150											
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced	to phase 2:1	NBTL and	16:SBT, S	Start of G	reen							
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.04												
Intersection Signal Delay: 6	52.0			lr	Itersection	n LOS: E						

Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.5%

ICU Level of Service G

Analysis Period (min) 15

- Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
 Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
- # 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
- m Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

Splits and Phases: 4: Boggy Creek Rd & Simpson Rd

Ø1	🚽 📢 ø2 (R)	Ø3	⊸ ▶Ø4	
37.1 s	38 s	18.3 s	56.6 s	
Ø 5	4 Ø6 (R) 🕊	🐓 🖉		←ø8
24 s	51.1 s	41.3 s		33.6 s

2045 Build PM Peak 5: Lake Nona Blvd & SR 417 SB Off Ramp

10/04/2019

	٦	-	\mathbf{i}	∢	←	×	1	Ť	1	1	Ŧ	4
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations				ሻሻ		1	ሻሻ	††			t₽	
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	0	725	0	220	715	655	0	0	470	210
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	0	725	0	220	715	655	0	0	470	210
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	0		0	1000		750	0		0	0		0
Storage Lanes	0		0	1		1	2		0	0		0
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	0	0	3433	0	1583	3433	3539	0	0	3376	0
Flt Permitted				0.950			0.174					
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	0	0	3433	0	1583	629	3539	0	0	3376	0
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)						232					49	
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		1045			1472			617			924	
Travel Time (s)		23.8			33.5			14.0			21.0	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	0	763	0	232	753	689	0	0	716	0
Turn Type				Perm		Perm	pm+pt	NA			NA	
Protected Phases							5	2			6	
Permitted Phases				8		8	2					
Total Split (s)				54.0		54.0	45.0	96.0			51.0	
Total Lost Time (s)				5.5		5.5	5.5	5.5			5.5	
Act Effct Green (s)				48.5		48.5	90.5	90.5			45.5	
Actuated g/C Ratio				0.32		0.32	0.60	0.60			0.30	
v/c Ratio				0.69		0.35	0.67	0.32			0.68	
Control Delay				48.0		5.7	55.9	21.0			46.3	
Queue Delay				0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0			0.2	
Total Delay				48.0		5.7	55.9	21.0			46.4	
LOS				D		А	Е	С			D	
Approach Delay					38.1			39.2			46.4	
Approach LOS					D			D			D	
Queue Length 50th (ft)				335		0	323	168			303	
Queue Length 95th (ft)				408		62	m386	m225			376	
Internal Link Dist (ft)		965			1392			537			844	
Turn Bay Length (ft)				1000		750						
Base Capacity (vph)				1110		668	1117	2135			1058	
Starvation Cap Reductn				0		0	0	0			0	
Spillback Cap Reductn				0		0	0	0			34	
Storage Cap Reductn				0		0	0	0			0	
Reduced v/c Ratio				0.69		0.35	0.67	0.32			0.70	
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 150												
Actuated Cycle Length: 150	0											
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced	to phase 2:I	NBTL and	6:SBT, 3	Start of Gi	reen							
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.69												
Intersection Signal Delay: 4	40.5			In	tersectior	n LOS: D						

Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.2% ICU Level of Service G

Analysis Period (min) 15

m Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

Splits and Phases: 5: Lake Nona Blvd & SR 417 SB Off Ramp

1 Ø2 (R)			
96 s			
Ø 5		Ø8	
45 s	51 s	54 s	

2045 Build PM Peak 6: Lake Nona Blvd & SR 417 NB Off Ramp

10/04/2019

	٦	-	\mathbf{r}	∢	-	•	1	Ť	1	1	↓	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲		1					††	1	۲	<u>††</u>	
Traffic Volume (vph)	220	0	855	0	0	0	0	1150	1110	100	1095	0
Future Volume (vph)	220	0	855	0	0	0	0	1150	1110	100	1095	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	750		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
Storage Lanes	1		1	0		0	0		1	1		0
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	0	1583	0	0	0	0	3539	1583	1770	3539	0
Flt Permitted	0.950									0.062		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	0	1583	0	0	0	0	3539	1583	115	3539	0
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)			58						798			
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		1019			1486			1374			617	
Travel Time (s)		23.2			33.8			31.2			14.0	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	232	0	900	0	0	0	0	1211	1168	105	1153	0
Turn Type	Perm		Perm					NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	
Protected Phases								2		1	6	
Permitted Phases	4		4						2	6		
Total Split (s)	75.0		75.0					64.5	64.5	10.5	75.0	
Total Lost Time (s)	5.5		5.5					5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	
Act Effct Green (s)	69.5		69.5					59.0	59.0	69.5	69.5	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.46		0.46					0.39	0.39	0.46	0.46	
v/c Ratio	0.28		1.18					0.87	1.06	0.97	0.70	
Control Delay	26.1		127.8					50.0	57.5	112.3	47.3	
Queue Delay	0.0		0.0					0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	
Total Delay	26.1		127.8					50.0	57.5	112.3	48.4	
LOS	С		F					D	E	F	D	
Approach Delay		107.0						53.7			53.8	
Approach LOS		F						D			D	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	138		~1021					572	~744	73	400	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	202		#1285					671	#1013	m#156	492	
Internal Link Dist (ft)		939			1406			1294			537	
Turn Bay Length (ft)	750											
Base Capacity (vph)	820		764					1392	1106	108	1639	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0		0					0	0	0	255	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0		0					0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0		0					0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.28		1.18					0.87	1.06	0.97	0.83	
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 150												
Actuated Cycle Length: 15	0											
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced	I to phase 2:I	VBT and	6:SBTL, S	Start of G	reen							
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.18												
Intersection Signal Delay:	66.4			In	tersectior	LOS: E						

2045 Build PM Peak 6: Lake Nona Blvd & SR 417 NB Off Ramp

10/04/2019

Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.2%

ICU Level of Service G

Analysis Period (min) 15

- Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
 Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
- # 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
- m Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

Splits and Phases: 6: Lake Nona Blvd & SR 417 NB Off Ramp

😼 🖕 🖗 🖉 2 (R)	- [≜] Ø4
10.5 s 64.5 s	75 s
↓ Ø6 ()	
75 s	

2045 Build PM Peak 9: Narcoossee Rd & Boggy Creek Rd

1	0	/0	4	2	0	1	9	
---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	--

	٦	-	\mathbf{r}	¥	+	×	1	1	۲	6	ţ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ኘካ	1	1	۲	4		ኘኘ	ተተኈ		ሻ	<u></u>	1
Traffic Volume (vph)	550	110	430	20	75	95	425	1800	35	100	2065	885
Future Volume (vph)	550	110	430	20	75	95	425	1800	35	100	2065	885
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	500		500	250		0	350		0	500		250
Storage Lanes	2		1	1		0	2		0	1		1
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Satd. Flow (prot)	3433	1863	1583	1770	1706	0	3433	5070	0	1770	5085	1583
Flt Permitted	0.950			0.950			0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	3433	1863	1583	1770	1706	0	3433	5070	0	1770	5085	1583
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)			48		28			2				482
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		769			573			1249			2280	
Travel Time (s)		17.5			13.0			28.4			51.8	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	579	116	453	21	179	0	447	1932	0	105	2174	932
Turn Type	Prot	NA	pm+ov	Prot	NA		Prot	NA		Prot	NA	Perm
Protected Phases	7	4	5	3	8		5	2		1	6	
Permitted Phases			4									6
Total Split (s)	37.0	48.6	30.2	11.9	23.5		30.2	95.2		24.3	89.3	89.3
Total Lost Time (s)	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5	5.5
Act Effct Green (s)	31.5	43.1	73.3	6.4	18.0		24.7	89.7		18.8	83.8	83.8
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.18	0.24	0.41	0.04	0.10		0.14	0.50		0.10	0.47	0.47
v/c Ratio	0.96	0.26	0.67	0.34	0.92		0.95	0.76		0.57	0.92	0.94
Control Delay	101.5	57.4	44.5	99.5	111.6		106.2	39.1		79.6	41.5	27.2
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	101.5	57.4	44.5	99.5	111.6		106.2	39.1		79.6	41.5	27.2
LOS	F	Е	D	F	F		F	D		Е	D	С
Approach Delay		74.5			110.4			51.7			38.6	
Approach LOS		Е			F			D			D	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	355	112	394	25	182		274	668		129	632	291
Queue Length 95th (ft)	#478	177	533	60	#339		#387	726		m154	816	m#596
Internal Link Dist (ft)		689			493			1169			2200	
Turn Bay Length (ft)	500		500	250			350			500		250
Base Capacity (vph)	600	446	673	62	195		471	2527		184	2367	994
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.96	0.26	0.67	0.34	0.92		0.95	0.76		0.57	0.92	0.94
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 180												
Actuated Cycle Length: 180												
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced to	o phase 2:1	VBT and	6:SBT, S	tart of Gre	en							
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.96												
Intersection Signal Delay: 51	1.1			lr	tersection	n LOS: D						

Intersection Capacity Utilization 95.8%

ICU Level of Service F

Analysis Period (min) 15

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

m Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

Splits and Phases: 9: Narcoossee Rd & Boggy Creek Rd

Ø1	10 2 (R)	√ Ø3 →Ø4	
24.3 s	95.2 s	11.9 <mark>s </mark> 48.6 s	
🔦 ø5	● ↓ Ø6 (R)	▶ _{Ø7}	← Ø8
30.2 s	89.3 s	37 s	23.5 s

	amp/OF			mpα	Cyrlis						10/0	,2013
	•	-	\mathbf{r}	1	-	•	1	Ť	1	*	Ŧ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ካካ	∱ Ъ		<u>۳</u>	<u>††</u>	1	۳.		1	ሻሻ		1
Traffic Volume (vph)	580	860	50	125	620	475	30	0	85	710	0	860
Future Volume (vph)	580	860	50	125	620	475	30	0	85	710	0	860
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	750		0	500		500	250		0	750		750
Storage Lanes	2		0	1		1	1		1	1		1
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Satd. Flow (prot)	3433	3511	0	1770	3539	1583	1770	0	1583	3433	0	1583
Flt Permitted	0.950			0.950			0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	3433	3511	0	1770	3539	1583	1770	0	1583	3433	0	1583
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		4				500			98			488
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		922			976			985			1157	
Travel Time (s)		21.0			22.2			22.4			26.3	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	611	958	0	132	653	500	32	0	89	_747	0	905
Turn Type	Prot	NA		Prot	NA	Perm	Perm		Perm	Perm		Perm
Protected Phases	5	2		1	6	-			-			
Permitted Phases						6	8		8	4		4
Total Split (s)	36.6	54.0		21.0	38.4	38.4	75.0		75.0	75.0		75.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5		5.5
Act Effct Green (s)	31.1	48.5		15.5	32.9	32.9	69.5		69.5	69.5		69.5
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.21	0.32		0.10	0.22	0.22	0.46		0.46	0.46		0.46
v/c Ratio	0.86	0.84		0.73	0.84	0.68	0.04		0.11	0.47		0.91
Control Delay	70.3	55.0		87.6	67.0	9.0	22.3		3.5	28.8		30.7
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Total Delay	70.3	55.0		87.6	67.0	9.0	22.3		3.5	28.8		30.7
LUS Annual Delay	E	E		F	E 40.0	A	C	0.5	A	C	00.0	C
Approach Delay		61.0			46.6			8.5			29.8	
Approach LUS	200	E		407	D	0	47	A	0	054	C	457
Queue Length 50th (ft)	300 #200	457		127	325	107	17		0	254		457
Queue Length 95th (ft)	#390	546		#226	401	107	38	005	21	310	4077	#812
Internal LINK Dist (ft)	750	842		500	896	500	050	905		750	1077	750
Turn Bay Length (ft)	750	4407		500	770	500	250		700	/50		750
Base Capacity (Vpn)	/11	1137		182	//6	/3/	820		/80	1590		995
Starvation Cap Reductin	0	0		0	0	0	0		0	0		0
Spillback Cap Reductin	0	0		0	0	0	0		0	0		0
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.86	0.84		0.73	0.84	0.68	0.04		0.11	0.47		0.91
Intersection Summary									••••	••••		
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 150												
Actuated Cycle Length: 15	0											
Offset: () (0%) Referenced	to phase 2.	EBT and	6.WBT S	start of Gr	een							
Control Type: Pretimed	2.10 phase 2.1		0.11D1, C		0011							
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.91												
Intersection Signal Delay	44 5			In	tersection	10 <u>8</u> D						

2045 Build PM Peak 10: OPE EB Off Ramp/OPE WB Off Ramp & Cyrils

10/04/2019

Intersection Capacity Utilization 86.2%

ICU Level of Service E

Analysis Period (min) 15

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 10: OPE EB Off Ramp/OPE WB Off Ramp & Cyrils



2045 Build PM Peak 11: OPE EB Off Ramp/OPE WB Off Ramp

10/04/2019

	٦	-	\mathbf{F}	∢	+	×	1	Ť	1	1	Ļ	4
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲		11	۲		11	ካካ	<u></u>	1	ሻሻ	<u></u>	1
Traffic Volume (vph)	275	0	645	335	0	795	535	1490	420	970	2070	225
Future Volume (vph)	275	0	645	335	0	795	535	1490	420	970	2070	225
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	750		750	995		995	800		500	750		750
Storage Lanes	1		1	1		0	2		1	1		1
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	0	2787	1770	0	2787	3433	5085	1583	3433	5085	1583
Flt Permitted	0.950			0.950			0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	0	2787	1770	0	2787	3433	5085	1583	3433	5085	1583
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)			79			30			79			30
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		1410			1570			2280			907	
Travel Time (s)		32.0			35.7			51.8			20.6	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	289	0	679	353	0	837	563	1568	442	1021	2179	237
Turn Type	Prot		pm+ov	Prot		pm+ov	Prot	NA	pm+ov	Prot	NA	pm+ov
Protected Phases	4		5	8		1	5	2	8	1	6	4
Permitted Phases			4			8			2			6
Total Split (s)	47.0		39.0	47.0		65.0	39.0	68.0	47.0	65.0	94.0	47.0
Total Lost Time (s)	8.0		8.0	8.0		8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
Act Effct Green (s)	39.0		78.0	39.0		104.0	31.0	60.0	107.0	57.0	86.0	133.0
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.22		0.43	0.22		0.58	0.17	0.33	0.59	0.32	0.48	0.74
v/c Ratio	0.75		0.54	0.92		0.52	0.95	0.93	0.45	0.94	0.90	0.20
Control Delay	79.7		34.8	98.0		23.3	84.5	84.0	13.8	75.6	49.0	6.7
Queue Delay	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	79.7		34.8	98.0		23.3	84.5	84.0	13.8	75.6	49.0	6.7
LOS	E		С	F		С	F	F	В	E	D	A
Approach Delay		48.2			45.5			72.1			54.0	
Approach LOS		D			D			E			D	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	324		298	413		317	349	609	158	608	853	68
Queue Length 95th (ft)	443		369	#612		381	m#438	m659	m222	#739	918	100
Internal Link Dist (ft)		1330			1490			2200			827	
Turn Bay Length (ft)	750		750	995		995	800		500	750		750
Base Capacity (vph)	383		1252	383		1622	591	1695	973	1087	2429	1177
Starvation Cap Reductn	0		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spillback Cap Reductn	0		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Storage Cap Reductn	0		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.75		0.54	0.92		0.52	0.95	0.93	0.45	0.94	0.90	0.20
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 180												
Actuated Cycle Length: 180)											
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced	to phase 2:1	NBT and	6:SBT, S	tart of Gre	en							
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.95												
Intersection Signal Delay: 5	57.8			In	tersectio	n LOS: E						

2045 Build PM Peak 11: OPE EB Off Ramp/OPE WB Off Ramp

Intersection Capacity Utilization 97.8%

ICU Level of Service F

Analysis Period (min) 15

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

m Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

Splits and Phases: 11: OPE EB Off Ramp/OPE WB Off Ramp

ø ₀₁	Ø2 (R)	💐 ø4
65 s	68 s	47 s
\$ Ø5	∮ Ø6 (R)	₹ ₹ø8
39 s	94 s	47 s

2045 Build PM Peak 12: Simpson Rd Extension & OPE EB Off Ramp

1	0	/0	4/	2	0	1	9
---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---

	٦	-	\mathbf{r}	4	-	•	1	1	1	>	Ļ	4
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		1	1	٦	†					۲		1
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	725	315	205	440	0	0	0	0	190	0	290
Future Volume (vph)	0	725	315	205	440	0	0	0	0	190	0	290
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	0		250	300		0	0		0	0		250
Storage Lanes	0		1	1		0	0		0	1		1
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	1863	1583	1770	1863	0	0	0	0	1770	0	1583
Flt Permitted				0.157						0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	1863	1583	292	1863	0	0	0	0	1770	0	1583
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)			310									305
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		1176			705			1010			1168	
Travel Time (s)		26.7			16.0			23.0			26.5	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	763	332	216	463	0	0	0	0	200	0	305
Turn Type		NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA					Perm		Perm
Protected Phases		4		3	8							
Permitted Phases			4	8						6		6
Total Split (s)		70.0	70.0	20.0	90.0					30.0		30.0
Total Lost Time (s)		5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5					5.5		5.5
Act Effct Green (s)		64.5	64.5	84.5	84.5					24.5		24.5
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.54	0.54	0.70	0.70					0.20		0.20
v/c Ratio		0.76	0.33	0.56	0.35					0.55		0.54
Control Delay		28.0	3.0	27.0	9.4					49.5		8.4
Queue Delay		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					0.0		0.0
Total Delay		28.0	3.0	27.0	9.4					49.5		8.4
LOS		С	A	С	A					D		A
Approach Delay		20.4			15.0						24.7	
Approach LOS		С	-		В						С	
Queue Length 50th (ft)		444	8	121	152					140		0
Queue Length 95th (ft)		613	51	205	260					219		76
Internal Link Dist (ft)		1096			625			930			1088	
Turn Bay Length (ft)		4004	250	300	1011					0.0.4		250
Base Capacity (vph)		1001	994	384	1311					361		565
Starvation Cap Reductn		0	0	0	0					0		0
Spillback Cap Reductn		0	0	0	0					0		0
Storage Cap Reductn		0 70	0	0	0 25					0		0
Reduced V/c Ratio		0.76	0.33	0.56	0.35					0.55		0.54
Intersection Summary	0.11											
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 120	•											
Actuated Cycle Length: 12	0	10.0-		(0								
Uffset: U (U%), Referenced	to phase 2:	and 6:SE	E, Start o	of Green								
Control Type: Pretimed												
iviaximum v/c Ratio: 0.76	40.7											
Intersection Signal Delay:	19.7			In	tersectior	n los: B						

2045 Build PM Peak 12: Simpson Rd Extension & OPE EB Off Ramp

10/04/2019

Intersection Capacity Utilization 73.8%

Analysis Period (min) 15

ICU Level of Service D

Splits and Phases: 12: Simpson Rd Extension & OPE EB Off Ramp

	√ Ø3	⊸ ≢ø4	
	20 s	70 s	
₩ Ø6 (R)	Ø8		
30 s	90 s		

2045 Build PM Peak 13: OPE WB Off Ramp & Simpson Rd Extension

10	/04	/20	19
10	/04/	120	13

	≯	-	\mathbf{F}	4	-	•	1	1	1	5	Ļ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲	1			1	1	٦		1			
Traffic Volume (vph)	435	480	0	0	440	285	205	0	135	0	0	0
Future Volume (vph)	435	480	0	0	440	285	205	0	135	0	0	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	300		0	0		250	300		0	0		0
Storage Lanes	1		0	0		1	1		1	0		0
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1863	0	0	1863	1583	1770	0	1583	0	0	0
Flt Permitted	0.228						0.950					
Satd. Flow (perm)	425	1863	0	0	1863	1583	1770	0	1583	0	0	0
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)						300			142			
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		705			2048			955			1231	
Travel Time (s)		16.0			46.5			21.7			28.0	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	458	505	0	0	463	300	216	0	142	0	0	0
Turn Type	pm+pt	NA			NA	Perm	Perm		Perm			
Protected Phases	7	4			8							
Permitted Phases	4					8	2		2			
Total Split (s)	39.2	88.2			49.0	49.0	31.8		31.8			
Total Lost Time (s)	5.5	5.5			5.5	5.5	5.5		5.5			
Act Effct Green (s)	82.7	82.7			43.5	43.5	26.3		26.3			
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.69	0.69			0.36	0.36	0.22		0.22			
v/c Ratio	0.68	0.39			0.69	0.39	0.56		0.31			
Control Delay	35.8	7.8			38.8	4.5	48.1		8.2			
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0			
Total Delay	35.8	7.8			38.8	4.5	48.1		8.2			
LOS	D	А			D	А	D		А			
Approach Delay		21.1			25.3			32.2				
Approach LOS		С			С			С				
Queue Length 50th (ft)	239	129			301	0	150		0			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	346	200			424	58	232		53			
Internal Link Dist (ft)		625			1968			875			1151	
Turn Bay Length (ft)	300					250	300					
Base Capacity (vph)	670	1283			675	765	387		457			
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0			0	0	0		0			
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0			0	0	0		0			
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0			0	0	0		0			
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.68	0.39			0.69	0.39	0.56		0.31			
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 120												
Actuated Cycle Length: 120)											
Ottset: 0 (0%), Referenced	to phase 2:1	VBL and 6	5:, Start o	t Green								
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.69												
Intersection Signal Delay: 2	4.6			In	tersectior	n LOS: C						

Intersection Capacity Utilization 73.8% ICU Level

Analysis Period (min) 15

ICU Level of Service D

Splits and Phases: 13: OPE WB Off Ramp & Simpson Rd Extension

ï2 (R)	<u></u> ø₄		
31.8 s	88.2 s		
	▶ _{Ø7}	<mark>≪≜</mark> Ø8	
	39.2 s	49 s	

2045 Build PM Peak 14: OPE EB On Ramp & Laureate Blvd

1	0	/0	4	2	0	1	9
---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---

	→	\mathbf{r}	∢	-	1	1
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations	•	1	7	•		
Traffic Volume (voh)	275	645	335	535	0	0
Future Volume (vph)	275	645	335	535	0	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ff)	1000	150	250		0	0
Storage Lanes		1	1		Ő	Ő
Taper Length (ft)			25		25	0
Satd, Flow (prot)	1863	1583	1770	1863	0	0
Flt Permitted	1000	1000	0.583		v	v
Satd, Flow (perm)	1863	1583	1086	1863	0	0
Right Turn on Red	1000	Yes		.000		Yes
Satd Flow (RTOR)		100				100
Link Speed (mph)	30			30	30	
Link Distance (ff)	1092			630	737	
Travel Time (s)	24.8			14 3	16.8	
Peak Hour Factor	24.0 0 05	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.0	0.95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)	0.95	0.90	0.35	0.95	0.90	0.95
Lane Group Flow (uph)	280	670	353	563	0	٥
Lane Gloup Flow (vpil)	209	Dorm	Dorm	505	0	U
Protected Phases	INA 1	Feilli	Feilli	NA 0		
Pormitted Phases	4	Α	0	0		
Termilleu Phases	100.0	4	0 100 0	120.0		
Total Split (S)	120.0	120.0	120.0	120.0		
Act Effet Croop (c)	100.0	5.5 100.0	0.0 100.0	0.0 100.0		
Actuated a/C Datia	120.0	120.0	120.0	120.0		
Actuated g/C Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		
V/C Ratio	0.16	0.43	0.33	0.30		
Control Delay	0.2	0.9	0.6	0.3		
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
l otal Delay	0.2	0.9	0.6	0.3		
LUS	A	A	A	A		
Approach Delay	0.7			0.4		
Approach LOS	A	^	^	A		
Queue Length 50th (ft)	0	0	0	0		
Queue Length 95th (tt)	0	0	m0	m0	0	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	1012	150	050	550	657	
Turn Bay Length (ft)		150	250			
Base Capacity (vph)	1863	1583	1086	1863		
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0		
Spillback Cap Reductn	342	0	0	0		
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0		
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.19	0.43	0.33	0.30		
Intersection Summary						
Area Type:	Other					
Cycle Length: 120						
Actuated Cycle Length: 12	0					
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced	to phase 2:	and 6:, S	tart of Gr	een		
Control Type: Pretimed		, -				
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.43						
Intersection Signal Delay:	0.5			In	tersection	LOS: A

Intersection Capacity Utilization 101.0%

ICU Level of Service G

Analysis Period (min) 15

m Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

Splits and Phases: 14: OPE EB On Ramp & Laureate Blvd

₩ Ø4			
120 s			
₩ Ø8			
120 s			

10/04/2019	J
------------	---

	→	\mathbf{F}	4	←	•	1
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations	1			1	۲	1
Traffic Volume (vph)	970	0	0	335	535	420
Future Volume (vph)	970	0	0	335	535	420
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)		0	0		250	0
Storage Lanes		0	0		1	1
Taper Length (ft)		-	25		25	
Satd, Flow (prot)	1863	0	0	1863	1770	1583
Flt Permitted		v	v		0.950	
Satd, Flow (perm)	1863	0	0	1863	1770	1583
Right Turn on Red	,000	Yes	v			Yes
Satd, Flow (RTOR)						.00
Link Speed (mph)	30			30	30	
Link Distance (ft)	630			1849	692	
Travel Time (s)	14.3			42.0	15.7	
Peak Hour Factor	0 95	0 95	0 95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Shared Lane Traffic (%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50
Lane Group Flow (vpb)	1021	0	0	353	563	442
Turn Type	NΔ	U	U	NΔ	Prot	Perm
Protected Phases	<u> </u>			8	2	i cim
Permitted Phases				0	2	2
Total Solit (s)	73.0			73.0	47.0	47 0
Total Lost Time (e)	5.5			5.5	55	5.5
Act Effet Green (s)	67.5			67.5	11 5	11 5
Actuated a/C Patio	07.5			07.5	0.25	41.5
v/c Ratio	0.00			0.30	0.00	0.33
Control Delay	10.50			15.2	50 7	21.2
	40.7 26 0			0.0	0.0	04.2
Total Dolay	01 C			15.2	0.0 50.7	24.0
	04.0			10.3	59.7	34.Z
LUS Annrach Delais	F			45.0	10 C	U
Approach Delay	ŏ4.b			15.3	48.5	
Approach LOS	F			В	D	005
Queue Length 50th (ft)	/30			141	416	235
Queue Length 95th (ft)	#1054			203	#633	363
Internal Link Dist (ft)	550			1/69	612	
Turn Bay Length (ft)	40.1-			40.4=	250	
Base Capacity (vph)	1047			1047	612	611
Starvation Cap Reductn	110			0	0	0
Spillback Cap Reductn	0			0	0	0
Storage Cap Reductn	0			0	0	0
Reduced v/c Ratio	1.09			0.34	0.92	0.72
Intersection Summary						
Area Type:	Other					
Cycle Length: 120						
Actuated Cycle Length: 12	20					
Offset: 0 (0%), Reference	d to phase 2:N	NBL and (6:, Start o	f Green		
Control Type: Pretimed						
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.98						
Intersection Signal Delay:	59.1			In	tersectior	LOS: E

Intersection Capacity Utilization 101.0%

ICU Level of Service G

Analysis Period (min) 15

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 15: OPE WB Off Ramp & Laureate Blvd

ï2 (R)	→ Ø4
47 s	73 s
	← Ø8
	73 s

2045 Build PM Peak 28: Narcoosse NB

	4	*	٦	1	` +	\mathbf{F}
Lane Group	WBL	WBR	NBL	NBR	SEL	SER
Lane Configurations			ሻሻሻ	1		
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	1850	1035	0	0
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	1850	1035	0	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	0	0	0	750	0	0
Storage Lanes	0	0	3	1	0	0
Taper Length (ft)	25		25		25	
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	0	4990	1583	0	0
Flt Permitted			0.950			
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	0	4990	1583	0	0
Link Speed (mph)	30		30		30	
Link Distance (ft)	361		1000		250	
Travel Time (s)	8.2		22.7		5.7	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Shared Lane Traffic (%)						
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	2011	1125	0	0
Sign Control	Stop		Free		Stop	
Intersection Summary						
Area Type:	Other					

Control Type: Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Utilization 113.1% Analysis Period (min) 15

ICU Level of Service H

2045 Build PM Peak 32: Narcoosse SB

	F	×.	1	لر	•	/
Lane Group	WBL	WBR	SBL	SBR	NEL	NER
Lane Configurations			Y	***		
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	210	2810	0	0
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	210	2810	0	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	0	1638	4085	0	0
Flt Permitted			0.987			
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	0	1638	4085	0	0
Link Speed (mph)	30		30		30	
Link Distance (ft)	361		600		250	
Travel Time (s)	8.2		13.6		5.7	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Shared Lane Traffic (%)				20%		
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	839	2443	0	0
Sign Control	Stop		Free		Stop	
Intersection Summary						
	Other					

Area Type: Control Type: Unsignalized

Intersection Capacity Utilization 117.3% Analysis Period (min) 15 ICU Level of Service H

2045 Build PM Peak 34: Narcoosse SB

	٨	ľ	Ļ	1	÷	t
Lane Group	FRI	FRR	SRI	SBR	NI\\/I	NWR
Lane Configurations			ካካካ			
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	1600	565	0	0
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	1600	565	0	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	0	4990	1583	0	0
Flt Permitted			0.950			
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	0	4990	1583	0	0
Link Speed (mph)	30		30		30	
Link Distance (ft)	356		1100		250	
Travel Time (s)	8.1		25.0		5.7	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Shared Lane Traffic (%)						
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	1739	614	0	0
Sign Control	Free		Free		Free	
Intersection Summary						
Area Type:	Other					

Area Type: O Control Type: Unsignalized

Intersection Capacity Utilization 82.6% Analysis Period (min) 15 ICU Level of Service E

2045 Build PM Peak 36: SR 417 SB Off Ramp

	*	*	\	2	3	/
Lane Group	WBL	WBR	SEL	SER	NEL	NER
Lane Configurations	ኘቸ	7				
Traffic Volume (vph)	1420	250	0	0	0	0
Future Volume (vph)	1420	250	0	0	0	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Satd. Flow (prot)	3434	1441	0	0	0	0
Flt Permitted	0.953					
Satd. Flow (perm)	3434	1441	0	0	0	0
Link Speed (mph)	30		30		30	
Link Distance (ft)	1513		274		274	
Travel Time (s)	34.4		6.2		6.2	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Shared Lane Traffic (%)		10%				
Lane Group Flow (vph)	1570	245	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free		Stop		Stop	
Intersection Summary						

Area Type:OtherControl Type: UnsignalizedIntersection Capacity Utilization 82.4%Analysis Period (min) 15

ICU Level of Service E

	٢	-	-	*	\	4
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SEL	SER
Lane Configurations		†			ሻሻ	
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	1035	0	0	210	0
Future Volume (vph)	0	1035	0	0	210	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	1863	0	0	3433	0
Flt Permitted					0.950	
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	1863	0	0	3433	0
Link Speed (mph)		30	30		30	
Link Distance (ft)		361	1400		361	
Travel Time (s)		8.2	31.8		8.2	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Shared Lane Traffic (%)						
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	1125	0	0	228	0
Sign Control		Yield	Stop		Free	
Intersection Summary						
Area Type:	Other					

Control Type: Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Utilization 117.3% Analysis Period (min) 15

ICU Level of Service H

2045 Build PM Peak 40: SR 417 NB Off Ramp

	_#	-	-	۲	6	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SWL	SWR
Lane Configurations	۳	4				
Traffic Volume (vph)	590	685	0	0	0	0
Future Volume (vph)	590	685	0	0	0	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Satd. Flow (prot)	1681	1763	0	0	0	0
Flt Permitted	0.950	0.996				
Satd. Flow (perm)	1681	1763	0	0	0	0
Link Speed (mph)		30	30		30	
Link Distance (ft)		1200	361		361	
Travel Time (s)		27.3	8.2		8.2	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Shared Lane Traffic (%)	10%					
Lane Group Flow (vph)	577	809	0	0	0	0
Sign Control		Free	Stop		Stop	
Intersection Summary						
Area Type:	Other					

Control Type: Unsignalized

Intersection Capacity Utilization 78.4% Analysis Period (min) 15

ICU Level of Service D

2045 Build PM Peak 41: Narcoosse NB

	_#	~	•	1	4	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBR	SWL	SWR
Lane Configurations			ኘዋ	11		
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	405	2035	0	0
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	405	2035	0	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	0	3215	2723	0	0
Flt Permitted			0.982			
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	0	3215	2723	0	0
Link Speed (mph)	30		30		30	
Link Distance (ft)	356		600		250	
Travel Time (s)	8.1		13.6		5.7	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Shared Lane Traffic (%)				33%		
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	1170	1482	0	0
Sign Control	Free		Free		Free	
Intersection Summary						
Area Type:	Other					

Area Type: C Control Type: Unsignalized

Intersection Capacity Utilization 60.3% Analysis Period (min) 15 ICU Level of Service B

← ₹ ·	6 1
	- '
Lane Group EBL EBT WBT WBR SV	VL SWR
Lane Configurations	1
Traffic Volume (vph) 0 0 405 0	0 565
Future Volume (vph) 0 0 405 0	0 565
Ideal Flow (vphpl) 1900 1900 1900 1900 190	00 1900
Satd. Flow (prot) 0 0 3539 0	0 1611
Flt Permitted	
Satd. Flow (perm) 0 0 3539 0	0 1611
Link Speed (mph) 30 30 30	30
Link Distance (ft) 1205 356 35	56
Travel Time (s) 27.4 8.1 8	3.1
Peak Hour Factor 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92	92 0.92
Shared Lane Traffic (%)	
Lane Group Flow (vph) 0 0 440 0	0 614
Sign Control Stop Free Yie	əld
Intersection Summary	
Area Type. Other	

Control Type: Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Utilization 60.3%

Analysis Period (min) 15

ICU Level of Service B
2045 Build PM Peak 51: Narcoosse SB & SR 417 NB Off Ramp

	_#	\rightarrow	1	T.	¥	*			
Lane Group	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBR	SWL	SWR	Ø3	Ø4	
Lane Configurations		11			ነነነነ				
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	685	0	0	2810	0			
Future Volume (vph)	0	685	0	0	2810	0			
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900			
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	2787	0	0	6441	0			
Flt Permitted					0.950				
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	2787	0	0	6441	0			
Right Turn on Red		Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes			
Satd. Flow (RTOR)					396				
Link Speed (mph)	30		30		30				
Link Distance (ft)	361		1000		250				
Travel Time (s)	8.2		22.7		5.7				
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92			
Shared Lane Traffic (%)									
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	745	0	0	3054	0			
Turn Type		Prot			Prot				
Protected Phases		2			43		3	4	
Permitted Phases									
Total Split (s)		83.0					24.0	73.0	
Total Lost Time (s)		6.0							
Act Effct Green (s)		77.0			91.0				
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.43			0.51				
v/c Ratio		0.62			0.88				
Control Delay		43.1			4.1				
Queue Delay		0.0			1.2				
Total Delay		43.1			5.3				
LOS		D			А				
Approach Delay	43.1				5.3				
Approach LOS	D				A				
Intersection Summary									
Area Type:	Other								
Cycle Length: 180									
Actuated Cycle Length: 180									
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced t	o phase 2:I	EBR and	6:, Start o	of Green					
Control Type: Pretimed									
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.94									
Intersection Signal Delay: 12	2.7			In	tersection	n LOS: B			
Intersection Capacity Utilizat	tion 86.5%			IC	CU Level	of Service	E		
Analysis Period (min) 15									

Splits and Phases: 51: Narcoosse SB & SR 417 NB Off Ramp

#51 #52 #53 #54 #55 #56	#51 #52 #53 #5	# \$5 # \$6 2 #53 #54 #55 #56
🚗 📉 🕇 🌶 🗡 🎸 ø2 (R)		↓ ↓ ↓ Ø4
83 s	24 s	73 s

2045 Build PM Peak 52: Narcoosse SB & Narcoosse NB

	.	×	2	F	×	۲	3	*	~	í,	*	×
Lane Group	SEL	SET	SER	NWL	NWT	NWR	NEL	NET	NER	SWL	SWT	SWR
Lane Configurations					<u>†††</u>						1111	
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	0	0	1850	0	0	0	0	0	2810	0
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	0	0	1850	0	0	0	0	0	2810	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	0	0	0	5085	0	0	0	0	0	6408	0
Flt Permitted												
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	0	0	0	5085	0	0	0	0	0	6408	0
Right Turn on Red			Yes	Yes		Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)												
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		250			250			250			250	
Travel Time (s)		5.7			5.7			5.7			5.7	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	0	0	2011	0	0	0	0	0	3054	0
Turn Type					NA						NA	
Protected Phases					2						43	
Permitted Phases												
Total Split (s)					83.0							
Total Lost Time (s)					6.0							
Act Effct Green (s)					77.0						91.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio					0.43						0.51	
v/c Ratio					0.92						0.94	
Control Delay					57.0						41.9	
Queue Delay					0.0						0.0	
Total Delay					57.1						41.9	
LOS					E						D	
Approach Delay					57.1						41.9	
Approach LOS					E						D	
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 180	-											
Actuated Cycle Length: 18	0											
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced	to phase 2:	EBR and	6:, Start o	of Green								
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.94												
Intersection Signal Delay:	47.9	,		In	tersection	n LOS: D						
Intersection Capacity Utiliz	ation 113.1%	0		IC	U Level	of Service	Н					
Analysis Period (min) 15												
Solits and Phases: 52: N	Varcoosse SP	R & Narco	NR									

#51 #52 #53 #54 #55 #56	#51 #52 #53 #54	# 55 # 56 2 #53 #54 #55 #56
🖡 🔪 🕇 🌶 🗡 🎸 øz (R)	4 🖌 🥕 🌶	, f / / t 🗙 🕇 ø4
83 s	24 s	73 s

Lane Group	Ø3	Ø4
Lane Configurations		
Traffic Volume (vph)		
Future Volume (vph)		
Ideal Flow (vphpl)		
Satd. Flow (prot)		
Flt Permitted		
Satd. Flow (perm)		
Right Turn on Red		
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		
Link Speed (mph)		
Link Distance (ft)		
Travel Time (s)		
Peak Hour Factor		
Shared Lane Traffic (%)		
Lane Group Flow (vph)		
Turn Type		
Protected Phases	3	4
Permitted Phases		
Total Split (s)	24.0	73.0
Total Lost Time (s)		
Act Effct Green (s)		
Actuated g/C Ratio		
v/c Ratio		
Control Delay		
Queue Delay		
Total Delay		
LOS		
Approach Delay		
Approach LOS		
Intersection Summary		

2045 Build PM Peak 53: Narcoosse NB & SR 417 NB Off Ramp

	الحر	\rightarrow	1	1	ţ	-			
Lane Group	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR	Ø3	Ø4	
Lane Configurations	۲			^					
Traffic Volume (vph)	590	0	0	1850	0	0			
Future Volume (vph)	590	0	0	1850	0	0			
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900			
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	0	0	5085	0	0			
Flt Permitted	0.950								
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	0	0	5085	0	0			
Right Turn on Red	Yes	Yes				Yes			
Satd. Flow (RTOR)	1								
Link Speed (mph)	30			30	30				
Link Distance (ft)	361			250	600				
Travel Time (s)	8.2			5.7	13.6				
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92			
Shared Lane Traffic (%)									
Lane Group Flow (vph)	641	0	0	2011	0	0			
Turn Type	Prot			NA					
Protected Phases	43			2			3	4	
Permitted Phases									
Total Split (s)				83.0			24.0	73.0	
Total Lost Time (s)				6.0					
Act Effct Green (s)	91.0			77.0					
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.51			0.43					
v/c Ratio	0.72			0.92					
Control Delay	40.0			8.5					
Queue Delay	0.0			0.0					
Total Delay	40.0			8.5					
LOS	D			А					
Approach Delay	40.0			8.5					
Approach LOS	D			А					
Intersection Summary									
Area Type:	Other								
Cycle Length: 180									
Actuated Cycle Length: 18	30								
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced	d to phase 2:	EBR and	6:, Start o	of Green					
Control Type: Pretimed									
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.94									
Intersection Signal Delay:	16.1			In	tersection	LOS: B			
Intersection Capacity Utiliz	zation 93.4%			IC	U Level o	of Service	F		
Analysis Period (min) 15									

Splits and Phases: 53: Narcoosse NB & SR 417 NB Off Ramp

#51 #52 #53 #54 #55 #56	#51 #52 #53 #	#54	# \$5 # \$6 2 #53 #54 #55 #56
🚗 📉 🕇 🌶 🗡 🎸 øz (R)	4 🖌 🥕	*	🖌 📂 🥕 🔧 🖌 ø4
83 s	24 s		73 s

2045 Build PM Peak 54: Narcoosse NB & SR 417 SB Off Ramp

	L,	لر	F	•	•	~				
Lane Group	SBL	SBR	NWL	NWR	NEL	NER	Ø2	Ø3		
Lane Configurations				11	ካካካ					
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	0	250	2035	0				
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	0	250	2035	0				
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900				
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	0	0	2787	4990	0				
Flt Permitted					0.950					
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	0	0	2787	4990	0				
Right Turn on Red		Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes				
Satd. Flow (RTOR)				8	1199					
Link Speed (mph)	30		30		30					
Link Distance (ft)	1100		274		250					
Travel Time (s)	25.0		6.2		5.7					
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92				
Shared Lane Traffic (%)										
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	0	272	2212	0				
Turn Type				Prot	Prot					
Protected Phases				4	23		2	3		
Permitted Phases										
Total Split (s)				73.0			83.0	24.0		
Total Lost Time (s)				6.0						
Act Effct Green (s)				67.0	101.0					
Actuated g/C Ratio				0.37	0.56					
v/c Ratio				0.26	0.67					
Control Delay				38.9	0.7					
Queue Delay				0.0	0.3					
Total Delay				38.9	1.1					
LOS				D	А					
Approach Delay			38.9		1.1					
Approach LOS			D		А					
Intersection Summary										
Area Type:	Other									
Cycle Length: 180										
Actuated Cycle Length: 18	0									
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced	to phase 2:	EBR and	6:, Start o	of Green						
Control Type: Pretimed										
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.94										
Intersection Signal Delay: 5	5.2			In	Itersection	n LOS: A				
Intersection Capacity Utilization	ation 80.2%			IC	CU Level of	of Service	D			
Analysis Period (min) 15										

Splits and Phases: 54: Narcoosse NB & SR 417 SB Off Ramp

#51 #52 #53 #54 #55 #56	#51 #52 #53 #	54 # \$5 # \$6 2 #53 #54 #55 #56
🚗 📉 🕇 🌶 🗡 🎸 øz (R)	↓ × ≯	2 🖌 📂 🐣 🔧 🖌 ø4
83 s	24 s	73 s

2045 Build PM Peak 55: Narcoosse NB & Narcoosse SB

	4	×	2	~	×	ť	3	*	~	í,	*	×
Lane Group	SEL	SET	SER	NWL	NWT	NWR	NEL	NET	NER	SWL	SWT	SWR
Lane Configurations		<u> </u>						^				
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	1600	0	0	0	0	0	2035	0	0	0	0
Future Volume (vph)	0	1600	0	0	0	0	0	2035	0	0	0	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	5085	0	0	0	0	0	5085	0	0	0	0
Flt Permitted												
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	5085	0	0	0	0	0	5085	0	0	0	0
Right Turn on Red	Yes		Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)												
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		250			250			250			250	
Travel Time (s)		5.7			5.7			5.7			5.7	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	1739	0	0	0	0	0	2212	0	0	0	0
Turn Type		NA						NA				
Protected Phases		4						23				
Permitted Phases												
Total Split (s)		73.0										
Total Lost Time (s)		6.0										
Act Effct Green (s)		67.0						101.0				
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.37						0.56				
v/c Ratio		0.92						0.78				
Control Delay		62.7						13.4				
Queue Delay		0.1						0.0				
Total Delay		62.7						13.4				
LOS		E						В				
Approach Delay		62.7						13.4				
Approach LOS		E						В				
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 180												
Actuated Cycle Length: 18	0											
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced	to phase 2:I	EBR and	6:, Start c	of Green								
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.94												
Intersection Signal Delay: 3	35.1			In	tersectior	n LOS: D						
Intersection Capacity Utilization	ation 80.2%			IC	CU Level of	of Service	D					
Analysis Period (min) 15												
Solits and Phases: 55: N	larcoosse NI	R & Narco	osse SR									

#51 #52 #53 #54 #55 #56	#51 #52 #53 #54 #\$5]#\$6 2 #53 #54 #55 #56
👡 🖹 🕇 🌶 🗡 🎸 øz (R)	4 🖌 🗡 🏌 🗡 🥕 🔧 🕇 🙀
83 s	24 s 73 s

Lane Group	Ø2	Ø3	 	
Lane Configurations				
Traffic Volume (vph)				
Future Volume (vph)				
Ideal Flow (vphpl)				
Satd. Flow (prot)				
Flt Permitted				
Satd. Flow (perm)				
Right Turn on Red				
Satd. Flow (RTOR)				
Link Speed (mph)				
Link Distance (ft)				
Travel Time (s)				
Peak Hour Factor				
Shared Lane Traffic (%)				
Lane Group Flow (vph)				
Turn Type				
Protected Phases	2	3		
Permitted Phases				
Total Split (s)	83.0	24.0		
Total Lost Time (s)				
Act Effct Green (s)				
Actuated g/C Ratio				
v/c Ratio				
Control Delay				
Queue Delay				
Total Delay				
LOS				
Approach Delay				
Approach LOS				
Intersection Summary				

2045 Build PM Peak 56: Narcoosse SB & SR 417 SB Off Ramp

	Ť	۲	4	ŧ	¥	ŧ۷		
Lane Group	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SWL	SWR	Ø2	Ø3
Lane Configurations				<u></u>	ሻሻ			
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	0	1600	1420	0		
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	0	1600	1420	0		
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900		
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	0	0	5085	3433	0		
Flt Permitted					0.950			
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	0	0	5085	3433	0		
Right Turn on Red		Yes			Yes	Yes		
Satd. Flow (RTOR)					3			
Link Speed (mph)	30			30	30			
Link Distance (ft)	600			250	274			
Travel Time (s)	13.6			5.7	6.2			
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92		
Shared Lane Traffic (%)								
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	0	1739	1543	0		
Turn Type				NA	Prot			
Protected Phases				4	23		2	3
Permitted Phases								
Total Split (s)				73.0			83.0	24.0
Total Lost Time (s)				6.0				
Act Effct Green (s)				67.0	101.0			
Actuated g/C Ratio				0.37	0.56			
v/c Ratio				0.92	0.80			
Control Delay				9.8	35.5			
Queue Delay				0.0	0.0			
Total Delay				9.8	35.5			
LOS				А	D			
Approach Delay				9.8	35.5			
Approach LOS				А	D			
Intersection Summary								
Area Type:	Other							
Cycle Length: 180								
Actuated Cycle Length: 18	30							
Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced	d to phase 2:E	EBR and	6:, Start c	f Green				
Control Type: Pretimed								
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.94								
Intersection Signal Delay:	21.9			In	tersectior	n LOS: C		
Intersection Capacity Utiliz	zation 82.4%			IC	CU Level of	of Service	E	
Analysis Period (min) 15								

Splits and Phases: 56: Narcoosse SB & SR 417 SB Off Ramp

#51 #52 #53 #54 #55 #56	#51 #52 #53 #5	# \$51#\$6 2 #53 #54 #55 #56
🚗 📉 🕇 🌶 🗡 🎸 øz (R)		↓ ↓ ↓ 04
83 s	24 s	73 s

APPENDIX F

Traffic Model Documentation

Engineering Analysis Technical Memorandum Osceola Parkway Extension





Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) Model 3.0 & 3.1 Documentation

Year 2017 Model Update and Validation

PREPARED FOR THE CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY APRIL 2019 Prepared by CDM Smith

Table of Contents

Table of	f Contents	
List of F	igures	i
List of T	۲ables	i
1.	Introduction	1
1.1.	CFX Models Background	
1.2.	CFX Model Area	
1.3.	Overview of Document Structure	
2.	External Trips	4
3.	Trip Generation	4
4.	Highway Network	6
5.	Trip Distribution	7
6.	Mode Choice	
7.	Model Results	

List of Figures

Figure 1-1: FSUTMS Model Flow Process used by CFX Models	2
Figure 1-2: Geographic Area Covered by CFX Models	3
Figure 5-1: Final Calibrated HBW Trips in Metro Orlando Area	9

List of Tables

Table 5-1: Sample of Friction Factor table from CFX Models	
Table 5-2: Average Trip Length by Trip Purpose during Off-Peak Period	10
Table 5-3: Average Trip Length by TripPurpose during Peak Period	10
Table 7-1: CFX Model 3.1 Daily v/c Ratios	11
Table 7-2: CFX Model 3.1 Daily %RMSE Statistics	12
Table 7-3: CFX Model 3.1 Daily %RMSE Statistics by County	12



1.Introduction

1.0 CFX Models Background

CDM Smith, Inc. under contract with the Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) has developed a travel demand model for travel forecasting specifically on CFX owned/operated facilities. The Central Florida Regional Planning Model version 6.1 Daily Model (CFRPM v6.1) was utilized as the starting point for the CFX Model 3.0. The CFRPM v6.1 is the travel demand model that was utilized in the development of the year 2040 Long Range Transportation Plans for the area Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Transportation Planning Organizations (TPOs) within FDOT District Five and was originally validated to a base year 2010 conditions. The CFRPM v6.1 was used to validate and calibrate the CFX 3.0 Model for a 2015 base year with a concentration on the sub-area of Osceola County and south Orange County. The CFX 3.0 model covers all of Orange, Seminole, Osceola, Lake, Sumter, Marion, Volusia, Flagler, Polk, Brevard Counties, as well as connected portions of Indian River County and it was developed for the purpose of evaluating the Osceola County Master Plan projects: Osceola Parkway Extension, Northeast Connector Parkway, Southport Connector Expressway, and the Poinciana Parkway I-4 Connector projects for the Concept, Feasibility and Mobility Studies. In 2018, the CFX Model 3.0 was further calibrated and the CFX Model 3.1 was developed for the purposes of evaluating the Poinciana Parkway.

Both the CFX Models 3.0 and 3.1 follow the Florida Standard Urbanized Transportation Modeling Structure (FSUTMS). Traditionally travel demand models have four main components, thus they are called four-step models. These components are trip generation, trip distribution, mode choice, and traffic assignment. FSUTMS is a daily model structure that was built around these four main components through following individual modules namely; the general modules of External Trips (EXTERNAL Module), Trip Generation (TRIP GENERATION Module), Highway Network and Build Highway Paths (HIGHWAY NETWORK Module), Trip Distribution (DISTRIBUTION Module), Build Transit Networks and Build Transit Paths (TRANSIT Module), Mode Choice (MODE CHOICE Module), Transit Assignment (TRANSIT ASSIGNMENT Module), and finally the Highway Assignment (HIGHWAY ASSIGMENT Module). In order to calibrate and validate CFX models, the components of FSUTMS were all analyzed. **Figure 1-1** illustrates the individual modules of the FSUTMS daily modeling process.





This report documents the updates that were done in CFRPM v6.1 during the development of CFX Models 3.0 and 3.1. Some of the key updates of the final calibrated model are as follows:

- Revisions to External-External Trip Interchanges
- Updates to zonal structure in base and future year model networks
- Updates to Socio-Economic (SE) Data
- Revisions to Trip Generation step in the model
- Updates to Trip Distribution step to better account for county to county flows
- Updates to Mode Choice step to better account for special generators
- Model Validation to 2015 conditions

1.2 CFX Model Area

Both the CFX Models 3.0 and 3.1 are distinct models that they encompass a large area comprised of eleven counties with varying densities and travel characteristics. The model includes the nine counties represented by FDOT's District Five namely Brevard, Flagler, Lake, Marion, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, Sumter, and Volusia counties. In addition, both models contain all of Polk County and part of Indian River County for purposes of interactions with these areas. **Figure 1-2** shows the CFX Models coverage



area. Orange, Seminole, and Osceola counties are part of the Orlando Urban Area and are distinctly urbanized in terms of population and employment characters. Volusia and Lake counties are nearby counties with many of its residents traveling to the Orlando Urban Area for work. The other counties are more rural in character thus they have more inter-county travel patterns.

1.3 Overview of Document Structure

This document provides the summary of the validation and calibration steps that were taken for the CFX Models 3.0 and 3.1. **Section 2** reviews the External Stations and Trips Module and presents the updates applied to the external trips. **Section 3** presents the review of Trip Generation Module and discusses the updates applied in both standard and lifestyle trip generation modules. The special generators in the model and the related updates are also discussed in this section. Trip Generation Module also includes the SE data updates, which are also presented in Section 3. In **Section 4** Highway Network related updates are presented both in base year and future year networks, such as traffic analysis zone disaggregation and addition of proposed project routes. The updates that were applied to Trip Distribution patterns in the model are presented in **Section 5**. CFX Models validation and calibration also evaluated the Mode Choice Module of CFRPM v6.1, which is presented in **Section 6**. Finally, the calibration and validation results of the final model are presented in **Section 7**.







2. External Trips

External trips in a model represent the traffic entering and exiting the model boundary and are defined based on their destination in the model namely External-Internal (EI) and External-External (EE) trips. The EI trips are those that start outside of the model network, entering at the roadway that crosses the model boundary, and are destined within the model network. EE trips, on the other hand, are those that start outside of the model network, and as such these trips are passing through the network without stopping inside. Modeling of external trips is accomplished in the External Module. Locations where external trips enter and exit the model network are referred to as external stations.

The external station zones are numbered in CFX models sequentially in a clockwise direction starting at A1A in Indian River and ending at A1A in St. Johns County. For calibration purposes, all external stations in the model are reviewed. By using 2015 daily counts major EE trips in the model such as I-4, I-95, and I-75 were adjusted. EI trips were also updated by using the updated EE trips in the model. Also, by using Origin-Destination data provided by StreetLight Data, Inc. certain EE trips that did not make logical sense were removed from the model.

3.Trip Generation

The trip generation step in a travel demand model is the step that the trips are generated using SE data sets such as population, employment, school enrollment, etc. The SE data sets are tied to the zone numbers on the model network, meaning if a zone has both residential and employment characteristics then population and dwelling units (DUs) data, -whether it is single-family or multi-family, and employment data, -whether it is industrial, commercial, or service employment are provided for that zone. Similarly, if a zone has schools in its boundary, school enrollment data is also provided for that zone. Traditionally trips are generated based on their purposes; Home-Based Work (HBW), Home-Based Shopping (HBSHOP), Home-Based Social Recreation (HBSOCREC), Home-Based Other (HBO), Non-Home Based (NHB), External-Internal (EI), Light Truck (LTRK), Heavy Truck (HTRK), and Taxi (Taxi). The CFRPM v6.1 has trips specific to the region that are destined to special generators such as theme parks in Orlando area. These special generation trip purposes that are modeled in CFRPM are Airport Tourist (APT-T), Airport Resident (APT-R), Airport External-Internal (APT-EI), Orange County Convention Center Tourist (OCCC-T), Orange County Convention Center Resident (OCCC-R), Orange County Convention Center External-Internal (OCCC-EI), Universal Orlando Tourist (UNI-T), Universal Orlando Resident (UNI-R), Universal Orlando External-Internal (UNI-EI), SeaWorld Tourist (SEW-T), SeaWorld Resident (SEW-R), SeaWorld External-Internal (SEW-EI), Disney Tourist (DIS-T), Disney Resident (DIS-R), Disney External-Internal (DIS-EI), Kennedy Space Center Tourist (KSC-T), Kennedy Space Center Resident (KSC-R), Kennedy Space Center External-Internal (KSC-EI), Port Canaveral Tourist (PC-T), Port Canaveral Resident (PC-R), and Port Canaveral External-Internal (PC-EI).

CFX models utilize two trip generation modules that was inherited from CFRPM v6.1; a lifestyle trip generation process that was used for all counties in the model and a standard trip generation process that was aimed to use to generate special generator trips, truck/taxi (TT) trips, and EI trips. The lifestyle trip generation process was initially developed for Volusia County and it was applied to all counties in the CFRPM v6.0 update as it stated in the CFRPM v6.1 Technical Memorandum: Refined 2010 Base Year Model Calibration and Validation (Supplemental to Version 6.0 Documentation) report. Same report also suggests that the trip generation module remained unchanged as compared to the CFRPM v6.0.

During CFX Model 3.0 and 3.1 updates, it was found that the separation of special generator zones from rest of the zones, to implement Volusia County lifestyle process to all counties in the model other than special generators, did not account for all the special generators on the network. One of the updates completed for the CFX Models 30 and 3.1 was to connect the special generator zone ranges in the model



scripts which excludes those zones from the lifestyle trip generator module. During zonal number update, it was also discovered that one of the special generator zones was listed in the SE data set as a regular zone with population and dwelling unit data associated to it, so the SE data sets in the model were updated to reflect this detail.

For the model updates, Fishkind Associates (FKA) developed independent socioeconomic (SE) forecasts for all of Osceola County and the southeast portion of Orange County and were included in both the CFX Models 3.0 and 3.1. The remainder of the counties assumed the SE data forecasts provided in the CFRPM v6.1 model. The aforementioned special generator zones were not in the boundary of the subarea that the SE data updates were completed by FKA, thus the SE data reviews for the special generators were conducted by CDM Smith modeling team.

Even though the trip productions of special generators are done in the Highway Network module to take the advantage of skimmed distances of the network for Orlando Airport trips, the special generators' trip production distributions and related updates are documented in Trip Generation Section. The CFRPM v6.1 structure utilizes a lookup table where the special generator module estimated trip productions associated with visitor, tourist, and external trip rates that are all tied to special generator zones on the model network. During CFX model updates, the zone numbers identified in the lookup table were updated to match with the model network. Plus, the estimated number of productions for the special generators were calibrated by using Streetlight data. Also, the special generator zones but there are attractions. Meaning that these special zones are destination zones with trips that are produced at other zones on the network, and there are no trips originated from these special zones. Since these attracted trips need to be tied back to their originated zones, a production and attraction balancing were done for these zones. This update also helped special generators' issue of attracting trips from other special generators such as trips from KSC to Disney area, which were originally hardcoded in the trip table.

Another detail was found in the trip generation step that the school trips for Volusia County were not included in any of the trip generation modules, neither lifestyle nor standard. Thus, in CFX Models 3.0 and 3.1, a step was added to lifestyle trip generation module to account for missing school trips in Volusia County.

CFRPM's standard trip generation module utilizes Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP) trip generation rates to support production and attraction balancing at the county level. Thus, a CTPP trip generation rate matrix representing the county to county flows was incorporated in the CFRPM v6.1 modeling structure. The matrix also includes EI trips as a separate dimension to account for the trips that are originated from any of the counties but destined to an area outside of the model. In earlier CFRPM versions, Polk County was partially incorporated to the models, thus the CTPP trip generation rates were adjusted accordingly. With the addition of entire Polk County to the modeling network, it was a necessary to review CTPP trip generation rates to reflect proper flows from Polk County to other counties and vice versa. During CFX model updates this detail was reflected carefully and Polk County flows including EI trips were adjusted. Other county to county flows were also reviewed and updated accordingly. In the next step, CFRPM structure combines the standard trip generation and the lifestyle trip generation modules to get the total productions and attractions for each major trip purposes for each zone. During this process it was found that the EI trips that are destined to Polk County zones were multiplied by a factor of 15. Removing this high factor required the calibration of Friction Factors (FF) of EI trips that are destined to Polk County, which will be explained later in detail in **Section 5**.



4. Highway Network

In travel demand models, the roadway related data is processed at the Highway Network module step. Each roadway is represented by a set of nodes and links on the model network, which is geographically tied to each roadway's physical location via coordinates. The model network has also centroid nodes where roadway links and nodes start and end, they act as the activity center of the zone that they represent. Various attributes are used to describe the characteristics of the individual roadway links such as area type, facility type, number of lanes, posted speeds, etc. and nodes such as turning movements. At this modeling step, the base network is prepared by identifying/updating certain link and node attributes mentioned above. As part of CFX model updates, the base-year network that was inherited from CFRPM v6.1 was reviewed and improved to reflect 2015 existing conditions, which include details about the CFX System and other toll roads. 2015 improvements also included extensive review of area type, facility type, number of lanes, capacity, and posted speed of all major roadways on the network feeding the CFX system roadways. For the purpose of evaluating the new corridors for CFX projects, zonal disaggregation was needed as the project alignments and supporting roads were added. Corresponding transit lines in the transit network were also updated by these additions. In Orange and Osceola counties, to incorporate the project alignments and new developments in the study areas, the zones in the model networks were split. CFRPM v6.1 structure allocates dummy zones that are associated to each county on the network zone system, so when further enhancements are needed such as splitting zones and creating new zones, these dummy zones are utilized. As mentioned earlier, the zones in Orange and Osceola counties needed to be split, however there were not enough dummy zones available in either Orange or Osceola county zone ranges. Thus, after a quick analysis it was found that the Brevard County zone range has the highest available dummy zones, which were borrowed to accommodate the disaggregation planned for Orange and Osceola counties. The SE data sets for the new zones were developed by FKA as mentioned in previous section. Also, the input files that were used in lifestyle and standard trip generation modules were updated accordingly to reflect the new zone ranges for the counties on the network. The missing school trips and incorrect special generator zone numbers mentioned in previous section were identified during this input files updates due to new zone numbering.

The CFRPM v6.1 structure also utilizes a lookup table to store variables that need to be assigned to each individual roadway link on the network by their facility type. The lookup table has parameters that are used by the model for the volume-delay function (VDF). The VDF is the main function in the model to identify the amount of time needed to travel on a roadway link as a function of travel volume. The VDF relationship used in most travel demand models in FL is based on the Bureau of Public Roads (BPR) formula. This particular function is applied at the Highway Assignment step of the model, but the parameters of BPR formula are identified for each roadway link at the Highway Network step. For calibration purposes, the BPR function parameters (BPR coefficient and BPR exponent) are updated for I-4 links on the west end of the base network in Polk County using the most available data. Besides the regular links, the time needed to travel on the toll facilities are also identified in the network step for toll links. The travel time for the toll facilities are defined by the Cost of Tolls also known as the CTOLL value. The CTOLL value is expressed as the inversion of the Value of Time (VOT). During Highway Assignment step, the CTOLL value is multiplied by the toll rate and converted into travel time in minutes. CFRPM v6.1 utilizes a global CTOLL value of 0.06 which corresponds to VOT of \$16.67 per hour for 2015 conditions. After reviewing the toll facilities on the network, it was found that CTOLL value of 0.06 for Turnpike and Polk Parkway facilities was not enough to attract enough traffic to these facilities, thus CTOLL value of 0.04, or \$25.00 was used. The CTOLL value for CFX facilities were assumed to stay the same. The VOT that is usually derived from average income level of the region was inflated for all future year scenarios and it was reflected to all CTOLL values used on the network.



5. Trip Distribution

Trip productions and attractions that were identified in the Trip Generation step are distributed among the zones on the model network by matching the trip productions to the trip attractions (e.g. from home to work, aka home-based-work trip or HBW trip). It is simply determining the destination point of trips that are produced in each zone. The distribution is done based on the relative attractiveness and accessibility of each attraction zone. The attractiveness of a zone is measured in terms of the relative number of trips attracted to it. On the other hand, the accessibility of a zone is measured based on the travel costs (distance, cost of the journey in dollars, or time) between two zones in relative to the travel costs among the different pairs of zones on the model network. Traditionally, the travel demand models use the gravity model formula to distribute the trips. The gravity model formula suggests that all trips starting from a given zone are attracted to other zones in direct proportion to the relative attractiveness of a zone, higher the number of trips attracts to itself. The number of trips it attracts from other zones get lesser if the distance between the zones increases and same way the number of trips the destination zone attracts get higher if the distance between the zones decreases. The gravity model formula in CFRPM structure is expressed as:

$$T_{ij} = \frac{A_j F_{ij} K_{ij}}{\sum_{j=1}^n A_j F_{ij} K_{ij}} \times P_i$$

Where:

- T_{ij} is the trips produced in zone i and attracted to zone j,
- P_i is the total trip production at zone i,
- A_j is the total trip attraction at zone j,
- F_{ij} is the friction factor,
- K_{ij} is a socioeconomic adjustment factor for zones i and j, commonly known as the K-factor, and
- n is the total number of zones.

In gravity model, the attractiveness of a zone is simulated through friction factors (FF) which represent the travel time impedances between zones or origins and destinations. Traditionally FF are developed by trip purposes in travel demand models. The CFRPM v6.1 structure has FF tables identified for 9 traditional trip purposes for each county and for 7 special generator trips in one-minute increments from minute 1 to minute 220. A sample of FF table is shown in **Table 5-1**.



MIN	HBW	HBSH	HBSR	HBO	NHB	LTRK	HTRK	TAX	EI
1	999,999	999,999	999,999	999,999	630,733	999,999	999,999	999,999	999,999
2	5,627,354	163,912,491	111,703,695	663,20,844	2,951,582	347,241	347,241	999,999	999,999
3	264,640	332,723	331,819	146,499	112,023	130,521	130,521	90,000	999,999
4	86,936	57,971	61,953	17,877	9,101	64,632	64,632	70,000	999,999
5	86,779	68,803	79,903	26,269	43,930	37,223	37,223	50,000	999,999
6	50,655	25,724	45,668	15,367	20,670	23,587	23,587	23,587	999,999
7	35,335	16,661	36,135	10,401	16,683	15,965	15,965	15,965	999,999
8	24,706	8,763	21,795	7,238	10,171	11,340	11,340	11,340	999,999
9	19,572	5,962	16,096	4,609	7,990	8,357	8,357	8,357	999,999
10	14,512	3,835	11,482	3,515	7,074	6,341	6,341	6,341	24,678
11	11,721	2,337	8,077	2,369	4,645	4,926	4,926	4,926	14,143
12	9,829	2,080	6,450	1,872	3,732	3,901	3,901	3,901	8,521
13	7,631	923	4,321	1,201	2,937	3,141	3,141	3,141	5,354
14	7,031	823	3,465	1,048	2,596	2,564	2,564	2,564	3,487
15	5,771	637	2,718	772	2,252	2,118	2,118	2,118	2,342

Table 5-1: Sample of Friction Factor table from CFX Models

There are 5 sets of FF table used in CFRPM v6.1, where each of the FF table has travel time impedance values for the trip purposes HBW, HBSH, HBSR, HBO, NHB, LTRK, HTRK and EI as shown in Table 5-1. These FF table sets are identified based on the counties on the model network namely; one set for Brevard and Indian River counties, one set for Polk county, one set for Metro Orlando counties (Orange, Osceola, and Seminole), one set for Lake, Marion, and Sumter counties, and one set for Volusia and Flagler counties.

To calibrate the CFX Models 3.0 and 3.1, the FF tables in CFRPM v6.1 for HBW, HBSH, HBSR, HBO, NHB trips for each county were updated by using 2009 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) data for FL. For that, the origins and destinations taken from NHTS database were identified on the model network and the true (free flow) travel times were skimmed from the model for those origins and destinations, instead of using travel times reported on the survey. It is known that people tend to overestimate or underestimate the travel times that they experience for a given trip, such as reporting a trip to a market as 5 minutes whereas the trip takes 8 minutes. If 5 minutes is used instead of 8 minutes to calibrate the model that 3 minute difference creates a big impact in modeling environment. By using these data, the observed travel time frequencies are calculated in one-minute interval (time bin) as in FF tables and are compared to the travel time frequencies that are identified through the gravity model. The relationship between observed travel times and model travel times is reflected in the FF travel time impedance values for each time bin, for each trip purpose (except LTRK, HTRK, and EI) in the FF table set. Then the updated FF tables are fed into the distribution step in the model and new travel time frequencies are generated and compared against observed travel times frequencies. This iterative process is done until the model adequately reproduces the productions and attractions trip table and matches the observed average trip length and frequencies from the survey. The FF tables for the trip purposes HBW, HBSH, HBSR, HBO, and NHB in each county FF set were calibrated by this iterative process. The final calibrated HBW trip length distributions for Metro Orlando area are presented in Figure 5-1.



Figure 5-1: Final Calibrated HBW Trips in Metro Orlando Area



As mentioned earlier in **Section 3**, a high factor was used for the EI trips that are attracted to Polk County zones, which was removed during calibration process. Removal of this factor required the calibration of FF values that are applied to the external stations at the Polk County boundary. The rest of the external stations in the model network were set to use the FF values that was inherited with the model.

The gravity model also uses K-factors besides the FF to identify the attractiveness of the zones. K-factors are also known as the SE adjustment factors for a region, where the calibrated FF are by themselves are not enough to simulate and identify the attractiveness of the zones, usually due to lack of data. For example, if the region has too many rural area trips attracted to it or if low income resident trips are attracted to suburban office locations. The K-factors were reviewed and updated in the CFRPM structure. For example, the K-factors from Polk County external stations to Brevard/Indian River Counties zones and similarly from Brevard/Indian River Counties external stations to Polk County zones were set to zero, simply assuming that there would be not enough attractions between these counties due to their high distance to each other. Similarly, the external stations at the south end of the model network that are representing the trips coming from Turnpike, SR 60, and SR 441 and Brevard/Indian River Counties zones were assumed to have no interactions, thus K-factors were set to zero. Another assumption was also made for the Polk County zones that there was a disproportionate share of live and work trips that were attracted to the Metro Orlando area from Polk County. Thus the trips within the Polk County need to have higher attractions to each other than other zones on the network. To simulate this detail, K-factors for Polk County zones to Polk County zones were doubled.

The updated FF tables and K-factors were used as the inputs in the gravity model and average trip lengths from the model for each major trip purposes were reported. Average trip lengths by trip purposes for Off-Peak and Peak periods from the calibrated model are presented in **Tables 5-2** and **5-3**, respectively.



Trip Purpose	Total Trips	Trip-Minutes	Average Minutes	Trip-Miles	Average Miles				
HBW	2,498,233	52,839,009	21.15	32,605,160	13.05				
HBSH	1,438,722	21,025,742	14.61	11,425,074	7.94				
HBSR	1,657,744	28,280,222	17.06	17,697,614	10.68				
HBO	4,079,202	64,385,847	15.78	36,169,082	8.87				
NHB	4,775,677	77,605,946	16.25	45,199,408	9.46				
LTK	1,412,877	21,139,412	14.96	12,006,730	8.50				
НТК	336,971	4,936,715	14.65	2,808,033	8.33				
TAXI	15,869	236,181	14.88	132,384	8.34				
IE	535,495	25,362,107	47.36	21,763,179	40.64				

Table 5-2: Average Trip Length by Trip Purpose during Off-Peak Period

Table 5-3: Average Trip Length by TripPurpose during Peak Period

Trip Purpose	Total Trips	Trip-Minutes	Average Minutes	Trip-Miles	Average Miles
HBW	2,498,233	71,954,302	28.80	34,438,179	13.79
HBSH	1,438,722	27,204,479	18.91	11,667,820	8.11
HBSR	1,657,744	42,138,579	25.42	19,242,816	11.61
HBO	4,079,202	84,194,581	20.64	37,331,029	9.15
NHB	4,775,677	105,459,718	22.08	47,191,596	9.88
LTK	1,412,877	27,431,558	19.42	12,448,946	8.81
НТК	336,971	6,514,497	19.33	2,899,606	8.60
TAXI	15,869	308,724	19.45	137,312	8.65
IE	535,495	33,805,758	63.13	22,601,874	42.21

6. Mode Choice

After trip distribution module, the CFRPM structure goes through a step called 'mode choice' where the modes of travels are identified such as if the person trip will be done with an auto or a public transportation. Thus, the person trip tables that were identified at the end of the distribution step are split into non-transit and transit modes by determining the percentage of trips made by each mode for each zone pair on the network. The non-transit person trips then are converted into vehicle trips by using auto occupancy rates. At the end of this step, two trip tables are generated, the auto trip table and the transit trip table. Auto trip tables are usually further divided into sub-groups by means of auto occupation such as drive alone, shared ride, shared ride with 2 or more occupants, etc. After person trips are converted into vehicle trips, the productions and attractions are needed to be rebalanced, this time by using vehicle trips. Since, special generation person trips are also converted to vehicle trips and included in this rebalancing step, during calibration of CFX models, mode choice module was updated. As mentioned earlier, the special generation zones were set such a way in the trip generation step to have only attractions but no productions. Thus, the special generators rebalancing at the end of the mode choice step was also set such a way to reflect this detail.



7. Model Results

After all the calibration steps were applied, the highway assignment module was run, and highway assignment statistics of CFX Model 3.1 were reported for validation purposes. One of the parameters for evaluating the model results is the model's ability to reasonably replicate in-field traffic counts for the base year, thus identifying of base year traffic counts is a critical component of validating travel demand models. For validation purposes of CFX Model 3.1, more than four thousand 2015 daily traffic counts by direction were obtained from various area agencies and added to the base network via lookup tables.

Traditionally, the highway statistics are checked at three levels; link level, area level, and systemwide level. To check the reasonableness of the model at the link level, the daily 2015 counts were compared to the model generated traffic volumes and volume to count (v/c) ratios were identified. **Table 7-1** presents the v/c ratios for all the links with counts on the networks by facility type. The v/c of a link is only significant in relation to its functional classification and the magnitude of the daily volume it can carry. As presented in **Table 7-1** the areawide v/c ratio for the region reported as 1.05 meaning that model generated volumes are higher than the link counts only by 5 percent. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) validation standards¹ suggest that the accepted range of areawide v/c ratio for a daily model is ±5 percent.

Daily v/c Ratios for Links with Counts								
Facility Type	CBD	High	Medium	Low	Very	Total		
		Density	Density	Density	Low			
Freeways	1.14	1.21	1.18	1.16	1.19	1.17		
Divided Arterials	1.13	1.06	1.01	0.97	1.08	1.00		
Undivided	1.16	1.08	1.04	1.10	1.62	1.16		
Collectors	0.87	1.71	1.06	0.90	1.16	1.00		
One-Way Facilities	1.04	1.72	1.14	1.01	0	1.08		
Ramps	1.42	0.94	1.04	1.23	1.14	1.12		
Toll Facilities	0.95	0.98	0.99	1.04	1.30	1.04		
Areawide	1.11	1.12	1.04	1.02	1.23	1.05		

Table 7-1: CFX Model 3.1 Daily v/c Ratios

Besides the v/c ratio, another measure of the model's ability to assign traffic volumes is the percent Root Mean Square Error (%RMSE). The %RMSE measures the deviation between the model generated traffic volumes and the traffic counts and is expressed as:

 $\% RMSE = \frac{100 * \sqrt{\frac{(Model - Count)^2}{Number of Counts}}}{\frac{\sum Counts}{Number of Counts}}$

A large %RMSE indicates a large deviation between the assigned and the counted traffic volumes; whereas a small %RMSE indicates a small deviation. Usually, lower volume roads show bigger %RMSE and higher volume roads show smaller %RMSE. **Tables 7-2** and **7-3** present the %RMSE of CFX Model

¹ 'FSUTMS-Cube Framework Phase II - Model Calibration and Validation Standards' Table 2-9: Volume-Over-Count Ratios and Percent Error. Florida Department of Transportation Systems Planning Office. October 2008. Accessed at <u>http://www.fsutmsonline.net/images/uploads/reports/FR2_FDOT_Model_CalVal_Standards_Final_Report_10.2.08.pd</u> on April 2019.



3.1 for the entire model area and by county, respectively. FDOT validation standards² suggest that the areawide acceptable %RMSE range is 35% to 45%. Both **Table 7-2** and **Table 7-3** indicate that the daily %RMSE statistics of the CFX Model 3.1 are within the reasonable ranges.

Volume Group	Count Range	Model %RMSE	Acceptable %RMSE	Volume	Count	v/c Ratio	Number of Links
1	1-5,000	92.83%	45% - 100%	5,732,426	4,544,590	1.26	1,598
2	5,000- 10,000	53.98%	35% - 45%	9,144,502	8,310,210	1.10	1,130
3	10,000- 15,000	34.97%	27% - 35%	8,386,082	8,526,500	0.98	683
4	15,000- 20,000	24.93%	25% - 30%	7,414,084	7,521,700	0.99	431
5	20,000- 30,000	23.55%	15% - 27%	7,829,869	7,904,950	0.99	331
6	30,000- 50,000	24.43%	15% - 25%	3,999,223	3,862,900	1.04	102
7	50,000- 60,000	31.89%	10% - 20%	1,229,468	1,103,500	1.11	20
8	60,000+	17.56%	10% - 19%	3,541,121	3,177,000	1.11	41
Are	awide	42.06%	35% - 45%	47,276,775	44,951,350	1.05	4,336

Table 7-2: CFX Model 3.1 Daily %RMSE Statistics

Table 7-3: CFX Model 3.1 Daily %RMSE Statistics by County

County	Model %RMSE	v/c Ratio
Seminole	30.46%	1.04
Orange	37.45%	1.09
Osceola	35.11%	1.01
Lake	30.63%	1.03
Brevard	47.35%	0.83
CFX Total	41.91%	1.05

² '*FSUTMS-Cube Framework Phase II - Model Calibration and Validation Standards*' Table 2-11: Root Mean Square Error (RMSE). Florida Department of Transportation Systems Planning Office. October 2008. Accessed at http://www.fsutmsonline.net/images/uploads/reports/FR2_FDOT_Model_CalVal_Standards_Final_Report_10.2.08.pd f on April 2019.



APPENDIX G

Comments and Coordination Report

Engineering Analysis Technical Memorandum Osceola Parkway Extension



COMMENTS AND COORDINATION REPORT

Central Florida Expressway Authority

Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation Project Number: 599-223A

Prepared for:

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

SECTION 2 – STAKEHOLDER COORDINATION AND MEETINGS

- 2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP
- 2.2 PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP
- 2.3 LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS
- 2.4 OTHER STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS
- 2.5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND MEETINGS
- 2.6 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

SECTION 3 – PROJECT WEBSITE

SECTION 4 – MEDIA COVERAGE

SECTION 5 – APPENDICES

5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP DOCUMENTS
5.2 PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP DOCUMENTS
5.3 LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS' DOCUMENTS
5.4 OTHER STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS' DOCUMENTS
5.5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT MEETINGS' DOCUMENTS
5.6 PUBLIC COMMENTS
5.6.1 STAKEHOLDER DATABASE REPORT
5.7 WEBSITE DOCUMENTS
5.8 MEDIA COVERAGE DOCUMENTS

5.9 FACEBOOK DOCUMENTS

SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

The Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) in July 2018 began the Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation to review alternatives for a new expressway connection between State Road 417 near Boggy Creek Road in Orange County and Cyrils Drive in Osceola County.

The goals of the proposed 9-mile, limited-access facility include providing for additional east-west capacity within the project area, enhancing mobility of the area's growing population and economy, relieving congestion on local roads, providing for the incorporation of transit options and promoting regional connectivity.

The study re-evaluation examined engineering, estimated project costs, and evaluated all alternatives and their potential impacts to the physical, natural, social and cultural environment. The study determined that the project is viable and fundable in accordance with CFX policies and procedures.

The preferred alternative, consisting of the Lake Nona Alternative to the west of Narcoossee Road and the Split Oak Minimization Alternative to the east of Narcoossee Road, had the fewest social impacts and highest projected traffic of the alternatives considered.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Osceola Parkway Extension has been identified as a need in several local, long-range plans and master plans. The former Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX) completed a PD&E Study in May 2017 for the Osceola Parkway Extension and presented a recommended alternative.

The CFX's enabling legislation (Senate Bill 230, Ch.2014-171) incorporated the parkway extension and other portions of the OCX 2040 Master Plan into the CFX 2040 Master Plan. In spring of 2018, CFX completed a Concept, Feasibility, and Mobility Study for the Osceola Parkway Extension. The input provided through public outreach, including stakeholder meetings, site tours and advisory committee meetings, during that study phase was a major component of the CFX PD&E Study Re-evaluation.

Public involvement and interagency coordination have been an integral part of the assessment process, and multiple opportunities for participation have been provided. A Public Involvement Plan (PIP) was established to initiate and maintain early, meaningful, continuous and high-level public and stakeholder involvement during the study.

The public involvement techniques utilized provided information to, and helped obtain vital input from: citizens, residential and business groups; elected and appointed officials; other government entities; environmental advocates; and others interested in the corridor-wide implications of the study re-evaluation segments.

Community groups could request a presentation via the *www. CFXWay.com* website, by emailing Public Involvement Coordinator Mary Brooks at <u>ProjectStudies@CFXWay.com</u> or calling the study hotline at 407-

802-3210. Citizens could submit comments via the website or project email address. They could also follow the study on Facebook (@OsceolaPkwyExtPDE) for updates as well as to submit comments.

SECTION 2 – STAKEHOLDER COORDINATION AND MEETINGS

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP

An Environmental Advisory Group (EAG) was formed to provide input for this study. As a special advisory resource to CFX and the consultant team, the EAG provided input regarding environmental impacts, local needs, concerns and potential physical, natural, social and cultural impacts that are crucial in the evaluation of corridor and alternative alignments.

For the PD&E Study Re-evaluation, one EAG meeting was scheduled. Meeting invitations were sent to representatives from environmental agencies and organizations, other government agencies, large landholders, community groups and other key stakeholders.

The EAG meeting was held on November 18, 2019 from 1:30 p.m. – 4:15 p.m. at the Central Florida Expressway Authority, Board Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807. The meeting was attended by 61 people including 22 EAG members, 22 study personnel and 17 other attendees in the audience. Invitation letters were mailed to 89 members of the EAG. A GoToMeeting invitation was sent to members who indicated a need to join remotely. Organizations represented by the EAG members attending the meeting included:

- Audubon Society of Florida (Also Orange County and Kissimmee Valley Chapters)
- Bear Warriors United
- East Central Florida Regional Planning Council
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
- Florida Native Plant Society (State and Tarflower Chapters)
- Florida Trail Association (State and Central Florida Chapters)
- Friends of Split Oak Forest
- Lake Mary Jane Alliance
- League of Women Voters of Orange County
- Orange County
- Osceola County
- Sierra Club
- South Florida Water Management District

The purpose of the EAG meeting was to review the study history and background, discuss the advisory group roles, discuss the project purpose and need, describe the study methodology, review the results of the study re-evaluation, and receive comments from the group. During this meeting, the CFX study team presented their findings from the development and comparative evaluation of the alternatives and requested input from EAG members. All factors related to the conceptual design and location of the facility, including transportation needs, financial feasibility, social impacts, economic factors,

environmental impacts, engineering analysis, and right-of-way requirements, were considered during the study re-evaluation.

Comments and suggestions from the EAG included:

- Provide funding for restoration and ongoing management of 1,550 acres of dedicated conservation land if donated by nearby landowners.
- Consider bridging the expressway over wetlands, trails and wildlife crossings in Split Oak Forest
- Provide multiple, high quality pedestrian and wildlife underpasses for the segment through Split Oak Forest.
- Provide a map showing the larger regional impact of the addition of 1,550 acres of conservation land indicating the proximity to other nearby conservation lands, as well as the St. Johns and Econlockhatchee Rivers.
- Do not go through Split Oak Forest.

2.2 PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP

A Project Advisory Group (PAG) was formed to provide input for this study. As a special advisory resource to CFX and the consultant team, the PAG provides input regarding local needs, concerns and potential physical, natural, social and cultural impacts that are crucial in the evaluation of corridor and alternative alignments.

During the PD&E Study Re-evaluation, one PAG meeting was scheduled. Meeting invitations were sent to representatives from homeowner associations, government agencies, large landholders, community groups and other key stakeholders.

The PAG meeting was held on November 18, 2019 from 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. at the Central Florida Expressway Authority, Board Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807. The meeting was attended by 44 people including 11 PAG members, 21 study personnel and 12 other attendees in the audience. Invitation letters were mailed to 45 members of the PAG. A GoToMeeting invitation was sent to members who indicated a need to join remotely. Organizations represented by the PAG members attending the meeting included:

- Deseret Ranches
- Lake Ajay Village
- League of Women Voters of Orange County
- Orange County
- Osceola County
- Osceola County Public Schools
- Suburban Land Reserves
- Southern Oaks Lennar Homes
- Tavistock

The purpose of the PAG meeting was to review the study history and background, discuss the advisory group roles, discuss the project purpose and need, describe the study methodology, review the results of

the study re-evaluation, and to receive comments from the group. During this meeting, the CFX study team presented their findings from the development and comparative evaluation of the alternatives and requested input from PAG members. All factors related to the conceptual design and location of the facility, including transportation needs, financial feasibility, social impacts, economic factors, environmental impacts, engineering analysis, and right-of-way requirements, were considered during the study.

Comments and suggestions from the PAG included:

- Questions regarding the recommendation of the Minimization Alternative on the eastern portion of the corridor.
- Question about the possibility of any development on the 1,550 acres of dedicated conservation land.

2.3 LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

The Public Involvement Program involved identifying and communicating with state, regional, and local agencies having a potential interest in this project due to jurisdictional review or expressed interest.

Staff from Orange and Osceola counties regularly attended the first study progress meeting of each month throughout the re-evaluation process. Elected and appointed officials were provided notice of all public meetings. Municipal and agency officials also participated in the EAG and PAG meetings.

On Thursday, October 24, 2019, a meeting was held at the CFX offices at 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando to discuss matters relating to the Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study Re-evaluation. Attendees included CFX staff, members of the Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study Re-evaluation consultant team, and staff from Orange and Osceola counties.

Dan Kristoff of RS&H, the consultant for the Study Re-evaluation, provided an overview of the PD&E Study corridor and alternatives. A PowerPoint presentation was shared that included background on the study corridor. Mr. Kristoff discussed the major constraints in the study area and reviewed the typical section and various alignment alternatives. He described in detail the location and attributes of the Boggy Creek and Lake Nona Alternatives on the west end of the study area, and the Split Oak Avoidance and Split Oak Minimization Alternatives on the east end.

Ms. Kelsey Lucas of RS&H then discussed the alternative evaluation matrix, starting with the west segment. She noted the alternatives on the west end had very similar impacts in regard to utilities and contamination sites. Regarding cultural and historic effects, the Boggy Creek Alternative has higher impacts on historic properties than the Lake Nona Alternative: 18 conflicts vs. six conflicts.

Regarding the natural environment, the two west alternatives have similar impacts to lakes, floodplains and wetlands. The Lake Nona Alternative has a higher impact on gopher tortoises (123 acres vs. 58 acres). The Boggy Creek Alternative impacts an eagle's nest. The species ratings for the two alternatives are both moderate. Neither alternative would impact conservation or mitigation properties. Regarding potential social impacts, Ms. Lucas stated the Boggy Creek Alternative has higher impacts to residential and non-residential properties. The Boggy Creek Alternative would have 25 displacements, while the Lake Nona Alternative would have six displacements. The socioeconomic impacts to special populations would be moderate for the Boggy Creek Alternative, and low for the Lake Nona Alternative, as most of that land is vacant.

The impacts between the two to developments of regional impact (DRI's) are similar, though slightly higher for the Lake Nona Alternative. There is a difference of just under \$100 million more in right of way costs for the Lake Nona Alternative. She noted the Lake Nona Alternative was being recommended as the preferred alternative due to the lower impacts previously mentioned.

Ms. Lucas discussed the evaluation matrix for the east segment alternatives. She noted there were similar utility and contamination site impacts between the Split Oak Avoidance and Minimization Alternatives. There were no historic impacts for either alternative.

She stated a significant distinction between the two alternatives is the impacts to the natural environment. Ms. Lucas noted the avoidance alternative has a higher impact to lakes, ponds and wetlands; the minimization alternative has a lesser impact to caracara, but a higher impact to gopher tortoises than the avoidance alternative.

She noted that both alternatives have similar impacts to floodplains. The minimization alternative has a high composite rating for potential species impacts; the avoidance alternative has a moderate impact.

Ms. Lucas stated as far as social impacts, the avoidance alternative involves 16 potential displacements compared to one parcel for the minimization alternative. The minimization alternative avoids disruption to the residences along Cyrils Drive; avoids potential impacts to the Southern Oaks development where construction is expected to begin soon; and moves the expressway farther away from the Lake Ajay Village community.

The minimization alternative would impact two parks and one trail, which the alternative will overpass. There would be a moderate impact to community cohesion for the avoidance alternative, and a low impact in that regard for the minimization alternative.

The impacts to DRI's would be the same for either alternative (48 acres each). As far as impacts to residential planned developments, the avoidance alternative would impact 175 acres vs. 88 acres for the minimization alternative.

Ms. Lucas noted the cost of the avoidance alternative would be \$100 million higher. She noted for the east segment CFX is recommending the minimization alternative as the preferred alternative. Mr. Kristoff discussed the recommended preferred alternative.

Glenn Pressimone, CFX's Chief of Infrastructure, presented information about the 1,550 acres of proposed dedication land from others, noting about 582 acres would be in Osceola County and 968 acres in Orange County. He noted the proposed conservation lands have been discussed previously with

staff at this meeting and with the Split Oak Forest Working Group. He noted the property owners relocated a proposed water treatment facility further south in response to working group requests.

Orange and Osceola County staff attending were:

- Renzo Nastasi, Orange County Transportation Planning Manager
- Beth Jackson, Orange County Environmental Protection Division
- Tawny Olore, Executive Director of Osceola County Transportation and Transit
- Bob Mindick, Director of Osceola County Parks and Public Lands

CFX and consultant staff addressed their questions regarding connection to local roads, distance from Lake Ajay, access to Split Oak Forest, funding for restoration and land management.

It should be noted that seven members of the CFX Governing Board sit on local government boards, including the Orange County Commission and Osceola County Commission.

2.4 OTHER STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

The study team met with large landholders, community associations, environmental advocates and agencies during the course of the study re-evaluation including:

The study team met with the following stakeholders:

- Greater Orlando Aviation Authority
- Tavistock
- Deseret Ranches
- Suburban Land Reserve
- Friends of Split Oak
- Annamarie Reithmiller, Landholder
- Lake Ajay Homeowners Association
- South Florida Water Management District
- Kimberly Buchheit, Environmental Advocate

Stakeholder Meeting Summaries

- On Tuesday, June 5, 2018 a meeting with CFX and Tavistock was held at CFX offices. The purpose
 was to discuss the OPE Study Re-evaluation and its anticipated schedule. CFX requested
 development planning documents from Tavistock; they said they would share those. Tavistock
 asked about potential interchanges or connections to roadways in the Lake Nona area. They also
 inquired about the corridor width of the planned expressway.
- On Wednesday, June 13, 2018 CFX met with representatives of the Greater Orlando Aviation Authority (GOAA) at GOAA offices. The purpose was to update GOAA on the OPE Study Reevaluation. CFX asked about GOAA's Poitras property. GOAA indicated it sold the eastern portion of that property, along with the conservation easements, to Tavistock, but GOAA retained the

western portion of Poitras. CFX asked for the master plan documents for that property; GOAA said they would provide those documents. GOAA expressed its strong desire for a direct connection to Orlando International Airport from the Osceola Expressway Extension.

- On Monday, July 9, 2018 a meeting with CFX and Tavistock was held at the CFX office building. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the timeline of the PD&E schedule compared to the application to Florida Communities Trust (FCT). CFX made it clear that the application to FCT is separate from the PD&E study re-evaluation and is not part of the schedule. Discussion centered on potential requirements to secure FCT approval of a land grant and linear facility easement in Split Oak Forest.
- On Monday, July 23, 2018 a meeting with CFX, Tavistock, Deseret Ranches, Suburban Land Reserve, and Hopping Green & Sams was held at the CFX Main office building. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the timeline of the PD&E schedule compared to the application to FCT.
- On Tuesday, August 7, 2018 a meeting with CFX and Tavistock was held at the CFX Main office building to share study information with Tavistock staff responsible for the development and build-out of the Lake Nona area and Poitras parcel.
- On Monday, August 13, 2018 the project team gathered at the main entrance to Split Oak Forest for the purpose of a guided tour of the portions of Split Oak potentially affected by the proposed roadway alternatives. Attendees included representatives from the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Audubon of Florida, Orange County and Osceola County. The tour primarily focused on traversing the areas affected by the 2015 PD&E Study alignment as well as the previous Refinement 1A alignment.
- On Thursday, August 16, 2018 a meeting with CFX, Tavistock and Deseret Ranches was held at the CFX Main office building. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Osceola Parkway Expressway alternatives. Tavistock noted that Del Webb is closing in December on about 270 acres from Cyrils Drive south. There was also discussion related to the actual land arrangements associated with Refinement 1A from the previous CF&M Study.
- On Wednesday, September 5, 2018 a meeting with CFX, Tavistock, Deseret Ranches and Suburban Land Reserve was held at CFX headquarters. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Osceola Parkway Expressway alternatives. Access to the airport was the main topic of this discussion. Both Tavistock and Deseret representatives agreed near-term access to the airport could be provided via an upgraded Boggy Creek Road and therefore the direct OPE connection to the airport could be deferred to a later phase. Direct access between OPE and SR 417 via new ramps is critical. CFX confirmed the existing Boggy Creek interchange was designed to accommodate the SR 417/OPE future direct connect ramps to / from the south, but not the direct north/south movement that by-passes the existing diamond ramp termini. Extensive discussion regarding the prominent movement/direction east of Split Oak Forest occurred. Based on information developed through the Northeast Connector Expressway Extension study, CFX suggested that only one east/west limited access facility was needed and it should extend to the southeast linking with Nova Road and eventually connecting with I-95 in Brevard County; the other east/west facility could be a high-capacity arterial.

- On Monday, September 17, 2018 a meeting with CFX, Tavistock, Deseret Ranches and Suburban Land Reserve was held at CFX headquarters. The purpose of the meeting was to update information for the re-evaluation with a review of alternatives and the impact that recent development plans would have on them. Tavistock informed CFX that the alternative shown would impact a planned water/sewer treatment plant for the Sunbridge development. They also reported that the Lennar property to the west of Split Oak Forest received approval for a planned development. Tavistock indicated its plans for a future extension of Medical City Drive over SR 417. There was discussion about the mainline/through traffic going south toward Nova Drive and the need to modify the ramps to 70 mph criteria instead of 60mph for all alternatives.
- On Friday, September 28, 2018, Public Involvement Coordinator Mary Brooks with Quest Corporation of America met as requested with Annamarie Riethmiller at her 15-acre property, located at 5900 Cyrils Drive. She stated it would be very difficult to get the east-west corridor through this area without affecting the Split Oak Forest Wildlife Environmental Area (SOFWEA). She requested the following be part of the project:

1) A wildlife crossing between SOFWEA and the wetlands on the east side of her property;

2) If her property must be affected, she only wants a partial take – not full – so she can have enough left to build a wildlife sustainability center;

3) If the alternative selected is associated with the developer-offered, conservation land dedication, she wants the SOFWEA remainder to be used for a wildlife education center;

4) Study field staff must contact her for property access as she has pigs and mini horses that kick;5) The wetlands that extend east to Absher and south to Jack Brack should be protected at all costs.

- On Monday, October 22, 2018 a meeting with CFX, Tavistock and Deseret Ranches was held at CFX headquarters. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Osceola Parkway Extension alternatives. They discussed the significant elements of the SR 417 west interchange alternative that combines the Osceola Parkway Extension (OPE) and SR 417 systems interchange with a local access interchange at Lake Nona Boulevard and Laureate Boulevard. Joe Berenis, CFX's Chief of Infrastructure, explained that CFX does not allow local traffic and system interchange traffic to mix for safety and operational reasons.
- On Monday, November 5, 2018 a meeting with CFX, Tavistock and Deseret Ranches was held at CFX headquarters. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Osceola Parkway Extension alternatives, with the key items being the OPE/SR 417 Interchange and the OPE interchange adjacent to Split Oak Forest.
- On Thursday, November 15, 2018, the study team and Osceola County Commissioner and CFX Board Member Fred Hawkins met with the Lake Ajay HOA at the Eagle Creek clubhouse. The HOA had requested an update on the Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study Re-evaluation at its annual meeting. Mr. Hawkins said he was there as Osceola County Commissioner. The study team presented the alternatives that were being reviewed and fielded questions from meeting attendees.

- On Tuesday, November 27, 2018, CFX met with the South Florida Water Management District for purposes of a pre-application meeting for the Osceola Parkway Extension. They reviewed stormwater criteria and environmental concerns connected with the proposed project.
- On February 7, 2019, Glenn Pressimone, CFX Director of Engineering, and consultant Public Involvement Coordinator Mary Brooks met with Kim Buchheit to address her questions and comments regarding the Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study Re-evaluation.
- On Friday, March 8, 2019 a meeting with CFX and Tavistock was held at CFX headquarters. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss proposed pond sites for the various Osceola Parkway Extension alternatives.

2.5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND MEETINGS

The PIP included conducting a public meeting to present the study re-evaluation information and to gather feedback. An effort to obtain public input regarding the Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study Re-evaluation was conducted by meeting with key stakeholders, engaging the media, meeting with the Project and Environmental Advisory Groups, and holding a public workshop.

The Public Workshop was held on November 19, 2019 from 5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m. in the cafeteria of Lake Nona Middle School, 13700 Narcoossee Road, Orlando, FL 32832. The meeting was advertised in advance with legal ads in the Orange and Osceola editions of the *Orlando Sentinel* and the Spanish-language *El Sentinel* on Sunday, November 3; Sunday, November 10 and Sunday, November 17; the *Osceola News Gazette* on Thursday, November 7 and Thursday, November 14; and the Spanish-language *El Osceola Star* on Thursday, November 7 and Thursday, November 14. An ad was posted in the *Florida Administrative Register (FAR)* on Thursday, October 31, 2019, and a news release was distributed to major media outlets on Wednesday, November 13, 2019 as follows:

Discover Osceola	La Prensa	Spectrum News 13, Ch. 13
Osceola News Gazette	Telemundo	WESH-TV, Ch. 2
El Osceola Star	Orlando Business Journal	WKMG-TV, Ch. 6
Orlando Sentinel	Florida Politics	WFTV-TV, Ch. 9
El Sentinel	Osceola Woman	WOFL-TV, Ch. 35
Orlando Weekly	Orange Observer	WOTF-TV, Ch. 43
Sunshine State News	Florida Politics	News Service of Florida
WFLA Radio	Florida's Radio Network	WDBO Radio
WMFE-FM	Celebration News	GrowthSpotter
WTLN Radio	Positively Osceola	Engineering News-Record
		(ENR)

Workshop invitation letters were mailed to 3,607 property owners and tenants within the corridor and to 42 elected officials on Tuesday, October 29, 2019. Public Workshop invitation letters were emailed on Thursday, October 31, 2019, to 48 elected officials and their aides; 31 local, regional, state, and federal agency contacts; and 182 people in the database. Meeting information was also posted on the study re-evaluation website and Facebook page.
There were 433 attendees who signed in at the Public Workshop. This included 396 members of the public and 37 staffers. Officials attending included representatives of the offices of U.S. Senator Marco Rubio, State Representative Mike LaRosa and Orange County Commissioner Emily Bonilla; Tawny Olore and Joshua DeVries of Osceola County; Beth Jackson of Orange County; and Rax Jung of Florida's Turnpike Enterprise.

During the workshop, attendees viewed a looped audiovisual presentation that provided an overview of the study re-evaluation process, history and details, alternatives considered, and the proposed preferred alternative. They were also able to view multiple exhibits showing the OCX adopted alternative that was re-evaluated, the alternatives that were developed during the re-evaluation, the typical section of the proposed road, and an evaluation matrix of the various factors considered in recommending a preferred alternative. Study team members were on hand to answer questions and manage three smart screens that allowed attendees to zoom into various locations along the corridor.

2.6 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

A total of 288 written comments were received during the Public Workshop comment period: 178 were submitted at the meeting and 110 were emailed by November 30, 2019. **Exhibit 2-1** reflects the general nature of the comments received. Many comment forms touched on multiple topics, so referenced numbers may exceed the total number of comment forms received.

It should be noted that the vast majority of the commenters supporting the minimization alternative indicated their support was tied to full restoration of the dedicated conservation lands to match the quality of Split Oak Forest, funding for ongoing maintenance of the conservation lands, and connectivity of both uplands and wetlands to nearby preserves.



Exhibit 2-1: Comment Categories from Public Workshop

Comment categories and related statements from the Public Workshop are listed below.

- I support the minimization alternative with the "full compensation package."
- I strongly oppose any roads through conservation areas, specifically Split Oak Forest.
- We have options and we need to protect endangered species.
- Split Oak Forest needs to be preserved in perpetuity, as intended by the measures taken in the 90's.
- Ensure critter crossing for animals and light and noise barriers for people.
- Please leave the turn lane open to make a U-turn by Narcoossee Road and Clapp Simms Duda Road.
- Can people at Fells Landing get a wall buffer?
- The proposed roadway will be a few feet from our house. This is a huge negative change in our lifestyle.
- I would like to see Boggy Creek Road widened before the project event gets started. Too many cars using it now.
- Let's put it up for a decision and start building!

SECTION 3 – WEBSITE

Study information was housed for easy public access on the study's website:

https://www.cfxway.com/agency-information/plans-studies/project-studies/osceola-parkwayextension-pde/

The website was updated with the latest alternatives exhibits, schedules, fact sheets, presentations, meeting notices and summaries, photos, and news releases. Information from the EAG and PAG meetings were also posted on the website. Between July 2018 and December 2019, the study website had 4,448 visits. An electronic comment form was available on the website, as well as a request form to receive email updates.

Additionally, a study Facebook page (*@OsceolaPkwyExtPDE*) provided meeting notices, photos, and links to information available on the website.

SECTION 4 – MEDIA COVERAGE

The Public Involvement Program included the strategy of using the media to help share information and meeting notices about the PD&E study re-evaluation.

The news release regarding the Public Workshop was sent to major media outlets on Wednesday, November 13, 2019.

Deanna Albrittin of WFTV-TV, Ch. 9 conducted interviews and did a live shot from Lake Nona Middle School for the late evening newscasts.

 Table 4-1 provides detail on the media coverage of this study.

Date	Media Outlet	Medium	Headline	Summary and Link
11/19/18	WFTV-TV, Ch. 9	τv	None	Report about the Public Workshop and plans for the Osceola Parkway Extension. <u>http://mms.tveyes.com/MediaCenterPlayer.aspx?u=aHR0c</u> <u>DovL21IZGIhY2VudGVyLnR2ZXIIcy5jb20vZG93bmxvYWRnY</u> <u>XRId2F5LmFzcHg%2FVXNIckIEPTQyND11MiZNREIEPTEyNTE</u> <u>yMTE5Jk1EU2VIZD00MTQzJIR5cGU9TWVkaWE%3D</u>
11/19/19	Spectrum News 13	TV/Online	None	Preview story on the Public Workshop and what attendees will see at the meeting. https://www.mynews13.com/fl/orlando/environment/201 9/11/19/plan-calls-for-toll-road-through-forest-near-lake- nona
11/19/19	WESH-TV, Ch. 2	τv	None	Report previewing the Public Workshop. http://mms.tveyes.com/MediaCenterPlayer.aspx?u=aHR0c DovL21IZGIhY2VudGVyLnR2ZXIIcy5jb20vZG93bmxvYWRnY XRId2F5LmFzcHg%2FVXNIckIEPTQyNDI1MiZNREIEPTEyNTE yMTc5Jk1EU2VIZD02NTI5JIR5cGU9TWVkaWE%3D
11/18/19	Growth Spotter	Online	CFX consultant to recommend developer- backed route for Osceola Parkway Extension	Report that CFX consultant to recommend route for Osceola Parkway Extension. <u>https://www.cfxway.com/wp-</u> <u>content/uploads/2019/11/GROWTHSPOTTER-11.19.19.pdf</u>
11/5/19	Florida Politics	Print / Online	Orange Co. proposal would lock down Split Oak Forest preserve	Article about an amendment before the Orange County Charter Review Commission. <u>https://floridapolitics.com/archives/310426-orange-co-</u> proposal-would-lock-down-split-oak-forest-preserve
10/31/19	Orlando Sentinel	Print / Online	Split Oak controversy over expressway route re- emerges with tough choices	Report about upcoming meetings on the recommended preferred alternative for the Osceola Parkway Extension. <u>https://www.orlandosentinel.com/news/transportation/os</u> <u>-ne-split-oak-road-controversy-reawakens-20191031-</u> <u>5vq47stbf5fdtflbghmq6lyyja-story.html</u>
10/29/19	Growth Spotter	Online	Tavistock, Deseret Ranches sign \$93M right- of-way agreement for Osceola Parkway Extension	Article about a ROW agreement for the Osceola Parkway Extension. <u>https://www.cfxway.com/wp-</u> <u>content/uploads/2019/11/GROWTHSPOTTER-10.29.19.pdf</u>

Table 4-1: Media Coverage

SECTION 5 – APPENDICES

5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP DOCUMENTS
5.2 PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP DOCUMENTS
5.3 LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS' DOCUMENTS
5.4 OTHER STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS' DOCUMENTS
5.5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT MEETINGS' DOCUMENTS
5.6 PUBLIC COMMENTS
5.6.1 STAKEHOLDER DATABASE REPORT
5.7 WEBSITE DOCUMENTS

5.8 MEDIA COVERAGE DOCUMENTS

5.9 FACEBOOK DOCUMENTS

5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP DOCUMENTS



ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP (EAG) MEETING - SUMMARY

DATE / TIME: Monday, November 18, 2019, 1:30 p.m. - 4:20 p.m.

LOCATION: Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) Board Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando

ATTENDEES: There were 62 attendees including 22 EAG members, 22 staff members and 17 other attendees in the audience. See sign-in sheets attached.

I. Notifications

Invitation letters were emailed to 89 members of the EAG on October 29, 2019 and a reminder was emailed on November 12, 2019. A GoToMeeting invitation was sent to members who indicated a desire to join remotely. There were no participants in the GoToMeeting.

II. Welcome

Kathy Putnam of Quest Corporation of America, the Public Involvement Coordinator for CFX, called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. She explained that while the meeting was open to the public, the purpose of the meeting was to present the study re-evaluation to the EAG members and receive their input. She advised that only the EAG members at the table would participate in the meeting's discussion, but there was plenty of opportunity for people in the audience to leave their written comments. EAG members and presenters then introduced themselves. Kathy then checked if



anyone had joined by GoToMeeting; they had not. Kathy said that today's presentation was divided into two portions and she urged EAG members to hold their comments and questions until after both portions were presented. She then opened the presentation with the Title VI information and called up Dan Kristoff of RS&H, the study consultant.

III. Study Presentation

Kathy called up Consultant Project Manager Dan Kristoff from RS&H to review the history and study background.

Background

The Osceola Parkway Extension has been under consideration for over 15 years, beginning with the adoption of comprehensive plans by Osceola County. This was followed by Regional Transportation Plans by the Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX) and the Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX), both of which included the Osceola Parkway Extension.

In 2017 OCX completed a Project Environmental Impact Evaluation Study. The study results culminated with OCX adopting a Preferred Alternative. Beginning at the western terminus the interchange at Boggy Creek Road is modified to accommodate direct connection ramps to SR 417 and Jeff Fuqua Blvd. Approaching the Osceola County Boundary, the alignment curves to the east. An interchange provides a connection to Boggy Creek Road, opposite Simpson Road. The alignment extends eastward, parallel to the Orange/Osceola County boundary and remains in Orange County. Approaching Narcoossee Road the alignment avoids the Fells Landing community. An interchange occurs at Narcoossee Road. The alignment continues east and north of Clapp Simms Duda Road. Approaching the canal and Eagles Roost, the alignment curves to the southeast passing through Split Oak Forest. Just east of Split Oak Forest an interchange provides connections to Sunbridge Parkway to the east and south toward Nova Road.

In March of 2018, the Central Florida Expressway Authority completed a Concept, Feasibility, and Mobility (CF&M) Study for the Osceola Parkway Extension. Other alignments were studied. Numerous meetings were held with stakeholders, state and local agencies, and the general public. In July of last year, we began the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation. So, what is a Study Re-evaluation?

• Project Development Process

The CF&M study phase was completed in the spring of 2018, and the project is currently in the PD&E phase. If the CFX Governing Board moves the project forward, it would first go into design and then, later, construction.

• Study Methodology

The study is following the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) PD&E Manual. The study process compares the approved OCX adopted alternative to others that have merit. Further analysis of significant issues occur. Public outreach is part of the process. The documentation will be a Project Environmental Impact Re-evaluation Report. The report will identify a Preferred Alternative. The report findings will be presented to the CFX Board.

• Stakeholder Outreach

With the presence of the Split Oak Forest and other area preserves, environmental investigations and coordination are an important part of the study activities. A field visit to Split Oak Forest was conducted last summer with county staff and environmental advocates. Due to the extensive growth planned and approved in this area, there have been exhaustive meetings and other communications with large landholders and community groups. All feedback is being factored into refinements of previous alternatives, as well as the development of new ones. The primary alternatives under consideration are on display today.

• Public Involvement

Public involvement has focused so far on a number of key stakeholder meetings and coordination meetings with local government representatives. Today is an opportunity for a continued exchange of information as we move forward with the study process.

• Major Constraints – Social & Environmental

There are some significant environmental and social constraints. In the west, from Boggy Creek Road to Narcoossee Road, the land use is predominately residential, both existing and planned. The Boggy Creek floodplain is the most significant natural feature, and several wetland systems surround the neighborhoods. In the east, from Narcoossee Road to the east terminus, natural environmental areas are more prevalent with Moss Park, Eagles Roost, Isle of Pine and Split Oak Forest. However, in addition to the existing residential communities, ongoing and planned unit developments such as Eagle Creek, Southern Oaks, and Del Webb also present challenges.

• Typical Section

The current standard typical section that CFX has adopted for new location expressways was presented. The typical section utilized for analysis requires 330 feet of right of way. Initial construction would be a minimum of two lanes in each direction. A wide median can accommodate additional lanes in the future and provides an envelope for mass transit. The 88-foot border width provides room for errant vehicles to recover, lateral ditches for the collection of stormwater, and enough distance for landscaping and harmonizing with adjacent property.

• Alternatives Considered

The three re-evaluation alternatives under consideration are all depicted herein. The dark blue alignment is the previously approved OCX Alternative. West of Narcoossee Road, the light blue and purple are the new alternatives. East of Narcoossee Road the green and orange are the new alternatives.

• West Segment/Boggy Creek Alternative

The Boggy Creek Alternative alignment is very similar to the OCX adopted alignment, but there are differences: The direct ramp connections from the OPE to the Orlando International Airport have been removed due to future operational concerns and conflicts with the existing bridges and the alignment next to Boggy Creek Road is shifted west to minimize impacts to the neighborhood. The interchange to access Boggy Creek Road remains and the east/west alignment is virtually the same as the one that was adopted by OCX. The interchange at Narcoossee is different, but Fells Landing and the two new residential developments are avoided. Due to the interchange operations, Clapp Simms Duda Road's connection to Narcoossee Road will be relocated to align opposite Boggy Creek Road.

• West Segment/Lake Nona Alternative

The Lake Nona Alternative connects to SR 417 some 3000 feet east of Boggy Creek Road. This location allows for direct connect high speed ramps to both SR 417 and the Orlando International Airport. The alternative includes a half diamond interchange at Laureate Boulevard. An access road will connect the properties north and south of SR 417. The alignment to the south avoids the existing residential neighborhood and turns east just prior to the county boundary line. An interchange will connect to Boggy Creek Road and will align opposite Simpson Road. The alignment continues east and similar to the Boggy Creek alignment, avoids existing and planned development. There is an interchange at Narcoossee Road that is the same as the one in the Boggy Creek Alternative. The Clapp Simms Duda Road relocation must also occur.

• East Segment/Split Oak Avoidance Alternative

At Narcoossee Road the alignment remains north of Clapp Simms Duda Road. The Clapp Simms Duda connection to Narcoossee Road is closed and Clapp Simms Duda is relocated to connect opposite Boggy Creek Road. The expressway continues eastward, remaining north of Clapp Simms Duda Road until just west of the canal, where it turns south. There are bridges over Clapp Simms Duda and the canal. The expressway continues south through the Southern Oaks development, then curves east and just avoids Split Oak Forest, where it bridges over Cyrils Drive. The eastbound and westbound lanes on Cyrils Drive are split apart to create space for the expressway to drop between them. Ramps to and from the expressway and Cyrils Drive provide local access to Absher Drive. Bridges just east of Split Oak allow access to the proposed local road system, at which point the expressway curves to the southeast toward Nova Road.

• East Segment/Split Oak Minimization Alternative

From Narcoossee Road to just west of the canal the alignment is similar to the avoidance alignment. However, the curve to the southeast begins much closer to the canal and the alignment is shifted farther from Lake Ajay. The alignment enters Split Oak Forest just south of Orange County and continues southeast for a short distance, then curves to the east. A bridge maintains connectivity for the trail and an interchange just east of Split Oak Forest provides

connections to the current and proposed county roadways. Similar to the prior east alternative the alignment extends to the southeast for a possible future link to Nova Road.

• Comparative Matrix of Key Elements

A summary matrix evaluation has been developed for both the west and east segments of the project. It is one of the display exhibits and handouts are being provided to committee members. As mentioned earlier, the two new alternatives are being compared to each other. However, the original OCX approved alignment through Split Oak is no longer considered viable. Specific physical, cultural, natural environmental, social and economic factors have been evaluated for each of the new alternatives. Note that the major items are broken up into the categories mentioned before and the first item that we have is actually a new item, called the design item. Looking at the west segment, one of the most important factors is the difference in the volume of traffic that would utilize the roadway. The Lake Nona Alternative certainly would utilize more traffic, accept more traffic, which would help relieve more traffic on some of the local roadways and provide more mobility around the local areas. The physical impacts are relatively the same.

Cultural environmental impacts are a major difference between the Lake Nona and the Boggy Creek Alternatives with the Boggy Creek having potential impact to 18 potential historic sites and one potential linear resource, which is the canal. Looking at the natural environmental impacts you can see there are a number of items here, with the most significant on the left column under Lake Nona. And you'll notice that, potential habitat is impacted with that particular Alternative in comparison to Boggy Creek. Dropping down into the social impacts, the most important factor to us, and it should be to you, is the number of displacements between the two Alternatives. There are only six on the Lake Nona Alternative but 25 on the Boggy Creek Alignment. Dropping down to the estimated cost, you see the difference in roadway construction and bridge construction costs. The Lake Nona Alternative is more expensive. So, when we look at that, what are the positives of the Lake Nona Alternative? As mentioned, for instance, more traffic is taken to the expressway, so the traffic on the local road system is reduced. We can now continue to provide a connection to the airport as well as (SR) 417. And we have substantially less impacts with respect to the social environment and disruption to the local neighborhood.

Let's go on to the East segment:

On the east, under the design element, the most significant item is the number of bridges that are required, and the length of those bridges. That's significant to us with respect to constructing the facility. There is no difference in physical environment, very little in the cultural effects. In the natural environment we know that we have high impacts with respect to potential species. As noted, there is high impact (Split Oak Minimization Alternative) against moderate impact with the Split Oak avoidance Alternative. Again, we have a high impact with respect to Split Oak Forest. As opposed to the Avoidance Alternative, which does not have any impact.

As we get down to the social elements, again, the Split Oak Alternative only affects one residence. Sixteen are impacted in the neighborhood that is south of Split Oak Forest. Let's look what are entitled developments that are already under construction now or will be under construction shortly. The Avoidance Alternative has twice as many impacts in those particular areas.

As we look at the cost elements, in total, you'll know that there is a significance difference between the Split Oak Alternative and Split Oak Avoidance Alternative. So, economics are important to us. Going back to the traffic volumes, regardless of the Alternative selected, there's very little difference between those traffic volumes. So, to recoup some of that investment of a hundred million dollars more on the, on East Alternative. It's a dramatic consideration. With that assessment, I'll like to just point out that based on our analysis, of the social and the cultural, physical and natural environment the currently Preferred Alternative is a combination of the Lake Nona Alternative on the West and the Split Oak Minimization Alternative.

• Preferred Alternative

Based upon the analysis of the social, cultural, physical, natural environmental and economic considerations the currently preferred alternative is a combination of the Lake Nona Alternative for the west segment and the Split Oak Minimization Alternative for the east segment.

IV. Next Steps

Kathy Putnam explained that the Public Workshop would occur on November 19, followed by a decision by the CFX Governing Board on how to proceed. She indicated the comment period for the study re-evaluation would be open until November 30, 2019 and she explained the multiple avenues to comment through the study's email address, website, Facebook or direct mail.

V. Conservation Lands

Nicole Gough with Dewberry, the General Engineering Consultant for CFX, presented the second portion discussing the potential dedication of conservation lands adjacent to Split Oak Forest. She explained that several members of this committee have provided input into this process throughout this PD&E study re-evaluation and the previous Concept, Feasibility, and Mobility, or CF&M, study.

Nicole said since the last EAG meeting for this corridor, there has been a lot of activity and focused meetings to work on furthering the many recommendations from the previous CF&M study. CFX has been working through a "to-do list" of how to best minimize potential social and environmental impacts of any alignment that was necessary to pass through Split Oak Forest. She referred to one of the exhibits that listed the considerations requested previously and noted that almost all of them had been addressed. These included:

- Relocate water treatment plant.
- Move alignment farther south and west to:

- + Lessen loss of good habitat
- + Distance it from scrub jay area
- + Protect ability to manage land by prescribed burns
- Ensure access to the Florida National Scenic Trail through the corridor and Moss Park.
- Have reputable land trust or government agencies hold conservation property and restrict its future use through recorded conservation easements.
- Prevent third-party conservation offer from diminishing Tavistock's and Deseret Ranches' mitigation requirements.
- Provide matching acreage for the mitigation credits that were sold for gopher tortoise habitat.
- Ensure dedicated land is of high quality to replace Split Oak Forest Wildlife and Environmental Area land impacted by roadway.
- Incorporate the 102-acre pine area off Lake Mary Jane Road into the conservation picture.
- Ensure the floodplain compensation area does not affect quality lands and does not destroy habitat.
- Break down uplands and wetlands in both impact area and remainder for each alternative.
- Assure linkage of Split Oak, Moss Park, Isle of Pines Preserve and the newly dedicated lands to regional wildlife corridors.
- Provide adequate funding for restoration and management dedicated land to ensure that impacted portions are returned and maintained as high quality habitat.

As the PD&E re-evaluation determined an alignment passing through Split Oak Forest was still viable and a necessary option for evaluation, discussions from these focused meetings, with input from the EAG members presented an opportunity to dedicate conservation lands that can provide an ecologic corridor and buffer existing Conservation Lands from the rapid development in this region.

Nicole explained that Split Oak Forest, under Florida Communities Trust (FCT), was established as a Trust Project Site. As outlined in the Department of Environmental Protection – Florida Forever Program, Grant Application Procedures legislation, the Declaration of Restrictive Covenants for Trust Project Sites limits the use of the property to conservation, outdoor recreation, and other activities. However, FCT understood that Trust Project Sites may at times, due to unique circumstances, require Management Plan amendments to allow for linear facilities within its borders. As such, CFX, in coordination with the landowners Orange and Osceola counties, will request of FCT a linear facility easement for the expressway through Split Oak Forest. The complete methodology to approach FCT to request an easement for the roadway is outlined within Rule 62-818.015 F.A.C.

Currently, Split Oak Forest in Osceola County forms the southernmost piece of a larger tract of Conservation Lands that also include Isle of Pine Preserve, Moss Park, Eagles Roost, GCB, and Split Oak Forest in Orange County.

Focusing more on the Split Oak Forest area- Planned uses for the property immediately adjacent to the west include higher density residential, and adjacent to the east over 2 million square feet of industrial and mixed-use development.

The Conservation Lands of Split Oak Forest combined for Osceola and Orange counties are currently 1,689 acres. The Preferred Alternative shown would directly impact 60 acres of uplands and wetlands for the right of way and CFX considers the remainder of 100 acres to the southwest of the corridor as secondarily impacted. Therefore, CFX considers the total projected impacts to Split Oak Forest as 160 acres.

The Dedication Lands located in Osceola County are a matrix of wetlands and uplands directly buffering the Split Oak Forest parcel.

Dedicated Conservation Lands in Orange County help connect the existing Isle of Pine Preserve to Moss Park and encompass a large portion of Robert's Island Slough. It can be stated that some of the proposed Dedication Lands in both Osceola and Orange counties are of the same character as Split Oak Forest, and contain areas considered High Conservation Priority for Biodiversity. Over the course of time, the restoration of these lands will continue to provide a much larger contiguous conservation area than exists today.

A map depicting the ecological context of the existing Conservation Lands in relation to the Dedicated Conservation Lands was presented. The existing Conserved Land assemblage is 3,985 acres.

The total Conservation Land assemblage would be 5,375 acres. In being aware of the nature of the contiguous land assemblage, this total doesn't include the 100 acres of Split Oak Forest that remain southwest of the proposed alignment. While these 100 acres will be generally separated from the assemblage, opportunities exist for improvements to trailhead facilities and trail and wildlife connections will be provided underneath the alignment.

The property owners have provided a signed contractual agreement for consideration of the Land Dedication presented here.

VI. Open Discussion

Kathy Putnam, Quest Corporation of America (on behalf of CFX)

At this time, we would like to open up for questions from the advisory group members at the table, relative to the PD&E Study Re-evaluation or to further clarify or to discuss next steps to approach the Florida Communities Trust.

Marge Holt, Sierra Club

This has been a polarizing project, to say the least. It's been difficult to try to reign in those impacts to Split Oak Forest. On behalf of Sierra Club, I truly oppose the project, but at the same time want to work to minimize and try to get this road as far south as possible. I am concerned that the release of this land from the Florida Communities Trust contract is somewhat of a

betrayal of the fact that this land is operating quite highly as it was intended to do. I have noted the impacts throughout the whole region and cumulative impact of other easements to valuable wetlands and uplands. I am interested in the next steps with the Florida Communities Trust.

Charles Lee, Audubon Society of Florida (jump drive presentation-screened)

I'd like to give a little bit of a perspective on Split Oak Forest historically and talk about the proposed dedication of the 1,550 acres of compensation land.

- Slide 1 This first picture is Split Oak at the southern end and likely a part that will be affected by this project. It's good stuff as far as long leaf pine habitat.
- Slide 2 This is what Split Oak looked like in 1944. What I'd like you to notice from this aerial photo is Split Oak during



this period of time was heavily impacted by early logging. Very sparse vegetation. The boxed shaped areas where it looked like agriculture clearings. Much of Florida, at that time, was impacted by uncontrolled logging and Split Oak was no exception in the 1940s.

- Slide 3 This is Split Oak again in 1959. You can see the forest had become denser. The logging had become a thing of the past. You can still see the evidence of the intrusion of the agriculture clearing to the north. Its condition was improving, but it had its share of impacts.
- Slide 4 This is Split Oak in 1980. Two things I'd like you to notice, you can see Cyrils Drive, it had been built at that point. North of Cyrils Drive, some type of clearing had gone in a linear path across the property. To the north you had another one. The area we refer to as the scrub area of Split Oak, by 1980 it had been impacted by a mechanical clearing as had a swath going across the entire mile wide length of Split Oak just outside the Osceola County line.
- Slide 5 This is Split Oak today. If you toggle back and forth between the last two. You can see the area that has become what we know as the scrub area now. It's been a dynamic place in terms of what has happened to it over the years.

I saw a biologist out there last week extolling the virtues of this virgin forest, this ancient forest. Some of us have seen ancient forests in Florida. Split Oak is very well managed long leaf after 20 years of management. It is by any stretch of the imagination a virgin, unaffected forest. It has gone through a lot of changes since photos started to be taken from the air in 1944.

- Slide 6 This is the scrub area within the 1,550 acres to be dedicated. This is pretty decent area of scrub. It's a larger area of scrub than what is preserved in Split Oak now. If the proposed Split Oak Minimization Alternative with these dedicated lands is accepted, another 60 acres of scrub will be added to the matrix for future management and it is really decent stuff in this area of Florida.
- Slide 7 This is part of the upland habitat in some of the area and this talk is going to focus on solely the upland area of Split Oak. It is emerging long leaf pine habitat.

- Additional Slides All these are taken within upland areas within the 1,550 acres of compensation lands. You can see you have scrubby oak and long leaf pine, some of which is of the character the same as you would find on Split Oak itself.
- Slide Large Cypress Dome within 1,550 acres an area cleared for agriculture. It is clearly impacted land and it clearly needs restoration. If you look at the land from an upland and wetland perspective, you can see the affected area.
- Slide You can see the Orange county portion is the most impacted uplands in the dedication area. You can see an old orange grove and the area up to where the wetlands begin. 102 acres of long leaf pine a readily restorable tract with thinning and controlled burns it will come back quickly to match what you have in Split Oak.

My message here is managing a tract like Split Oak cannot be undertaken by looking within the four corners of Split Oak's boundaries. The current proposal to put 2,900,000 square feet of industrial up against the boundary of Split Oak/Moss Park is already approved in Osceola County. The advantage of the compensation lands is that you eliminate all of that development on the east side of Split Oak and eliminate all that development. As Audubon looks at the longterm management of properties, we can't just take a snapshot in time of a property and hope that it will always stay the same. We've got to look at the big picture, the long-range picture. We have to ask, what is the best long-range picture? My current feeling is the preferred proposal with the dedicated compensation lands is clearly the best future for Split Oak and these other conservation tracts. There are unanswered questions in my mind about the proposal. The chief question that needs the most discussion is you can't give these lands to Orange and Osceola counties for them to struggle to manage it, nor would it be appropriate to expect state agencies to manage it. The management money that caused Split Oak to be what it is just is not happening at the state level anymore. In my experience, the threshold is at least \$2 to \$3M in immediate money for restoration, and in the \$200-\$300K a year for a period of 10 to 20 years to subsidize the capabilities of Osceola County and Orange County and the other agencies. My point of view is that this funding should come from CFX. The proposed Split Oak Avoidance Alternative costs \$103M more than the minimization alternative. In the final analysis the preferred project is \$102M less expensive. We think it's entirely appropriate for CFX to put in the needed funds to restore and manage this land and it's an essential part of this that is missing. We would ask CFX to work with the agencies, beginning with Osceola County, Florida Communities Trust, Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission Division of State Lands to determine the appropriate numbers and put that money into this package.

Beth Jackson, Orange County Environmental Protection Division

Orange County needs to be included in that.

Valerie Anderson, Friends of Split Oak

I will agree the western part of the road is for the public good alleviating traffic on Narcoossee Road and would be used to relieve congestion, but the eastern part of the road is a road to new development. There are no masses of people waiting to get to I-4. So, if CFX was truly interested in proving this road was necessary, it would be pretty fine with going through the eminent domain process. It's pretty clear CFX does not want to do that. So, because this is a public park, purchased with public money, protected by the strongest protections afforded conservation lands in the state of Florida, it needs to be looked at big picture. For example, a road going through Split Oak would make it much easier in the future for other unnecessary toll roads to go through conservation lands. Is this a risk the people of the state of Florida are willing to take? That's not a risk I am willing to take because there is a feasible, slightly more expensive alternative, to go around Split Oak. I would challenge the Expressway Authority to put this conservation land swap through a rigorous process with actual biologists and see if there is actual value in the deal even assuming there is a necessity for the road.

Brian Barnett, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC)

This project has been a tough one for us as managers of Split Oak. We are really proud of the job we have done out there. We think it's a beautiful area. Giving up any of it is really tough. In that regard, I have a statement I would like to read this has gone through senior management of the agency. (LETTER READ HERE) When you say that this compensation land would not be considered as mitigation for the road, are you talking about wetland mitigation or are you talking about a gopher tortoise incidental take permit? Or this land wouldn't apply to that.

Nicole Gough, Dewberry

The PD&E Re-evaluation was completed in order to determine whether there was a viable roadway project. With that, there is criteria and we only considered the current standards for mitigation. So, yes, we would likely purchase mitigation credits. The state has a lot of viable options for mitigation within the region. Then, as far as species impact, we would go the particular route of each species. We would certainly relocate each gopher tortoise appropriate to the guidelines of Fish and Wildlife. So, that is distinct and separate. The dedication is relative only addressing the Florida Communities Trust.

Brian Barnett, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC)

So, we would not be looking at gopher tortoise surveys of what is out there in this 1,550 acres. We wouldn't be comparing that to Split Oak and trying to satisfy our permit requirements?

Nicole Gough, Dewberry

Not for actual further design of the roadway, if that makes sense.

Brian Barnett, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC)

Do you think you would be looking at that area for relocation potential?

Nicole Gough, Dewberry

That would be something that would be discussed because FWC obviously has an interest in that so that is something that could be discussed, but right now we are only looking at going the typical routes.

Brian Barnett, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC)

Is Tavistock, their deal is to basically just to give the land for conservation, they aren't offering any kind of management?

Nicole Gough, Dewberry

No. The agreement we have in front of us for consideration is to place this land in conservation and for Florida Communities Trust to determine who is the ultimate operation and maintenance entity of the properties.

Brian Barnett, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC)

You know their (Tavistock) biologists probably know more about these properties than anyone else. I would love to see them offer up a vision for restoration for some of these properties. The orange grove is just a mess and I know they don't want that adjacent to their development. What do they think could be done out there? What would they like to see in terms of a habitat plan? They still have BDA (Breedlove, Dennis and Associates) working for them?

Kathy Putnam, Quest Corporation of America

We're looking for those kinds of ideas and suggestions. Any thoughts that you may have or "I want to see" this. That's what we are looking for today.

Deborah Green, Orange Audubon Society

I would encourage you to put a funding package together for restoration and management if this is the route that is to be taken. The restoration of Split Oak in the 90s is very different than what the restoration would require today, so that needs to be budgeted.

Charles Lee, Audubon Society of Florida

I agree with Brian's suggestion that BDA be tasked. They have a good deal of background and knowledge of these parcels and they could come up with a suggested restoration plan. There will need to be gopher tortoise credits for this project, and it is possible they could be made up on these new lands. You need to have a survey, suitability of habitat and drainage conditions to see how much can make up for that. If CFX needs a site to relocate tortoises it would probably make sense to the extent there are suitable lands that have been surveyed to accept relocations. It would make sense to move them there.

Gloria Pickar, League of Women Voters of Orange County

Speaking on behalf of League of Women Voters of Orange, Osceola counties and State of Florida. President Patty Brigham asked me to include the state league in these comments. The project affects both our transportation committee and natural resources committees. We hope to pass the one penny sales tax supported by both Mayor Demings and Mayor Dyer. Transportation is very important. We are glad to support that effort. We think it's critical we get more money for transportation in Central Florida. This potential project that goes through Split Oak, we do not support. None of our leagues support that. With help from Associate Professor Rachel Deming Director of Environmental Law, Barry Law Clinic prepared a letter. (LETTER read into minutes of meeting)

Suzanne Arnold, Lake Mary Jane Alliance

(provided background on formation and work of Lake Mary Jane Alliance) We are not optimistic about the road going around Split Oak. Like many residents we know it's the wrong thing and sad to hear about it going through the preserve. However, there are a lot of reasons that we also look at why this is a better solution. One of those being if that was going to be within our community we would be extremely upset, and would rather have it cut off an edge. The residents of Lake Ajay are going to be impacted and much worse if the road were to go through their community rather than into the southern end of Split Oak. We want to make sure the restoration and maintenance component is included. If it isn't, I believe we would oppose this. You can't just donate the land and not do something with it. This is very important to us. We're trying to look at the whole picture. We definitely have a question about future roadways going through Split Oak and the new proposed conservation land. When you say this new land is going into conservation, will it also have the ability to have linear facility go through it? Is there a way to block it further? It's there (development), it's coming. There is nothing worse than having things built and then trying to put your major roads through. That's when you have more issues of eminent domain. We know the road is going to eventually go in, future development is approved and it's coming. Having BDA put in a management plan may have a conflict of interest because they work with Tavistock and Deseret. We would like to have other groups evaluate it and put together a management plan.

Bob Mindick, Osceola County Environmental Lands Conservation Program

I keep requesting a regional map. The reason, we think the 1,500 acres are very important is because we tend to look short term. Building a road is short term – maybe 10-15 years. As available lands start running out, this is one of the last options to provide connections for wildlife and flora. The most important connectors that have been identified in the entire state are the Econ and St. Johns.

To do things artificially is almost always more expensive in the long term. (comments about the map and land) For that 160 acres, I want to make very clear the County's position on that 100 acres that is south of the 60-acre impact from the road itself. It will have a conservation easement that will remain on it. It will not be used for development. It will be used as a park, an underpass to be used for the Florida Scenic Trail and for folks who live in Osceola County to have access to the other conservation areas and trails that go up into the Orange County portion. We have a good partnership with Orange County, and we have a great deal of respect for the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and the work they have done. They still have areas not considered natural areas in Split Oak. There is still improved pasture out there – 52 acres. It's not all conservation. I am sure over time it will become viable habitat. Every undeveloped area that we have has conservation value whether it's in protective status or not. This area (1,500acre conservation dedication) has conservation value there is no question about it. However, does it have the best conservation value or by looking at this opportunity that won't be there if we move that road outside of the safety boundary that has been created? That value is going to diminish by having development around it. The conservation area suggested has a greater value than what Split Oak has now. The value in the connectivity of the proposed land. All things being equal, yes you would rather see the road be avoided. But you look at the safety studies and you see that is the safest route we can do. I know the importance for drivers I want to have a safe road to go on. You can say okay we don't need the road right now but if you look at 10 to 15 years of planning, we hopefully are avoiding some of the situations you see like I-4. Can we do something to improve it. Yes, I think this does it. If we can get past the emotional part and get to the logical part, this is the best option. No one is saying we are taking up 160 acres here, we'll

use 160 acres over here. We have folks in the development business, but they are also in the community business. They have to make their places appealing. They have offered to give the 1,500 acres because they know what a difficult challenge and what we are taking away from our community nearby. Some of that area could be used for good development. They didn't have to offer this other property. Let's not make some people evil because it's good for business. These are also our citizens we should be looking out for and caring for. Can we look at having FWC, Orange and Osceola County develop the management plan for this land? That same group could determine what the restoration and management value truly is.

Juliet Rynear, Florida Native Plant Society

Our position is the same as the League of Women Voters. We do not support a road through Split Oak Forest. We don't support roads through any of our conservation lands. These are public lands paid for by taxpayer dollars and they provide a multitude of benefits to the public. Not just plants and animals. We have seen a free for all of development across the state and we are in the process of losing some of our last remaining habitats and once we lose them, that's it. We're trying to do massive plant rescues on development now. The thought that small areas of conservation are not valuable, is actually not true. There have been a number of studies where it has been documented that some of the greatest biodiversity happened in these small preserves. A lot of these sites are very important so we shouldn't dismiss them because they are small and isolated. One of my concerns, I don't see external costs evaluated – human health, chronic diseases, heavy metals, asthma – everything associated with road building. Whether are you driving on the roads or living near them. Proposing a road through undeveloped lands there is a cost to that including carbon costs. The cost to aquifer recharge and water quality impacts. These have a cost to the public. The public is put out a lot. This is affecting us. You see the impacts to water. What isn't going into recharging the aquifer is making its way into the ocean. It's making its way into our estuaries. It's having an impact. Our fishing. Our tourism. My recommendation as we analyze. Has there ever been a no build option for this road? The impact to quality of life isn't going to be mitigated.

Dan Kristoff, RS&H

When we do a PD&E study, referring to the original when Osceola County did it, there was consideration of a no build option in 2017. You balance the no build option against the build. The no build has to consider increased pollution because traffic can't move as fast. You also get noise impacts and air impacts. Now some of the things you mentioned we are trying to get taken care of in consultation with our environmental agencies. It takes retention ponds. It takes acreage. It helps prevent the steams from getting direct pollution off the automobile. When we are replacing bridges, we use new techniques to minimize impacts. It's taking into consideration what's best for everybody.

Kelly Weiner, Florida National Scenic Trail

I'm looking for answers about what those trail connections would look like for the Florida Scenic Trails. Will the highway be elevated? And trailheads at Clapp Simms Duda?

Dan Kristoff, RS&H

Yes, as a matter of fact, any one of the locations we are looking at will have a bridge 100 feet

long there won't be any problem with traversing under the roadway, we can build that in. All we need to do is work with the specific locations that are of interest. We know that there needs to be improvement at Clapp Simms Duda. But we would not undertake that, it would need to go through local government.

Kelly Weiner, Florida National Scenic Trail

If all things are equal in those regards as far as what our trail crossing looks like and it was guaranteed that we would have a trail crossing, given that we are having huge challenges connecting our trail through Central Florida. It's our biggest issue across the state, small pieces of public land are important and precious to connect. All things being equal, our preference would be to have the highway not go into our public lands if it could be avoided.

Katrina Shadix, Bear Warriors United

I'm seeing that any option means spending over a billion dollars with the west segment and the east segment. If we are talking about the big picture. I am seeing the potential of another highway that's going to look like I-4 in another 20 years and why can't we take that money and invest it into a speed rail that would connect our tourist areas and other urban centers. I was in Europe a few weeks ago, and I didn't have to rent a car. It was easy, inexpensive and accessible. As a taxpaying-second generation Floridian I want a better investment in transportation. I was against this road before this meeting, any road, any version it. After seeing this evaluation matrix, it's the same. There are too many species impacts. It's either moderate or high. Neither one of those is acceptable. It seems like we are being given false choices. How about the no harm option? I think that should still be an option. Going specifically to bears, I don't see any wildlife crossings. Are wildlife overpasses and underpasses figured in?

Dan Kristoff, RS&H

We have not identified any specific locations. When we opened the meeting, I think it was mentioned there is a lot of work to be done regardless of which option we choose and much of that work about type and size of wildlife crossing would be done in subsequent phases.

Katrina Shadix, Bear Warriors United

If we are going to be forced into this highway, there should be state of the art overpass or underpasses, the nice ones that have forests built on top of them, not fences. They don't work and it's a very cheap alternative. If we are going to be forced with this kind of environmental damage, then the wildlife needs state of the art over or underpasses. Another concern is how easily these protections are being discarded. We have a heart and if we take our heart out and put it on our back, it's not going to do us any good. A lot of us have lost faith. I don't have any faith that anything we use as mitigation for this project is going to be saved. We have to stand our ground on this particular piece just out of principle. CFX or developers should have to fully support the Back to Nature Wildlife Refuge because there will be huge fallout of animals getting hit on the highway. Vehicle strikes are the number one cause of bear deaths in our state. There was a recent video of an 8-month old bear cub that was hit recently, and the driver kept going and the bear cub had some head damage and he was disoriented, and his mother was trying to pull him to the side of the road. I think if you could see this you would see we don't want another highway going through our wildlife habitat. I beg you to pick a no build option.

Marge Holt, Sierra Club

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. Mr. Mindick's comment about the southern portion of, or Split Oak being a sink, I'd like to address that. The portion of the map in pink, dark and light pink, at the time I legally challenged this on behalf of the Sierra Club, was a portion of the Northeast Conceptual Master Plan that's comprised of 44,000 acres, of which the owners – the Mormons, released this land that used to be on the CARL (Conservaton and Recreational Lands) list. It was named the Upper Econ Mosaic, so named for its unique composition of uplands and wetlands that formed wonderful habitat in this area. It's largely still today a clean palette. It has been approved for development, but there is absolutely no reason why Split Oak and that portion should be considered a sink. There is the opportunity to connect. And there is the potential to connect over the Lake Ajay. I have some history on this and have fiercely tried to defend the area. With the approval of the development of the North Ranch Master Plan, that's about 100,000 acres of which is still a working ranch, and there is no reason to viably connect into what's still left out there.

Valerie Anderson, Friends of Split Oak

There is no improvement in the actual wildlife corridor. To sell this an an improvement of the wildlife corridor, that's not true. It's creating a larger island which I'm willing to fight for every last piece of conservation land. Any negative effects of this road are being caused by the Central Florida Expressway Authority. The impacts to residential areas. For people who are buying that they have to take sides, it's a shell game.

Charles Lee, Audubon Society of Florida

Regarding the Florida Constitution, oh I wish it were so. We have some precedent. Clay Henderson was a member of the Constitution Revision Commission wrote that and got it approved to go on the ballot. It changed from what Clay proposed. An absolute you cannot get rid of conservation lands. The rest of paragraph 18 of Article 10 of the Constitution says that the determination of whether a piece of conservation lands of whether it is needed is made by the owner. In this case it would be the Osceola County Commission. The Constitution expression of the process is they have to have a 2/3 majority vote. And that's all that's in the constitution. It's been 21 years. There have been a number of roads since that time that have gone through the process and been challenged through the process. You have to look at that language in its entirety and, whether you like it or not, the Constitution does create the ability for landowners to have 2/3 vote and declare, in their view as landowners, that the land is no longer needed for conservation. You are suggesting there is another criterion. Again, I wish it were so. It's not the way that things have happened since 1998. Going to road projects alone, there are a number that have gone through Florida Forever Lands and Preservation 2000 Lands. Sometimes there are things that we wish were in the law or readings of the law that we would like to see that aren't necessarily what has happened in reality. In this case, under certain circumstances, whether we as conservationists like it or not, where the law provides for linear facilities to go through conservation lands once minimization has been achieved and avoidance has been determined not to be practical. Look at the alternative, if you spend \$102M to move the road slightly south and out of Split Oak, the whole east side of that area of conservation lands gets developed into highly dense industrial and commercial development. This is not a happy choice. No one relishes the idea of losing that 60 acres and partially losing that 100 acres. My point of

view is if you look at the long term of survivability of this tract. What happens east and south of that boundary line? This is not hypothetical development. It's approved as a comprehensive land amendment. This needs to be displayed on a map larger than the map we see today for more clarity to show how corridors would plug in and provide wildlife access.

William Graf, South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD)

Everything I am hearing from Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission sounds reasonable. As they are the primary land management entity of Split Oak, I feel compelled to support their position. Our incoming governor did have a rather stark impact on the leadership of SFWMD. We have noticed a change in tenor of the governing board. The 9-member board does set policy. I would say we have seen a move to more of a conservation minded, environmental stewardship perspective. In the most recent administration, it's the governor's office that runs the Water Management District. This governor has taken a tact to the conservation side. I'm not aware where we might hold easements, but I can say the release of those easements, there is now a higher bar, so for you and your consultants that might be a consideration. I stand with the folks at FWC. They are the people on the ground doing the work at Split Oak and it would be foolish of me to second guess them.

Hugh Harling, East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC)

The ECFRPC has looked at these corridors and they are supportive of safety and traffic and being able to move the citizens of Central Florida from point A to point B. I think the extended map would be an excellent thing to be able to see a broader view. I really appreciate the information that Charles Lee provides at these meetings.

Larry Rosen, Kissimmee Valley Audubon Society

Like for a lot of us, this is a tough one. We don't like to see any part of the park affected. The Split Oak Avoidance Alternative has received a lot of pushback from communities, particularly on the west side. There have been a lot of development and development plans for the rest of the area to the west that used to be the Carter property. These were developments that we fought back in the 2000s to influence so they wouldn't be as close to Split Oak. We have to deal with the reality that even though Tavistock has chosen a slightly smaller footprint for that northeast district than was approved, the remainder, those corners next to Split Oak can still be developed because Osceola County gave approval for that even though they aren't scheduled for immediate development. We think that the minimization plan might be the best to allow better maintenance of Split Oak so that the scrub habitat doesn't become even more isolated. There have been documented scrub jays there, but scrub jays have a way of winking out. But if we don't get the compensation lands then the winking out is pretty much guaranteed. That's where we are.

Bob Mindick, Osceola County Environmental Lands Conservation Program

Wildlife goes across water. The small little canal that was referred to is not a barrier for wildlife to go through. It is imperative that the regional map be done to show those lands are critical for wildlife to move north-south as well as east-west. Otherwise, you have a large island that will be created by this. The corridors are what allows wildlife to move through. Rather than moving through the neighborhoods along Lake Mary Jane. You would also have invasive wildlife like wild boar or wild hog. They are extremely damaging to those areas as well as deer. It won't eliminate them but having an alternative that doesn't go through neighborhoods is a better option. As far as small areas for plants. We need to think of plants. We don't think of plants as moving items, but they do over a long period of time especially when you add climate change to it.

Suzanne Arnold, Lake Mary Jane Alliance

Connectivity is very, very important. It must include wetlands and uplands.

Deborah Green, Orange Audubon Society

I would echo what Suzanne said about connectivity. And, the funds for restoration and management.



Juliet Rynear, Florida Native Plant Society

I just wanted to make a comment on climate change. We do know biodiverse intact habitat is the most resilient to climate change. So even in these small isolated parcels we have noticed they have been able to weather drastic changes in temperature, hurricanes, etc., rather than disturbed or slightly intact habitats. Going forward, we need to preserve the genetic biodiversity in these small parcels.

Katrina Shadix, Bear Warriors United

I just wanted to address the comment about the canal not affecting wildlife moving around. I am concerned about gopher tortoises because they can't swim so I do think it would heavily impact the gopher tortoise. (Read excerpt from Land Scope Florida website about habitat loss) Florida Fish and Wildlife has done an amazing job managing this land. We would hate for anything to happen to it. We would like it to stay exactly the way it is. For the forest and for the neighborhood not to be affected. I respectfully ask for a no-build option.

Charles Lee, Audubon Society of Florida

Enter into the record the letter we sent last year to Florida Communities Trust into record. The exotic issues surrounding Split Oak are not limited to cogon grass and not limited to disturbed areas. There is a serious *lygodium*, or old growth climbing fern, issue in the Roberts Island Strand. Unless that land is brought under public management, which this proposal would do, and management begins to knock that back, that *lygodium* has the potential to spread across the entirety of the conservation land complex, including the Split Oak tract itself. With the falling revenues for management, with all the conservation agencies holding land have experienced since 2010, it's a very real threat to these lands. Hopefully, if enough management and restoration money comes through the door through a comprehensive package surrounding the Osceola Parkway we could maybe get ahead of that and return the level of management it should to all of these acres, including the 1,550 acres, and threats like that *lygodium* can be averted.

Brian Barnett, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC)

Unfortunately, relinquishing conservation easements is common. Almost every time a road is widened, we get involved in giving up a management easement or sometimes fee title. The governor and cabinet have a procedure of this. You have to provide 1.5 acres for every acre you take. This is something we do all the time. We have two or three right now. We have one in Immokalee next to the Immokalee Airport. That's a real typical kind of a deal. SR 60 is being widened west of the Kissimmee River. We are in negotiations for additional lands to make up for that. This is a process we are used to, and we go through all the time. It's happening all the time. Going through an area like this is the exception. The rule is infringing on the edges of a conservation area. Usually we manage to make a pretty good deal and we get a lot more than the 1.5 acres. Obviously, when you are widening an existing road, you've already got the impact of that road its much less of a big of a deal than taking a 100-acre strip off a management area.

Valerie Anderson, Friends of Split Oak

Commercial development is less affected by burns than highways. Fire can jump a highway.

Charles Lee, Audubon Society of Florida

As development encroaches, whether its roads or the development that Osceola County has already approved, the limitations on burning on the southern portion of Split Oak are going to get worse. Having all of this land to the east of it will provide another window of smoke. When the Osceola Expressway Authority made the recommendation to have the road go right through the middle of Split Oak, it would have destroyed Split Oak. Don't split, Split Oak. We are no longer splitting Split Oak; we are shaving off the southern end about 10% of Split Oak. I understand the concept of a no build alternative. Whether that is appropriate is above my pay grade. Even if you got the no build alternative, from a long-term environmental standpoint, when the land to the west and the south turns into warehouses and industrial, you are going to impinge on its manageability. None of this is happy stuff. I wish growth would stop, but I'm not going to hold my breath. And until it does stop its going to be necessary to make the least amount of impact and to make the decisions that make the best sense for management of this piece of land.

Kathy Putnam, Quest Corporation of America

There was discussion about the wildlife crossing in other meetings. Dan addressed that. Any other questions about that?

Katrina Shadix, Bear Warriors United

Would we be allowed to be involved in the design of the corridors? If it comes down to the road being built, I would want to make sure we are not using fences. Something the world could look to as a model.

Nicole Gough, Dewberry Yes, absolutely there will be opportunity during the design phase for EAG and stakeholder input.

Suzanne Arnold, Lake Mary Jane Alliance

Both paths now go down (south). Is there a reason, is there a future plan to still go east or it is

all just going down and across?

Dan Kristoff, RS&H

Based on the long range adopted plan there are allowances to go further east and west. You have local roads that will be approved by local government. Our responsibility is for the expressway system not for the extensions from those interchange locations.

Glenn Pressimone, CFX

Through the PD&E study re-evaluation we asked about the Expressway going east. That has been abandoned in favor of a local road. It was more a vision for a local road rather than an expressway addition. Everything in the form of an expressway goes south from here.

Kathy Putnam, Quest Corporation of America

We thank you very much for your input. As you have seen with this display your past input has been very important. We appreciate your time. We adjourn the EAG of the PD&E Study Re-evaluation

VII. Close

Kathy Putnam thanked the EAG members for their comments and thanked them for their time. There being no further questions or comments, the meeting was adjourned.

END OF SUMMARY

This meeting summary was prepared by Kathy Putnam, Public Involvement Coordinator with Quest Corporation of America. It is not meant to be verbatim but is a summary of the meeting activities and overall discussion. If you feel something should be added or revised, please contact Kathy Putnam by email at <u>ProjectStudies@CFXway.com</u> or by telephone 407-802-3210 within five days of receipt of this summary.

PUBLIC SIGN-IN SHEET



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
	d - Prince and				
ClintBealy	Trustoce	Laters Blud		cheater tavistocka	
BOB TURNER	Lake Asay V. More	3159 Forest Breeze way	St Clark.	bub, turner 3159@ gma	il. com Oto
Anh Volmer	League of Women Voter	433 E. Grantist Orl, 32806	Orbudo 32806	anh volumer @ give ilion	AV.
DAVID WEGMAN	SPLIT GAR	ORL FL 32822	ORC, FL 32822	DAWEGMAN 1960 Cgmailor	DAN
ARIEL HARTNEY	Foso	199 E. Ce darwood Cr	Kussman, FL	ahar they 2007 a griail on	AH
Jessi Blakkey	Tavistack	6900 Tavistock Lalas Blud	Orlando, FL	iblakley phuistak can	9B
DAile Douling	BDA	330 W. CANTON Avenue	Winter Park FL, 32789	ddouling Obda-mere	and
32 fath	ECERPC		,	hhadin	-

PUBLIC SIGN-IN SHEET



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Sratehen Rob. hso	FOSOF	520 Remonatane	Orlando/fl/32802	pallas 779 rogmail.com	SR
				T	
				201	
					3

PUBLIC SIGN-IN SHEET

CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

CENTRAL FLORIDA

EXPRESSWAY

AUTHORITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Richard Leve	TOC			vlevere tavistock.con	le
ODIA-phys	SLR			John & StReserver.com	JOH .
Richard Brightuan	H65	ste 300	Ta Hanko ssee 32301	richards physlew. Low	1 RESS
Stacy Ford	Lake Ajay Villose	3185 Whisper Wind Dr. St. Claud	34771	stacyemickeysbackyar	I.con SJF
Sarah Neme	S Southern Group			hemese the southerngro	UD. Cam (FN).
NieoleWilson	2	1807 Glenday Ct	Windermen, FL34786	ncwilson s@gmail.com	Mille
Kim Buchhet	self	6500 SWAIN RD	Sornano Fi 32776	Kinberly buchheit@ mail	KAZ
Littuch D'Som	SPERKE VIE WORKNA	2328 Por Vinne A	Asporter	CHUCKFORFLORDA COMMILCON	cuO
Jih Druch	SettetLWVac	116			
RNACTASA					
Suzanne Arnold	LMJ Alliane	13306 Lake Mary Sun	Orlande FL 32832	Suz Arnold @mindspry rea	. SA

STAFF SIGN-IN SHEET

CENTRAL

FLORIDA

EXPRESSWAY

AUTHORITY

Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Email Address	Initials
Laura Kelley	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Laura.Kelley@CFXWay.com	V
Michelle Maikisch	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Michelle.Maikisch@CFXWay.com	
Glenn Pressimone	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Glenn.Pressimone@CFXWay.com	
Will Hawthorne	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Will.Hawthorne@CFXWay.com	~
Angela Melton	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Angela.Melton@CFXWay.com	
Brian Hutchings	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Brian.Hutchings@CFXWay.com	\checkmark
Emily Brown	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Emily.Brown@CFXWay.com	\checkmark
Chris Caprio	ARC Document Solutions	Christopher.Caprio@e-arc.com	
Carleen Flynn	CDM Smith	flynncm@cdmsmith.com	
Hugh Miller	CDM Smith	millerhw@cdmsmith.com	\frown
Merissa Battle	Dewberry	MBattle@dewberry.com	MB
Nicole Gough	Dewberry	NGough@dewberry.com	NG V
Jonathan Williamson	Dewberry	JWilliamson@dewberry.com	Nul
Jeff Jones	Inwood Inc.	Jjones@inwoodinc.com	

STAFF SIGN-IN SHEET

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Email Address	Initials
Dan Kristoff	RS&H	Daniel.Kristoff@rsandh.com	pt2
Kelsey Lucas	RS&H	Kelsey.Lucas@rsandh.com	K
Myra Monreal	RS&H	Myra.Monreal@gmail.com	m
John Rice	RS&H	John.Rice@rsandh.com	
Mary Brooks	Quest Corporation of America	Mary.Brooks@qcausa.com	MER
Kathy Putnam	Quest Corporation of America	Kathy.Putnam@qcausa.com	ZP
Elaine Rodriguez	Quest Corporation of America	Elaine.Rodriguez@qcausa.com	ČeR
Kevin Camara	Quest Corporation of America	Kevin.Camara@qcausa.com	KC
Nick Nulli	Quest Corporation of America	Nick.Nulli@qcausa.com	
Laurie Windham	Quest Corporation of America	Laurie.Windham@qcausa.com	· · · · · ·
Lisa Marks	Quest Corporation of America	Lisa.Marks@qcausa.com	
Susan Clary	Quest Corporation of America	Susan.Clary@qcausa.com	440
Nathan Silva	RS:H	Nathan. Gilvac vsandh.com	NS
Eddie Gonzalez	RS&H	Eddie. Gunzalez Prisndh.or	h



STAFF SIGN-IN SHEET

Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Email Address	Initials
Churs Dailey	Þ8H		CD
hory Kooneve	Corum Kans Dormenny	Werry RUMANTED CERTING CUM	\bigcirc
	E.		
r.			

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Jane West	1000 Friends of Florida	PO Box 5948	Tallahassee, FL 32314	friends@1000fof.org	
Deb Johnson	Alligator Lake Chain Alliance (ALChA)	3250 Alligator Lake Road	St. Cloud, FL 34772	captjimdeb@aol.com	
Charles Lee	Audubon Society of Florida	1101 Audubon Way	Maitland, FL 32751	Chlee2@earthlink.net	Al
Larry Rosen	Audubon Society - Kissimmee Valley	PO Box 420115	Kissimmee, FL 34742	LarryRosen@CFL.RR.com	CA
Sandy Webb	Audubon Society - Kissimmee Valley	PO Box 420115	Kissimmee, FL 34742	slwebbzeit@gmail.com	
Rick Baird	Audubon Society - Orange County	1920 North Forest Avenue	Orlando, FL 32803		
Deborah Green	Audubon Society - Orange County	1920 North Forest Avenue	Orlando, FL 32803	sabalpress@mac.com; watermediaservices@icloud.com ; watermediaservices@mac.com; watermediaservices@me.com	DS &



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Katrina Shadix	Bear Warriors United	PO Box 622621	Oviedo, FL 32762	bearwarriorsunited@gmail.com	
Patricia Steed	Central Florida Regional Planning Council (CFRPC)	555 East Church Street	Bartow, FL 33830	psteed@cfrpc.org	
Traci Deen	Conservation Trust for Florida	1731 NW 6th Street, Suite D	Gainesville, FL 32609	traci@conserveflorida.org	
Laurie Ann MacDonald	Defenders of Wildlife – Florida	233 Third Street North, Suite 201	St. Petersburg, FL 33701	Imacdonald@defenders.org	
Hugh Harling	East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC)	455 North Garland Avenue, 4 th Floor	Orlando, FL 32801	hharling@ecfrpc.org	
Fred Milch	East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC)	455 North Garland Avenue, 4 th Floor	Orlando, FL 32801	fmilch@ecfrpc.org	An
Eleanor Foerste	Eleanor Foerste Adventures	PO Box 450627	Kissimmee, FL 34745	ellie.f@embarqmail.com	



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Jennifer Rubiello	Environment Florida	3110 1st Avenue North, Suite 2H	St. Petersburg, FL 33713	jennifer@environmentflorida.org	
Casey Lyon	FDOT-District 5	719 South Woodland Boulevard	DeLand, FL 32720	casey.lyon@dot.state.fl.us	
Bill Walsh	FDOT-District 5	719 South Woodland Boulevard	DeLand, FL 32720	william.walsh@dot.state.fl.us	
Irene Cabral	FDOT-Emergency Management Office	605 Suwannee Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	irene.cabral@dot.state.fl.us	
Katasha Cornwell	FDOT-Office of Environmental Management	605 Suwannee Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	katasha.cornwell@dot.state.fl.us	
Nahir DeTizio	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	400 West Washington Street, Suite 4200	Orlando, FL 32801	nahir.detizio@dot.gov	
Joseph Sullivan	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	400 West Washington Street, Suite 4200	Orlando, FL 32801	Joseph.Sullivan@dot.gov	



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Pete Dunkleberg	Florida Citizens for Science			petedunkpi@gmail.com	
Rodney Durbin	FL Dept. of Agriculture - Fresh from Florida	6490 Old Melbourne Highway	St. Cloud, FL 34771	Rodney. Durbin@FreshFromFlorida.com	
Michael Facente	FL Dept. of Agriculture - Fresh from Florida	6490 Old Melbourne Highway	St. Cloud, FL 34771	Michael.Facente@FreshFromFlorida.com	e:
Wil Kitchings	FL Dept. of Agriculture - Fresh from Florida	8431 South Orange Blossom Trail	Orlando, FL 32809	Wil.Kitchings@FreshFromFlorida.com	
Sean Gallagher	FL Dept. of Agriculture - Fresh from Florida	8431 South Orange Blossom Trail	Orlando, FL 32809	Sean.Gallagher@FreshFromFlorida.com	r
Linda Reeves	FL Dept. of Environmental Protection	3900 Commonwealth Boulevard	Tallahassee, FL 32399	linda.reeves@dep.state.fl.us	
Justin Wolfe	FL Dept. of Environmental Protection	3900 Commonwealth Boulevard	Tallahassee, FL 32399	justin.g.wolfe@dep.state.fl.us	



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Corey Lentz	FL Dept. of State - Div. of Historical Resources	500 South Bronough Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	corey.lentz@dos.myflorida.com	*
Timothy Parsons	FL Dept. of State - Div. of Historical Resources	500 South Bronough Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	timothy.parsons@dos.myflorida.com	
Brian Barnett	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	620 South Meridian Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	brian.barnett@myfwc.com	6B
Laura DiGruttolo	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	620 South Meridian Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	laura.digruttolo@myfwc.com	
Jason Hight	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	620 South Meridian Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	jason.hight@myfwc.com	
Dylan Imlah	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	620 South Meridian Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	dylan.imlah@myfwc.com	


CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Richard Mospens	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	a Fish and 620 South Meridian Tallahassee, FL 32399 rid fe Conservation Street nission		richard.mospens@myfwc.com	
Tom Shupe	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	620 South Meridian Tallahassee, FL 32399 Street		tom.shupe@myfwc.com	
David Turner	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	620 South Meridian Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	david.turner@myfwc.com	ž
Shannon Wright	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	620 South Meridian Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	shannon.wright@myfwc.com	
Dale Allen	Florida Greenways & Trails Foundation	PO Box 4142	Tallahassee, FL 32315	wm.dale.allen@gmail.com	,
Shawn Thomas	Florida National Scenic Trail (FNST)	PO Box 510275	Melbourne, FL 32931	shawn.c.thomas@usda.gov	



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Kelly Weiner	Florida National Scenic Trail (FNST)	PO Box 510275	Melbourne, FL 32931	KellyW@Floridatrail.org	
Juliet Rynear	Florida Native Plant Society	2228 Jessica Lane	Kissimmee, FL 34744	executivedirector@fnps.org	Spe
Julie Becker	Florida Native Plant Society - Tarflower Chapter	PO Box 536021	Orlando, FL 32853		
Pete Dunkleberg	Florida Native Plant Society - Tarflower Chapter	PO Box 536021	Orlando, FL 32853	petedunkpi@gmail.com	
Jim Erwin	Florida Native Plant Society - Tarflower Chapter	PO Box 536021	Orlando, FL 32853	jimerwin9@gmail.com	
Amanda Martin	Florida Native Plant Society - Tarflower Chapter	PO Box 536021	Orlando, FL 32853	ajm.fnps@gmail.com	Hen

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Eliott Miller	Florida Native Plant Society - Tarflower Chapter	PO Box 536021	Orlando, FL 32853	tarflower.fnps@gmail.com	
Tayler Figueroa	Florida Native Plant Society - Pine Lily Chapter	2228 Jessica Lane	Kissimmee, FL 34744	fnpsPineLily@gmail.com	
Sandra Webb	Florida Native Plant Society - Pine Lily Chapter	2228 Jessica Lane	Kissimmee, FL 34744	slwebbzeit@gmail.com	
Janet Akerson	Florida Trail Association	5415 Southwest 13th Street	Gainesville, FL 32608	janetakerson@floridatrail.org	
Kelly Wiener	Florida Trail Association	5415 Southwest 13th Street	Gainesville, FL 32608	KellyW@floridatrail.org	KW
Bill Turman	Florida Trail Association - Central Florida Chapter	415 Lakepointe Drive, Suite 104	Altamonte Springs, FL 32701	hokiebill@bellsouth.net	M.D.
Valerie Anderson	Friends of Split Oak			valerietheblonde@gmail.com	Oal



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Harry Gregg	Friends of Split Oak	1151 Perugia Lane	St. Cloud, FL 34771	hgregg@bellsouth.net	HA.
Gretchen Robinson	Friends of Split Oak	520 Ramona Lane	Orlando, FL 32805		
Robert Stern	Friends of Split Oak	4707 Mesa Verde Drive	St. Cloud, FL 34769	bobstern0523@gmail.com	
Dave Wegman	Friends of Split Oak	2811 Buckboard Way	Orlando, FL 32822	dawegman1960@gmail.com	
Suzanne Arnold	Lake Mary Jane Alliance	13306 Lake Mary Jane Road	Orlando, FL 32832	suzarnold@mindspring.com	
Sharon Robbins	Lake Mary Jane Alliance			robbins.sharon1@gmail.com	
Gloria Pickar	League of Women Voters of Orange County			gloria.pickar@gmail.com	Mor
Renzo Nastasi	Orange County	PO Box 1393	Orlando, FL 32802	renzo.nastasi@ocfl.net	M
Beth Jackson	Orange County - Environmental Protection Division	800 Mercy Drive, Ste. 4	Orlando, FL 32808	beth.jackson@ocfl.net	B. Jackson

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Neal Thomas	Orange County - Environmental Protection Division	800 Mercy Drive, Ste. 4	Orlando, FL 32808	neal.thomas@ocfl.net	
Linda Chapin	Orange County, Former Chair				
Robert Goff	Orange County - Parks and Recreation	800 North Orange Avenue	Orlando, FL 32801	robert.goff@ocfl.net	
Gail Piazza	Orange County - Parks and Recreation	800 North Orange Avenue	Orlando, FL 32801	gail.piazza@ocfl.net	
Josh DeVries	Osceola County	1 Courthouse Square	Kissimmee, FL 34741	joshua.devries@osceola.org	
Justin Eason	Osceola County	1 Courthouse Square	Kissimmee, FL 34741	justin.eason@osceola.org	
Kerry Godwin	Osceola County	1 Courthouse Square	Kissimmee, FL 34741	kgod@osceola.org	
Caroline Horton	Osceola County	1 Courthouse Square	Kissimmee, FL 34741	caroline.horton@osceola.org	
Tawny Olore	Osceola County	1 Courthouse Square	Kissimmee, FL 34741	Tawny.Olore@osceola.org	THO



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Bob Mindick	Osceola County Env Lands Conservation Program	1 Courthouse Square – Suite 1400	Kissimmee, FL 34741	robert.mindick@osceola.org	FM
Marjorie Holt	Sierra Club	8502 Alveron Avenue	Orlando, FL 32817	marjorieholt@earthlink.net	mh.
John Puhek	Sierra Club	P.O. Box 941692	Maitland, FL 32794	flsquirrel@aol.com	
John Ryan	Sierra Club	PO Box 773	Winter Haven, FL 33882	floridaconservation@msn.com	
Marian Ryan	Sierra Club	PO Box 773	Winter Haven, FL 33882	marianryan@gmail.com	
Marc Ady	South Florida Water Management District	1707 Orlando Central Parkway Suite 200	Orlando, FL 32809	mady@sfwmd.gov	
William Graf	South Florida Water Management District	1707 Orlando Central Parkway, Suite 200	Orlando, FL 32809	wgraf@sfwmd.gov	VAS
Patricia Martin	The Nature Conservancy	2500 Maitland Center Parkway, Suite 311	Maitland, FL 32751	Tricia_martin@tnc.org	



.

CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Zach Prusak	The Nature Conservancy	2500 Maitland Center Parkway, Suite 311	Maitland, FL 32751	zprusak@tnc.org	
Brandon Conroy	US Army Corps of Engineers	400 High Point Drive, Suite 600	nt Drive, Cocoa, FL 32926 Brandon.J.Conroy@usace.army.n		
Irene Sadowski	US Army Corps of Engineers	400 High Point Drive, Suite 600	Cocoa, FL 32926	irene.sadowski@usace.army.mil	
Mary Walker	US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	61 Forsyth Street Southwest	Atlanta, GA 30303	mary.walker@epa.gov	
Zakia Williams	US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	7915 Baymeadows Way	Jacksonville, FL 32256	zakia_williams@fws.gov	
John Wrublik	US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	1339 20th Street	Vero Beach, FL 32960	John_Wrublik@fws.gov	

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

October 31, 2019

Subject: Environmental Advisory Group Meeting – November 18, 2019 CFX Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation Osceola Parkway Extension CFX Project No.: 599-223

Dear Study Stakeholder:

The <u>Central Florida Expressway Authority</u> (CFX) would like to invite you or your designee to the Environmental Advisory Group (EAG) meeting for the <u>Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study Re-</u> <u>evaluation</u>. The purpose of the study re-evaluation is to determine if a new expressway connection between <u>State Road 417</u> near Boggy Creek Road in Orange County and the proposed Sunbridge Parkway in Osceola County is viable and fundable in accordance with CFX policies and procedures.

The meeting will be held on Monday, November 18, 2019 from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. at the CFX Headquarters located at 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, 32807. A brief presentation will be provided, followed by group discussion.

Please note that only one person per EAG member organization is invited to sit at the meeting table and engage in the group discussion. Others are invited to sit in the audience area and leave written comments.

During this meeting, the CFX study team is expected to present the preferred alternative and receive comment from EAG members. All factors related to the conceptual design and location of the facility, including transportation needs, financial feasibility, social impacts, economic factors, environmental impacts, engineering analysis, and right-of-way requirements, continue to be considered.

When the PD&E Study Re-evaluation concludes, it will result in a recommendation to the CFX Governing Board of the preferred alternative. If the project is approved by the CFX Governing Board, it would move forward for further project development.

The overall goals of the proposed Osceola Parkway Extension are to provide improved connections between area roads; accommodate anticipated transportation demand; provide consistency with local and regional plans; support economic viability and job creation; support intermodal opportunities; and enhance evacuation and emergency services.

Your participation in the EAG is encouraged. As a special advisory resource to CFX and the consultant team, the EAG provides input regarding environmental impacts, local needs, concerns and potential physical, natural, social and cultural impacts that are crucial in the evaluation of corridor and alternative alignments.

For more information, visit the study's website at <u>http://bit.ly/OscPkwyExtRe</u>. Please respond to Mary Brooks, Public Involvement Coordinator, by Tuesday, November 12, if you are able to attend the EAG

meeting or if you would prefer to designate a representative. Ms. Brooks can be reached by phone at 407-802-3210 or by email at <u>ProjectStudies@CFXway.com</u>.

Sincerely,

1 DLI

Glenn Pressimone, PE Chief of Infrastructure Central Florida Expressway Authority

Attachment: Meeting Location Map



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Stu Environmental Advisory Group	udy Re-evaluation First Name	Last Name	F-mail	Mailing Name 1	Mailing Name 2	Address 1	Address 2	City State 70	,	Not as
Environmental Advisory Group	Prist Name	Last Name	Cinan		Waning Wante 2		Address 2	City State 21		
1000 Friends of Florida P	Policy and Planning Director Jane	West	friends@1000fof.org	1000 Friends of Florida		PO Box 5948		Tallahassee FL 32	314-5948	10/15/19 - updated POC
Alligator Lake Chain Alliance (ALChA)				Alligator Lake Chain Alliance (ALChA)		3250 Alligator Lake Rd		St Cloud FL 34	772	Added 06/27/18; 013118 EAG Sign in Sheet
<u> </u>	Deb	Johnson	captjimdeb@aol.com	U						
Audubon Society - Central Florida				Audubon Florida		1101 Audubon Way		Maitland FL 32	751	Updated local address 062718.
	Director of Advocacy Charles	Lee	Chlee2@earthlink.net_							
Audubon Society - Kissimmee Valley	Vice President Sandy	Webb	slwebbzeit@gmail.com	Kissimmee Valley Audubon Society Inc		PO Box 420115		Kissimmee FL 34	742	
	Larry	Rosen	LarryRosen@CFL.RR.com							Added 1/3/18
Audubon Society - Orange County				Orange Audubon Society		1920 North Forest Avenue		Orlando FL 32	803-1537	7/20/18 - Revised Address
	President Deborah	Green	sabalpress@mac.com; watermediaservice	es@icloud.com; watermediaservices@mac.com; watermediaservice	es@me.com					7/20/18- Deleted Phyllis Hall 7/20/18- Changed tite
	Rick	Baird								7/20/18 - Added
Bear Warriors United	Eventive Directory Kataina	Chadin	haan marina witad Qaanail aan	Bear Warriors United		PO Box 622621		Oviedo FL 32	762	080218 - added from 062918 CFX speaker card
	Executive Director Katrina	Shadix	bearwarriorsunited@gmail.com							
Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX)) Chief of Infrastructure Glenn	Pressimone	glenn.pressimone@cfxway.com	Central Florida Expressway Authority		4974 ORL Tower Rd		Orlando FL 32	807	10/15/19 - updated title
м	Director of Engineering Will	Hawthorne	will.hawthorne@cfxway.com							10/15/19 - updated POC
		menton	ungelutine tonie extra y com							
Central Florida Regional Planning Council ((CFRPC) Executive Director Patricia	Steed	psteed@cfrpc.org	Central Florida Regional Planning Council		555 E Church St		Bartow FL 33	830	
Conservation Trust for Florida				Conservation Trust for Florida		1731 NW 6th St	Ste D	Gainesville FL 32	609	
	Executive Director Traci	Deen	traci@conserveflorida.org							
Defenders of Wildlife - Florida				Defenders of Wildlife		233 Third Street North	Ste 201	St Petersburg FL 33	701	Updated local address 062718
	Florida Director Laurie Ann	MacDonald	laurie.macdonald@defenders.org							
East Central Florida Regional Planning Cou	Incil (ECFRPC)	Harling	bharling@ecfroc.org	East Central Florida Regional Planning Council		455 N Garland Ave	Fourth Floor	Orlando FL 32	801	
	Project Manager Fred	Milch	fmilch@ecfrpc.org							Updated title 032619
Eleanor Foerste Adventures						PO Box 450627		Kissimmee FL 34	745	Updated addres: http://osceolahistory.org/listings/7981/eleanor-foerste-adventures-lic/
	Eleanor	Foerste	ellie.f@embargmail.com							Added 1/3/18
Environment Florida	Charles Discussion of the Maria	Dubielle	ionnifor@on	Environment Florida		3110 1st Ave N	Ste 2H	St Petersburg FL 33	713	Added POC; con https://environmentfordd.org/staff
	State Director Jennifer	nuDiello	remmenter wenvironmenthorida.org							oposteo une sin aucere risi in 2002
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	Environmental Specialist Joseph	Sullivan	Joseph.Sullivan@dot.gov	Florida Division	Federal Highway Administration	400 W. Washington Street	Suite 4200	Orlando FL 32	801	
	Local Programs Engineer Nahir	DeTizio	nahir.detizio@dot.gov							
Florida Citizens for Science										
	Board Member Pete	Dunkleberg	petedunkpi@gmail.com							Added 1/3/18
FL Dept. of Agriculture - Fresh From Florida	a General Manager, Rodney	Durbin	Rodney Durbin@FreshFromFlorida.com	Florida Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services		6490 Old Melbourne Hwy.		St. Cloud FL 34	771-7601	
Osceola Cou	unty Forest Area Supervisor Michael	Facente	Michael.Facente@FreshFromFlorida.com	l.						https://www.freshfromflorida.com/Divisions-Offices/Florida-Forest-Service/Our-Forests/Field-Operations/Forest-Area-Supervisors/Find-a-Forest-Area-Supervisor
FL Dept. of Agriculture - Fresh From Florida	a			Florida Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services	Florida Forest Service	8431 S Orange Blossom Trail		Orlando FL 32	809	
Orange Cou	unty Forest Area Supervisor Wil Manager Sean	Kitchings Gallagher	Wil.Kitchings@FreshFromFlorida.com Sean.Gallagher@FreshFromFlorida.com							https://www.freshfromflorida.com/Division-Dfiftes/Florida-Forest-Service/Our-Forests/Field-Operations/Florest-Area-Supervisor https://www.freshfromflorida.com/Division-Dfiftes/Florida-Forest-Service/Our-Forests/Field-Operations/Orlando-Distrit-Field-Unit
Cl. Death of Carrier and a locatestica				Flavida Dependence of Favignee and a Dependence		2000 Commonwealth Divid		Tallaharana Di 22	200	
PE Dept. of Environmental Protection	Operations Manager Linda	Reeves	linda.reeves@dep.state.fl.us	Florida Department of Environmental Protection		5900 Commonwealth Bivu		Tallanassee FL 52	299	https://lioridadep.gov/lands/land-and-recreation-grants/content/land-and-recreation-grants-program-staff-contacts
	Attorney Justin	Wolfe	justin.g.wolfe@dep.state.fl.us							10/15/19 - upda https://www.floridabar.org/directories/find-mbr/profile/?num=641601
FL Dept. of State - Div. of Historical Resource	ces	Lanta	anna lasta Odas au flasida ann	Florida Division of Historical Resources		RA Gray Building	500 S Bronough St	Tallahassee FL 32	399-0250	
Division Director, State H	Architectural Historian Cory listoric Preservation Officer Timothy	Parsons	timothy.parsons@dos.myflorida.com							upaateo vuL us nttps://dos.my/inition/ai/about/istan-people-programs/
FDOT-District 5				Florida Department of Transportation	District 5	719 S Woodland Blvd		DeLand FL 32	720	
	District Permit Coordinator Casey	Lyon	casey.lyon@dot.state.fl.us							7/20/15 - Deleb <u>http://www.fds.gov/nodway/6fminage/5f.shtm</u>
En	ivironmental Administrator Bill	waish	william.waisn@dot.state.n.us							//zu/is-keviseo lines
FDOT-Emergency Management Office	rgency Coordination Officer Irene	Cabral	irene.cabral@dot.state.fl.us	Florida Department of Transportation	Office of Emergency Management	605 Suwannee St		Tallahassee FL 32	399-0450	https://www.fdot.gov/emergencymanagement/
EDOT Office of Environmental Managemen	at .		-	Elocida Dopartment of Transportation	Office of Environmental Management	605 Sumanaa St		Tallabarrao El 22	200	
State Environmental Wanagemen	ental Process Administrator Katasha	Cornwell	katasha.cornwell@dot.state.fl.us	Fiorital Department of Transportation	Office of Environmental Management	ous suwannee st		Tallanassee FL 52	233	7/20/18 - Updai https://www.fdot.gov/ervironment/staff.shtm
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Com	nmission			Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission		Farris Bryant Building	620 S Meridian St	Tallahassee FL 32	399-1600	7/20/18 - Added Titles
Ν	Transportation Biologist Brian	Barnett Wright	brian.barnett@myfwc.com shannon wright@myfwc.com							Added title 032619 Added title 032679
	Biological Scientist Laura	DiGruttolo	laura.digruttolo@myfwc.com							Added title 032619
Cand Use Plann	Conservation Land Manager Richard	Mospens	richard.mospens@myfwc.com							opdate tre zo rings./www.intedin.com/m/jason-ingin-3022022/ Adde trite 032619
	Wildlife Biologist Tom Biological Scientist David	Shupe Turner	tom.shupe@myfwc.com david.turner@myfwc.com							Added title 032619 Added title 032619 Added title 032619
	Sr. Conservation Planner Dylan	Imlah	dylan.imlah@myfwc.com							
Florida Greenways & Trails Foundation				Florida Greenways & Trails Foundation		PO Box 4142		Tallahassee FL	32315	
	President Dale	Allen	wm.dale.allen@gmail.com							7/20/18 - Revisi http://gtt.org/ou-board
Florida National Scenic Trail (FNST)	Brogram Director, Kelly	Wainar	KellyW@Floridatrail.org	Florida National Scenic Trail		PO Box 510275		Melbourne FL 32	931	
	Shawn	Thomas	shawn.c.thomas@usda.gov							
Florida Native Plant Society - Tarflower Cha	apter			Florida Native Plant Society	Tarflower Chapter	PO Box 536021		Orlando FL 32	853	Updated addres: http://search.sunbiz.org/Inquiny/CorporationSearch/SearchResultDetail?inquinytype=EntityName&directionType=CurrentList&searchNameOrder=TARFLOWERCHAPTERFLORIDANATIVEP%20N313120&aggregated=dommp-n31312-11e4a663-e1ab-
Interim Count	Eliott til Chair and Board Director Julie	Miller Becker	tarflower.fnps@gmail.com							Added 062718; 013118 EAG Sign in Sheet
	Jim	Erwin	jimerwin9@gmail.com							Added 1/3/18
	President Amanda	Martin	ajm.fnps@gmail.com							Added 025c1) https://us10.campaign-archive.com/?u=753e08107/280c8c19bdc8120&id=0cd16560b
Florida Native Plant Society - Pine Lily Char	pter			Florida Native Plant Society	Pine Lily Chapter	2228 Jessica Ln		Kissimmee FL 34	744	Updated addres: https://visulate.com/rental/visulate_search.php?CORP_ID=NIB800002035
Con	Chapter Respresentative Tayler	Figueroa	fnpsPineLily@gmail.com							Added email 0.6: http://pinelily.fnpschapters.org/index.php?id=community
con	State Executive Director Juliet	Rynear	executivedirector@fnps.org							Aked to attend the EAG meeting. Cell: 228-238-4657
Florida Trail Association				Florida Trail Association		5415 SW 13th St		Gainesville FL 32	608	
	Administrative Director Janet	Akerson	janetakerson@floridatrail.org							Added PCC 0627. https://www.floridatrail.org/about-us/staff/
	Trail Program Director Keny	wieller	Kenyw@nondatran.org							111212- obgeen And
Florida Trail Association - Central Florida C	Chapter Director Bill	Turman	hokiebill@bellsouth.net	Florida Trail Association		415 Lakepointe Dr	Suite 104	Altamonte Spri FL 32	701	Added 062718; f https://www.floridatrail.org/about-us/ourboard/
Friends of Solit Oak										
	Dave	Wegman	dawegman1960@gmail.com			2811 Buckboard Way		Orlando FL 32	822	Added J/J/18 080218 - added address from 062918 CFX speaker card
	President Valerie Gretchen	Anderson Robinson	valerietnebionde@gmail.com			520 Ramona Lane		Orlando FL 32	805	Autor ur yr yr 6 080218 - addef from 062918 CPX speaker card
	Harry Robert	Gregg Stern	hgregg@bellsouth.net bobstern0523@gmail.com			1151 Perugia Lane 4707 Mesa Verde Dr		St Cloud FL 34 St Cloud FL 34	771 769	080213 - added from 062318 CFX speaker card 080216 - dded from 062318 CFX speaker card
	induction of the									
Lake Mary Jane Alliance										
	Communications Suzanne Board Member Sharon	Arnold Robbins	suzarnold@mindspring.com robbins.sharon1@gmail.com			13306 Lake Mary Jane Rd		Orland FL	32832	Added 13/18 Added a Added ti http://www.iakemaryianeilliance.com/contact.htm Added 13/18 Added title 0256: http://www.iakemaryianeilliance.com/contact.htm
League of Women Voters of Orange Court	v									
Bac or mornen voters or Orange Connt	Natural Resources Chair Mary	Dipboye	mdipboye@yahoo.com							Added 1/3/18 https://www.wikiwewiki/www.wikiwe
										A0060 1/3/18
The Nature Conservancy	Fire Manager Zach	Prusak	zprusak@tnc.ore	The Nature Conservancy	Florida Field Office	2500 Maitland Center Pkwy	Suite 311	Maitland FL 32	751	POC updated 062718; 013118 EAG Sign in Sheet

RCHAPTERFLORIDANATIVEP%20N313120&aggregateId=domnp-n31312-11e4a663-e1ab-4a14-8bb6-fba31bb238d2&searchTerm=Tarfad%2C%20LLC&listNameOrder=TARFAD%20L120001177;

	Patr	ricia (Tricia)	Martin	tricia_martin@tnc.org								7/20/18 - Revised Contact
										-		
Orange County					Orange County	Planning Division	PO Box 1393		Orlando	FL	32802	
	Transportation Planning Manager Ren	IZO	Nastasi	renzo.nastasi@ocfl.net								
Orange County - Enviro	nmental Protection Division				Orange County	Environmental Protection Division	800 Mercy Drive	Suite 4	Orlando	FI	32808	Undated David as POC and address 062718
	Environmental Program Supervisor Beth	h	Jackson	beth.jackson@ocfl.net								7/20/18 - Revised address; Deleted David Jones and Elizabeth Johnson
	Environmental Program Supervisor Nea	al	Thomas	neal.thomas@ocfl.net								
Orange County - Parks	and Recreation				Orange County	Parks and Recreation Division	800 N Orange Avenue		Orlando	FL	32801	
	Project Manager Rob	pert	Goff	robert.goff@ocfl.net								
	Program Manager Gail	I	Piazza	gail.piazza@ocfl.net								
Osceola County					Osceola County		1 Courthouse Square		Kissimmee	FL	34741	
	Executive Director Taw	ny	Olore	Tawny.Olore@osceola.org								Delete Osceola Expressway Authority and Atlee Mercer. Moved Tawny 032619.
	Transportation Planning Director Josh	h.	DeVries	joshua.devries@osceola.org								Updated title 032619
	Director of Planning and Design Kerr	ry	Godwin	kgod@osceola.org								Deleted Mary Moskowitz (now at Seminole County) and Jodell (now at VHB) and Brenda Ryan (now at Groveland) 032619
	Planner II Care	oline	Horton	caroline.horton@osceola.org								Added 06/27/18 Updated title 032619
	Planner II, Transportation and Transit Just	tin	Eason	justin.eason@osceola.org								Added 06/27/18; 013118 EAG Sign in Sheet
Osceola County Env Lan	nds Conservation Program				Osceola County Environmental Lands Conservation Program		1 Courthouse Square	Ste 1400	Kissimmee	FL	34741	
	Public Lands Manager Bob)	Mindick	robert.mindick@osceola.org								
Sierra Club					Sierra Club	Central Florida Group	P.O. Box 941692		Maitland	FL	32794	Updated addres: http://centralfloridasierra.org/get-involved/
	Chairperson, Conservation Chair Mar	rjorie	Holt	marjorieholt@earthlink.net			8502 Alveron Ave		Orlando	FL	33	817 Added 1/3/18 Updated address 062718
	Transportation Chair John	n	Puhek	flsquirrel@aol.com								
Sierra Club					Sierra Club	Ancient Island Group	PO Box 773		Winter Have	n FL	33882	Updated addres: http://centralfloridasierra.org/get-involved/
	Vice Chair, Conservation Committee Mar	rian	Ryan	marianryan@gmail.com								
	Ancient Island Group Member John	n	Ryan	floridaconservation@msn.com								
South Florida Water Ma	anagement District				South Florida Water Management District	Orlando Service Center	1707 Orlando Central Pkwy	Ste 200	Orlando	FL	32809	7/20/18 - Deleted Ayounga Riddick
	Lead Regional Representative Will	liam	Graf	wgraf@sfwmd.gov								https://www.sfwmd.gov/contact?combine=riddick&op=Search
	Environmental Analyst Supervisor Mar	rc	Ady	mady@sfwmd.gov								
St Johns River Water M	lanagement District				St Johns River Water Management District		601 S Lake Destiny Rd	Ste 200	Maitland	FL	32751	
	Hydrologist IV Bill		Adams	wadams@sjrwmd.com								7/20/18 - Added all staff
	Regulatory Scientist I Alys	ssa	Alers	aalers@sjrwmd.com								Added POC 062718
	Supervising Hydrologist Jam	nes	Hollingshead	jhollingshead@sjrwmd.com								
	Environmental Resource Program Manager Can	nmie	Dewey	cdewey@sjrwmd.com								
US Army Corps of Engin	neers				Jacksonville District							
	Section Chief Iren	ne	Sadowski	irene.sadowski@usace.army.mil	Cocoa Permits Section		400 High Point Drive	Suite 600	Cocoa	FL	32926	Updated local address 062718.
	Biologist, Permits Section Bran	ndon	Conroy	Brandon.J.Conroy@usace.army.mil	Cocoa Permits Section		400 High Point Drive	Suite 600	Cocoa	FL	32926	Updated local at Updated title 032619
US EPA					US Environmental Protection Agency - Region 4	Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center	61 Forsyth St SW		Atlanta	GA	30303-8960	
	Region 4 Administrator Mar	гу	Walker	mary.walker@epa.gov								101519 - update https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/about-acting-administrator-epas-southeast-region-region-4
US Fish and Wildlife Ser	rvice (LISEWS)				South Florida Ecological Services Field Office	US Fish and Wildlife Service	1339 20th St		Vero Beach	FI	32960-3559	7/20/18 - Changed South to North: Revised address
and the set	Planning and Resource Conservation John	n	Wrublik	John Wrublik@fws.gov								Updated email 0 https://www.fws.gov/verobeach/StaffDirectory.html
	Project Consultation Biologist Zaki	ia	Williams	zakia_williams@fws.gov			7915 Baymeadows Way	Suite 200	Jacksonville	FL	32256	Added 062718; I https://www.fws.gov/northflorida/staff3.htm



Save the Date

OSCEOLA PARKWAY EXTENSION



CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

MEETING NOTICE

Central Florida Expressway Authority

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

DATE: November 18, 2019

TIME: 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

LOCATION: Central Florida Expressway Authority 4974 ORL Tower Road Orlando, FL 32807 CFX Board Meeting Room

This is the meeting of the Environmental Advisory Group (EAG) for the Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation.

As a special advisory resource to the Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) and the consultant team, the EAG provides input regarding local needs, concerns and potential physical, environmental, natural, social and cultural impacts that are crucial in the evaluation of corridor and alternative alignments.

For more information, visit the study's website at http://bit.ly/OscPkwyExtRe.

Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes states that if a person decides to appeal any decision made by a board, agency, or commission with respect to any matter considered at a meeting or hearing, he will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, he may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

Persons who require translation services, which are provided at no cost, should contact CFX at (407) 690-5000 x5317 or by email at Iranetta.dennis@CFXway.com at least three (3) business days prior to the event.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if any person with a disability as defined by the ADA needs special accommodation to participate in this proceeding, then not later than two (2) business days prior to the proceeding, he or she should contact the Central Florida Expressway Authority at (407) 690-5000.

Posted 10/31/19 at CFX Administration Building

This notice has nothing to do with any rule or rulemaking process.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING:

The Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) announces Project Advisory Group (PAG) and Environmental Advisory Group (EAG) meetings that are open to the public.

DATE and TIME: Monday, November 18, 2019

PAG

9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. A brief presentation on the study re-evaluation will be provided, followed by a group discussion.

EAG

1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. A brief presentation on the study re-evaluation will be provided, followed by a group discussion.

PLACE: Central Florida Expressway Authority CFX Boardroom 4974 ORL Tower Road Orlando, Florida 32807

GENERAL SUBJECT MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED:

CFX Project No.: 599-223

Project Description: CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

The Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) is conducting a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation for the proposed Osceola Parkway Extension. The study will determine if a new expressway connection between State Road 417 near Boggy Creek Road and the proposed Sunbridge Parkway is viable and fundable in accordance with CFX policies and procedures.

The overall goals of the proposed Osceola Parkway Extension are to provide improved connections between area roads; accommodate anticipated transportation demand; provide consistency with local and regional plans; support economic viability and job creation; support intermodal opportunities; and enhance evacuation and emergency services.

As special advisory resources to CFX and the consultant team, the PAG and EAG provide input regarding environmental impacts, local needs, concerns and potential physical, natural, social and cultural impacts that are crucial in the evaluation of corridor and alternative alignments.

A study information sheet will be distributed at the meeting.

When the PD&E Study Re-evaluation concludes, it will result in a recommendation to the CFX Governing Board of the preferred alternative. If the project is approved by the CFX Governing Board, it would move forward for further project development.

Persons with disabilities who require accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services, free of charge, should contact Ms. Mary Brooks, Public Involvement Coordinator at 407-802-3210 or via email at <u>ProjectStudies@CFXway.com</u> at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting. If you are hearing or speech impaired, please contact us by using the Florida Relay Service, 1-800-955-8771 (TDD) or 1-800-955-8770 (Voice).

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. For additional information concerning these studies, please contact Mary Brooks at the contact information above. You also may log onto the study webpage at http://bit.ly/OscPkwyExtRe.

CENTRAL COMMENT FORM Osceola Parkway Extension FLORIDA Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation EXPRESSWAY ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING AUTHORITY CFX Project No.: 599-223 CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807 Monday, November 18, 2019, 1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m. DATE: dated 11-18-19 que abmen 150 comme AIVPO (Please continue comments on the back of this page if more space is needed.) AR, COPRESIDENT, LEAGUE 15LORIA Name: VOTERS OF ORANGE COUNTY NEN Address: K, F2 32790 WIN 901 Email: 1)287-7483 mo Phone:

We welcome your comments. You may mail your comments to Mary Brooks, Public Information Coordinator, Central Florida Expressway Authority, 4974 ORL Tower Rd, Orlando, FL 32807. You can also email your comments to ProjectStudies@CFXway.com or call 407-802-3210.

Thank you!



November 18, 2019

Osceola Parkway Extension Environmental Advisory Group

Subject: Split Oak Forest Wildlife and Environmental Area (Split Oak)

On behalf of the League of Women Voters of Orange and Seminole Counties, we continue to support routing the proposed Osceola Parkway Extension around Split Oak to protect Florida Forever conservation lands. The current proposal for a road through Split Oak violates the clear language of our Constitution and ignores the mandate of our citizens who voted to amend our Constitution to protect our Florida Forever conservation lands.

This letter reiterates our continued opposition to proposals that include appropriating Split Oak conservation lands and summarizes our reasons which are explained in a February 15, 2018 letter to the Central Florida Expressway Authority and a second letter dated July 9, 2018 to the Boards of Commissioners of Orange and Osceola Counties, the Florida Communities Trust, Rita Ventry and the Central Florida Expressway Authority. Those letters are attached.

Our constitution explicitly protects conservation lands in Article X, Section 18. The voters overwhelming approved this provision in 1998. This constitutional provision prohibits getting rid of Florida conservation lands unless they no longer have conservation value – that is the only basis for changing the use of land that has been acquired for conservation purposes in Florida. This provision was approved by the voters because everyone at the time recognized that pressures for development threatened our unique Florida Forever lands, because short-term, often economic, objectives overlook long term impacts. Protection of our Florida Forever lands requires a long-term perspective.

This current attempt to circumvent the will of the voters and violate our Constitution is not the first attack on conservation lands. The State tried to sell off many of these lands in 2013 by declaring them "surplus." These lands are also a target for infrastructure development because they are already owned by governmental entities, and therefore are seen by some as a less expensive way to build something now in spite of the fact that the governmental entities involved promised to protect this land when they asked for public funds to create conservation lands. The League has consistently opposed these efforts and opposes any proposal through Split Oak for the same reasons.

Split Oak was created in 1992 with the intent and understanding that it would be used for conservation purposes indefinitely, with both Orange and Osceola counties declaring that designating this land was consistent with their growth management plans. All of Split Oak is currently being used for conservation. The Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission has

confirmed this in its most recent 5-year study. In addition, much of Split Oak is being used as mitigation credits for environmental impacts created elsewhere.

Proposals for exchanges of land – giving away some current conservation land in exchange for other land to be designated for conservation – are not permitted by our Constitution. Our Constitution says the only way to dispose of conservation land is when it no longer has conservation value. While some people may think there should be some exceptions to the prohibition against getting rid of some conservation land, that is not what is currently the law of Florida. In fact, the constitutional amendment was specifically proposed *because* of the pressure to change the use of these lands – to protect past achievements from unraveling and to assure the public that these lands will not be sacrificed in the future. Exchanges only create uncertainty for all conservation lands. It is important for protection of sensitive ecosystems and threatened and endangered species to have them remain the same place.

The current proposals for the Osceola Parkway Extension include appropriation of part of Split Oak for a major highway in exchange for some other land which will designated as conservation land. The conservation value provided by Split Oak cannot be measured by acres. Conservation includes stability. Orange and Osceola Counties promised to preserve Split Oak, and the Constitution of Florida requires them to honor that promise.

Sincerely yours,

Glaria D. Picker

Dr. Gloria D. Pickar and Sandi Vidal, Co-Presidents, League of Women Voters of Orange County Sharon Lynn, President, League of Women Voters of Seminole County



President Pamela Goodman	February 21, 2018
First VICE PRESIDENT	Central Florida Expressway Authority The Honorable Fred Hawkins, Jr., Chairman, Osceola County Representative
Patricia Brigham	Dear Mr. Hawkins,
SECOND VICE PRESIDENT Cecile M. Scoon	On behalf of the League of Women Voters of Orange County, Seminole County, and the State of Florida, we urge you to stand up for protecting our natural lands by routing the proposed Osceola Parkway Eastern Extension around the Split Oak Forest Wildlife and Environmental Area (SOFWEA).
Theresa Francis-Thomas Secretary	The League of Women Voters is a nonpartisan organization. We study natural resources, as well as other socioeconomic, social welfare, and political issues, and take positions and actions after careful deliberation.
Patricia Drago	After lengthy study and consideration of this issue, we adopted the position that we oppose any road through Split Oak Forest Wildlife and Environmental Area.
Board of Directors Shawn Bartelt Lisa Hall Julie Kessel, M.D. Maggie Lawrence	The Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) has incorporated the views of citizens through public input forums. CFX has paid particular attention to the views of the environmental community. We commend your openness in this regard.
Michele Levy The Hon. Mark Pafford Marty Sullivan	Orange and Osceola Counties purchased Split Oak more than 20 years ago as a mitigation bank to offset wetland and gopher tortoise impacts. Since then, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission has managed the area by conducting prescribed burns, chemically removing invasive species and bringing in dozens of
Executive Director Penny Walker Bos	relocated gopher tortoises.
2507 Callaway Road Suite 102A Tallahassee, FL	Ros Schultz, first Osceola County Land Manager, reports that SOFWEA began in the early 1990s during a lunch under the actual Split Oak when he, Maury Carter the land owner, and others looked around them and agreed the land should be saved Rod
32303 (850)224-2545	teamed with Orange County and won a \$5.5 million Preservation 2000 (Florida Forever predecessor) grant to buy SOFWEA. To protect the land from encroachment, by 1994 they had tied the land up in multiple layers of easements with multiple participants, including Florida Communities Trust, Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission, and both counties. Subsequent use of SOFWEA for mitigation added many more participants.

SOFWEA is land owned by the Florida public under the constitutionally based Florida Forever program to acquire land for conservation. It also includes land used as mitigation for other development projects. Currently under consideration is a roadway land swap for a portion of SOFWEA in exchange for some of developers' land elsewhere. CFX is convening discussions about this potential swap between developers and representative of environmental advocates. Legality of such a swap has been questioned because of the deed covenants and Florida constitutional restrictions on disposal of public conservation lands.

The League of Women Voters of Orange County, Seminole County, and League of Women Voters of Florida oppose any road through Split Oak Forest Wildlife and Environmental Area

Sincerely,

Pamela Goodman President, League of Women Voters of Florida

Leesa Bainbridge Co-president, League of Women Voters of Orange

Carol Davis Co-president, League of Women Voters of Orange

Zelda Ladan President, League of Women Voters of Seminole County

Cc:

Laura Kelley, Executive Director, Central Florida Expressway Authority Jay Madara, Vice Chairman The Honorable Brenda Carey, Treasurer, Seminole County Representative The Honorable Jim Barfield, Brevard County Representative The Honorable Buddy Dyer, Mayor of Orlando Andria Herr, Governor's Appointee The Honorable Teresa Jacobs, Orange County Mayor The Honorable Sean Parks, Lake County Representative S. Michael Scheeringa, Governor's Appointee The Honorable Jennifer Thompson, Orange County Representative



July 9, 2018

PRESIDENT Patricia Brigham

First VICE PRESIDENT

Cecile M. Scoon, Esq.

SECOND VICE PRESIDENT

Theresa Francis-Thomas

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Maggie Lawrence

Charlotte Nycklemoe

The Hon. Mark Pafford

Joanne Aye

Michele Levy

Marty Sullivan

Lisa Hall

Shawn Bartelt

TREASURER

Re: Split Oak Forest Wildlife and Environmental Area and proposed Osceola Parkway Extension

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

On behalf of the League of Women Voters of Orange County, Seminole County, and the State of Florida, we are reaffirming our opposition to the proposed Osceola Parkway Extension through Split Oak Forest Wildlife and Environmental Area (SOFWEA).

The League of Women Voters is a nonpartisan organization. We study issues regarding natural resources and other socioeconomic, social welfare, and political issues and take positions and actions after careful deliberation. We submit this letter as part of our commitment to protecting our State's signature Florida Forever conservation program.

Orange and Osceola Counties conceived SOFWEA in 1991 as an innovative joint venture to preserve critical wildlife habitats and wetlands in the increasingly urban environment of the two Counties. The proposal was based on placing a significant area of contiguous uplands and wetlands in a rural area in a designated conservation area and mitigation bank, as protected habitat for wildlife. The counties received Preservation 2000 funds based on their commitment to this conservation project. In the application for the funds from the Florida Communities Trust (FCT), the Counties explained that the creation of this protection area was consistent with their current and future development plans. The counties also explained that this area was adjacent to existing and planned conservation lands.

On February 21, 2018, we sent a letter to Mr. Hawkins in his capacity as the Chairman of the Central Florida Expressway Authority expressing our opposition to a right-of-way through SOFWEA for the Osceola Parkway Extension. A copy of this previous letter is attached.

Since that time, the League obtained a copy of a May 2, 2018 letter written by Mr. Hawkins, in his capacity as Chair of the Osceola Board of County Commissioners, to Mr. Jim Zboril, President of Tavistock Development Company. This letter responded to Mr. Zboril's April 13, 2018 letter setting forth certain conditions that include having Osceola County and its Board of Commissioners "[l]ead a public process (both local and state) to get the associated land in the Split Oak Forest released for right-of-way [for the Parkway extension]." Mr. Hawkins stated that "[i]t is the consensus of the Osceola County Commission that we support and will act on the conditions outlined in your letter." Mr. Hawkins also stated in his letter that he had scheduled a meeting with the FCT on May 15, 2018 to discuss this issue. These letters are also attached.

The League contends that this proposal should not be pursued because it violates the Florida Constitution's protection for conservation lands. Article X, Section 18 states that conservation lands cannot be transferred unless there is a determination that the land no longer serves a conservation purpose:

The fee interest in real property held by an entity of the state and designated for natural resources conservation purposes as provided by general law *shall be* managed for the benefit of the citizens of this state and may be disposed of *only if* the members of the governing board of the entity holding title determine the property is no longer needed for conservation purposes and only upon a vote of two-thirds of the governing board. (emphasis added)

Disposal of land includes transfer of control and therefore this provision applies to the proposed grant of a right-of-way for the Parkway extension to CFX.

In 1998, Florida voters overwhelmingly approved this amendment to the Florida Constitution to provide long-term protection for conservation lands like SOFWEA. Both gubernatorial candidates at the time, Jeb Bush and Buddy MacKay, and over 100 industry leaders, in addition to conservationists, supported the proposed constitutional amendment. This amendment was proposed to make it difficult to sell off conservation lands in order to "protect past achievements from unraveling."¹

Because SOFWEA retains conservation value, it is not possible to make the determination required by the constitution for the transfer of conservation lands. When Orange and Osceola Counties jointly applied for state conservation funds to acquire SOFWEA,² they described the SOFWEA as a "long-term, permanent protection of entire ecosystems" and "an innovative mechanism for natural resources protection." The program's objective was to provide a better alternative for "continued long-term protection of wetlands and wildlife" by designating a large tract of land in a rural area for conservation purposes rather than create "small islands of habitat" that end up being incapable of supporting certain wildlife populations. SOFWEA was designed to "maximize the habitat value of the site for the benefit of species such as the gopher tortoise, Florida mouse, gopher frog, Sherman's fox squirrel, and the red-cockaded woodpecker" and to have all management activities "evaluated in terms of the anticipated impact of the proposed action on listed wildlife within the park."

A major highway through SOFWEA clearly destroys the important function that this forest and wildlife and environmental area was designed to, and does, provide. The conservation manager of the SOFWEA, the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC), performed an extensive review of the SOFWEA in 2016 and concluded:

The evaluation of SOFWEA by FWC has determined that *all portions of the area* are being managed and operated for the original purposes of acquisition, and remain integral to the continued conservation of important fish and wildlife resources, and continue to provide quality

¹ Wm. Clay Henderson and Deborah Ben-David, Protecting Natural Resources, 72 Florida Bar Journal 21, 24 (Oct. 1998).

² Florida Communities Trust, Preservation 2000 Program, Application Form submitted by Orange and Osceola Counties on December 31, 1991.

fish and wildlife resource based public outdoor recreational opportunities. Therefore, *no portion* of the SOFWEA is recommended for potential surplus review.³ (emphasis added)

The letters between Mr. Hawkins and Tavistock mentioned above describe efforts to arrange for a deal to allow the proposed Parkway extension to be built in the Osceola portion of SOFWEA in exchange for some concessions from Tavistock, including the designation of other property for conservation. The trade-offs being discussed are not permitted by the explicit language of the 1998 Constitutional provision. Article X, section 18 clearly states that the only time conservation lands may be disposed of is when they no longer serve a conservation purpose. The underlying bases for this Constitutional provision -- to prevent conservation achievements from unraveling and to preserve conservation lands from the anticipated pressures of development – explains the reasons for not allowing exchanges.

Considering the relevant provisions of our Constitution and these facts, the League of Women Voters of Orange County, Seminole County, and the state of Florida urge you to cease pursuing alternatives for the proposed Osceola Parkway Extension that damage SOFWEA and instead recognize it for the innovative and valuable role it plays in the Florida Forever program. There are alternatives that do not destroy constitutionally protected land and habitats and the League encourages you to pursue one of these options instead.

Sincerely,

Patricia Brigham President, League of Women Voters of Florida

Leesa Bainbridge Co-president, League of Women Voters of Orange County

Gloria Pickar Co-president, League of Women Voters of Orange County

Sharon Lynn President, League of Women Voters of Seminole County

CC: Board of County Commissioners, Orange County

The Honorable Teresa Jacobs, Mayor 201 Rosalind Ave., 5th Floor Orlando, FL 32801 Mayor@ocfl.net

³ Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, A Management Plan for Split Oak Forest Wildlife and Environmental Area 2017 – 2027 (2016), <u>http://mvfwc.com/media/4155127/SOFWEAMP2016-2026.pdf</u>. There are similar statements from both Orange and Osceola county authorities affirming the conservation purposes provided by SOFWEA.

Commissioner Betsy VanderLey 201 S. Rosalind Ave., 5th Floor Orlando, FL 32801 <u>District1@ocfl.net</u>

Commissioner Victoria P. Siplin 201 S. Rosalind Ave., 5th Floor Orlando, FL 32801 District6@ocfl.net

Commissioner Emily Bonilla P.O. Box 1393 Orlando, FL 32802-1393 <u>District5@ocfl.net</u>

Commissioner Jennifer Thompson Board of County Commissioners 201 S. Rosalind Ave., 5th Floor Orlando, FL 32801 Jennifer.Thompson@ocfl.net

Commissioner Pete Clarke Board of County Commissioners 201 S. Rosalind Ave., 5th Floor Orlando, FL 32801 <u>District3@ocfl.net</u>

Commissioner Rod A. Love 201 S. Rosalind Ave., 5th Floor Orlando, FL 32801 District2@ocfl.net

Board of County Commissioners, Osceola County

Commissioner Fred Hawkins, Jr., Chairman 1 Courthouse Square, Suite 4700 Kissimmee, FL 34741 <u>Fred.HawkinsJr@osceola.org</u>

Commissioner Peggy Choudhry 1 Courthouse Square, Suite 4700 Kissimmee, FL 34741 Peggy.Choudhry@osceola.org

Commissioner Brandon Arrington 1 Courthouse Square, Suite 4700 Kissimmee, FL 34741 Brandon.Arrington@osceola.org

Commissioner Vivian Janer 1 Courthouse Square, Suite 4700 Kissimmee, FL 34741 <u>Viviana.Janer@osceola.org</u>

Commissioner Cheryl Grieb 1 Courthouse Square, Suite 4700 Kissimmee, FL 34741 <u>Cheryl.Grieb@osceola.org</u>

Florida Communities Trust FloridaCommunitiesTrust@floridadep.gov

Rita Ventry, Planner for Orange and Osceola Counties <u>Rita.Ventry@dep.state.fl.us</u>

Central Florida Expressway Authority

Ms. Laura Kelly 4974 ORL Tower Road Orlando, FL 32807 info@CFXway.com

FWC Statement to the Osceola Parkway Extension Environmental Advisory Group

November 18, 2019

Perpetual conservation easements are an important tool for conservation, and release of a perpetual easement requires a thorough evaluation of the mitigation package being proposed in exchange.

Any alternative alignment that does not completely avoid Split Oak Forest Wildlife and Environmental Area requires FWC to consider modifying the conservation easement we hold over Split Oak, and we will need to consider the extent of state resources that have been spent managing Split Oak to date.

While the Split Oak Avoidance Alternative remains our preferred alternative for conservation, we recognize the significant implications this represents for the communities affected by this alignment.

The Split Oak Minimization Alternative offers an exchange of a 160-acre loss of Split Oak for an approximately 1,550-acre addition to regional conservation lands. A small portion of the addition is of similar habitat type to Split Oak; while much of the rest consists of wetlands.

The proposed easement exchange provides nearly a 10:1 mitigation ratio for release of the portion of the conservation easement impacted by the extension project. The ratio of uplands gained to uplands released from the easement is approximately 4:1; however the upland acres within the proposed addition are in need of restoration and management.

Modifying perpetual conservation easements to reduce the encumbered acreage is not a good precedent to set for conservation and mitigation programs; however, with the substantial offset ratio being proposed, we agree it is beneficial to continue discussing the mitigation, permitting, restoration, and management options associated with the Split Oak Minimization Alternative.

Split Oak Preserve Long Term Perspective











Split Oak walled in by future development...

Osceola Parkway Extension Planned Development Surrounding Split Oak Forest



4

Osceola Co. good quality pine/scrub within 1,550 acres



Good quality uplands/pine/scrub in light green Lands in yellow in need of active restoration.

Orange County longleaf pine needing management



Pineland area in light green needs immediate management Lands in yellow need active restoration.

Scrub within 1,550 acres to be dedicated


Pineland Habitat in 1,550 acre dedication



Pine and scrubby pine on 1,550 acs.





Scrub and pine interface on 1,550 ac



Typical good habitat on 1,550 acres



Typical relatively undisturbed habitat on 1,550 acres



Foreground disturbed area, background undisturbed cypress wetland in 1,550 ac.



1,550 acres of new conservation land AND the existing conservation tracts MUST have influx of funding for RESTORATION and MANAGEMENT.

- Exact amount determined by FWC, FCT, DSL and Osceola County
- Likely in range of \$2 3 million for restoration
- Management funding 10-15 years at least \$200,000 per year

COMMENT FORM

Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING CFX Project No.: 599-223 CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807 Monday, November 18, 2019, 1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

DATE: 1//18/19

CENTRAL

FLORIDA

EXPRESSWAY

AUTHORITY

In Perpetuity 111
Orange & Osceola Counties should be
fighting this instead as long as
they have the 213rds vote the can
dectare it is no lower conservation
property
Where Poer It Stop!

(Please continue comments on the back of this page if more space is needed.) Name: Address: .0 V Email: 4 0 0

Phone:

We welcome your comments. You may mail your comments to Mary Brooks, Public Information Coordinator, Central Florida Expressway Authority, 4974 ORL Tower Rd, Orlando, FL 32807. You can also email your comments to ProjectStudies@CFXway.com or call 407-802-3210.

Thank you!

COMMENT FORM

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING CFX Project No.: 599-223 CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807 Monday, November 18, 2019, 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

DATE: IIII5/19
I have not heard anyone address the ecosystem services
-provided by Spit Dak and those impacted by the Split Only
- Minimization route I would like the criteria used to
determine the "high quality" designation for the compensation
land explained in Full. Population growth will continue
unabboted but it is our repossibility to procerve what
little remains of natural Florida and avoid impacting
uldlife habilat when the spipertunty is presented.
Don't Selit Sert Oak Forest.

	(Please continue comments on the back of this page if more space is r	ieeded.)
Name:	And Harney	
Address:	199 E Cedaharond Cire	
	Kiyimme FL 34743	
Email:	ahar they 2008 & gmail, com	
Phone:	407 962. 5469	

We welcome your comments. You may mail your comments to Mary Brooks, Public Information Coordinator, Central Florida Expressway Authority, 4974 ORL Tower Rd, Orlando, FL 32807. You can also email your comments to ProjectStudies@CFXway.com or call 407-802-3210.

Thank you!

COMMENT FORM

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation **PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING** CFX Project No.: 599-223 CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Monday, November 18, 2019, 9:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. 18/19 DATE: 11/ build nless you can th 2 road stu 59 0 0 0. CCA 60 ota O1 00 iŠ Ind Ohsu þ 01 serilation 0.001 ert ner 9 Ors đ 52 Q mization S 200 ore 9 con Sa Con no 18h 15 ag mininizatio nuces a 45 0 mine and US MISS 11 (Please continue comments on the back of this page if more space is needed.) Name: nson 2 0 Address: among Leve 2805 Email: mail . Com

Phone:

We welcome your comments. You may mail your comments to Mary Brooks, Public Information Coordinator, Central Florida Expressway Authority, 4974 ORL Tower Rd, Orlando, FL 32807. You can also email your comments to ProjectStudies@CFXway.com or call 407-802-3210.

520-576-6706

Thank you!

As to the neighborhoods impacted, I am aware that these are privileged neighborhoods that we the project seeks to spare. Older, established, but less provileged neighborhoods have received no such consideration, to my knowledger Unlerstand that privileged neighborhoods are still private interests, undeflat human inhabitants can see relocate to other localities that still provèle an appropriate human hebitat. The plant and animal species that depend upon the specific habitat of Split Oak Forest are not able to do so. They have already had a considerable part of their habitat lestoayed, and your are proposity to destroy more The proposed and susep does not provide me actual mitigather for this additional habitat destruction, as it is not of the some quelity or aboracter as the Split Oak Forest Mits pation fra.

Finally, if the entities involved are willing to dorate 1,500 acres to expand the conservation area as a carrot, and withhold it as a stick, that smacks rather too much of duress. Rober than extorting compliance by daugling conservation land in front of the environ neutral community, Tourstock should show good faith by simply donating those lands anyway.

Also: if prescribed burns are a requirement in SOF then development that can be thanked the by those burns can't be approved - ust the other very around, Existing conservation takes precedence by law.

Project Development &

Environment Study Re-evaluation

OSCEOLA PARKWAY EXTENSION

Fall 2019

STUDY HISTORY

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY

AUTHORITY

The Osceola Parkway Extension has been identified as a need in several local, long-range plans and master plans. The former Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX) completed a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study in May 2017 for the Osceola Parkway Extension and presented a recommended alternative. (*Figure 1 on back*)

The Central Florida Expressway Authority's (CFX) enabling legislation (Senate Bill 230, Ch. 2014-171) incorporated the parkway extension and other portions of the OCX 2040 Master Plan into the CFX 2040 Master Plan. In 2018, CFX completed a Concept, Feasibility, and Mobility Study for the Osceola Parkway Extension after evaluating a number of alternatives and concluded the project is viable under CFX criteria.

STUDY UPDATE

CFX has been re-evaluating the OCX PD&E Study recommended alternative as well as considering other alternatives. The input provided through public outreach, including stakeholder meetings, site tours and advisory committee meetings held during CFX's Concept, Feasibility, and Mobility Study, has been a major component of CFX's PD&E Study Re-evaluation. In addition, the study team has continued to conduct stakeholder meetings to gather further feedback in preparation for a recommended Preferred Alternative.

CFX conducted an extensive analysis of the social, environmental, cultural, and physical impacts of potential alternatives. Of the four evaluated alternatives, two on the west side and two on the east side of the corridor, the recommended preferred alternative (*Figure 2 on back*) results in the least social impacts.



PROJECT GOALS

The goals of the proposed 9-mile, limited-access facility include:

- providing for additional east-west routes within the project area,
- enhancing mobility of the area's growing population and economy,
- relieving congestion on local roads,
- providing for the incorporation of transit options and;
- promoting regional connectivity.

FIGURE 1: OSCEOLA COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY APPROVED ALTERNATIVE — MAY 2017



FIGURE 2: PD&E STUDY RE-EVALUATION PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION



TO FIND OUT MORE ABOUT THE STUDY, CONTACT:

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY Mary Brooks, Public Involvement Coordinator Phone: (407) 802-3210 Email: *ProjectStudies@CFXway.com*

4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807 Phone: (407) 690-5000 Fax: (407) 690-5011 Email: Info@CFXway.com You may also visit the study's webpage at: http://bit.ly/OscPkwyExtRe



@OsceolaPkwyExtPDE

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Para más información en español acerca del proyecto, por afavor comuníquese con Elaine Rodriguez al 407-252-7886 o por correo electrónico Elaine.Rodriguez@qcausa.com.



Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development & Environment Study Re-evaluation

— November 18, 2019 —

Osceola Parkway Extension Title VI Compliance

This meeting, project, or study is being conducted without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons wishing to express their concerns relative to compliance by the Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) with Title VI may do so by contacting:

> Kathy Putnam Public Involvement Coordinator 4974 ORL Tower Road Orlando, FL 32807 407-802-3210 Projectstudies@CFXway.com

All inquiries or complaints will be handled according to CFX procedure and in a prompt and courteous manner.



Osceola Parkway Extension Background

- 2005 Osceola County Comprehensive Plan: New corridors around growth boundary
- 2012 Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX): 2040 Master Plan. ETDM Programming Screen Summary Report published (ETDM No. 13789).
- 2016 CFX incorporated OCX master plan segments into CFX Master Plan.
- 2017 OCX completed the Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study and approved a Project Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).



Osceola Parkway Extension Background – OCX Approved Alternative



Osceola Parkway Extension Background

- 2005 Osceola County Comprehensive Plan: New corridors around growth boundary
- 2012 Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX): 2040 Master Plan. ETDM Programming Screen Summary Report published (ETDM No. 13789).
- 2016 CFX incorporated OCX master plan segments into CFX Master Plan.
- 2017 OCX completed the Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study and approved a Project Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).
- March 2018 CFX completed a Concept Feasibility and Mobility Study for the Osceola Parkway Extension





Osceola Parkway Extension Background

- 2005 Osceola County Comprehensive Plan: New corridors around growth boundary
- 2012 Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX): 2040 Master Plan. ETDM Programming Screen Summary Report published (ETDM No. 13789).
- 2016 CFX incorporated OCX master plan segments into CFX Master Plan.
- 2017 OCX completed the Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study and approved a Project Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).
- March 2018 CFX completed a Concept Feasibility and Mobility Study for the Osceola Parkway Extension
- July 2018 CFX began PD&E Study Re-evaluation



Osceola Parkway Extension Study Methodology – PD&E Re-evaluation

- Compare the OCX approved alternative against others
- Analyze physical, natural, cultural and social impacts
- Conduct public outreach
- Produce a Project Environmental Impact Re-evaluation Report
 - Identify a preferred alternative
- Present the findings to the CFX Board



Osceola Parkway Extension Key Study Activities

- Environmental Data Collection & Analysis
- Large Landholder & Other Key Stakeholder Meetings
- Refining Feasibility Study Alternatives
- Developing Additional Alternatives
- Updating environmental, engineering and social data
- Public Involvement





Osceola Parkway Extension Public Involvement

- Officials' Briefings & Stakeholder Meetings
- Osceola Co. Commissioner Transportation Update -Dec. 4, 2018
- Board Presentations
 - Osceola Co. Expressway Authority Oct. 9, 2018
 - CFX Governing Board Dec. 12, 2018
- Environmental & Project Advisory Groups TBD
- Public Meeting TBD
- CFX Study Webpage & Study Facebook Page





Osceola Parkway Extension Major Constraints: Social and Environmental



Osceola Parkway Extension Typical Section



Osceola Parkway Extension Alternatives Considered



Osceola Parkway Extension West Segment – Boggy Creek Alternative



Osceola Parkway Extension West Segment – Lake Nona Alternative



Osceola Parkway Extension East Segment – Split Oak Avoidance Alternative



Osceola Parkway Extension East Segment – Split Oak Minimization Alternative



Osceola Parkway Extension Evaluation Matrix

- Physical
 - Utility Impacts and Contamination
- Cultural
 - Historic and Archaeological Resources
- Natural Environment
 - Wetlands, Floodplains, Habitat, Species, Mitigation Properties, Conservation Easements
- Social
 - Right-of-way Impacts, Displacements, Community Impacts, Planned Developments
- Estimated Costs
 - Construction, Right-of-Way, Mitigation, and Engineering / Legal



Osceola Parkway Extension Preferred Alternative



Osceola Parkway Extension What's Next?

- Public Meeting Tomorrow, November 19th
- Board Meeting Present Final Recommendations to CFX Board



Osceola Parkway Extension Public Comment





Approach to Florida Communities Trust

62-818.015 Consideration of Recipient's Request for Linear Facilities.

The Declaration of Restrictive Covenants for Trust Project Sites limits the use of the property to conservation, outdoor recreation, and other related activities. However, the Trust periodically receives requests for Management Plan modifications to allow linear facilities and related appurtenances on the Trust Project Site. When evaluating these requests, the following process must be followed.

(1) First, there has to be a determination:

(a) That there is no reasonable alternative to the proposed modification land use on the Trust Project Site; and,

(b) That the land use is designed to have a minimal impact to the site; and,

(c) A copy of an alternative analysis assessment of other off-site alternatives or options considered by the Recipient.

(2) If the Trust determines that no practical off-site alternatives exist, then the following information is required:

(a) A written statement that the Local Government has reviewed and approved the proposed use;

(b) A description and dimensions of the linear facility, and of the area that will be affected during construction;

(c) Information on the natural communities and cultural features found on, and immediately surrounding the site of the proposed facility;

(d) A statement explaining how the proposed facility will be compatible with planned recreational uses of the Trust Project Site, as committed to in the approved Management Plan;

(e) Discussion of the proposed mitigation for impacts to the Trust Project Site; and,

(f) A modified master site plan drawing identifying the locations of existing vegetation and all proposed structures, facilities and restoration areas that will be affected by the facility.

After receiving all of the above information, staff will evaluate and review the request for consistency according to the above listed requirements. If the proposal meets the above requirements and has minimum impact to the Project Site, staff may approve the request. If public objections are received, if it is a large project, or if the project could be viewed as controversial the proposal will be presented to the Trust Governing Board for consideration.

(3) If the request is approved, the Recipient must:

(a) Provide an appraisal of the land use area or other valuation method as approved by Trust staff;

(b) Provide a legal description from a licensed surveyor;

(c) Sign an amendment to the Declaration of Restrictive Covenants that provides for the changed use of the Project Site; and,

(d) Record the amended Declaration of Restrictive Covenants in the Public Records of the County where the property is located. The Recipient will be required to pay for the land use area. The payment shall be allocated to the Recipient and the Trust based on the percentage of the original grant (i.e., 50% Recipient participation and 50% Trust participation).

CENTRAL

FLORIDA

EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

Rulemaking Authority 380.507(11) FS. Law Implemented 259.105, 380.510 FS. History–New 2-8-10, Formerly 9K-7.015.



Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Re-evaluation Study
Planned Development Surrounding Split Oak Forest



Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Re-evaluation Study



Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Re-evaluation Study

Osceola County +/- 582 Acres

Legend

Parcel 1 (Osceola County)



Uplands (219.02 ac)



Wetlands (326.47 ac)

Surface Waters (1.83 ac)

Parcel 2 (Osceola County)



Uplands (34.02 ac) Wetlands (0.81 ac)



Orange County +/- 968 Acres



CS-2 (Orange County)
Uplands (239.97 ac)
Wetlands (64.63 ac)
Surface Waters (6.23 ac)







Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Re-evaluation Study











nett School of Biomedical Science

Laureate Blvd

Poitras West













>	24'	12' 106'	2' 24'	88'
		330' Right-of-Way		

CENTRAL FLORIDA **EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY**

Working Group Requests & **Considerations for Commitments**





Move alignment farther south and west to:

- + Lessen loss of good habitat
- + Distance it from scrub jay area
- + Protect ability to manage land by prescribed burns



Ensure access to the Florida National Scenic Trail through the corridor and Moss Park.



Have reputable land trust or government agencies hold conservation property and restrict its future use through recorded conservation easements.



Prevent third-party conservation offer from diminishing Tavistock's and Deseret Ranches' mitigation requirements.



Provide matching acreage for the mitigation credits that were sold for gopher tortoise habitat.



Ensure dedicated land is of high quality to replace SOFWEA land impacted by roadway.



Incorporate the 102-acre pine area off Lake Mary Jane Road into the conservation picture.



Ensure the floodplain compensation area does not affect quality lands and does not destroy habitat.



Break down uplands and wetlands in both impact area and remainder for each alternative.



Assure linkage of Split Oak, Moss Park, Isle of Pines Preserve and the newly dedicated lands to regional wildlife corridors.



Provide adequate funding for restoration and management dedicated land to ensure that impacted portions are returned and maintained as high quality habitat.

5.2 PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP DOCUMENTS



PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP (PAG) MEETING - SUMMARY

DATE / TIME: Monday, November 18, 2019, 9:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

LOCATION: Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) Board Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando

ATTENDEES: There were 44 attendees including 11 PAG members, 21 staff members and 12 other attendees in the audience. See sign-in sheets attached.

I. Notifications

Invitation letters were emailed to 45 members of the PAG on October 29, 2019 and a reminder was emailed on November 12, 2019. A GoToMeeting invitation was sent to members who indicated a desire to join remotely. There were no participants in the GoToMeeting.

II. Welcome

Kathy Putnam of Quest Corporation of America, the Public Involvement Coordinator for CFX, called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. She explained that while the meeting was open to the public, the purpose of the meeting was to present the study re-evaluation to the PAG members and receive their input. She advised that only the PAG members at the table would participate in the meeting's discussion, but there was plenty of opportunity for people in the audience to leave their written comments. PAG members and presenters then introduced themselves. Kathy then



checked if anyone had joined by GoToMeeting; they had not. Kathy said that today's presentation was divided into two portions and she urged PAG members to hold their comments and questions until after both portions were presented.

III. Study Presentation

Kathy Putnam opened the presentation with the Title VI information and called up Dan Kristoff of RS&H, the study consultant.

Background

The Osceola Parkway Extension has been under consideration for over 15 years, beginning with the adoption of comprehensive plans by Osceola County. This was followed by Regional Transportation Plans by the Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX) and the Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX), both of which included the Osceola Parkway Extension.

In 2017 OCX completed a Project Environmental Impact Evaluation Study. The study results culminated with OCX adopting a Preferred Alternative. Beginning at the western terminus the interchange at Boggy Creek Road is modified to accommodate direct connection ramps to SR 417 and Jeff Fuqua Blvd. Approaching the Osceola County Boundary, the alignment curves to the east. An interchange provides a connection to Boggy Creek Road, opposite Simpson Road. The alignment extends eastward, parallel to the Orange/Osceola County boundary and remains in Orange County. Approaching Narcoossee Road the alignment avoids the Fells Landing community. An interchange occurs at Narcoossee Road. The alignment continues east and north of Clapp Simms Duda Road. Approaching the canal and Eagles Roost, the alignment curves to the southeast passing through Split Oak Forest. Just east of Split Oak an interchange provides connections to Sunbridge Parkway to the east and south toward Nova Road.

In March of 2018, the Central Florida Expressway Authority completed a Concept, Feasibility, and Mobility (CF&M) Study for the Osceola Parkway Extension. Other alignments were studied.

Numerous meetings were held with stakeholders, state and local agencies, and the general public. In July of last year, we began the Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation. So, what is a Study Re-evaluation?

• Project Development Process

The CF&M study phase was completed in the spring of 2018, and the project is currently in the PD&E phase. If the CFX Governing Board moves the project forward, it would first go into design and then, later, construction.

• Study Methodology

The study is following the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) PD&E Manual. The study process compares the approved OCX adopted alternative to others that have merit. Further analysis of significant issues occur. Public outreach is part of the process. The documentation will be a Project Environmental Impact Re-evaluation Report. The report will

identify a Preferred Alternative. The report findings will be presented to the CFX Board.

• Stakeholder Outreach

With the presence of the Split Oak Forest and other area preserves, environmental investigations and coordination are an important part of the study activities. A field visit to Split Oak Forest was conducted last summer with county staff and environmental advocates. Due to the extensive growth planned and approved in this area, there have been exhaustive meetings and other communications with large landholders and community groups. All feedback is being factored into refinements of previous alternatives, as well as the development of new ones. The primary alternatives under consideration are on display today.

• Public Involvement

Public involvement has focused so far on a number of key stakeholder meetings and coordination meetings with local government representatives. Today is an opportunity for a continued exchange of information as we move forward with the study process.

• Major Constraints – Social & Environmental



There are some significant environmental and social constraints. In the west, from Boggy Creek Road to Narcoossee Road, the land use is predominately residential, both existing and planned. The Boggy Creek floodplain is the most significant natural feature, and several wetland systems surround the neighborhoods. In the east, from Narcoossee Road to the east terminus, natural environmental areas are more prevalent with Moss Park, Eagles Roost, Isle of Pine and Split

Oak Forest. However, in addition to the existing residential communities, ongoing and planned unit developments such as Eagle Creek, Southern Oaks, and Del Webb also present challenges.

• Typical Section

The current standard typical section that CFX has adopted for new location expressways was presented. The typical section utilized for analysis requires 330 feet of right of way. Initial construction would be a minimum of two lanes in each direction. A wide median can accommodate additional lanes in the future and provides an envelope for mass transit. The 88-foot border width provides room for errant vehicles to recover, lateral ditches for the collection of stormwater, and enough distance for landscaping and harmonizing with adjacent property.

• Alternatives Considered

The three re-evaluation alternatives under consideration are all depicted herein. The dark blue alignment is the previously approved OCX Alternative. West of Narcoossee Road, the light blue and purple are the new alternatives. East of Narcoossee Road the green and orange are the new alternatives.

• West Segment/Boggy Creek Alternative

The Boggy Creek Alternative alignment is very similar to the OCX adopted alignment, but there are differences: The direct ramp connections from the OPE to Jeff Fuqua Boulevard (and access to Orlando International Airport) have been removed due to future operational concerns and conflicts with the existing bridges and the alignment next to Boggy Creek Road is shifted west to minimize impacts to the neighborhood. The interchange to access Boggy Creek Road remains and the east/west alignment is virtually the same as the one that was adopted by OCX. The interchange at Narcoossee is different, but Fells Landing and the two new residential developments are avoided. Due to the interchange operations, Clapp Simms Duda Road's connection to Narcoossee Road will be relocated to align opposite Boggy Creek Road.

• West Segment/Lake Nona Alternative

The Lake Nona Alternative connects to SR 417 some 3000 feet east of Boggy Creek Road. This location allows for direct connect high speed ramps to both SR 417 and Orlando International Airport via Jeff Fuqua Boulevard. The alternative includes a half diamond interchange at Laurate Boulevard. An access road will connect the properties north and south of SR 417. The alignment to the south avoids the existing residential neighborhood and turns east just prior to the county boundary line. An interchange will connect to Boggy Creek Road and will align opposite Simpson Road. The alignment continues east and similar to the Boggy Creek alignment, avoids existing and planned development. There is an interchange at Narcoossee Road that is the same as the one in the Boggy Creek Alternative. The Clapp Simms Duda Road relocation must also occur.

• East Segment/Split Oak Avoidance Alternative

At Narcoossee road the alignment remains north of Clapp Sims Duda Road. The Clapp Sims Duda Road connection to Narcoossee Road is closed and Clapp Sims Duda is relocated to connect opposite Boggy Creek Road. The expressway continues eastward, remaining north of Clapp Sims Duda Road until just west of the canal, where it turns south. There are bridges over Clapp Sims Duda and the canal. The expressway continues south through the Southern Oaks development, then curves east and just avoids Split Oak Forest, where it bridges over Cyrils Drive. The eastbound and westbound lanes on Cyrils Drive are split apart to create space for the expressway to drop between them. Ramps to and from the expressway and Cyrils Drive provide local access to Absher Drive. Bridges just east of Split Oak allow access to the proposed local road system, at which point the expressway curves to the southeast toward Nova Road.

• East Segment/Split Oak Minimization Alternative

From Narcoossee Road to just west of the canal, the alignment is similar to the avoidance alignment. However, the curve to the southeast begins much closer to the canal and the alignment is shifted farther from Lake Ajay. The alignment enters Split Oak Forest just south of Orange County and continues southeast for a short distance, then curves to the east. A bridge maintains connectivity for the trail and an interchange just east of Split Oak Forest provides connections to the current and proposed county roadways. Similar to the prior east alternative the alignment extends to the southeast for a possible future link to Nova Road.

• Comparative Matrix of Key Elements

The two new alternatives are being compared to each other, as well as against the original OCX approved alignment. A summary matrix evaluation has been developed for both the west and east segments of the project. It is one of the display exhibits and handouts to the committee members for your perusal. Specific physical, cultural, natural environmental, social and economic factors have been evaluated for each of the new alternatives.



• Preferred Alternative

Based upon the analysis of the social, cultural, physical, natural environmental and economic considerations the currently preferred alternative is a combination of the Lake Nona Alternative for the west segment and the Split Oak Minimization Alternative for the east segment.

IV. Next Steps

Kathy Putnam explained that the Public Workshop would occur on November 19, followed by a decision by the CFX Governing Board on how to proceed. She indicated the comment period for the study re-evaluation would be open until November 30, 2019 and she explained the multiple avenues to comment through the study's email address, website, Facebook or direct mail.

V. Conservation Lands

Nicole Gough with Dewberry, the General Engineering Consultant for CFX, presented the second portion discussing the potential dedication of conservation lands adjacent to Split Oak Forest. She explained that several members of this committee have provided input into this process

throughout this PD&E study re-evaluation and the previous Concept, Feasibility, and Mobility, or CF&M, study.

Nicole said since the last PAG meeting for this corridor, there has been a lot of activity and focused meetings to work on furthering the many recommendations from the previous CF&M studies. CFX has been working through a "to-do list" of how to best minimize potential social and environmental impacts of any alignment that was necessary to pass through Split Oak Forest.

As the PD&E re-evaluation determined an alignment passing through Split Oak Forest was still viable and a necessary option for evaluation, discussions from these focused meetings, with input from the PAG and EAG members, presented an opportunity to dedicate conservation lands that can provide an ecologic corridor and buffer existing Conservation Lands from the rapid development in this region.

Nicole explained that Split Oak Forest, under Florida Communities Trust (FCT), was established as a Trust Project Site. As outlined in the Department of Environmental Protection – Florida Forever Program, Grant Application Procedures legislation, the Declaration of Restrictive Covenants for Trust Project Sites limits the use of the property to conservation, outdoor recreation, and other activities. However, FCT understood that Trust Project Sites may at times, due to unique circumstances, require Management Plan amendments to allow for linear facilities within its borders. As such, CFX, in coordination with the landowners Orange and Osceola counties, will request of FCT a linear facility easement for the expressway through Split Oak Forest. The complete methodology to approach FCT to request an easement for the roadway is outlined within Rule 62-818.015 F.A.C.

Currently, Split Oak Forest in Osceola County forms the southernmost piece of a larger tract of Conservation Lands that also include Isle of Pine Preserve, Moss Park, Eagles Roost, GCB, and Split Oak Forest in Orange County.

Focusing more on the Split Oak Forest area- Planned uses for the property immediately adjacent to the west include higher density residential, and adjacent to the east over 2 million square feet of industrial and mixed-use development.

The Conservation Lands of Split Oak Forest combined for Osceola and Orange counties are currently 1,689 acres. The Preferred Alternative shown would directly impact 60 acres of uplands and wetlands for the right of way and CFX considers the remainder of 100 acres to the southwest of the corridor as secondarily impacted. Therefore, CFX considers the total projected impacts to Split Oak Forest as 160 acres.

The Dedication Lands located in Osceola County are a matrix of wetlands and uplands directly buffering the Split Oak Forest parcel.

Dedicated Conservation Lands in Orange County help connect the existing Isle of Pine Preserve to Moss Park and encompass a large portion of Robert's Island Slough. It can be stated that some

of the proposed Dedication Lands in both Osceola and Orange counties are of the same character as Split Oak Forest, and contain areas considered High Conservation Priority for Biodiversity. Over the course of time, the restoration of these lands will continue to provide a much larger contiguous conservation area than exists today.

A map depicting the ecological context of the existing Conservation Lands in relation to the Dedicated Conservation Lands was presented. The existing Conserved Land assemblage is 3,985 acres.

The total Conservation Land assemblage would be 5,375 acres. In being aware of the nature of the contiguous land assemblage, this total doesn't include the 100 acres of Split Oak Forest that remain southwest of the proposed alignment. While these 100 acres will be generally separated from the assemblage, opportunities exist for improvements to trailhead facilities and trail and wildlife connections will be provided underneath the alignment.

The property owners have provided a signed contractual agreement for consideration of the Land Dedication presented here.

At this time, I'll open up to questions from the Advisory Group members relative to the PD&E re-evaluation or to further clarify the Next Steps to approach Florida Communities Trust.

VI. Open Discussion

Theo Webster, League of Women Voters of Orange County

Why did you select the minimization as opposed to the avoidance alternative, which is totally outside of Split Oak?

Dan Kristoff, RS&H

The avoidance alternative is very disruptive to the neighborhood to the south of Split Oak Forest, and that neighborhood is an old established neighborhood. The relocation of those residents would be extremely difficult, and the impact to currently constructed developments to the east of that neighborhood and to the west of Split Oak Forest. And there is a significant economic difference between the alternatives of approximately \$100M. The Split Oak Minimization Alternative is less expensive. It comes down to the social relocation and impacts to the neighborhoods as well as economic.

Theo Webster, League of Women Voters of Orange County

On your considerations for commitments, the one box that's not checked is "provide adequate funding for restoration and management dedicated..." Can you address that?

Glenn Pressimone, Central Florida Expressway Authority

Through the groups, that's one where we want to have a healthy conversation with the EAG. We want to get some feedback and to get an idea of what that commitment represents. There was nothing to talk about until we could get to the point where we are now.

Tawny Olore, Osceola County

Are the signed agreements with the landowners something you can share with us?

Nicole Gough, Dewberry

Yes, that can be made available.

Beverly Hughes, Osceola County Schools

You said you had an agreement with landowners, does that prohibit development (on that land) at this point until the rest of this is approved?

Nicole Gough, Dewberry

My understanding is that the conservation lands would be dedicated for conservation.

Clint Beaty, Tavistock Development

To finish the thought related to the conservation lands question, that 1,550 acres is being held from development during the process of this entire roadway study and ultimate decision on its construction. In addition to that, those lands are being dedicated with full mitigation rights associated with those lands to whomever the ultimate owner of those lands are.



Tawny Olore, Osceola County

Does that mean the mitigation is up to the future landowners or is that part of the CFX project?

Clint Beaty, Tavistock Development

The mitigation value associated with those lands and the rights to monetize them, will go with the land.

Nicole Gough, Dewberry

Just to be clear, for the purposes of the PD&E Re-evaluation, the mitigation for the alignments for the CFX project, is per criteria. It has nothing to do with these lands. These lands are not part of the mitigation plans for the project.

Nicole Gough, Dewberry

Is there anyone on the phone?

Kathy Putnam, Quest Corporation of America (on behalf of CFX)

No.

JD Humpherys, Suburban Land Reserve

You mentioned the Florida Communities Trust process, what do you anticipate that to look like?

Richard S. Brightman, Hopping, Green & Sams (Attorney Advisor to CFX)

Florida Communities Trust is a board comprised of five individuals. Actually, one has a vacancy right now, but they sit and meet quarterly in Tallahassee. After this whole project is approved through CFX, there will have to be an application filed to them for designation of these lands as use for a linear facility. Their staff will analyze that application and there will be a public hearing in Tallahassee by the community trust board, at which they will vote whether to authorize it. If you want more details, I would be happy to try to fill them in.

Kathy Putnam, Quest Corporation of America (on behalf of CFX)

So, from our advisory group members, any other comments? Any other questions? There was a lot of information provided today.

VII. Close

Kathy Putnam said the public meeting is tomorrow night, and the Environmental Advisory Group meeting this afternoon. If you think of anything, if there is something that you would like to comment on, we have multiple ways to get your comments in. The comment period for the study re-evaluation ends November 30. So, we urge you to get into us any comment, any input by November 30. The easiest way is through email: projectstudies@cfxway.com.

If there is nothing else, we can stand adjourned for the Project Advisory Group Meeting of the Central Florida Expressway Authority's Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development & Environment Study Re-evaluation. Thank you for coming out today and thank you for your participation.

END OF SUMMARY

This meeting summary was prepared by Kathy Putnam, Public Involvement Coordinator with Quest Corporation of America. It is not meant to be verbatim but is a summary of the meeting activities and overall discussion. If you feel something should be added or revised, please contact Kathy Putnam by email at <u>ProjectStudies@CFXway.com</u> or by telephone 407-802-3210 within five days of receipt of this summary.



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Billy Hattaway	City of Orlando	PO Box 4990	Orlando, FL 32802	billy.hattaway@cityoforlando.net	
W. Don Whyte	Deseret Ranches	13754 Deseret Lane	St. Cloud, FL 34773	dwhyte@deseretranches.com	22
Casey Lyon	FDOT-District 5	719 South Woodland Boulevard	DeLand, FL 32720	casey.lyon@dot.state.fl.us	
Cathy Owen	FDOT-District 5	719 South Woodland Boulevard	DeLand, FL 32720	catherine.owen@dot.state.fl.us	
Mike Shannon	FDOT-District 5	719 South Woodland Boulevard	DeLand, FL 32720	michael.shannon@dot.state.fl.us	
Brian Stanger	FDOT-District 5	719 South Woodland Boulevard	DeLand, FL 32720	brian.stanger@dot.state.fl.us	
Alison Stettner	FDOT-District 5	719 South Woodland Boulevard	DeLand, FL 32720	alison.stettner@dot.state.fl.us	
Karen Snyder	FDOT-District 5	719 South Woodland Boulevard	DeLand, FL 32720	karen.snyder@dot.state.fl.us	



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Bill Walsh	FDOT-District 5	719 South Woodland Boulevard	DeLand, FL 32720	william.walsh@dot.state.fl.us	
Irene Cabral	FDOT- Emergency Management Office	605 Suwannee Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	irene.cabral@dot.state.fl.us	
Katasha Cornwell	FDOT - Office of Environmental Management	605 Suwannee Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	katasha.cornwell@dot.state.fl.us	
Bart Vernace	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)	8427 South Park Circle, Suite 524	Orlando, FL 32819	Bart.Vernace@faa.gov	
Nahir DeTizio	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	400 West Washington Street, Suite 4200	Orlando, FL 32801	nahir.detizio@dot.gov	
Joseph Sullivan	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	400 West Washington Street, Suite 4200	Orlando, FL 32801	Joseph.Sullivan@dot.gov	
Corey Lentz	FL Dept of State - Div of Historical Resources	500 South Bronough Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	corey.lentz@dos.myflorida.com	



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Timothy Parsons	FL Dept of State - Div of Historical Resources	500 South Bronough Street	Tallahassee, FL 32399	timothy.parsons@dos.myflorida.com	
Henry Pinzon	Florida's Turnpike Enterprise	PO Box 613069	Ocoee, FL 34761	henry.pinzon@dot.state.fl.us	
Phil Brown	Greater Orlando Aviation Authority (GOAA)	One Jeff Fuqua Boulevard	Orlando, FL 32827	pbrown@goaa.org	
Christina Morris	Greater Osceola Partnership for Economic Prosperity	3 Courthouse Square, Second Floor	Kissimmee, FL 34741	christina.morris@osceola.org	
Mike Fischetti	Lake Ajay Village				
Jim Phillips	Lake Ajay Village	3183 Whisper Wind Drive	St. Cloud, FL 34771	jak-phillips@msn.com	Shilly
Angela Phillips	Lake Ajay Village	3183 Whisper Wind Drive	St. Cloud, FL 34771	phoebe2916@gmail.com	angela Philleps



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Dierdre MacNab	League of Women Voters of Orange County			didimacnab@earthlink.net	
Theo Webster	League of Women Voters of Orange County			twebster49@gmail.com	
Dr. Richard Levey	Levey Consulting, LLC	PO BOX 560156	Orlando, FL 32856	rlevey@leveyconsulting.com	n.v.
Jim Harrison	LYNX	455 North Garland Avenue	Orlando, FL 32801	jharrison@golynx.com	
Tiffany Holmer- Hawkins	LYNX	455 North Garland Avenue	Orlando, FL 32801	tholmer@golynx.com	
Gary Huttmann	MetroPlan Orlando	250 South Orange Ave, Suite 200	Orlando, FL 32801	ghuttman@metroplanorlando.com	
Nick Lepp	MetroPlan Orlando	250 South Orange Ave, Suite 200	Orlando, FL 32801	nlepp@metroplanorlando.com	

CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

CENTRAL FLORIDA

EXPRESSWAY

AUTHORITY

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Mayra Labrador	Orange County BoCC District 4 Commission Office			district4@ocfl.net	
Eric Ushkowitz	Orange County Economic Development	201 South Rosalind Avenue, 5 th Floor	Orlando, FL 32801	Eric.Ushkowitz@ocfl.net	
Tim Boldig	Orange County - Environmental Protection	3165 McCrory Place, Suite 200	Orlando, FL 32803	tim.boldig@ocfl.net	
Robert Goff	Orange County - Parks and Recreation	4801 West Colonial Drive	Orlando, FL 32808	robert.goff@ocfl.net	
Gail Piazza	Orange County - Parks and Recreation	4801 West Colonial Drive	Orlando, FL 32808	gail.piazza@ocfl.net	
Faye Bartell	Orange County Schools - Transportation	6721 Hanging Moss Road	Orlando, FL 32807	faye.bartell@ocps.net	
Renzo Nastasi	Orange County - Transportation Planning	201 South Rosalind Avenue, #2	Orlando, FL 32801	renzo.nastasi@ocfl.net	Blakun bu Penjo Nastasi



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Brian Sanders	Orange County - Transportation Planning	201 South Rosalind Avenue, #2	Orlando, FL 32801	brian.sanders@ocfl.net	
Cori Carpenter	Osceola County	1 Courthouse Square	Kissimmee, FL 34741	cwel@osceola.org	
Josh DeVries	Osceola County	1 Courthouse Square	Kissimmee, FL 34741	joshua.devries@osceola.org	
Kerry Godwin	Osceola County	1 Courthouse Square	Kissimmee, FL 34741	kgod@osceola.org	
Tawny Olore	Osceola County	1 Courthouse Square	Kissimmee, FL 34741	Tawny.Olore@osceola.org	
Susan Caswell	Osceola County - Community Resources	1 Courthouse Square, Suite 1100	Kissimmee, FL 34741	susan.caswell@osceola.org	THO
Beverly Hughes	Osceola County Schools - Transportation	401 Simpson Road	Kissimmee, FL 34744	beverly.hughes@osceolaschools.net	BJN.
Shawn Tucker	Osceola County Schools - Transportation	401 Simpson Road	Kissimmee, FL 34744	Shawn.Tucker@osceolaschools.net	

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
JD Humpherys	Suburban Land Reserve			jdh@slreserve.com	2A
Mark McDonald	Southern Oaks – Lennar Homes	6750 Forum Drive, #310	Orlando, FL 32821	mark.mcdonald@lennar.com	
Brock Nicholas	Southern Oaks – Lennar Homes	6750 Forum Drive, #310	Orlando, FL 32821	Brock.nicholas@lennar.com	B
Clint Beaty	Tavistock Development	6900 Tavistock Lakes Boulevard, #200	Orlando, FL 32827	cbeaty@tavistock.com	ĊB
Darren Vierday	US Rep. Darren Soto (FL 9th District)	804 Bryan Street	Kissimmee, FL 34741	Darren.Vierday@mail.house.gov	
		Y			

PUBLIC SIGN-IN SHEET



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials	
in the second		×				
Richard Brightman	1765	300 5 mensore st ste 300	Tallahause 7230	1 vichard be haslaw,	om RSB	
KIM BUCHHEIT	self	6500 SWAIN RD. SORRENTO, FL 32776		Kimberlybuchheit@gmail. Com	KAB	
Gretchen Robinson	FOSOF	520 Ramona Lene Orlando 32805	Orlando 32805	pallas Hgr Ogmail.com	SAR	
Theo Webster	- LWVOC	759Altontue.	Orland 0 32804	twebster 49@gmail.co	m And	
Laura Kinsler	Growth Spotter	Orlando Sentire	R	LKinslere granth spo	Hencim	CL
Nicole Wilson	FOSO	1807 Glenbuy Ct	Windermore, FL 34786	ncubilson 5 Qqmail. Com	1L	
Ariel Hartney	FOSD	199 E. Cedarcond Cin	Kissim FL 34743	afar treij20088 gmant.cor	AA	
Jerry Hume Forgerson	News 13	20 N. Orange	Orlando, FL	Verry hume Echanter. com	TH	
ų i J						

PUBLIC SIGN-IN SHEET



CFX Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Address	City/State/Zip	Email Address	Initials
Jr McGovern	Friends Split Ock	55 GO Jeck Breck	STCLUUD EL 347	McGoverndonce 9 mail	TR
Scott Power	Fluride Politics	10151 University Block NO247	Ortudo, Fl 32817	Scottle Advids Alvia . Can	Sur
Kunt Gurbar	Curil Rudrigun		Winte Pul, FL	kgarbood Fishbachlan. con	KNR
Jim Erwin	EL Wathre Plast Society	116 Farnwood St.	02/ 32806	jimorning egina, licon	JE.
		61			
5. -					

STAFF SIGN-IN SHEET

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Email Address	Initials
Laura Kelley	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Laura.Kelley@CFXWay.com	/
Michelle Maikisch	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Michelle.Maikisch@CFXWay.com	04
Glenn Pressimone	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Glenn.Pressimone@CFXWay.com	AND.
Will Hawthorne	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Will.Hawthorne@CFXWay.com	WA
Angela Melton	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Angela.Melton@CFXWay.com	1
Brian Hutchings	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Brian.Hutchings@CFXWay.com	19/A
Emily Brown	Central Florida Expressway Authority	Emily.Brown@CFXWay.com	- 210-
Chris Caprio	ARC Document Solutions	Christopher.Caprio@e-arc.com	
Carleen Flynn	CDM Smith	flynnmc@cdmsmith.com	
Hugh Miller	CDM Smith	millerhw@cdmsmith.com	
Merissa Battle	Dewberry	MBattle@dewberry.com	ŒB
Nicole Gough	Dewberry	NGough@dewberry.com	16
Jonathan Williamson	Dewberry	JWilliamson@dewberry.com	NW
Jeff Jones	Inwood Inc.	Jjones@inwoodinc.com	/

STAFF SIGN-IN SHEET

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Email Address	Initials
Dan Kristoff	RS&H	Daniel.Kristoff@rsandh.com	A
Kelsey Lucas	RS&H	Kelsey.Lucas@rsandh.com	809
Myra Monreal	RS&H	Myra.Monreal@gmail.com	me
John Rice	RS&H	John.Rice@rsandh.com	2
Mary Brooks	Quest Corporation of America	Mary.Brooks@qcausa.com	Meth
Kathy Putnam	Quest Corporation of America	Kathy.Putnam@qcausa.com	KP
Elaine Rodríguez	Quest Corporation of America	Elaine.Rodriguez@qcausa.com	ČR
Kevin Camara	Quest Corporation of America	Kevin.Camara@qcausa.com	KC
Nick Nulli	Quest Corporation of America	Nick.Nulli@qcausa.com	
Laurie Windham	Quest Corporation of America	Laurie.Windham@qcausa.com	
Lisa Marks	Quest Corporation of America	Lisa.Marks@qcausa.com	
Susan Clary	Quest Corporation of America	Susan.Clary@qcausa.com	Sac
CHAN DAILY	RsiH	CHAIS. DAILEY ONSANDHION	6
hoor Roman	CFX	WOORY ADONIGNER O CAXWAY. CON	R



+

STAFF SIGN-IN SHEET

Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

CFX Project No.: 599-223

CFX Board Meeting Room, 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807

Name	Organization	Email Address	Initials
John Rice	RSAH	John. Rice & rsandh.com	CAR
Nathan Silva	ά	nathan, silva @ rsald. com	usl fu NS
Eddie Gonzal	ez 11	Cisardh.com	you for ER
* 22 H			
			c
9°			



Save the Date

OSCEOLA PARKWAY EXTENSION


October 31, 2019

Subject: **Project Advisory Group Meeting – November 18, 2019** CFX Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation Osceola Parkway Extension CFX Project No.: 599-223

Dear Study Stakeholder:

The <u>Central Florida Expressway Authority</u> (CFX) would like to invite you or your designee to the Project Advisory Group (PAG) meeting for the <u>Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study Re-evaluation</u>. The purpose of the study re-evaluation is to determine if a new expressway connection between <u>State Road</u> <u>417</u> near Boggy Creek Road in Orange County and the proposed Sunbridge Parkway in Osceola County is viable and fundable in accordance with CFX policies and procedures.

The meeting will be held on Monday, November 18, 2019 from 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. at the CFX Headquarters located at 4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, 32807. A brief presentation will be provided, followed by group discussion.

Please note that only one person per PAG member organization is invited to sit at the meeting table and engage in the group discussion. Others are invited to sit in the audience area and leave written comments.

During this meeting, the CFX study team is expected to present the preferred alternative and receive comment from PAG members. All factors related to the conceptual design and location of the facility, including transportation needs, financial feasibility, social impacts, economic factors, environmental impacts, engineering analysis, and right-of-way requirements, continue to be considered.

When the PD&E Study Re-evaluation concludes, it will result in a recommendation to the CFX Governing Board of the preferred alternative. If the project is approved by the CFX Governing Board, it would move forward for further project development.

The overall goals of the proposed Osceola Parkway Extension are to provide improved connections between area roads; accommodate anticipated transportation demand; provide consistency with local and regional plans; support economic viability and job creation; support intermodal opportunities; and enhance evacuation and emergency services.

Your participation in the PAG is encouraged. As a special advisory resource to CFX and the consultant team, the PAG provides input regarding local needs, concerns and potential physical, natural, social and cultural impacts that are crucial in the evaluation of corridor and alternative alignments.

For more information, visit the study's website at <u>http://bit.ly/OscPkwyExtRe</u>. Please respond to Mary Brooks, Public Involvement Coordinator, by Tuesday, November 12, if you are able to attend the PAG

meeting or if you would prefer to designate a representative. Ms. Brooks can be reached by phone at 407-802-3210 or by email at <u>ProjectStudies@CFXway.com</u>.

Sincerely,

LIQU

Glenn Pressimone, PE Chief of Infrastructure Central Florida Expressway Authority

Attachment: Meeting Location Map



Project Advisory Group	First Name	Last Name	E-mail	Mailing Name 1	Mailing Name 2	Address 1	Address 2	City	State	ZIP
Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX)				Central Florida Expressway Authority		4974 ORL Tower Rd		Orlando	FL	32807
	Chief of Infrastructure Glenn	Pressimone	glenn.pressimone@cfxway.com							
	Director of Engineering Will	Hawthorne	will.hawthorne@cfxway.com							
Senior	Communications Specialist Brian	Hutchings	Brian.Hutchings@CEXWay.com							
M	lanager of Communications Angela	Melton	Angela.Melton@CFXWay.com							
	-									
Deseret Cattle & Citrus				Deseret Cattle & Citrus		13754 Deseret Lane		St. Cloud	FL	34773
	Vice President - Planning W. Don	Whyte	dwhyte@deseretranches.com							
F 4 4				To do yell An Soldon a Advantation	Orden de Aline entre District Office	0407 Courth Doub Challs	C-11- 524	Orders de	-	22040
FAA	ADO Manager Bart	Vernace	Bart Vernace@faa.gov	Federal Aviation Administration	Orlando Airports District Office	8427 South Park Circle	Sulte 524	Oriando	FL	32819
	ADO Manager Bart	Vernace	bart. vernace@raa.gov							
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)				Florida Division	Federal Highway Administration	400 W. Washington Street	Suite 4200	Orlando	FL	32801
	Environmental Specialist Joseph	Sullivan	Joseph.Sullivan@dot.gov		с ,	5				
	Local Programs Engineer Nahir	DeTizio	nahir.detizio@dot.gov							
FL Dept of State - Div of Historical Resources				Florida Division of Historical Resources		RA Gray Building	500 S Bronough St	Tallahassee	FL	32399-0250
Division Director, State H	Architectural Historian Cory	Lentz	corey.lentz@dos.myflorida.com							
Division Director, state H	historic Preservation Officer Timothy	Parsons	umothy.parsons@dos.mynonda.com							
FDOT - Office of Environmental Management				Florida Department of Transportation	Office of Environmental Management	605 Suwannee St		Tallahassee	FL	32399-0450
State Environme	ental Process Administrator Katasha	Cornwell	katasha.cornwell@dot.state.fl.us	a de après a de la departe						
FDOT-District 5				Florida Department of Transportation	District 5	719 S Woodland Blvd		DeLand	FL	32720
Environ	nmental Permit Coordinator Casey	Lyon	<pre>casey.lyon@dot.state.fl.us</pre>							
	District Secretary Mike	Shannon	michael.shannon@dot.state.fl.us							
Sen	nior Environmental Scientist Cathy	Owen	catherine.owen@dot.state.fl.us							
Pro	nject Development Manager Karen	Snyder	karen.snyder@dot.state.fl.us							
Modal L	Development Administrator Brian	Stanger	brian.stanger@dot.state.fl.us							
Dianning and Environmental N	Environmental Manager Bill	VValsti	william.waish@dot.state.m.us							
Planning and Environmental h	Management Auministrator Alison	Stetther	anson.stetther@dot.state.n.us							
FDOT-Emergency Management Office				Florida Department of Transportation	Office of Emergency Management	605 Suwannee St		Tallahassee	FL	32399-0450
Emer	rgency Coordination Officer Irene	Cabral	irene.cabral@dot.state.fl.us		<u> </u>					
Florida's Turnpike Enterprise				Florida's Turnpike Enterprise		Turkey Lake Headquarters	PO Box 613069	Ocoee	FL	34761
En	nvironmental Administrator Philip	Stein	Philip.Stein@dot.state.fl.us							
	EMO Engineer Henry	Pinzon	henry.pinzon@dot.state.fl.us							
Lake Alay Village										
concentraty vinage	Jim	Phillips	iak-phillips@msn.com			3183 Whisper Wind Dr		St Cloud	FL	34771
	Angela	Phillips	phoebe2916@gmail.com			3183 Whisper Wind Dr		St Cloud	FL	34771
	Steven	Barnick	sabarnick@hotmail.com			3175 Whisper Wind Dr		St Cloud	FL	34771
	Napoleon	Estrada	napest56@yahoo.com			3174 Lake Breeze Circle		St Cloud	FL	34771
League of Women Voters of Orange County										
	Transportation Co-Chair Dierdre	MacNab	didimacnab@earthlink.net							
	Transportation Co-Chair Theo	Webster	twebster49@gmail.com							
LANX				LYNX Central Station		455 N Garland Ave		Orlando	FI	32801
Inte	erim Chief Executive Officer Jim	Harrison	iharrison@golynx.com							02001
(Chief Administrative Officer Tiffany	Holmer-Hawkins	thomler@golynx.com							
Levy Consulting				Levy Consulting, LLC		P.O. Box 560156		Orlando	FL	32856
	Dr. Richard	Levey	rlevey@leveyconsulting.com							

Project Advisory Group	First Name	Last Name	E-mail	Mailing Name 1	Mailing Name 2	Address 1	Address 2	City	State	ZIP
MetroPlan Orlando				MetroPlan Orlando		250 S Orange Ave	Suite 200	Orlando	FL	32801
	Executive Director Gary	Huttmann	ghuttmann@metroplanorlando.com			-				
	Director of Transportation Planning Nick	Lepp	nlepp@metroplanorlando.com							
Orange County Bocc District 4 Commission C	Maura	Labrador	district4@acfl pat							
Alde	ividyid	Labrauor								
Orange County - Transportation Planning				Orange County Planning Division		201 S Rosalind Ave	#2	Orlando	FL	32801
	Transportation Planning Manager Renzo	Nastasi	renzo.nastasi@ocfl.net							
Chi	ef Planner, Transportation Planning Brian	Sanders	brian.sanders@ocfl.net							
Orange County Economic Development	a serie Davide a serie Administration Frie	U ala la su Ata		Orange County Office of Economic Development		201 S Rosalind Ave	5th Floor	Orlando	FL	32801
ECC	nomic Development Administrator Eric	USNKOWITZ	Effc.Ushkowitz@octl.net							
Orange County - Environmental Protection				Orange County - Environmental Protection		3165 McCrory Pl	Suite 200	Orlando	FL	32803
	Deputy Director, CEDS Tim	Boldig	tim.boldig@ocfl.net			5105 1100 01 7 1 1	5000 200	onando		52000
		Ū								
Orange County - Parks and Recreation				Orange County Parks and Recreation		4801 W Colonial Dr		Orlando	FL	32808
	Project Manager Robert	Goff	<u>robert.goff@ocfl.net</u>							
	Program Manager Gail	Piazza	gail.piazza@ocfl.net							
Overse County Schools Transportation				Orange County Dublic Schools	Transportation Convisor	C721 Hansing Mass Dd		Orlanda	F 1	22007
Orange County Schools - Transportation	Senior Administrator, Fave	Bartell	fave hartell@ocns.net	Orange County Public Schools	Administrator	6721 Hanging Moss Ru		Unando	FL	32807
	Senior Administrator Taye	Darten	<u>aye.barten@ocps.net</u>		Administrator					
OIA / GOAA				Greater Orlando Aviation Authority	Orlando International Airport	One Jeff Fugua Blvd		Orlando	FL	32827-4392
	Executive Director Phil	Brown	pbrown@goaa.org		Executive Director					
Orlando - City				City of Orlando		PO Box 4990		Orlando	FL	32802-4990
	Transportation Director Billy	Hattaway	billy.hattaway@cityoforlando.net							
Osceola County				Osceola County		1 Courthouse Square		Kissimmee	FI	3/17/1
Executive Dir	ector of Transportation and Transit Tawny	Olore	Tawny.Olore@osceola.org	Oscella county		i contriouse square		Rissininee	16	34741
	Program Manager Cori	Carpenter	cwel@osceola.org							
	Transportation Planning Director Josh	DeVries	joshua.devries@osceola.org							
	Director of Planning and Design Kerry	Godwin	kgod@osceola.org							
Greater Osceola Partnership for Economic P	osperity			Greater Osceola Partnership for Economic Prosperity		3 Courthouse Square	Second Floor	Kissimmee	FL	34741
	CKA Director Unristina	IVIOTTIS	critistina.morris@osceoia.org							
Osceola County - Community Resources				Osceola County - Community Resources		1 Courthouse Square	Suite 1100	Kissimmee	FL	34741
Assistant Com	nunity Development Administrator Susan	Caswell	susan.caswell@osceola.org							
Osceola County Schools - Transportation				School District of Osceola County	Transportation Department	401 Simpson Rd		Kissimmee	FL	34744
	Director of Transportation Shawn	Tucker	Shawn.Tucker@osceolaschools.net							
	Supervisor of Safety Beverly	Hughes	beverly.hughes@osceolaschools.net							
Suburban Land Posonyo										
	ID	Humphervs	idh@slreserve.com							
			<u>han Concochenonn</u>							
Southern Oaks				Lennar Homes		6750 Forum Drive #310		Orlando	FL	32821
	Mark	McDonald	mark.mcdonald@lennar.com							
Tavistock		Beet		Tavistock Development		6900 Tavistock Lakes Blvd	#200	Orlando	FL	32827
	Vice President Clint	Beaty	cbeaty@tavistock.com							

Address 2	City	State	ZIP
Suite 200	Orlando	FL	32801

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

MEETING NOTICE

Central Florida Expressway Authority

PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP MEETING Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

DATE: November 18, 2019

TIME: 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

LOCATION: Central Florida Expressway Authority 4974 ORL Tower Road Orlando, FL 32807 CFX Board Meeting Room

This is the meeting of the Project Advisory Group (PAG) for the Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation.

As a special advisory resource to the Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) and the consultant team, the PAG provides input regarding local needs, concerns and potential physical, natural, social and cultural impacts that are crucial in the evaluation of corridor and alternative alignments.

For more information, visit the study's website at http://bit.ly/OscPkwyExtRe.

Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes states that if a person decides to appeal any decision made by a board, agency, or commission with respect to any matter considered at a meeting or hearing, he will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, he may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

Persons who require translation services, which are provided at no cost, should contact CFX at (407) 690-5000 x5317 or by email at Iranetta.dennis@CFXway.com at least three (3) business days prior to the event.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if any person with a disability as defined by the ADA needs special accommodation to participate in this proceeding, then not later than two (2) business days prior to the proceeding, he or she should contact the Central Florida Expressway Authority at (407) 690-5000.

Posted 10/31/19 at CFX Administration Building

Project Development &

Environment Study Re-evaluation

OSCEOLA PARKWAY EXTENSION

Fall 2019

STUDY HISTORY

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY

AUTHORITY

The Osceola Parkway Extension has been identified as a need in several local, long-range plans and master plans. The former Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX) completed a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study in May 2017 for the Osceola Parkway Extension and presented a recommended alternative. (*Figure 1 on back*)

The Central Florida Expressway Authority's (CFX) enabling legislation (Senate Bill 230, Ch. 2014-171) incorporated the parkway extension and other portions of the OCX 2040 Master Plan into the CFX 2040 Master Plan. In 2018, CFX completed a Concept, Feasibility, and Mobility Study for the Osceola Parkway Extension after evaluating a number of alternatives and concluded the project is viable under CFX criteria.

STUDY UPDATE

CFX has been re-evaluating the OCX PD&E Study recommended alternative as well as considering other alternatives. The input provided through public outreach, including stakeholder meetings, site tours and advisory committee meetings held during CFX's Concept, Feasibility, and Mobility Study, has been a major component of CFX's PD&E Study Re-evaluation. In addition, the study team has continued to conduct stakeholder meetings to gather further feedback in preparation for a recommended Preferred Alternative.

CFX conducted an extensive analysis of the social, environmental, cultural, and physical impacts of potential alternatives. Of the four evaluated alternatives, two on the west side and two on the east side of the corridor, the recommended preferred alternative (*Figure 2 on back*) results in the least social impacts.



PROJECT GOALS

The goals of the proposed 9-mile, limited-access facility include:

- providing for additional east-west routes within the project area,
- enhancing mobility of the area's growing population and economy,
- relieving congestion on local roads,
- providing for the incorporation of transit options and;
- promoting regional connectivity.

FIGURE 1: OSCEOLA COUNTY EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY APPROVED ALTERNATIVE – MAY 2017



FIGURE 2: PD&E STUDY RE-EVALUATION PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION



TO FIND OUT MORE ABOUT THE STUDY, CONTACT:

CENTRAL FLORIDA EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY Mary Brooks, Public Involvement Coordinator Phone: (407) 802-3210 Email: *ProjectStudies@CFXway.com*

4974 ORL Tower Road, Orlando, FL 32807 Phone: (407) 690-5000 Fax: (407) 690-5011 Email: Info@CFXway.com You may also visit the study's webpage at: http://bit.ly/OscPkwyExtRe



@OsceolaPkwyExtPDE

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Para más información en español acerca del proyecto, por afavor comuníquese con Elaine Rodriguez al 407-252-7886 o por correo electrónico Elaine.Rodriguez@qcausa.com.



Osceola Parkway Extension Project Development & Environment Study Re-evaluation

— November 18, 2019 —

Osceola Parkway Extension Title VI Compliance

This meeting, project, or study is being conducted without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons wishing to express their concerns relative to compliance by the Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) with Title VI may do so by contacting:

> Kathy Putnam Public Involvement Coordinator 4974 ORL Tower Road Orlando, FL 32807 407-802-3210 Projectstudies@CFXway.com

All inquiries or complaints will be handled according to CFX procedure and in a prompt and courteous manner.



Osceola Parkway Extension Background

- 2005 Osceola County Comprehensive Plan: New corridors around growth boundary
- 2012 Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX): 2040 Master Plan. ETDM Programming Screen Summary Report published (ETDM No. 13789).
- 2016 CFX incorporated OCX master plan segments into CFX Master Plan.
- 2017 OCX completed the Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study and approved a Project Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).



Osceola Parkway Extension Background – OCX Approved Alternative



Osceola Parkway Extension Background

- 2005 Osceola County Comprehensive Plan: New corridors around growth boundary
- 2012 Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX): 2040 Master Plan. ETDM Programming Screen Summary Report published (ETDM No. 13789).
- 2016 CFX incorporated OCX master plan segments into CFX Master Plan.
- 2017 OCX completed the Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study and approved a Project Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).
- March 2018 CFX completed a Concept Feasibility and Mobility Study for the Osceola Parkway Extension





Osceola Parkway Extension Background

- 2005 Osceola County Comprehensive Plan: New corridors around growth boundary
- 2012 Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX): 2040 Master Plan. ETDM Programming Screen Summary Report published (ETDM No. 13789).
- 2016 CFX incorporated OCX master plan segments into CFX Master Plan.
- 2017 OCX completed the Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Study and approved a Project Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).
- March 2018 CFX completed a Concept Feasibility and Mobility Study for the Osceola Parkway Extension
- July 2018 CFX began PD&E Study Re-evaluation



Osceola Parkway Extension Study Methodology – PD&E Re-evaluation

- Compare the OCX approved alternative against others
- Analyze physical, natural, cultural and social impacts
- Conduct public outreach
- Produce a Project Environmental Impact Re-evaluation Report
 - Identify a preferred alternative
- Present the findings to the CFX Board



Osceola Parkway Extension Key Study Activities

- Environmental Data Collection & Analysis
- Large Landholder & Other Key Stakeholder Meetings
- Refining Feasibility Study Alternatives
- Developing Additional Alternatives
- Updating environmental, engineering and social data
- Public Involvement





Osceola Parkway Extension Public Involvement

- Officials' Briefings & Stakeholder Meetings
- Osceola Co. Commissioner Transportation Update -Dec. 4, 2018
- Board Presentations
 - Osceola Co. Expressway Authority Oct. 9, 2018
 - CFX Governing Board Dec. 12, 2018
- Environmental & Project Advisory Groups TBD
- Public Meeting TBD
- CFX Study Webpage & Study Facebook Page





Osceola Parkway Extension Major Constraints: Social and Environmental



Osceola Parkway Extension Typical Section



Osceola Parkway Extension Alternatives Considered



Osceola Parkway Extension West Segment – Boggy Creek Alternative



Osceola Parkway Extension West Segment – Lake Nona Alternative



Osceola Parkway Extension East Segment – Split Oak Avoidance Alternative



Osceola Parkway Extension East Segment – Split Oak Minimization Alternative



Osceola Parkway Extension Evaluation Matrix

- Physical
 - Utility Impacts and Contamination
- Cultural
 - Historic and Archaeological Resources
- Natural Environment
 - Wetlands, Floodplains, Habitat, Species, Mitigation Properties, Conservation Easements
- Social
 - Right-of-way Impacts, Displacements, Community Impacts, Planned Developments
- Estimated Costs
 - Construction, Right-of-Way, Mitigation, and Engineering / Legal



Osceola Parkway Extension Preferred Alternative



Osceola Parkway Extension What's Next?

- Public Meeting Tomorrow, November 19th
- Board Meeting Present Final Recommendations to CFX Board



Osceola Parkway Extension Public Comment





Approach to Florida Communities Trust

62-818.015 Consideration of Recipient's Request for Linear Facilities.

The Declaration of Restrictive Covenants for Trust Project Sites limits the use of the property to conservation, outdoor recreation, and other related activities. However, the Trust periodically receives requests for Management Plan modifications to allow linear facilities and related appurtenances on the Trust Project Site. When evaluating these requests, the following process must be followed.

(1) First, there has to be a determination:

(a) That there is no reasonable alternative to the proposed modification land use on the Trust Project Site; and,

(b) That the land use is designed to have a minimal impact to the site; and,

(c) A copy of an alternative analysis assessment of other off-site alternatives or options considered by the Recipient.

(2) If the Trust determines that no practical off-site alternatives exist, then the following information is required:

(a) A written statement that the Local Government has reviewed and approved the proposed use;

(b) A description and dimensions of the linear facility, and of the area that will be affected during construction;

(c) Information on the natural communities and cultural features found on, and immediately surrounding the site of the proposed facility;

(d) A statement explaining how the proposed facility will be compatible with planned recreational uses of the Trust Project Site, as committed to in the approved Management Plan;

(e) Discussion of the proposed mitigation for impacts to the Trust Project Site; and,

(f) A modified master site plan drawing identifying the locations of existing vegetation and all proposed structures, facilities and restoration areas that will be affected by the facility.

After receiving all of the above information, staff will evaluate and review the request for consistency according to the above listed requirements. If the proposal meets the above requirements and has minimum impact to the Project Site, staff may approve the request. If public objections are received, if it is a large project, or if the project could be viewed as controversial the proposal will be presented to the Trust Governing Board for consideration.

(3) If the request is approved, the Recipient must:

(a) Provide an appraisal of the land use area or other valuation method as approved by Trust staff;

(b) Provide a legal description from a licensed surveyor;

(c) Sign an amendment to the Declaration of Restrictive Covenants that provides for the changed use of the Project Site; and,

(d) Record the amended Declaration of Restrictive Covenants in the Public Records of the County where the property is located. The Recipient will be required to pay for the land use area. The payment shall be allocated to the Recipient and the Trust based on the percentage of the original grant (i.e., 50% Recipient participation and 50% Trust participation).

CENTRAL

FLORIDA

EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

Rulemaking Authority 380.507(11) FS. Law Implemented 259.105, 380.510 FS. History–New 2-8-10, Formerly 9K-7.015.



Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Re-evaluation Study

Planned Development Surrounding Split Oak Forest



Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Re-evaluation Study



Osceola Parkway Extension PD&E Re-evaluation Study

Osceola County +/- 582 Acres

Legend

Parcel 1 (Osceola County)



Uplands (219.02 ac)



Wetlands (326.47 ac)

Surface Waters (1.83 ac)

Parcel 2 (Osceola County)



Uplands (34.02 ac) Wetlands (0.81 ac)

