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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Concept, Feasibility & Mobility Studies

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.
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.
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of Additional Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Define Purpose &amp; Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Informational Kickoff Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></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></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFX Board Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></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/](https://www.cfxway.com/agency-information/plans-studies/project-studies/public-involvement/)

- Study Facebook Page - [https://www.facebook.com/pg/CFXConceptStudies/about/](https://www.facebook.com/pg/CFXConceptStudies/about/)
Poinciana Parkway Extension / I-4 Connector
Project Background

- 2013 – Florida Department of Transportation District 5 initiated Project Development and Environment study of the I-4 Poinciana Parkway Connector
  - Agency Project Advisory Group Meetings
    - October 2013
    - February 2014
    - March 2015
- 2015 – Public Meeting held in June
- 2015 – Alternative Corridor Evaluation Report completed in November
Review of Previous Study

- The current Concept, Feasibility and Mobility Study is in agreement with the previous study’s general findings that Corridor 2A and Corridor 3 should be evaluated further.

- Based on the impacts associated with these corridors, further refinements and shifts in these alignments have been evaluated in an effort to improve the viability of the alignments.

- Refinements also have been explored to address the connections to Poinciana Parkway and I-4, as well as the construction of the expressway along parallel roads, including Kinney Harmon Road and CR 532.
Initial Alignments to be Evaluated

NOTE: INTERCHANGES WITH US 17-92 AND SR 532 TO BE EVALUATED BASED ON TRAFFIC FORECASTS
Initial Alignments to be Evaluated

NOTE: INTERCHANGES WITH US 17-92 AND SR 532 TO BE EVALUATED BASED ON TRAFFIC FORECASTS
Initial Alignments to be Evaluated

NOTE: INTERCHANGES WITH US 17-92 AND SR 532 TO BE EVALUATED BASED ON TRAFFIC FORECASTS
Typical Section on New Alignment

- Fence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed L/A R/W</th>
<th>12' Shoulder 10' Paved</th>
<th>8' Shoulders 4' Paved</th>
<th>8' Shoulders 4' Paved</th>
<th>12' Shoulder 10' Paved</th>
<th>Proposed L/A R/W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>88'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>94'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>324' ±</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Typical Section
Elevated Expressway Along CR 532

[Diagram showing the section with measurements and dimensions, including 12', 7', 24', 27', 12', 24', 8', 8', 24', 12', 27', 24', 7', 12', 5', 70', 164', 304', 70'].

[Central Florida Expressway Authority logo]
Poinciana Parkway
Common to All Alternatives

- Widening existing Poinciana Parkway to 4-lanes
- Complete interchanges at Marigold Ave. and KOA St.
- Maintain interchange with Cypress Pkwy.
- Expand existing ponds if needed
- No additional right-of-way anticipated
2A: I-4 Interchange Options

Center Alignment

North Alignment
Alternative 2A-1

- New 4-lane alignment northwest of existing Poinciana Parkway bridge
- Travels south of Kinney Harmon Rd.
  - Impacts existing and planned development
  - Impacts Loughman
- Interchange with US 17-92
  - Utilizes Kinney Harmon Rd. for some movements
- Interchange with CR 532
- Two options for I-4 interchange at SR 429
  - Northern Alignment
  - Center Alignment
Alternative 2A-2

- New 4-lane alignment northwest of existing Poinciana Parkway bridge
- Travels north of Kinney Harmon Rd.
  - Impacts Reedy Creek Mitigation Bank
  - Impacts Loughman Area
- Interchange with US 17-92
- Interchange with CR 532
- Two options for I-4 interchange at SR 429
  - Northern Alignment
  - Center Alignment
Alternative 2A-3

- New 4-lane alignment northwest of existing Poinciana Parkway bridge
- Travels north of Kinney Harmon Rd.
- Interchange with US 17-92
- Interchange with CR 532
- Two options for I-4 interchange at SR 429
  - Northern Alignment
  - Center Alignment
Alternative 2A-4

- New 4-lane alignment northwest of existing Poinciana Parkway bridge
- Travels north of Kinney Harmon Rd.
  - Avoids Loughman Area
- Interchange with US 17-92
- Interchange with CR 532
- Two options for I-4 interchange at SR 429
  - Northern Alignment
  - Center Alignment
Alternative 2A-5

- New 4-lane alignment northwest of existing Poinciana Parkway bridge
- Travels north of Kinney Harmon Rd. in Osceola Co.
  - Avoids Loughman Area
- Interchange with US 17-92
- Interchange with CR 532
- Two options for I-4 interchange at SR 429
  - Northern Alignment
  - Center Alignment
Alternative 3-2

- New 4-lane alignment northwest of existing Poinciana Parkway bridge to CR 532
- Travels north of Kinney Harmon Rd.
  - Impacts Loughman Area
- CR 532 Frontage Rd.
- Interchanges
  - US 17-92
  - CR 532
    • Slip ramps
- Two options
  - Widen CR 532 N
    • Shown
  - Widen CR 532 S
Alternative 3-5

- New 4-lane alignment northwest of existing Poinciana Parkway bridge to CR 532
- Travels north of Kinney Harmon Rd. in Osceola County
  - Avoids Loughman Area
- CR 532 Frontage Rd.
- Interchanges
  - US 17-92
  - CR 532
    - Slip ramps
- Two options
  - Widen CR 532 N
  - Widen CR 532 S
    - Shown
Alternative 3A-3

• New 4-lane alignment northwest of existing Poinciana Parkway bridge to CR 532
• Travels north of Kinney Harmon Rd.
  – Impacts Loughman Area
• South of CR 532
• Interchanges
  – US 17-92
  – CR 532
Alternative 3A-5

- New 4-lane alignment northwest of existing Poinciana Parkway bridge to CR 532
- Travels north of Kinney Harmon Rd. in Osceola County
  - Avoids Loughman Area
- South of CR 532
- Interchanges
  - US 17-92
  - CR 532
### Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Length (approximate)</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Right-of-Way Width (general and varies at interchanges)</td>
<td>feet</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Bridges (total length of all structures)</td>
<td>feet</td>
<td>4,153</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>2,463</td>
<td>3,135</td>
<td>3,033</td>
<td>3,421</td>
<td>3,69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Interchanges</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2045 Average Daily Traffic (AADT) Volume (in thousands)</td>
<td>vehicles</td>
<td>46,606</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>41,600</td>
<td>41,900</td>
<td>41,600</td>
<td>39,800</td>
<td>39,800</td>
<td>39,800</td>
<td>39,800</td>
<td>31,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical**

| Major Utility Conflicts - Existing | No. of Conflicts | 27 | 27 | 27 | 28 | 28 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 8 |
| Major Utility Conflicts - Planned | No. of Conflicts | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Conservation Sites & Facilities | No. of Conflicts | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Railroad Involvement | No. of Conflicts | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

**Cultural Environment Effects**

| Public Lands (Public Recreation Lands, Wildlife Refuge, etc.) | acres | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Section 8F Coordination Requested | VFN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Potential Historical Resources | No. of Conflicts | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Potential Historical/Liner Resources (Canals/Hatlways/Railroads) | No. of Resources | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Potential Archaeological Resources | No. of Resources | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

**Natural Environment**

| Water Features | acres | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada/Regulated Canals | No. of Conflicts | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Blood Hazards Areas - 100 Year Floodplain | acres | 576 | 576 | 576 | 576 | 576 | 576 | 576 | 576 | 576 | 576 |
| Wetlands (Han-Bedded and Interstratified) | acres | 177 | 177 | 177 | 177 | 177 | 177 | 177 | 177 | 177 | 177 |
| Potential Habitat - Federal Listed Species | acres | 553 | 553 | 553 | 553 | 553 | 553 | 553 | 553 | 553 | 553 |
| Potential Habitat - State Listed Species | acres | 236 | 236 | 236 | 236 | 236 | 236 | 236 | 236 | 236 | 236 |
| Potential Bald Eagle Nest | VFN | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |
| Potential Species Impacts (composite rating) | Rating | 1/100 | 1/100 | 1/100 | 1/100 | 1/100 | 1/100 | 1/100 | 1/100 | 1/100 | 1/100 |
| Mitigation Banks | acres | 13 | 52 | 43 | 36 | 46 | 52 | 46 | 48 | 51 | 48 |
| Conservation Easements | acres | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NAWI Protect Conservation Land | acres | 17 | 37 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 |

**Social**

| Right-of-Way Area (excluding proposed ponds) | acres | 500 | 541 | 541 | 541 | 541 | 541 | 541 | 541 | 541 | 541 |
| Potential Residential Impacts (includes partially impacted areas) | Total Parcels | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Potential Non-Residential Impacts (Excludes partially impacted parcels) | Total Parcels | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 |
| Community Facilities | No. of Conflicts | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Parks and Recreational Facilities (public and private) | No. of Conflicts | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trails | acres | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Community Cohesion Effects | Ranking | HIGH | HIGH | HIGH | LOW | LOW | HIGH | HIGH | HIGH | MEDIUM | HIGH | LOW |
| Socioeconomic Impacts to Special Population | Ranking | HIGH | HIGH | HIGH | LOW | LOW | HIGH | HIGH | HIGH | MEDIUM | HIGH | LOW |
| Proposed Development (PDP)/ Development of Regional Impact (DRI) | acres | 236 | 175 | 175 | 175 | 175 | 175 | 175 | 175 | 175 | 175 |

**Estimated Costs**

| roadway Construction | $211,350,000 | $207,700,000 | $350,200,000 | $321,800,000 | $300,600,000 | $314,800,000 | $331,400,000 | $352,400,000 | $375,500,000 | $184,500,000 |
| Bridges Construction | $127,100,000 | $125,400,000 | $196,000,000 | $196,000,000 | $196,000,000 | $196,000,000 | $196,000,000 | $196,000,000 | $196,000,000 | $196,000,000 |
| Interchanges Construction | $596,200,000 | $587,400,000 | $999,100,000 | $940,100,000 | $890,100,000 | $890,100,000 | $890,100,000 | $890,100,000 | $890,100,000 | $890,100,000 |
| Right-of-Way Area (including proposed ponds) | $398,500,000 | $392,200,000 | $398,500,000 | $392,200,000 | $392,200,000 | $392,200,000 | $392,200,000 | $392,200,000 | $392,200,000 | $392,200,000 |
| Mitigation, Wetlands, & Wildlife | $35,100,000 | $35,100,000 | $35,100,000 | $35,100,000 | $35,100,000 | $35,100,000 | $35,100,000 | $35,100,000 | $35,100,000 | $35,100,000 |
| Total Estimated Alternative Costs | $1,429,300,000 | $1,351,300,000 | $1,365,800,000 | $1,269,600,000 | $1,313,800,000 | $1,090,000,000 | $974,200,000 | $1,074,300,000 | $973,400,000 | $756,200,000 |
Open Discussion
Concept, Feasibility & Mobility Studies

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/