



**Lee County MPO
Land Use Scenarios Project
Local Government and Agency Planning Staff Meetings Summary**

From September 16 to October 10, 2013, eight meetings were held with local government and agency staff in Lee County assumed to include the lead contacts during the course of the study who would participate in the day long “Planners Workshop” in December. Information provided prior to the meeting included a meeting agenda, and the following drafts for discussion: Goals and Objectives, Measures of Effectiveness, and Sample Palette of Place Types for Scenarios, Sample Rating and Weighting Scale for Illustrative Indicators (attached). These meetings were designed to describe the project scope and schedule, and to help with data collection, revisions to the goals, and explain how the scenarios would be created. A summary of these meetings are provided below.

City of Sanibel

Date/Time: September 16, 2013 3:00 – 4:00 PM
Location: Sanibel City Hall, 800 Dunlop Rd, Sanibel, FL 33958
Attendees: Judie Zimomra, City of Sanibel (City Manager)
 Keith Williams, City of Sanibel (Public Works Director)
 Jimmy Jordan City of Sanibel (Planning Director)
 Benjamin Pople, City of Sanibel (Planner & Lee MPO TAC)
 Johnny Limbaugh, Lee MPO
 Jennifer Willman, Jacobs
 Bill Spikowski, Spikowski Planning Associates

Comments:

We need better public access to water, like Fort Myers Riverwalk.
Are we looking at status quo with intervention and the resulting strategies? Response: By 2040, we will add half again the current population and jobs. Easy to say jobs will go to Cape Coral and Fort Myers since they are already platted. Lee County EAR proposed mixed use centers that are accessible by transit and roads, it's a fairly aggressive smart growth approach.
Sanibel's paper Future Land Use Map (FLUM) finally being converted to electronic. Check other wetlands not on the FLUM to add.
For the scenario, can intensify "Town Center/Civic Core Center" (see FLUM), but not anything else on Sanibel. [Sanibel is using the term "Civic Core" in planning literature.] Response: Place types can be customized to each City/Town – Sanibel can have their own “Town Center” place type if needed.

Why is this work being done differently this time? Response: Planners developed previous model input data on their own. This time, the policy makers will ultimately decide which scenario to put into the travel model.
In the Goals and Objectives, references to “bike/ped” would be better as “complete streets” to address the entire transportation network (see #3 and 4.5).
Although gas prices continue to rise, there seems to be no motivation for workers to carpool even with toll at \$6. Sanibel is not interested in mass transit.

City of Bonita Springs

Date/Time: September 17, 2013 1:30 – 2:30 PM
 Location: City Hall, 9101 Bonita Beach Rd, Bonita Springs, FL 34135
 Attendees: Jacqueline Genson, City of Bonita Springs (Planning and Zoning Manager)
 Arleen Hunter, City of Bonita Springs (Development Services Manager)
 Jay Sweet, City of Bonita Springs (Development Surveyor)
 Invited but unable to attend: Jennifer Hagen, City of Bonita Springs
 Don Scott, Lee MPO
 Jennifer Willman, Jacobs
 Bill Spikowski, Spikowski Planning Associates

Comments:

Neighborhood Convenience is a Future Land Use Category (FLUC) but not mapped; look at specific zoning resolutions.
Bonita Bay is a gated community. That won't change, but it has a commercial area that should be added.
There are Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) – might need to look at the site plans – some have commercial areas shown.
Also look at FLUC Village Mixed Use, could be added to intensity map.
Want to intensify US 41 commercial areas.
Downtown – new ordinance, map doesn't reflect it yet. Numbered zones (example: 6B mixed use up to 20 units per acre allowed). Jay will send the map.
A lot of property around the rail head could be used more intensely.
Barraco and Associates was hired to plan the east side of the City. Council meeting is tomorrow at 9am. This is the so-called Density Reduction/Groundwater Resource (DR/GR) designation area.
Interchange Commercial should be added to intensification map.
Liberty Youth Ranch will stay as is, very low density.
Golf course will have some infill and redevelopment.
Downtown may be able to aggregate parcels to build condos, as part of a multimodal plan and Transportation Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA). US 41 will stay 2 travel lanes; could widen to add median and on-street parking but not more lanes.
Until June 2008, Lee County was doing the planning work for Bonita Springs.
Bernwood project is on south side of Bonita Beach Road.

No comments on Goals and Objectives or Measure of Effectiveness.
Jennifer Hagen is the lead contact.
Logan Road, Village Road and Palmira Boulevard, have right-of-way reserved.
Is Collier included? Response: It is in the 4-step model, but not the land use scenario project.

City of Cape Coral

Date/Time: September 19, 2013 10:30 – 11:30 AM
 Location: Cape Coral City Hall, 1015 Cultural Park Blvd, Cape Coral, FL 33990
 Attendees: John Szerlag, City of Cape Coral (City Manager)
 Derek Burr, City of Cape Coral (Planning Manager)
 Persides Zambrano, City of Cape Coral (Principal Planner)
 Paul Dickson, City of Cape Coral (Department of Community Development, Acting Director)
 Dana Brunett, City of Cape Coral (Economic Development, Director)
 Rick Sosnowski, City of Cape Coral (Comprehensive Planning Team Coordinator)
 Johnny Limbaugh, Lee MPO
 Bill Spikowski, Spikowski Planning Associates
 Don Scott, Lee MPO
 Ned Baier, Jacobs

Comments:

City staff described the Cape Coral build-out plan developed two years ago; it includes low and high forecasts for build-out. This information should be considered; Bill will follow up with Derek Burr or Rick Sosnowski.
The new coastal high hazard area map includes the Cape Coral downtown Community Redevelopment Area (CRA).
The most current and adopted land use map for Cape Coral is for 2030.
Rick Sosnowski or Wyatt Daltry should be contacted to obtain the most current maps for Cape Coral.
Recommend that local government Economic Development Organizations (EDOs) be contacted and made aware of this study.
Recommend removing the “reserve area” from the Limitations Map because the latest utility expansion phasing plan has essentially replaced it.
What is the projected build-out population in the adopted 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)? Response: 1 million.

City of Fort Myers

Date/Time: September 20, 2013 2:00 – 3:00 PM
 Location: 1825 Hendry St, Fort Myers, FL 33901
 Attendees: Bob Gardner, City of Fort Myers (Community Development Director)
 Lynee Rodriguez, City of Fort Myers
 Nicole DeVaughn, City of Fort Myers
 Bill Spikowski, Spikowski Planning Associates

Ned Baier, Jacobs
 Don Scott, Lee County MPO
 Johnny Limbaugh, Lee County MPO

Comments:

From the City perspective, less county sprawl and more infill and density increases would allow more development to occur in Fort Myers; we strongly support that. Still, density cannot be forecasted too high. The Sample Palette of Place Types for Scenarios (Table 1) needs to be realistic for conditions in Fort Myers. Response: This is an example and will be updated for the situation here locally.
There are several Historic District located in Fort Myers. City staff recommends not showing density increases in the historic districts, since the City's efforts to protect and preserve should be respected. Response: We will make the change to the map to delete historic districts from the intensification map, and maybe add them to the limitation maps. For example, Dean Park has a national historic designation.
Discussion about land use development in the City and discussions underway. There is increasing talk of a spring training baseball park for the Washington DC Nationals, to replace the Red Sox that moved into the unincorporated County.
Brownfield discussion. These could be shown on the maps, but unclear if these should be shown as restrictive areas or redevelopment areas.
Shellie Watts is the City of Fort Myers contact for obtaining shape files and other GIS data.
Bob Gardner will be the City lead for the planners workshop.
Discussion about education (elected officials and the public) and public engagement for this study and the LRTP.
Discussion about Rail Feasibility Study and potential station locations.

Town of Fort Myers Beach

Date/Time: September 23, 2013 3:30 – 4:30 PM
 Location: Spikowski Planning Associates, 1617 Hendry St, Ste 416, Fort Myers, FL 33901
 Attendees: Josh Overmyer, Town of Fort Myers Beach (Planning Coordinator)
 Walter Fluegel, Town of Fort Myers Beach (Community Development Director)
 Bill Spikowski, Spikowski Planning Associates
 Ned Baier, Jacobs
 Don Scott, Lee County MPO
 Johnny Limbaugh, Lee County MPO

Comments:

Last year was a record for tourism. More dollars were spent and some hotel rates are up. Rates were as high as \$300 to \$400 per night in some of the more upscale hotels like those at the Pink Shell resort. More upscale tourists are attracted to the beach. European visitors want a transit connection between the airport and the beach and improvements to the bus trolley schedule and frequency.

Expansion occurring in downtown district on the beach should be noted on the intensification map, and possibly extend intensification map about one mile up the beach.
The Town is considering an incentive program for developers to voluntarily provide needed right-of-way in exchange for height and density credits. Example: Town recently negotiated right-of-way for a LeeTran bus trolley stop in front of a business that was expanding.
Regarding the new coastal high hazard maps and impacts on insurance requirements, 54% of active policies in the town are impacted. Flood insurance cost on one property increased from \$2,600 to \$13,500 per year. By 2015/2016, another set of new maps may take effect because LIDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) topographic data is now available. Also, the old maps were based on only four transects, requiring massive interpolation to set the flood boundaries.
Walter Fluegel will participate as the lead Fort Myers Beach contact for information and will also participate in the planners workshop.
Discussion about San Carlos Boulevard, the state highway connecting the bridge to beach and the impact of the trolley service. The one-way pair around Seafarer's (proposed in the last EAR) is the answer.
Safety and bike/ped improvements needed on the beach. Trolley lanes and improved frequency are part of the solution.
Councilman Bob Raymond wants to improve city funding of the bus trolley and wants direct service to the airport. He will propose this to council soon. However, the Mayor and others are less supportive of the bus trolley lane; they see road improvements as the answer to congestion.

Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council (SWFRPC)

Date/Time: September 24, 2013 9:00 – 10:00 AM

Location: 1926 Victoria Avenue, Fort Myers, FL 33901

Attendees: David Crawford, SWFRPC

Invited but unable to attend: Margaret Wuerstle, SWFRPC (Executive Director)

Bill Spikowski, Spikowski Planning Associates

Don Scott, Lee MPO

Johnny Limbaugh, Lee County MPO

Ned Baier, Jacobs

Comments:

Babcock Ranch has 17,000 units that will have major travel impacts in the region.
The Terraces in Bonita Springs will include smaller lot size and smaller houses in a "life care retirement community." DiVosta's Village Walk of Bonita Springs is another one. There is a big push with Sector Plans east of I-75. Hendry County: 25,000 acres and 20,000 units. King Ranch was discussed. Adjacent counties have many sector plans in development. Some concern if the regional transportation model will not forecast impacts from the sector plans on Lee County roads.

Three sector plans have been proposed in Hendry County. Hendry County planner Sara Catala should be contacted for more information.
Developments planned for near Florida Gulf Coast University (FGCU). North of university, 3,000 units are planned in a new urbanist research type of park. South of university, another research park. Housing is planned for east of the FGCU campus. A linear urban corridor is planned along I-75 and Hwy 41. The issue of sprawl in the eastern edge impacting the Everglades and other environmental areas exists. SR 80 is the major east/west corridor in the region where growth and development will occur along the new 4-lane highway improvements.
There are currently six Notice of a Proposed Change applications underway to amend approved Developments of Regional Impact.
Sector Plan developments are forecasting a huge internal capture. This may or may not be realistic. Most of the sector plans are ostensibly mixed use. Florida Department of Community Affairs (now Department of Economic Opportunity) Sector Plan responsibility was to review and comment, but with no ability to require changes to the plans. Sector plans are approved by County Commissions.
David offered to attend the planners workshop on behalf of SWFRPC with the approval of Executive Director Margaret Wuerstle.
Requested presentation to the SWFRPC in January, plus a later presentation of recommendations. Response: We will follow-up after discussing with Don Scott.
Americas Gateway Logistics Center planned near Moore Haven. A major distribution center (warehouses) for freight transferred between truck and rail and the Port of Miami. Facilities would include storage for Target, Amazon, Wal-Mart, etc. Little workforce population nearby. The trucks making deliveries will impact roads. Rail will transfer shipping containers.

Lee County

Date/Time: September 24, 2013 2:00 – 3:00 PM
Location: 1500 Monroe St, Fort Myers, FL 33901
Attendees: Michael Tisch, Lee County DOT (Transportation Project Manager)
Matt Noble, Lee County (Principal Planner)
Rick Burris, Lee County (Principal Planner)
Andy Getch, Lee County (Planning Manager-Transportation)
Paul O'Connor, Lee County (Planning Division Director)
Tessa LeSage, Lee County (Manager-Office of Sustainability)
Brandon Dunn, Lee County (Senior Planner-Community Development)
Anthony Palermo, Lee County (Senior Planner-Zoning)
Rebecca Sweigert, Lee County (Principal Environmental Planner)
Robert Price, Lee County (Development Services)
David Loveland, Lee County Department of Transportation (Director)
Kathie Ebaugh, Lee County Planning Division (Principal Planner)

Bill Spikowski, Spikowski Planning Associates
Ned Baier, Jacobs

Comments:

<p>Dave Loveland said we need to study transportation links throughout the County. The present LRTP does not do that. There seems to be an over-emphasis in some of the transit connections by the MPO in this study. For example, why is Cape Coral to Lehigh Acres identified as a possible scenario for transit links? Response: MPO's project goals include improving transit and reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Cape Coral and Lehigh Acres need to be linked to regional job centers in Fort Myers, not to each other.</p>
<p>There were several questions about how costs are calculated for transportation. Dave Loveland said there are some levels of service and cost policy discussion required in the discussion about the transportation scenarios. Andy Getch added that the current Lee MPO LRTP needs plan is \$3.6 billion. Don said that statewide (from 26 MPOs), needs exceed \$120 billion. Don said that the Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) is updating the statewide number transportation for unfunded needs to try to make it based on realistic projects and not just take the numbers from all the MPO needs plans and add them up.</p>
<p>Dave Loveland asked why the MPO prioritizes and programs maintenance money in the LRTP? Dave also asked why maintenance should be listed as a goal for the land use study; isn't that really a policy for the LRTP? Don Scott replied that maintaining what we have is a major priority for the MPO Board and all MPO plans need to reflect this.</p>
<p>Tessa LeSage spoke about priority projects around schools and safe routes to school.</p>
<p>There was more discussion about communicating the project goals. Consensus was reached that we all need to better clarify in our message to elected officials about this study's purpose and assumptions and how it's linked to the County Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR)/Comprehensive Plan (The Lee Plan) and the County's sustainability program. Communication is especially important with the Lee MPO TAC, CAC, and other committees.</p>
<p>Concern about developing a new vision. Hillsborough is not a good example for Lee County. The Lee MPO should study the transportation impacts from our adopted land use visions instead of creating new scenarios. Discussion about the INDEX tool and how we are developing alternative inputs to the regional transportation model.</p>
<p>Both the "Limitations" and "Intensification" maps need updating to reflect The Lee Plan. Response: We will update and work with County planners Kathie Ebaugh and Rick Burris understand the changes and maps.</p>

<p>Lee County describes scenarios in the EAR/Comprehensive Plan process and should be used in this process. The documents we provided reflect the EAR but not ongoing work in updating the Comprehensive Plan. Even though the new update has not been before the Board, do not base the MPO scenarios on what was previously approved. Kathie Ebaugh said to work with Rick Burris on this.</p>
<p>The final Comprehensive Plan elements are being presented to the County Local Planning Agency (LPA) incrementally. Parks, Vision, Historic Preservation were tentatively approved by the LPA yesterday. Other elements will be approved in 4 to 5 months. Then the whole plan update will be presented to the County Commission.</p>
<p>Response: Yes, we agree that the MPO's Land Use Scenario study needs to use the EAR and Comprehensive Plans from the County and Cities and that is why we are here today and will work with you closely to incorporate your plans. This MPO project is testing inputs into the FDOT regional model in a new and transparent way. The end result will be transportation projects and improvements that will improve transit and reduce VMT and help implement your land use plans. These are our study goals.</p>
<p>The County workshop participants will include Andy Getch and Matt Noble. Tessa and Kathie said they can participate if needed. Perhaps Rick Burris also.</p>
<p>Tessa asked about public involvement. She said that the County EAR process has held over 45 public meetings. She said the County EAR process has helped identify performance criteria for the sustainability process. Tessa said she will email County sustainability information that may be useful. Response: We will not repeat your public involvements process; it was done very well and we are relying on it.</p>
<p>Andy Getch said that the EAR/Comprehensive Plan has not been tested for transportation impacts. The projects and how it impacts the transportation system will be tested in the MPO Land Use Scenario project, and this analysis is needed badly.</p>
<p>Dave Loveland agreed that this is not a duplicative effort to the EAR and this effort will be researching the transportation impacts of scenarios through the model.</p>

FDOT, District 1

Date/Time: October 10, 2013 2:00 – 3:30 PM
Location: D1 SWAO, 10041 Daniels Parkway, Fort Myers, FL 33913
Attendees: Lawrence Massey, FDOT D1 (SIS Coordinator)
Wayne Gaither, Lee County (LeeTran Planner)
Bob Crawley, FDOT D1
Rax Jung, FDOT D1
Luis Ruiz, FDOT D1 (Intern)
Jerry Graham, Traf-O-Data
Babuji Ambikopathy, GMB Engineers & Planners

Invited but unable to attend: Carmen Monroy, FDOT D1
Don Scott, Lee MPO
Bill Spikowski, Spikowski Planning Associates
Ned Baier, Jacobs

Comments:

<p>Discussion about the limitations and intensifications maps. It was noted that the intensification map should reflect the developments planned along US 41 in north Lee County near the Charlotte County border (former Zemel property). We will make sure they are included.</p>
<p>What is the development shown at Pine Island Center? Response: It reflects the county's Future Land Use Map, which is tightly drawn around existing subdivisions, but because of the coastal high hazard area, perhaps Pine Island Center should be eliminated from this map.</p>
<p>Can this study consider stakeholders from adjacent counties? The surrounding area has many sector plans that forecast a huge amount of growth that will impact Lee County roads, such as Babcock Ranch in Charlotte County and three potential sector plans in Hendry County, one of which would create a new north-south road between SR 80 and SR 82. Response: The outside growth will certainly impact the regional transportation model, but not necessarily the land use in Lee County. The standard DRI build-out is about 50% of what was approved, and there is some reflection of the growth in the current 2035 MPO LRTP with a new east-west road extension to Lehigh Acres. The utility infrastructure in Cape Coral has resulted in the unintended consequence of leap frog development because homebuilders and owners were trying to avoid paying utility assessments. One of the scenarios could reflect the anticipated effects in Lee County of sector plans outside Lee County.</p>
<p>Bill Spikowski asked if FDOT can run alternative models of the scenarios to better understand impacts, since stakeholders have asked for model impact and infrastructure costs as two of the most important performance measures in selecting a preferred alternative. Don Scott added that he may be able to fund this task and ask Traf-O-Data to do this outside this task assignment.</p>
<p>Lawrence Massey said he will participate in the planners workshop. Bob Crawley and others said they want to be kept informed and will review information sent to them and provide comments.</p>
<p>Why does the previous LRTP model results visualization map show so much growth in the north county area near the Charlotte County line? Response: There is too much emphasis on growth in Cape Coral and too little in Lehigh Acres. This will be fixed in this scenario planning exercise. There has been an ongoing battle for population and employment growth between Cape Coral and Lehigh Acres, and an alternating over-representation of each community in the development of future forecasts.</p>



**Lee County MPO
Land Use Scenarios Project
Planning Staff Coordination**

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Scenarios Project Overview
3. Goals and Objectives
4. Measures of Effectiveness and Place Types
5. Concepts for Scenarios
6. Planners Workshop
7. Next Steps

Attachments

- DRAFT Goals and Objectives
- DRAFT Measures of Effectiveness

Contacts

- Jennifer Willman, Jacobs Engineering Group (813) 746-3395 jennifer.willman@jacobs.com
- Ned Baier, Jacobs Engineering Group (813) 746-3396 ned.baier@jacobs.com
- Bill Spikowski, Spikowski Planning Associates (239) 334-8866 bill@spikowski.com
- Don Scott, Lee MPO Executive Director (239) 330-2241 dscott@leempo.com



**Lee County MPO
Land Use Scenarios Project
DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION: Goals and Objectives**

This draft document is based in large part on the Lee Plan Evaluation and Appraisal Report. Revisions are anticipated after review comments are provided by stakeholders. The goals and objectives will then be formally reviewed and approved by the MPO's committees and board.

VISION STATEMENT: Lee County will be a highly desirable place to live, work, and visit—recognized for its commitment to a sustainable future characterized by a healthy economy, environment, and community. Lee County will be a community of choice—valued for its quality of life; varied natural environment; unique sense of history and place; distinct urban, suburban, and rural communities; diverse economy and workforce; and varied travel options.

1. **SCENARIOS GOAL FOR COUNTY-WIDE ISSUES:** To improve the quality of Lee County's unique mix of diverse vibrant communities, affordable pre-platted subdivisions, coastal waterways, and interior wetlands.
 - a) Increase employment and shopping opportunities in Cape Coral, Lehigh Acres, and North Fort Myers to minimize the need for residents to drive long distances for daily needs.
 - b) Provide convenient public transportation between Cape Coral and Lehigh Acres and the regional jobs centers between them.
 - c) Minimize haphazard building on remote pre-platted lots by focusing infrastructure improvements in clearly designated growth areas.
 - d) Recognize the differences and similarities between urban and suburban neighborhoods.
 - e) Discourage further development in vulnerable low-lying areas that are threatened by intense tropical storms and rising sea levels.
 - f) Limit new development in rural areas.
 - g) Link conservation areas together to restore natural water flows, allow wildlife movement, and improve the ability to manage and restore natural patterns.

2. **SCENARIOS GOAL FOR NEW MIXED-USE PLACES:** To introduce mixed-use activity centers to serve existing and planned residential neighborhoods.
 - a) Provide a wider range of options for housing types, shopping and dining, employment, transportation alternatives, and recreation/social venues to attract residents and jobs and create unique lively destinations throughout the county.
 - b) Focus on livability priorities such as walkable blocks, public transit, civic spaces, public services, and multiple street connections to surrounding neighborhoods.
 - c) Promote mixed-use activity centers at five different scales: regional, community, neighborhood, rural, and infill/redevelopment corridors:
 - i. Regional mixed-use centers serve county residents, visitors, businesses, institutions, and the surrounding region. These centers are larger and more intense than the others and often serve as transit hubs.

- ii. Community mixed-use centers serve nearby neighborhoods or an entire community. They may include a grocery store and a compact mix of housing, offices, and services and are typically served by public transit.
 - iii. Neighborhood mixed-use centers serve one or more neighborhoods and provide small-scale services and housing. They are compact and pedestrian-friendly and may be at the edge of a neighborhood or within it.
 - iv. Rural mixed-use centers provide services and some housing in rural or natural areas to reduce the need for rural residents or visitors to travel longer distances to meet their daily needs.
 - v. Mixed-use infill/redevelopment corridors can revitalize existing commercial strips over time. Enhanced pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections are supplemented with on-street parking.
3. **SCENARIOS GOAL FOR NEIGHBORHOODS AND STREETS:** To maintain Lee County’s healthy neighborhoods and revitalize or build others to higher standards of connectivity and convenience.
- a) Promote a more compact pattern of development in new and revitalized neighborhoods, with a greater variety of housing types for all income levels, ages, and preferences.
 - b) Provide additional services, jobs, transit, and other amenities in or near these neighborhoods.
 - c) Provide interconnected street networks in new neighborhoods that accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians.
4. **SCENARIOS GOAL FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION NETWORK:** To optimize the existing regional transportation network to improve existing shortcomings and respond to evolving preferences in living and travel patterns.
- a) Vary the physical characteristics of arterial and collector roads to match the surrounding context, which often includes urban, suburban, and/or rural areas along a single road.
 - b) Today’s arterial and collector network is too sparse to provide optimal regional connectivity. There is little opportunity to further widen roadways to provide additional capacity on this network. New road links in urban areas could improve connectivity, provide redundancy in potential travel routes, and shorten travel distances to many destinations.
 - c) Ensure funding for adequate maintenance of existing roads before committing to build additional major roads.
 - d) Reduce the number and length of automobile trips and vehicle-miles traveled and avoid planning new roads that draw development away from existing urban areas.
5. **SCENARIOS GOAL FOR PUBLIC TRANSIT AND OTHER TRAVEL MODES:** To provide a wider variety of transportation choices for Lee County’s diverse population.
- a) Create complete streets to accommodate walking, bicycling, and transit use along all roadway types (except for Interstate 75).
 - b) Improve public transportation in response to rising fuel prices, which are making longer trips less practical even for those owning cars.



Lee County MPO Land Use Scenarios Project DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION: Measures of Effectiveness

Measures of effectiveness, or indicators, will be selected based on the land use scenarios goals and objectives. These measures are primarily quantitative. The land use scenarios will be evaluated using these measures of effectiveness, as follows:

1. A series of “place types” will describe potential conditions in Lee County in the year 2040. The format will be similar to the sample palette of place types shown in “Table 1. Sample Palette for Scenarios - Horizon Year Goals by Place Type.” This table will be modified to suit Lee County.
2. New place types will be added to mirror proposals in local comprehensive plans. For instance:
 - Cape Coral: Commercial activity centers;
 - Lee Plan Evaluation and Appraisal Report: Regional, community, neighborhood, and rural mixed-use centers, and mixed-use infill/redevelopment corridors;
 - Lehigh Acres: Mixed-use nodes; and
 - Evolving ideas on transit-oriented development and downtown redevelopment.
3. The densities, ratios and standards for each place type will be customized to existing and potential Lee County conditions.
4. The INDEX model forecasts performance using numerical indicators. Potential indicators include:

DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development intensity• Development mix• Place type shares• Centeredness	TRANSPORTATION: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Street network• Transit stop coverage• Bike route coverage• Walkable area	ENERGY & GREENHOUSE GASES: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Energy use• Greenhouse gas emissions• Home-based VMT
---	---	--
5. A rating and weighting scale will be created to identify which indicators are most important to the communities in Lee County, and the weight that each indicator should be assigned relative to the others. The attached “Table 2. Sample Rating and Weighting (RAW) Scale for Illustrative Indicators” illustrates how the scale would be applied.
6. The land use scenarios will apply the adjusted place types to suitable locations in Lee County where change is likely or possible by 2040.
7. The INDEX model will create summary scores by computing the selected indicators for various scenarios and then adjusting them using the rating and weighting scale. Non-numerical qualitative measures will also be considered, for instance to assess which scenarios would require the greatest changes to existing plans and codes, and which would be more practical to achieve.
8. The preferred scenario that is selected by the MPO will become the basis of the future transportation vision in the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan.

Table 1. Sample Palette for Scenarios - Horizon Year Goals by Place Type

Place Type (paint)	Typical Land Area (acres)	Land Uses			Street Network (intersections /sq mi)	Transit Service (peak headway)			Bike routes (miles /sq mi)	VMT /Capita /Day
		Residential Density (DU/net ac)	Non-Residential Intensity (FAR)	Jobs/Housing Ratio		Standard Bus (1 hr)	Frequent Bus (30 min)	BRT or Rail (15 min)		
Open space/non-developable	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rural residential/agriculture	N/A	0.1	N/A	N/A	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	30
Outer neighborhood	N/A	5	0.25	0.1	100	N/A	N/A	N/A	15	28
Inner neighborhood	N/A	10	0.5	0.2	200	Yes	N/A	N/A	20	25
Neighborhood center	25	15	0.8	0.4	250	Yes	Yes	N/A	25	20
Transit station area -- Bus	125	15	0.8	0.5	250	Yes	Yes	N/A	30	18
Transit station area -- BRT/Rail	500	20	1	0.6	275	Yes	Yes	Yes	30	16
Town center	250	25	1.25	0.8	300	Yes	Yes	Yes	35	16
Regional center	500	30	1.75	1	325	Yes	Yes	Yes	40	16
Central city	N/A	50	3	1.2	350	Yes	Yes	Yes	50	14

Table 2. Sample Rating and Weighting (RAW) Scale for Illustrative Indicators

<i>Indicator:</i>	<u>Set Up:</u>				<u>Application:</u>						
	<i>Weighting Allocation to Indicators (must total 100)</i>	<i>Rating of Indicator Scores</i>			<i>Indicator Score in Original Units</i>	<i>→</i>	<i>Equivalent Rating (0 to 1)</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>Indicator Weight</i>	<i>=</i>	<i>Indicator RAW Score</i>
		<i>Positive Movement of Score</i>	<i>Worst Score (= 0)</i>	<i>Best Score (= 1)</i>							
Housing:											
Dwelling Density	10	Up	10	20	16	→	0.6	x	10	=	6
Distance to Transit	30	Down	2000	300	1250	→	0.6	x	30	=	17
Employment:											
Employee Density	10	Up	20	50	37	→	0.6	x	10	=	6
Distance to Transit	15	Down	2640	300	863	→	0.2	x	15	=	4
Parks:											
Distance to Housing	35	Down	2640	300	2300	→	0.9	x	35	=	30
	<hr/> 100										
										<hr/>	
										Overall Score:	62
										(0-100 scale)	