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Learning Objectives

• Discuss mobility plans and explain the mobility fee concept
• Highlight important concepts and considerations in thoroughfare planning
• Emphasize the importance of complete streets and context sensitive solutions to achieving multimodal planning goals
• Explain key principles of access management and how it impacts the broader multimodal environment

Today’s Webinar

Part 2: Thoroughfare and Mobility Plans

• Mobility Plans and Fees
• Complete Streets and Context Sensitive Solutions
• Access Management
"Mobility Plans" & the Mobility Fee Concept

- **Countywide application**: Mobility needs are both local and regional

- **Interlocal agreements**: Mechanism for implementation, Establishes rules

- **Mobility plan**: Strategies for mobility, Project priorities

- **Mobility fee**: Partial funding mechanism, Additional funding needed for transit operating costs

Mobility fee is closely tied to land use and transportation plans.

Provide for mobility needs

Pasco County Mobility Plan
Market Area Map with Regional and Transit Nodes
Pasco County Mobility Plan

LAND USE
- Urban service area/TCEA
- Market areas
- TOD overlay, town centers, employment centers
- Transfer of development rights

TRANSPORTATION
- MPO 2035 LRTP (road, transit, bike/ped)
- Transit emphasis corridor

FUNDING
- Tiered mobility fee assessment districts
- Rate “buy-down”: TIF, gas tax, sales tax

Mobility Plan Strategies

Mobility Plan:
Alachua County’s Plan to Effectively Link Land Use and Transportation
Alachua County Mobility Plan

**LAND USE**
- Urban Cluster
- Activity Centers
- Transit-oriented development
- Traditional neighborhood development

**TRANSPORTATION**
- Multimodal Plan
- BRT
- Roadway connections
- Lanes over I-75
- Bicycle-pedestrian network

**FUNDING**
- Mobility fee
- Tax increment financing
- Infrastructure sales tax
- State/Federal transit

Mobility Plan Strategies

---

Express Transit Corridors

[Map showing Express Transit Corridors]
TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Network Improvement
Key Elements

Major Roadway Network
Local Roadway Network
Transit Network
Bicycle and Pedestrian Network

Complete gaps and increase connections
**Traffic Circulation Planning**

- Categorizing roadways by function
- Complete streets policies and design guidelines
- Systems and corridor management strategies
- Integrating land use

**Roadway Functional Classification**

![Diagram showing the classification of roadways based on context, function, and design.](See ITR 2-13 on page 83)
Categorizing the System

- ITE context sensitive solutions (CSS) thoroughfare typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
<th>Thoroughfare Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FREEWAY/EXPRESSWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RURAL HIGHWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOULEVARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVENUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RURAL ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALLEY/SEDAN LANE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correspondence between Functional Class and Thoroughfare Type

Consider Context

- Street design varies by land use context

Source: Duany Plater-Zyberk, A Typical Rural – Urban Transect
**Priority Routes by Mode**

- **Credit:** ITE

**Complete Streets Policies & Guidelines**

- **Complete Streets =**
  - Bicycle
  - Pedestrian
  - Vehicle
  - Transit
  - Appropriate Land Use mix

**Source:** Broward County Complete Streets Guidelines

See page 227, Appendix G of the Model Element
### Defining Street Types

#### Table 5: Broward County “Complete Streets” Typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>Walkable, moderate speed divided arterial in urban environments that traverses and connects districts and cities. Primarily a longer distance route for all vehicles including transit, goods movement, and emergency response. Design speeds should be 35 mph or less.</td>
<td>Serves as primary transit routes. Should have bike lanes and sidewalks standard. May have shared-use paths. Often has a planted median. May have on-street parking when passing through urban centers and urban cores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue</td>
<td>Walkable, low speed collector or minor arterial that serves as a short-distance connector between districts or urban centers and provides access to abutting land. Links streets with boulevards. For all vehicles including transit. Design speeds should be 30 mph or less; strong consideration should be given for 25 mph or less when onstreet parking is provided.</td>
<td>Serves as primary pedestrian and bicycle routes. Should have local transit routes. May or may not have a median. May or may not have onstreet parking depending on context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See page 84 of the Model Element

---

### Example Functional Classification Map

City of Deerfield Beach

![Functional Classifications Map](image-url)
Supporting Network

“Many, if not most, 6-lane roadways have resulted from widening of existing roadways because of the absence of an effective supporting circulation system...”

- NCHRP 15-43

Network Planning Concepts

Not to scale
Thoroughfare (Master Street) Plans

- Functional classification or street typology
- Regular spacing of continuous streets
- General location and alignment
- Example cross sections
- Access levels
- Generalized right-of-way needs and policies
- Improvement priorities and funding strategies

Linking Land Use and Thoroughfare Plans

- Define place types and general land use vision
- Clarify what is to be considered “Urban”
- Locate mixed-use “town centers” along major corridors & transit lines

See page 74 of the Model Element
Network Improvement
Largo, Florida: Multimodal Network

Complete MMLSQs evaluation 2012
Compile street design standards 2012/13
Proceed with Projects in CIP FY 2014

Multimodal System Design Guidelines
http://vimeo.com/71736052
FDOT Complete Streets

- Policy adopted in Sept 2014
- Requires “context-appropriate complete streets”
- Promotes economic development
- Addresses our safety problem with pedestrians and cyclists
- Let FDOT “right size” our streets to fit their contexts
- Promotes more cost-effective solutions to transportation issues

Complete Streets Website

www.FLcompletestreets.com
Complete Streets Implementation Plan

Five-part implementation framework:
I. Revising guidance, standards, manuals, policies, and other documents
II. Updating decision-making processes
III. Modify approaches for measuring performance
IV. Managing internal and external communication and collaboration during implementation
V. Providing ongoing education and training

Parts proceed in parallel, not successively
Target Timeline pp. 28-29 (subject to updates!)

- Phase 1 – finalize and adopt plan – Jan. 2016
- Phase 3 – Detailed Scoping - June 2016
- Phase 5 – Evaluate and Determine Next Steps – Jan. 2018/Ongoing
- Subject to reality as we proceed!

Access Management, Complete Streets, and Multimodal Considerations

- How can Florida DOT's access management program help our complete streets and multimodal safety?
Is Access Management the Enemy?

By Dom Nozzi

“Access Management—was touted strongly—to the detriment of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users and overall quality of life”

Source: https://domz60.wordpress.com/2010/07/06/access-management-for-bikes-and-peds/

Access Management is NOT the Enemy

Striving to Reduce Driveway and Pedestrian Conflict

Source: Sprinkle Engineers
Traditional Goals of Access Management

Reduced vehicle conflict
Favoring higher Speed

Managing Modal Conflicts

Separating Conflict Points

Auto
Transit
Bike
Pedestrian
Principle 1
Driveways and Access are for Pedestrians Too

Our Design Standards should include required driveway sidewalks into sites within one mile from urban areas.

Sidewalk Now Impossible Without Moving Utilities

SR56/Woodbury Road
Source: Deborah Tyrone
Limited Pedestrian Access to New Development

Source: Deborah Tyrone

• Good vehicular access management
• Carries great amount of traffic at high speed
• Some side street connectivity
• Median good for safety
Principle 3
Access Standards Should Fit the Context

Link to our full presentation on access management and complete streets: https://youtu.be/_XeBbskH2xc

**Cons**
- No Sidewalk
- No Mid Block Crossing
Please let us know if you use the model element.

Thank you!
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