SPIKOWSKI PLANNING ASSOCIATES

1617 Hendry Street, Suite 416
Fort Myers, Florida 33901-2947

telephone: (941) 334-8866
fax: (941) 334-8878

e-mail: bill@spikowski.com
web site: www.spikowski.com

MEMORANDUM

TO: Marsha Segal-George
FROM: Bill Spikowski
DATE: September 15, 2001
SUBJECT: ONE-WAY STREETS BETWEEN OLD SAN CARLOS AND CRESCENT

With the Old San Carlos streetscape improvements now fully designed and ready to construct, you have asked about plans for the future of Second and Third Street between Old San Carlos and Crescent.

These short streets were converted to one-way traffic earlier last decade. At that time the original pavement width of 18 feet was striped as a single wide travel lane for one-way traffic plus a marked bike lane. The pavement is centered 4 feet south of the center of the 50-foot right-of-way.

This change was made during or shortly after Lee County DOT's major drainage improvements to all streets in this area in the early 1990s. The one-way traffic pattern was not even evaluated in the traffic study that preceded these improvements. The bike lanes serve little purpose inasmuch as they don't connect to bike routes or meaningful destinations at either end.

The 1999 Old San Carlos/Crescent Master Plan proposed to restore Second and Third Streets to two-way traffic. The plan shows curbs, sidewalks, and parallel parking on both sides of both streets. (The only exception was the portion of Third Street between the Sky Bridge and Crescent, where straight-in parking would be allowed to cross the sidewalk to accommodate the existing resort units; however, since that time the town has approved a redevelopment plan for the Lighthouse Resort that resolves this problem on their side of Third Street by accessing all parking spaces from internal driveways.)

The physical improvements to Second and Third Streets are not part of the current streetscape improvements for Old San Carlos. However, I can find no reason why Second and Third Streets cannot be reverted to two-way traffic now. The curbs, sidewalks, and parallel parking can be constructed at a later date, perhaps as part of future improvements to Crescent Street.

The travel lanes on Second and Third would be 9 feet wide each, as they had previously existed. This is narrower than the 10-foot travel lanes being provided for the Old San Carlos streetscape, but with the absence of on-street parking this width will be adequate. In fact the narrow lanes will discourage the kind of speeding that now takes place on these streets. (The pavement on Crescent Street between Second and First Streets is actually narrower than either Second or Third Streets.)

The main advantage to reverting Second and Third Streets to two-way traffic before making the physical improvements would be to reduce confusion for motorists who are unfamiliar with the area. Local residents quickly adjust to one-way patterns, but visitors find them disorienting.

The simplest way to revert to two-way traffic is just to install proper signage and remove the existing striping (either by grinding or by hydro-blasting, which is a form of pressure washing). The downside to this approach is that remains of the striping will still be visible, particularly when it rains.

New centerline striping could be painted at the same time; its benefit would be as a second announcement to drivers that two-way traffic is now permitted on these streets. Once this pattern becomes familiar, the centerline striping need not be repainted because most local streets need no permanent striping (even Crescent Street has no center striping, and none will be needed on Old San Carlos).

If the remnants of the old striping are determined to be unsatisfactory, an asphalt overlay could be placed over the existing pavement. It is possible that this overlay could be extended over part of the existing gutters to widen the travel lanes a foot or two, but the existing gutters do not extend the entire length of either street so the widening would not be uniform without additional work to widen the base of the road. Thus widening of the travel lanes to 10 feet should probably be postponed until the permanent curbs, sidewalks, and parallel parking are installed.

ATTACHMENT: 8/13/01 memo from Mohsen Salehi

cc: Town Attorney

Memo

To: Bill Spikowski

From: Mohsen Salehi

Date: August 13, 2001

Re: FMB 2nd & 3rd Streets One Way Pair Conversion to Two Way Operation

---

I visited the site and consulted with the Paul Theberge, who managed the construction of the One-Way Pair, on the phone, and John Davis on-site to discuss the issues related to the sought conversion and have the following findings and recommendations.

Generally, the early 90's One-Way Pair was secondary to drainage improvements and as such it was a byproduct of the drainage improvements and did not really fit into any local or even area wide traffic circulation improvements until the mid 90's when the One Way Pair was incorporated as a "given" into a proposed traffic circulation in the context of the Times Square project by the CRA consultant (i.e. SWTE). Additionally, it should be noted that the bike lanes and the partial sidewalks did not and do not lend themselves to any meaningful bike/ped. circulation pattern in Fort Myers Beach, and the 2nd and 3rd Streets one way operations themselves may inadvertently cause maneuvers in Crescent St., Old San Carlos (OSC)Blvd. and even the Times Square's Center St., 5th and Estero Blvd. which as unintended consequences of this One Way Pair are counterproductive for an efficient local traffic circulation.

Findings:

A) 2nd St. has a 50' right-of-way and extend for 380' from Crescent centerline to OSC centerline.

A1) According to the as built plans for the bridge, the centerline of 2nd St. right-of-way is located 46' - 21/4" from span 3 and 50' - 0¾" from span 5 of the Matanzas Pass Bridge supports.

A2) 2nd St. currently has 18' of pavement (centerlined 29' from the eastern edge of the ROW/Bay side) including 4' bike lane, 12' travel lane, and stripings) 3' valley gutter on either side except for the west side from OSC to the western (Gulf side) drainage inlet (approx. 150') due to the ROW encroachment by the OSC corner property on the west (i.e. landscaping and on-street parking)

A3) 2nd Street dead ends onto OSC and Crescent.

B) 3rd St. has 50' right-of-way and extends 480' from Crescent centerline to OSC centerline.

B1) The as built plans for the bridge indicate that the centerline of the 3rd St. ROW is located 44' - 2½" from span 1 and 52' - 9¾" from span 3 supports.

B2) 3rd St. has 18' of pavement (centerlined 29' from the eastern edge of the ROW (Bay side)(including 12' travel lane, and 4' bike lane & stripings) 3' valley gutter on either side except for the east and west side from OSC to the

drainage inlets (approx. 150') due to the ROW encroachment by the OSC corner property on the west (i.e. landscaping, on-street parking and dumpster).

B3) 3rd Street dead ends onto Crescent but resumes two way operation north of OSC.

C) Crescent Street two way operation (no pavement stripping) between 1st and 2nd takes place in less pavement than 2nd Street 18' pavement..

D) 3rd Street north of OSC intersection operates as a two way street with 20' pavement without pavement stripping..

Considering the above referenced findings there are a number of options for the conversion of the current One Way Pair to two way traffic are hereby recommended with various short term and long term, as well as aesthetic, safety and costs implications.

1) The most cost effective and short term, would obviously be the removal of the existing stripping and resume the two way operation. This would require either hydro-blasting (pressure washing) or grinding the stripping. The downside to this approach is that thermoplastic stripping even after grinding or hydro-blasting is still visible particularly when it rains.

2) Beside the removal of stripping option, an overlay (850-900 linear feet) maybe a better intermediate option until the implementation of OSC and Crescent Master Plan. This can be done either

   2a) In conjunction with the extension of the valley gutters to the areas where they're currently missing (approx. 450') and the use of 1' of gutter (similar to the treatment on Crescent between 1st and 2nd)on either side to yield 20' of pavement (more costly) for a two way operation, or

   2b) Without extending the valley gutters and with the use of 1' of gutters where present (moderate costs), or

   2c) Without extending the gutters or the use of portions of gutters (overlay cost only).

3) For a more substantial roadway improvement as part of the Master Plan's implementation for 2nd and 3rd Streets, and in the absence of curbs, for a typical 25 MPH speed limit a 12' clearance from the bridge supports are required. Considering the distance of these supports and despite the 4' offset between the ROW centerline and the pavement, this can be easily accomplished. With the inclusion of curbs as a roadway feature for 2nd and 3rd Streets, the 12' clearance requirement would no longer be applicable.

In any of the above options, sight distances should be revisited, particularly on the Crescent Street side, as well as the placement of "Yield" or "STOP" signs for the 2nd Street on the Crescent side and for the 3rd Street on the OSC side.

Please feel free to call me with any questions and comments that you may have.