Concept, Feasibility & Mobility Studies

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:

Joseph Passiatore
CFX General Counsel
4974 ORL Tower Road
Orlando, FL 32807
407-690-5000
Joe.Passiatore@CFXWay.com

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

**December 19, 2005:** Osceola County Comprehensive Plan adopted, proposed several new corridors to meet the county’s anticipated growth.

**2012:** Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX) began creating its first long-range expressway plan.

**August 13, 2013:** OCX Master Plan 2040 finalized, defining the county’s expressway needs and providing for a program of projects to implement the plan.

**September 8, 2016:** CFX Board approved an interlocal agreement with Osceola County and OCX to transfer the lead for developing the remainder of the OCX 2040 Master Plan to CFX. CFX incorporated the OCX master plan segments into the CFX master plan.

**March 9, 2017:** CFX Board approved consultant contracts to conduct the Concept, Feasibility and Mobility studies.

**April 2017:** CFX commenced four concept, feasibility, and mobility studies to determine if any of the corridors are viable and fundable in accordance with CFX policies and procedures.
Each of the four corridor segments has been previously studied to varying degrees of detail. Our consultant teams have reviewed and evaluated the previous studies for each corridor segment.

- **Poinciana Parkway Extension / I-4 Connector**  
  *Alternative Corridor Evaluation Report (ACER) - November 2015*

- **Southport Connector Expressway**  
  *Alternative Corridor Evaluation Report (ACER) – October 2015*

- **Northeast Connector Expressway**  
  *(Southport Connector East, from Canoe Creek Road to SR 528)*  
  *Preliminary Alignment Evaluation – June 2010*

- **Osceola Parkway Extension**  
  *Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study – May 2017*
The four corridors lie within Osceola, Polk, and Orange Counties and encompass approximately 60 miles of primarily new-location highway.

- Poinciana Parkway Extension / I-4 Connector
  *Approximately 13 miles*

- Southport Connector Expressway
  *Approximately 13 miles*

- Northeast Connector Expressway
  *Approximately 25 miles*

- Osceola Parkway Extension
  *Approximately 9 miles*
Concept, Feasibility & Mobility Studies

Overall Goals of the Project Corridors

- Improve roadway connections from I-4/SR 429 to Florida’s Turnpike, to US 192 and SR 417;

- Promote regional connectivity and enhance mobility of the area’s growing population and economy via a high-speed expressway;

- Provide additional traffic capacity within the study area;

- Reduce congestion and delays on local roads by providing a new limited-access transportation option;

- Provide for the incorporation of transit options.

Input from both the EAG and PAG contributed to the development of the Purpose & Need for each corridor segment.
Study Methodology

The analysis has incorporated and built upon the previous work and coordination achieved from the preceding studies, while conducting a “fresh-look” at the proposed corridor segments and researching recent information that could influence the current decision-making.

- Documentation of the physical, natural, social and cultural environment, and assessment of potential impacts.

- Transportation demands have been determined and a range of transportation mobility options and programs are being developed and evaluated.

- If corridor(s) are found to be feasible, would proceed to a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study.
## Proposed Schedule Concept, Feasibility & Mobility Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice to Proceed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Previous Studies Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAG &amp; PAG Project Kickoff Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of Additional Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Define Purpose &amp; Need</td>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td><strong>Apr</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Informational Kickoff Meetings</td>
<td><strong>Jun</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jun</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Analysis</td>
<td><strong>Jul</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sep</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept, Traffic &amp; Design Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept, Feasibility &amp; Mobility Study Report</td>
<td><strong>Aug</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oct</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept, Feasibility &amp; Mobility Study Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAG &amp; PAG Pre-Public Workshop Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nov</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Informational Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Concept, Feasibility &amp; Mobility Report</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dec</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFX Board Review</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dec</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept, Feasibility &amp; Mobility Study Final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Involvement

Public involvement and stakeholder coordination are an integral part of the study and multiple opportunities for participation are being provided.

- Environmental Advisory Group & Project Advisory Group (July, January & February)
- Public Meetings
  - Kick-off: Sept. 19 & 26, Oct. 5, 2017 (400+ attendees, 284 comments received)
- Board Presentations:
  - Polk County Board of Commissioners: Aug. 8
  - Osceola County Expressway Authority: Oct. 10
  - Central Florida Expressway Authority: Oct. 12
- Additional Stakeholder Meetings - Ongoing
- CFX Study Webpage:
  
  https://www.cfxway.com/agency-information/plans-studies/project-studies/public-involvement/

- Study Facebook Page - https://www.facebook.com/pg/CFXConceptStudies/about/
Osceola Parkway Extension
Osceola Parkway Extension Project Background

- **March 2012**: Osceola County’s Osceola Parkway Extension Preliminary Feasibility Study
- **June 2012**: ETDM Programming Screen Summary Report published (ETDM No. 13789)
- **September 2012**: OCX & Florida’s Turnpike initiated PD&E Study
- **January 2017**: PD&E Study Public Hearing held
- **May 12, 2017**: OCX approved PD&E Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)
Osceola Parkway Extension Project Update

1. Where were we last time we met?
2. What’s happened since then?
3. What have we done with your input?
4. What are our current alternatives?
5. What’s next?
Osceola Parkway Extension
Project Update

1. Where were we last time we met?
   • EAG / PAG Meetings - July 2017
   • Public Meetings - September / October 2017
   • Initial Corridors Shown
Initial Corridors
Sept / Oct 2017 Public Meetings

Connects to existing SR 417 interchange at Boggy Creek Rd:
- Dark Blue - PD&E Recommended Alternative

Alternative SR 417 Connection:
- Orange – West 1
- Yellow – West 2

Alternative Northeast Connections:
- Green – East 1
- Pink – East 2
Public & Agency Input – What we heard…

• Minimize impacts to Split Oak Forest
• Provide noise barriers and landscape buffers near residences
• Provide for Florida National Trail connectivity across Osceola Parkway Extension
• Minimize impacts to existing residences
2. What’s happened since then?

- Public comments
- Stakeholder meetings
- Agency coordination
- Corridor refinements
- Reduction of impacts
Osceola Parkway Extension
Project Update

3. What have we done with your input?
   • Six potential alignments (2 west, 4 east)
   • Construction cost and right-of-way estimates
   • Desktop environmental analysis
   • Alternatives evaluation matrix
   • Traffic projections
Osceola Parkway Extension
Current Alternatives

- Moss Park
- Isle of Pine Preserve
- Eagles Roost Park
- Split Oak Forest
- Moss Park
- Isle of Pine Preserve

LEGEND
- Places of Worship
- Cemeteries
- Campground/RV Parks
- Planned Developments
- Development of Regional Impacts
- Orlando City Limits
- Public/State Lands
- Existing Trails
- Planned Florida National Scenic Trail
- School Boundaries
- Park Boundaries
- Proposed Roadways
- Planned Roadways
- Golf Course

- PD&E Alternative
- Alternative WEST 1B
- Alternative WEST 2
- Alternative EAST 4A
- Alternative EAST 4C
- Alternative EAST 5
- Alternative EAST 6

Proposed Interchange Location
Osceola Parkway Extension
Major Environmental Constraints

- Split Oak Forest
- Wildlife and Environmental Area
- Moss Park
- Eagles Roost Park
- Isle of Pine Preserve
Osceola Parkway Extension
West Ultimate Typical Sections

Limits:
Jeff Fuqua Boulevard to Laureate Boulevard

Limits:
Laureate Boulevard to Narcoossee Road
Osceola Parkway Extension

Current Alternative – West 1B

Advantages
• Full access at SR 417, Poitras, and Narcoossee Rd
• Impacts fewer wetlands

Limitations
• Longer / higher cost
• Impacts more floodways
Osceola Parkway Extension

Current Alternative – West 2

Advantages
- Full access at SR 417, Poitras, and Narcoossee Rd
- Shorter/Lower cost

Limitations
- Impacts more wetlands
- Impacts higher value parcels
Osceola Parkway Extension
East Expressway Ultimate Typical Section

OSCEOLA PARKWAY EXTENSION
EAST EXPRESSWAY
ULTIMATE
6 LANE EXPRESSWAY WITH TRANSIT AND MULTI-USE TRAIL

26’ MULTI-USE TRAIL CORRIDOR
BY OTHERS

50’ TRANSIT CORRIDOR
BY OTHERS

94’ Border

10’ 12’ 12’ 12’ 10’

10’ 12’ 12’ 12’ 10’

64’ Median

400’ right-of-way

94’ Border
Osceola Parkway Extension

Current Alternative – East 4A

Advantages
• Avoids existing residences
• Avoids Florida scrub-jay habitat

Limitations
• Reduces but still impacts Split Oak
• Impacts Springhead proposed development
Osceola Parkway Extension

Current Alternative – East 4C

Advantages
• Avoids existing residences
• Avoids Florida scrub-jay habitat

Limitations
• Further reduces Split Oak Impacts
• Impacts Springhead proposed development
Osceola Parkway Extension

Current Alternative – East 5

Advantages
- Minimizes impacts to Split Oak
- Avoids Lake Ajay Village

Limitations
- Impacts existing residences
- Impacts Southern Oaks proposed development
Osceola Parkway Extension

Current Alternative – East 6

Advantages
• No impacts to recreational areas
• Avoids Split Oak

Limitations
• Impacts many more existing residences
• Impacts Southern Oaks and Del Webb proposed developments
## Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>West 1B</th>
<th>West 2</th>
<th>West 1B</th>
<th>West 2</th>
<th>West 1B</th>
<th>West 2</th>
<th>West 1B</th>
<th>West 2</th>
<th>West 1B</th>
<th>West 2</th>
<th>West 1B</th>
<th>West 2</th>
<th>West 1B</th>
<th>West 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Length (Approximate)</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Bridges (Total Number of Structures by Alternative)</td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Bridges (Total Length of all Structures by Alternative)</td>
<td>Feet</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>20,468</td>
<td>12,352</td>
<td>12,427</td>
<td>12,187</td>
<td>12,292</td>
<td>11,480</td>
<td>11,775</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed frontage rate</td>
<td>Yards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2050 Average Daily Traffic (AADT): Volume (w/o Tondal)</td>
<td>Million vehicles</td>
<td>16,780</td>
<td>42,600</td>
<td>33,700</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Utility Conflicts - Existing No. of Conflicts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Utility Conflicts - Planned No. of Conflicts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Svc. &amp; Facilities No. of Conflicts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Impacts No. of Conflicts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic Impacts to Special Populations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreational Facilities (Public and Private)</td>
<td>No. of Conflicts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>No. of Conflicts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development (PD/Development of Regional Impact (DIR))</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrigation Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Construction</td>
<td>$115,000,000</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>$377,900,000</td>
<td>$312,700,000</td>
<td>$296,500,000</td>
<td>$306,100,000</td>
<td>$294,900,000</td>
<td>$261,500,000</td>
<td>$287,800,000</td>
<td>$291,400,000</td>
<td>$277,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Construction</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marching Construction</td>
<td>$87,000,000</td>
<td>$71,700,000</td>
<td>$105,400,000</td>
<td>$104,800,000</td>
<td>$104,800,000</td>
<td>$104,800,000</td>
<td>$104,800,000</td>
<td>$104,800,000</td>
<td>$104,800,000</td>
<td>$104,800,000</td>
<td>$104,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Costs (Including proposed parcels)</td>
<td>$197,700,000</td>
<td>$154,400,000</td>
<td>$281,000,000</td>
<td>$241,700,000</td>
<td>$240,400,000</td>
<td>$240,400,000</td>
<td>$240,400,000</td>
<td>$240,400,000</td>
<td>$240,400,000</td>
<td>$240,400,000</td>
<td>$240,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation, Water, &amp; Wtbks</td>
<td>$16,300,000</td>
<td>$19,000,000</td>
<td>$34,400,000</td>
<td>$34,100,000</td>
<td>$34,100,000</td>
<td>$34,100,000</td>
<td>$34,100,000</td>
<td>$34,100,000</td>
<td>$34,100,000</td>
<td>$34,100,000</td>
<td>$34,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Alternative Costs</td>
<td>$955,800,000</td>
<td>$438,400,000</td>
<td>$1,217,300,000</td>
<td>$1,017,400,000</td>
<td>$1,014,600,000</td>
<td>$1,014,600,000</td>
<td>$1,014,600,000</td>
<td>$1,014,600,000</td>
<td>$1,014,600,000</td>
<td>$1,014,600,000</td>
<td>$1,014,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Traffic Revenue (2035)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Osceola Parkway Extension
Project Update

5. What’s next?
• Incorporate all EAG / PAG / Public Input
• Refine corridors reflecting that input
• Complete summary report
• Present to CFX Board on March 8, 2018
Open Discussion
Next Steps

- PAG Meetings – Feb. 6 & 8
- Public Meetings – Feb. 13, 15 & 21
- Consultants Update Draft Concept Report
- Board Presentations – TBD
- CFX Board Concept Draft Report Review & Discussion – March 8
- Consultants Finalize Concept Report
Action Items
Concept, Feasibility & Mobility Studies

For More Information, Contact:

Mary Brooks
Public Involvement Coordinator
Email: ConceptStudies@cfxway.com
Hotline: 407-802-3210

Web Address: https://www.cfxway.com/agency-information/plans-studies/project-studies/public-involvement/

Follow the Studies on Facebook https://www.facebook.com/pg/CFXConceptStudies/about/