AGENDA
CMC
Congestion Management Committee
HYBRID IN-PERSON AND ZOOM VIRTUAL MEETING
IN-PERSON QUORUM REQUIRED
NOTE MEETING ROOM CHANGE:
Conference Room 609/610 GMD Planning & Regulation Building
2800 N Horseshoe Dr, Naples

Meeting ID: 839 1494 5323
Passcode: 326774

Please click here to be directed to the Zoom website, or you may dial in at 1-646-876-9923

January 20, 2021
2:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of September 16, 2020 Meeting Minutes
5. Open to Public for Comment on Items Not on the Agenda
6. Agency Updates
   A. FDOT
   B. MPO Director
   C. Other
7. Committee Action
   A. Elect Chair & Vice Chair
   B. Final Evaluation, Scoring and Ranking of Project Priorities
8. Reports and Presentations (May Require Committee Action)
9. Member Comments
10. Distribution Items (No presentation)
    A. 2021 Meeting Calendar
11. Next Meeting Date:
    Next Meeting Date: March 17, 2020 at 2 p.m.
    Hybrid: In-Person Quorum Required, Virtual Access Available via ZOOM
12. Adjournment

PLEASE NOTE:
This meeting of the Congestion Management Committee (CMC) of the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is open to the public and citizen input is encouraged. Any person wishing to speak on any scheduled item may do so upon recognition of the Chairperson. Any person desiring to have an item placed on the agenda shall make a request in writing with a description and summary of the item, to the MPO Director or CMC Committee Chair 14 days prior to the date of the next scheduled meeting of the CMC. Any person who decides to appeal a decision of this Committee will need a record of the proceedings pertaining thereto, and therefore may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person requiring special accommodations to participate in this meeting should contact the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization 72 hours prior to the meeting by calling (239) 252-5884. The MPO’s planning process is conducted in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Related Statutes. Any person or beneficiary who believes that within the MPO’s planning process they have been discriminated against because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, disability, or familial status may file a complaint with the Collier MPO by calling MPO Executive Director, Anne McLaughlin at (239) 252-5884 or by writing to Ms. McLaughlin at 2885 South Horseshoe Dr., Naples, FL 34104.
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE of the
COLLIER METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Via ZOOM

September 16, 2020
2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order

Mr. Khawaja called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Ms. McLaughlin called the roll and confirmed a quorum was present.

CMC Members Present
Tony Khawaja, Chairman, Collier County Traffic Operations
Tim Pinter, Vice-Chair, City of Marco Island (left early)
Karen Homiak, CAC Representative
Lorraine Lantz, Collier County Transportation Planning
Alison Bickett, City of Naples
Dr. Mort Friedman, BPAC Representative
Omar DeLeon, Public Transit Neighborhood Enhancement (PTNE)

CMC Members Absent
Dave Rivera, City of Naples
Dan Summers, Collier County Emergency Management
John Kasten, Collier County School District
Don Scott, Lee County MPO (non-voting)

MPO Staff
Anne McLaughlin, Executive Director
Karen Intriago, Administrative Assistant

Others Present
Victoria Peters, FDOT
Jennifer Marshall, FDOT
Pierre Beauvoir, Collier County Traffic Operations
Zachary Karto, PTNE
Jonathan Bass, Urban SDK
Drew Messer, Urban SDK
Justin Dennis, Urban SDK
Joseph Ciccarelli, Iteris
Anita Vandervalk, Iteris
3. Approval of the Agenda

Mr. Pinter moved to approve the agenda. Dr. Friedman seconded. Carried unanimously.

4. Approval of the July 15, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

Ms. Homiak moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Pinter seconded. Carried unanimously.

5. Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

None.

6. Agency Updates

A. FDOT

Ms. Peters – Last CMC meeting, discussed new applications. Mentioned newer GAP system accepting applications. Will not have to use new application for CMC projects and will not need to submit them to new GAP system. Applications will eventually be transitioned into GAP system. Draft tentative work program for 2022-2026 – currently working on now – should bring new tentative plan to Board during December 11, 2020 meeting. Draft tentative plan public hearings scheduled for December 7-11, 2020.

B. MPO Executive Director

Ms. McLaughlin – Working with Tindale Oliver on Local Road Safety Plan (“LRSP”). Hoped to have draft of Plan for CMC to review but did not receive in time. CAC/TAC will review at meetings scheduled for September 28, 2020 – will send out draft plan to CMC members for comment. Encouraged attendance through Zoom portal to see presentation. Will distribute draft when available and will send out links to Zoom presentations. Wally Blaine (Tindale Oliver) was able to work material into Transportation System Performance Report and include safety statistics as factor affecting congestion. Want safety represented in Long Range Transportation Plan. Tindale Oliver’s contract expires on November 5, 2020. Brief discussion regarding delay in generating report timely by Tindale Oliver.

C. Other

Ms. Bickett – None.

Mr. Pinter – None.


Ms. Lantz – Golden Terrace Elementary School in Golden Gate. Did not receive grant for project. A lot of competition. Will resubmit. Now known as Laverne Gaynor Elementary School.

7. Committee Action

A. Review Project Concept Sheets Submitted in Response to Call for Projects

Mr. Khawaja – 5 projects submitted (included in agenda packet). (1) Sidewalk on 91st Avenue N. between 41 and Vanderbilt. (2) Evaluation of Vanderbilt between Airport Pulling and Livingston. (3) ITS fiber optic project connecting devices to FPL. (4) ITS project to do vehicle detection at signalized intersections. (5) Timing project.

Ms. Lantz – Project 1 – for sidewalk project. Consulted with Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. Did not move forward with funding for last year’s call for projects. New evaluation criteria in TSPR applicable - project alleviates Vanderbilt Beach Rd congestion as parallel facility. Mercato is a major destination at the east side of the project. Requesting PE and construction. Submitted for Pathways SU box originally, feasibility study completed. Ms. McLaughlin – supports project and was disappointed when bike/ped committee felt it could not be pursued. Was over budget for priority list. Glad to see opportunity to bring it up again. Mr. Khawaja – Not enthusiastic about funding sidewalks with congestion management funds, but half of funding goes to ITS and half to bike path and facilities. Mr. Pinter – Agree. Only a 5 ft. sidewalk. Would expect 6-8 ft. as shared use function. Just sidewalk being funded. Ms. Lantz – Right-of-Way and drainage constraints precluded wider sidewalk and/or bike lanes. Brief discussion among members regarding clarity and scope of project.

Ms. Lantz – Project 2 – submitted as study then next level. Look at intersection and corridor. Can timing or technical improvements be made. Based on new requirements in CMP implementation matrix.

Mr. Beauvoir – for putting FPL power and fiber optics along various corridors for traffic count stations and PTZ cameras. Corridors include Airport Pulling, Collier Blvd., Golden Gate Blvd. – all arterial roads.

Mr. Beauvoir – vehicle detection. Currently have cameras that are fairly old – 2005-2007 – technology has changed. Looking to update cameras along several corridors in major locations. Actual locations in agenda packet materials. 73 total locations.

Mr. Beauvoir – timing of arterials for ATS in various locations. Rather than 39 intersections – it should be 52 intersections – but dollar amount remains the same.

Ms. McLaughlin – based on Ms. Otero’s review of the projects – it appears that all projects are eligible and total estimated cost falls within budgetary amount. In future, before another Call for
Projects issued, Committee should discuss how to incorporate hot spot congestion analysis in TSPR into other projects.

Ms. Peters – mentioned two projects from last round (ITS projects) that need funding. SU funds are available. (1) Moorings roundabout is in design for FY 2025. Will need constructions funds in FY 2027; (2) US 41 turning lane onto Golden Gate is in right of way in FY 2025. Will need construction funds in FY 2027. Would be eligible for funding consideration. Brief discussion among members regarding funding availability and SU funds. Ms. McLaughlin – projects are already on priority list. Nothing further to be done at this time.

Ms. Homiak made motion to move projects forward. Mr. Pinter seconded. Passed unanimously.

8. Reports and Presentations (May Require Committee Action)

A. FDOT Report on Current PD&E Studies


B. Reporting on Travel Time, Congestion Management Performance Measures – Two Vendors

Mr. Cicarelli – consultant with Iteris – two divisions of company: (1) focuses on hardware products/detection; (2) consultant division – Outback Hurricane – recently acquired. Develop performance measurement products including speed. Gave presentation in agenda packet. Explained relationship between Iteris SPM and ClearGuide for data collection and analysis. Gave detailed and thorough presentation using real-time examples of maps/traffic information. Historical data is available in system for 5-years. Information is available within 1 minute of actual status. Mr. Khawaja – interested in origin/destination – is data available. Mr. Ciccarelli – yes. Question is often asked. Have had discussions with different vendors and we think it is possible but have not had a client want to pursue it. Mr. Khawaja – is data for fleet vehicles versus passenger cars. Mr. Cicarelli – everything represented on current mapping is passenger vehicles. Brief discussion regarding types of data collected, how it is represented on the maps, and sources of data.

Mr. Dennis – consultant with Urban SDK. Introduced other consultants in attendance at meeting. Reviewed PowerPoint presentation in agenda packet. Mr. Messer – new company – first client in 2018. Data platform for FDOT for District 2 among other entities. Integrated mobility analytics software. Mr. Dennis – explained data harvesting including telemetry and IoT data sources. Services are specifically geared towards MPO needs. Data is refreshed every 15 minutes including traffic signals, traffic counts, bridge/pavement conditions, public transit, pedestrian (bike/ped) telemetry, roadway sensors, etc. All types of vehicles (commercial and
passenger) are recorded and data is counted. Provides origin/destination at traffic level or census traffic level. Gathered from carrier network and data partners. Can provide trips as well as pedestrian. Fleet vehicles as well or just general passenger vehicles. Gave demonstration of software capabilities. Statistics are obtained from integrated sources such as FDOT infrastructure and additional data is obtained using their platforms. Brief discussion concerning exactly what data is harvested from equipment and how it is categorized in statistical reporting.

9. Member Comments

None.

10. Distribution Items

N/A.

11. Next Meeting Date

November 18, 2020 – 2:00 p.m.  
TBD – Virtual or In-Person

12. Adjournment

There being no further comments or business to discuss, Mr. Khawaja adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.
Elect Chair and Vice-Chair

**OBJECTIVE:** For the Committee to elect a Chair and Vice-Chair for calendar year 2021.

**CONSIDERATIONS:** The CMC by-laws require that the Committee elect a Chair and Vice-Chair at the first regularly scheduled meeting of each year when a quorum is attained.

Any committee member may nominate or be nominated as Chair/Vice-Chair. Elections shall be decided by the majority vote of committee members present. The Chair and Vice-Chair shall serve a one-year term or until a successor is elected. Anthony Khawaja is the current Chair; Tim Pinter is the current Vice-Chair.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** That the Committee elect a Chair and Vice-Chair for calendar year 2021.

Prepared By: Anne McLaughlin, MPO Director
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
COMMITTEE ACTION
ITEM 7B

Final Evaluation, Scoring and Ranking of Project Priorities

OBJECTIVE: For the Committee to conduct a final review, scoring and ranking of project priorities.

CONSIDERATIONS: The Congestion Management Committee (CMC) reviewed 5 projects at the September CMC meeting and voted to move all projects forward for the next level of review. The submitted projects include:

1. 91st Ave N sidewalk construction
2. Vanderbilt Beach Road Corridor Study
3. ITS Fiber Optic and FPL Power Infrastructure
4. ITS Vehicle Detection Update/Installation at Signalized Intersections in Collier County
5. ITS ATMS Retiming of Arterials

MPO staff transmitted the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District One Priority Project Application and the Performance Measures checklist by email on November 5th. Both forms were due to be completed and returned to the MPO no later than close of business on January 4, 2021 in order to be considered for funding. The 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) approved by the Board on December 11, 2020 identifies a programming budget of roughly $5 million available in FY2027 for this Call for Projects. The MPO Board must approve project priority lists in June 2021.

The completed applications submitted by Collier County Transportation Planning are shown in Attachment 1. Applications submitted by Collier County Traffic Operations are shown in Attachment 2. MPO staff combined reporting for all 5 projects on a single Performance Measures Matrix, shown in Attachment 3. A Project Evaluation, Scoring & Ranking Matrix based on evaluation criteria and scoring which was distributed at the May meeting is provided in Attachment 4.

Project proponents will give a brief presentation on each application and respond to questions from the Committee. Committee members will then assign points to each application using the Project Evaluation, Scoring & Ranking Matrix and submit it to MPO staff who will tally the scores and report on the final ranking.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: For the Committee to conduct a final review, scoring and ranking of project priorities.

Attachments:
1. Collier County Transportation Planning Applications
2. Collier County Traffic Operations Applications
3. Performance Measures Matrix
4. Project Evaluation Scoring & Ranking Matrix

Prepared By: Anne McLaughlin, MPO Director
Please fill out this application completely. Please ensure all attachments are LEGIBLE. Applications containing insufficient information will not be reviewed by the FDOT.

Name of Applying Agency: Collier County BCC – Growth Management Division

Project Name: 91st Ave. North – Sidewalk from Vanderbilt Dr. to US41

Project Category:
Congestion Management □ ✔ TRIP □ CIGP □ SU Bike-Ped □

Transportation Alternative □ Transit/Modal □ SCOP □ SCRAP □

For more information on State Grant Programs (CIGP, SCOP, SCRAP, TRIP) please click here.

Is applicant LAP certified? Yes ✔ No □

Is project on State Highway System? Yes □ No ✔
If the project is off the state system and the applicant is LAP certified the project will be programmed as a LAP project.

Is the roadway on the Federal Aid Eligible System? Yes □ No ✔
If yes, provide Federal Aid roadway number: enter text. If no, give local jurisdiction: The project is on local roadways within Collier County, Florida. Click here to enter text. http://www.fdot.gov/statistics/fedaid/

Detailed Project Limits/Location:
91st Ave. North – Vanderbilt Drive to US 41 – approximately 1 mile south to north or west to east. Include jurisdiction (city/county), project length, attach a labeled project, map.

This project is for the construction of a new east/west sidewalk in the area of Collier County known as Naples Park along south side of 91st Ave. from Vanderbilt Dr. to US 41 (approximately 1 mile). The sidewalk will connect to the existing sidewalk adjacent to US 41 to bicycle and pedestrian facilities along Vanderbilt Dr.
Discuss how this project is consistent with the MPO/TPO Long Range Transportation Plan?

Page Number (attach page from LRTP): Click here to enter text.

This project is included in the MPO’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, in various appendices and numerous public comments. Citizens have requested this project because there are currently insufficient and gaps in existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the area and for safety reasons. The project is in the vicinity of an elementary school, in the vicinity of transit and located in an Environmental Justice area.

This project is also included in the MPO’s Naples Park Walkable Community Study completed in August 2013. Only the Tier 1 projects were given a priority based on the singular priority of school-related safety. All other segments were listed and not prioritized. 91st Ave. N from Vanderbilt Dr. to US41 was noted as having a Level of Service D.

Discuss the project in the local jurisdiction’s Capital Improvement Plan?

(Attach page from CIP): Click here to enter text. This project is not budgeted in the Collier County CIP at this time. Full funding is being requested by this application.
**Project Description**

Phase(s) requested:

Planning Study □   PD&E □   PE ✔   ROW □   CST ✔   CEI ✔

Project cost estimates by phase (Please include detailed cost estimate and documentation in back-up information):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase (PD&amp;E, ROW, PE, CST)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Matching Local Funds</th>
<th>Local Fund Source</th>
<th>Type of Match (Cash, in-kind)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$73,900</td>
<td>$73,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>$492,700</td>
<td>$492,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEI</td>
<td>$73,900</td>
<td>$73,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Phase] [Number] [Number] [Number] [Fund Source] [Match Type]

Total Project Cost: $ 640,500.00

**Project Details:** Clearly describe the existing conditions and the proposed project and desired improvements in detail. Please provide studies, documentation, etc., completed to-date to support or justify the proposed improvements. Include labeled photos and maps. (Add additional pages if needed):

91st Avenue North serves as a local road for the adjacent residential community and measures over 4 blocks in length, extending from Vanderbilt Drive to U.S. 41 and offers accessibility for its residents to surrounding businesses and stores. Currently there are no pedestrian facilities to accommodate the volume of pedestrian traffic along the corridor. The addition of a 5-ft sidewalk on the south side of the roadway is recommended. This would give residents the ability to travel to businesses as well as the beach, which is in close proximity, and would decrease the traffic on nearby roadways.

**Corridor Description**

91st Avenue N is an east-west roadway which extends from Vanderbilt Drive to the west and terminates at U.S. 41 to the east. Along the project limits, 91st Avenue N is a two-lane undivided roadway with 10-ft travel lanes with residential houses located along the north side of the roadway. Existing open swales serve as drainage and are located to the north and south of the corridor. The posted speed limit within the project limits is 25 mph.

The attached 2019 County Wide Non-Motorized Pathway Constructability Study was completed to support the County’s submission and feasibility of the proposed sidewalk.
**Constructability Review**

For items 2-9 provide labeled and dated photos (add additional pages if needed)

1. Discuss other projects (ex. drainage, utility, etc.) programmed (local, state or federal) within the limits of this project?
   - If programmed by the MPO/FDOT, the design and construction is expected to be approximately 5 years into the future. Transportation Planning has been and will continue to coordinate with the on-going stormwater and utility projects in the Naples Park vicinity. Once fully funded, the design and construction are feasible within 24 months.

2. Does the applicant have an adopted ADA transition plan?  
   - Yes ✔  
   - No □

Identify areas within the project limits that will require ADA retrofit. (Include GIS coordinates for stops and labeled photos and/or map.)

- There are no transit stops located within the project but there are four in the immediate vicinity of the project.

- Collier Area Transit Bus Stop ADA Assessment Final Report Dated October 15, 2014. There are two transit stops located near the project limits, however they are located on US41 and not on the road segment listed in this project.
• It was observed that there is an absence of detectable warnings at some of the sidewalk ends. To be compliant with the ADA, it is recommended that detectable warnings be added throughout the project limits at all sidewalk ends and/or crosswalks.

3. Is there a rail crossing along the project? Yes ☐ No ☑
   What is the Rail MP?
   Enter MP

4. Are there any transit stops/shelters/amenities within the project limits? Yes ☐ No ☑
   How many? Click here to enter text
   • There are no transit stops located within the project.
   Stop ID number: Click here to enter text.

5. Is the project within 10-miles of an airport? Yes ☑ No ☐
   • The project is approximately 7 miles from the Naples Municipal Airport.

6. Coordinate with local transit and discuss improvements needed or requested for bus stops?
   (add additional pages if needed):
   • As discussed above, Collier Area Transit (CAT) bus Route #11 is in the vicinity of the project but does not have stops within the project limits.
Location Map of CAT bus Route #11 and 4 closest stops to the Project.
Stop #36 – US 41 and 93rd Ave. N.
Stop #26 and Stop #37 – US 41 and Vanderbilt Beach Road
Stop #27 – US 41 and Mercato

7. Are turn lanes being added? Yes □ No ✓
If yes, provide traffic counts, length, and location of involved turn lanes.
Click here to enter text.

8. Drainage structures:

Please see the 2019 County Wide Pathway Constructability Study and Conceptual Planning Level Cost Estimate. These documents thoroughly describe the existing site conditions, the design parameters, constructability, project cost estimates, permitting and Long Range Transportation Planning.

- Number of culverts or pipes currently in place:
  - The Conceptual Planning Level Cost Estimate (referenced above and attached) includes a summary of the pay items and the descriptions.
Additional specifications and information to be determined during final design.

- The existing drainage for 91st Ave. N from Vanderbilt Drive to U.S. 41 consists of sheet flow from the crowned roadway across grassed shoulder into the adjacent roadside swales. All drainage patterns should be maintained with any future pedestrian improvements. The runoff from the roadway should continue to sheet flow into the adjacent swale. Proposed modifications to the drainage facilities would likely include possible reconstruction of some of the driveway culverts, and piping sections of swale. All drainage modifications should be made to provide equivalent conveyance. No drainage or treatment impacts are expected from this project.

- Based on the above drainage and environmental features, it is our understanding that the project qualifies for a SFWMD exemption under F.A.C. Rule 62.330-051(4)(c)4.a or F.A.C. Rule 62.330-051(10) for the proposed sidewalk. It is highly recommended that verification of qualification to conduct an exempt activity is received from SFWMD as described in F.A.C. Rule 62-330.050(2).

- Discuss lengths and locations of each culvert along the roadway:
  - Additional information regarding the design of the project will be available after the design.

- Discuss the disposition of each culvert and inlet. Which culverts are “to remain” and which are to be replaced, upgraded, or extended?
  - Additional information regarding the design of the project will be available after the design.

- Discuss drainage ditches to be filled in? (Discuss limits and quantify fill in cubic yards)
  - Additional specifications and information will be determined during final design. All existing drainage conveyances will be maintained and/or replaced in-kind as part of the project.

- Describe the proposed conveyances system (add additional pages if needed.)
  - Additional specifications and information will be determined during final design.

- Are there any existing permitted stormwater management facilities/ponds within the project limits? Yes ☐ No ☑

- If yes, provide the location and permit number (add additional pages if needed) Click here to enter text.
• Discuss proposed stormwater management permits needed for the improvements.

  • The existing drainage for 91st Ave. N from Vanderbilt Drive to U.S. 41 consists of sheet flow from the crowned roadway across grassed shoulder into the adjacent roadside swales. All drainage patterns should be maintained with any future pedestrian improvements. The runoff from the roadway should continue to sheet flow into the adjacent swale. Proposed modifications to the drainage facilities would likely include possible reconstruction of some of the driveway culverts, and piping sections of swale. All drainage modifications should be made to provide equivalent conveyance. No drainage or treatment impacts are expected from this project.

  • Additional specifications and information to be determined during final design. Based on the anticipated project impacts, an Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) modification or new ERP will likely be required.

• List specific utilities within project limits and describe any potential conflicts (add additional pages if needed):

  • Additional utility information is provided in the 2019 County Wide Pathway Constructability Study.

  • Based on the visual inspection performed during the site visit, it is recommended that a 5-ft concrete sidewalk be constructed at the southeast corner of the intersection and have an offset of 3-ft from the edge of pavement. To construct the sidewalk, it is recommended that existing signage, fiber optic cable, and utilities on the south side of the corridor be relocated to not affect the proposed sidewalk boundaries.

  • At U.S. 41 it is recommended that the proposed 5-ft sidewalk maintain the 3-ft offset from the edge of pavement. There is an existing sidewalk of the west side of U.S. 41. It is recommended that the proposed sidewalk be connected to the existing sidewalk.

  • There is existing signage and a possible utility conflict within the 5-ft sidewalk boundary. To construct the proposed sidewalk, it is recommended that the signage be adjusted accordingly and the utilities either be relocated or incorporated into the proposed sidewalk.
91st Ave. N. and Vanderbilt Drive Sidewalk Alignment

91st Ave. N. and US 41 Sidewalk Alignment
91st Ave. N. and US 41 Sidewalk Alignment and Utility Conflict

- Discuss Bridges within project limits?
  - There are no bridges within the project limits.

- Can bridges accommodate proposed improvements? Yes □ No □
  If no, what bridge improvements are proposed? (Offset and dimensions of the improvements, add additional pages if needed):

9. Has Right-of-way (ROW), easements, or ROW activity already been performed/acquired for the proposed improvements? If yes, please provide documentation

Yes ✔ No □

If ROW or Easements are needed detail expected area of need (acreage needed, ownership status):

  No additional ROW or easements are anticipated as part of the project.
  Click here to enter text.

10. Discuss required permits (ERP, Drainage, Driveway, Right of Way, etc.): Please refer to the 2019 County Wide Pathway Constructability Study section 5.5 Permitting related to the SFWMD and Environmental.

  No wetlands were identified within the alignment corridor during desktop review or the
September 4, 2019 site review. As such, wetland permitting with the SFWMD and USACE is not anticipated for the proposed alignment. No listed species utilization was observed within the proposed pathway corridor during the preliminary site review. Additionally, review of the FWC Eagle Nest Locator indicates there are currently no known bald eagle nests located within 660 feet of the proposed alignment. The project is located within the FWS FBB Consultation Area. However, during the site review no potential roosting habitat was located within the project area. Based on no potential roosting habitat being found within the project area and the project being less than 50 acres, the FWS Consultation Key indicates the project “may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect” the FBB and therefore does not require consultation with the FWS for effects on the FBB. The maintained right-of-way generally does not provide optimal habitat for listed species utilization. However, species such as the gopher tortoise and burrowing owl have been known to utilize disturbed areas such as a road right-of-way. As such, pre-construction surveys for listed species are recommended within 90-days of construction related activities. Should it become necessary to move listed species from the project area at that time, appropriate permits will need to be obtained from the applicable wildlife agencies to conduct required relocations.

If none are needed, state the qualified exemption:

Click here to enter text.

11. Are there any wetlands within the project limits? Yes □ No ✓

If yes, list the type of wetlands, estimated acreage and if mitigation will be required. Please note whether the project is within the geographic service area of any approved mitigation banks. Provide any additional information:

No wetlands were identified within the alignment corridor during desktop review or the September 4, 2019 site review.

12. Are there any federal or state listed/protected species within the project limits? Yes □ No ✓

If yes, list the species and what, if any mitigation or coordination will be necessary:

The maintained right-of-way generally does not provide optimal habitat for listed species utilization. However, species such as the gopher tortoise and burrowing owl have been known to utilize disturbed areas such as a road right-of-way. As such, pre-construction surveys for listed species are recommended within 90-days of construction related activities. Should it become necessary to move listed species from the project area at that time, appropriate permits will need to be obtained from the applicable wildlife agencies to conduct required relocations. In order to avoid any taking of listed species that may move into the project area in the future, it is recommended that pre-construction surveys for the presence of listed species be conducted within 9-days of construction-related activities.

If yes, discuss critical habitat within the project limits: Click here to enter text.
13. Discuss whether any prior reviews or surveys have been completed for historical and archaeological resources (include year, project, results)

None.

14. Are any Recreational, historical properties or resources covered under section 4(f) property within the project limits? Yes □ No ✔
   (Provide details) Click here to enter text.

15. Discuss whether any prior reviews or surveys have been completed for sites/facilities which may have potential contamination involvement with the proposed improvements. This should include a discussion of locations which may directly impact the project location or be which may be exacerbated by the construction of the proposed improvements. None.

16. Are lighting improvements requested as part of this project? Yes □ No ✔
   Please provide a lighting justification report for the proposed lighting. Click here to enter text.

17. Is a mid-block crossing proposed as part of the project? Yes □ No ✔
   If yes, please provide the justification for mid-block crossing. Click here to enter text.

Required Attachments

A. Detailed Project Scope with Project Location Map with sufficient level of detail (Please include typical section of proposed improvements)
B. Project Photos – dated and labeled (this is important!)
C. Detailed Cost Estimates including Pay Items
D. LRTP and Local CIP page
E. Survey/As-builts/ROW documentation/Utility/Drainage information
F. Detailed breakdown of ROW costs included in estimate (if ROW is needed/included in request or estimate)
Applicant Contact Information

Agency Name: Collier County Board of County Commissioners  
Mailing Address: 2685 S. Horseshoe Dr., Suite 103, Naples, FL 34104  
Contact Name and Title: Lorraine Lantz, AICP; Principal Planner  
Email: Lorraine.Lantz@CollierCountyFL.gov  
Phone: (239) 252-5779  
Signature: [Signature]  
Date: [Date]  
Your signature indicates that the information included with this application is accurate.

Maintaining Agency: Collier County Board of County Commissioners  
Contact Name and Title: Trinity Scott, Transportation Planning Manager  
Email: Trinity.Scott@CollierCountyFL.gov  
Phone: (239) 252-5832  
Signature: [Signature]  
Date: [Date]  
Your signature serves as a commitment from your agency to maintain the facility requested.

MPO/TPO: Collier MPO  
Contact Name and Title: Anne McLaughlin, Executive Director  
Email: Anne.McLaughlin@CollierCountyFL.gov  
Phone: (239) 252-5884  
Signature: [Signature]  
Date: [Date]  
Your signature confirms the request project is consistent with all MPO/TPO plans and documents, is eligible, and indicates MPO/TPO support for the project.
Additional required Questions and Answers

1. Project Relationship to Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP) (Demonstrate where/how project is Identified in the Network Needs analysis (Chapter 5) – provide page number, table, map, appendices if relevant, and/or identified in local plan adopted by reference, specify which Plan)

   As mentioned above regarding consistency, this project is included in the MPO’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, in various appendices and numerous public comments. Citizens have requested this project because there are currently insufficient pedestrian facilities to Mercato and for safety reasons. The project is in the vicinity of an elementary school, in the vicinity of transit and located in an Environmental Justice area.

2. If this is a design and/or construction project, describe how it addresses the Design Guidelines in Chapter 6 of the BPMP. (attach pages or documentation if needed.)

   The design of this project will utilize the two FDOT publications, the current edition of the Florida Greenbook and the Florida Design Manual, mentioned in Chapter 6 of the BPMP.

3. Describe how this project is consistent with the policies contained in Chapter 7 of the BPMP. (Attach additional pages or documentation if needed.)

   This project focuses on building a convenient multimodal network, public safety, and connectivity.
A. Detailed Project Scope with Project Location Map with sufficient level of detail (Please include typical section of proposed improvements)

Please see the 2019 County Wide Pathway Constructability Study (Location No. 2) and Conceptual Planning Level Cost Estimate. These documents thoroughly describe the existing site conditions, the design parameters, constructability, project cost estimates, permitting and Long Range Transportation Planning.

B. Detailed Cost Estimates including Pay Items

Please see the 2019 County Wide Pathway Constructability Study (Location No. 2 – 91st Ave. N. from Vanderbilt Dr. to US 41) and Conceptual Planning Level Cost Estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design / Permitting*</td>
<td>$73,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway Construction</td>
<td>$492,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration / CEI**</td>
<td>$73,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$640,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumed Approximately 15% of Construction Related Cost
**Assumed Approximately 15% of Construction Related Cost

C. Project Photos – dated and labeled (this is important!)

Please see the 2019 County Wide Pathway Constructability Study. This document includes proposed typical sections, site maps and project photos.
Figure 5-8: 91st Avenue N and 8th Street N Sidewalk Alignment and Drainage (East)

Figure 5-9: 91st Avenue N and Rear Entrance at 9051 Tamiami Trail N Sidewalk Alignment and Crosswalk
Figure 5-10: 91st Avenue N and Main Entrance at 9051 Tamiami Trail N Sidewalk Alignment and Crosswalk

Figure 5-11: 91st Avenue N and Main Entrance at 9051 Tamiami Trail N Sidewalk Alignment (East)
The following charts, graphs and information is derived from the Collier County Crash Data Management System in December 2020.
D. LRTP and Local CIP page

Table E5-6. Collier MPO 2045 LRTP Cost Feasible Plan Projects – FDOT Other Roads Projects and Local Roadway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Links From</th>
<th>Links To</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Project Cost (in millions)</th>
<th>FDOT Funding (in millions)</th>
<th>Other Roads Funding (in millions)</th>
<th>Total Non-MPO Match (in millions)</th>
<th>Total Non-MPO (in millions)</th>
<th>Total Exp (in millions)</th>
<th>MPO Share</th>
<th>Other Roads Share</th>
<th>Status and Year of Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$945.75</td>
<td>$231.92</td>
<td>$722.83</td>
<td>$24.79</td>
<td>$970.54</td>
<td>$76.24</td>
<td>$970.54</td>
<td>$76.24</td>
<td>$112.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$945.75</td>
<td>$231.92</td>
<td>$722.83</td>
<td>$24.79</td>
<td>$970.54</td>
<td>$76.24</td>
<td>$970.54</td>
<td>$76.24</td>
<td>$112.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E5-6. Collier MPO 2045 LRTP Cost Feasible Plan Projects – FDOT Other Roads Projects and Local Roadway Projects (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Links From</th>
<th>Links To</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Project Cost (in millions)</th>
<th>FDOT Funding (in millions)</th>
<th>Other Roads Funding (in millions)</th>
<th>Total Non-MPO Match (in millions)</th>
<th>Total Non-MPO (in millions)</th>
<th>Total Exp (in millions)</th>
<th>MPO Share</th>
<th>Other Roads Share</th>
<th>Status and Year of Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$945.75</td>
<td>$231.92</td>
<td>$722.83</td>
<td>$24.79</td>
<td>$970.54</td>
<td>$76.24</td>
<td>$970.54</td>
<td>$76.24</td>
<td>$112.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$945.75</td>
<td>$231.92</td>
<td>$722.83</td>
<td>$24.79</td>
<td>$970.54</td>
<td>$76.24</td>
<td>$970.54</td>
<td>$76.24</td>
<td>$112.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Diagram showing cyclists and pedestrian crashes by year of cash]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Notes</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
<th>FY2023</th>
<th>FY2024</th>
<th>FY2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- "A" = Auto Construction
- "D" = Study/Draft Design
- "M" = Remedial D = Construction R = RENW

**Abbreviations:**
- ACMS = Access Control System
- DS = Design Services
- ES = Environmental Services
- GE = Geotechnical Engineering
- I = Infrastructure
- R = Roadway
- RD = Roadway Design
- RE = Roadway Engineering
- SM = Survey, Mapping, and CAD
- SSM = System Safety Management
- W = Weather

**The Rural Landfill:** Food waste generated towards deforestation, bridges, and infrastructure improvements.

**Results:**
- **Year:** 2021
- **Streets:** 1,514
- **Bridges:** 1,703
- **Other Infrastructure:** 982
- **Total:** 4,207
F. Detailed breakdown of ROW costs included in estimate (if ROW is needed/included in request or estimate)

This Project is expected to keep within the existing right-of-way and not require any additional right-of-way acquisition.
Please fill out this application completely. Please ensure all attachments are LEGIBLE. Applications containing insufficient information will not be reviewed by the FDOT.

Name of Applying Agency: Collier County BCC – Growth Management Division

Project Name: Vanderbilt Beach Road Corridor Study from Airport-Pulling Rd. to Livingston Rd.

Project Category:
- [ ] Congestion Management
- [ ] TRIP
- [ ] CIGP
- [ ] SU Bike-Ped __
- [ ] Transportation Alternative
- [ ] Transit/Modal
- [ ] SCOP
- [ ] SCRAP

For more information on State Grant Programs (CIGP, SCOP, SCRAP, TRIP) please click here.

Is applicant LAP certified?  Yes ☑️  No ☐

Is project on State Highway System?  Yes ☐  No ☑️

If the project is off the state system and the applicant is LAP certified the project will be programmed as a LAP project.

Is the roadway on the Federal Aid Eligible System?  Yes ☑️  No ☐

If yes, provide Federal Aid roadway number: # 03512000

enter text. If no, give local jurisdiction: Collier County, Florida. Click here to enter text.

http://www.fdot.gov/statistics/fedaid/

Detailed Project Limits/Location:

Vanderbilt Beach Road (VBR) – Airport-Pulling Road to Livingston Road – approximately 1 mile

south to north or west to east. Include jurisdiction (city/county), project length, attach a labeled project, map.

The general objective for this project is to contract with a consultant to provide professional Transportation planning/engineering and technical support to Collier County Transportation Planning staff in order to evaluate the current and future levels of traffic congestion within the VBR corridor, and to identify and evaluate potential improvements to reduce congestion within the corridor. This project should also consider all multi-modal aspects of the roadway including coordination with transit and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The project will also include utility coordination and analysis. The result of the study will be draft conceptual plans and cross sections which define typical sections, ROW widths, utility needs and potential pond sites (if necessary). It is expected that an engineer will be able to use the concept plans to develop the draft 30% plans.
Intersections:
1. Airport-Pulling Rd.
2. Tiburon Dr.
3. Groves Rd.
4. Livingston Rd.

A study of the corridor will look at the physical roadway capacity now and, in the future, and determine ways to enhance or improve the corridor. The study is intended to include intersection analysis as recommended in Action Item #2 on page 3-10 and will follow the FDOT Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) or the most current evaluation tools. The study tasks will include:

1. Traffic Data Collection
2. Land Use Data Collection
3. Existing Conditions and LOS Analysis
4. Future Conditions LOS Analyses
5. Identification and Evaluation of Alternatives
6. Public Involvement Activities

Discuss how this project is consistent with the MPO/TPO Long Range Transportation Plan?
Page Number (attach page from LRTP): An intersection improvement at VBR and Livingston Rd. is included in the 2045 LRTP Needs plan on page ES-15 and the Cost Feasible Plan – Partially Funded Projects (FY2026-2045) on page ES-32, it is also found on page 4-37 and 6-9. An intersection improvement at VBR and Airport-Pulling Rd. is listed as a Need on page ES-16, 4-38 and 6-18. The 2045 LRTP was adopted by the MPO on December 11, 2020.

This project is included in the MPO’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, in various appendices and numerous public comments. Citizens indicated that VBR does not feel safe to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Locality Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Project Cost (M) FY2025</th>
<th>FY Funding 2022-2025 (M)</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Planned FY2026-2028 (M)</th>
<th>Planned FY2029-2031 (M)</th>
<th>Planned FY2032-2034 (M)</th>
<th>Total Cost 2023-2034 (M)</th>
<th>Total DB Costs (M)</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agricultural Rd</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
<td>Agricultural Rd</td>
<td>$3,474.20</td>
<td>$1,716.67</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$1,357.53</td>
<td>$206.90</td>
<td>$1,357.53</td>
<td>$12,825.70</td>
<td>$5,200.00</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Big Cypress Blvd</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
<td>Big Cypress Blvd</td>
<td>$3,566.56</td>
<td>$2,035.98</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$1,348.64</td>
<td>$206.90</td>
<td>$1,348.64</td>
<td>$13,224.90</td>
<td>$5,600.00</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pinelake Rd</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
<td>Pinelake Rd</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42A</td>
<td>Airport Access Rd</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
<td>Airport Access Rd</td>
<td>$1,254.46</td>
<td>$724.74</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$529.79</td>
<td>$89.90</td>
<td>$529.79</td>
<td>$5,544.46</td>
<td>$2,218.80</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42B</td>
<td>Airport Access Rd</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
<td>Airport Access Rd</td>
<td>$1,254.46</td>
<td>$724.74</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$529.79</td>
<td>$89.90</td>
<td>$529.79</td>
<td>$5,544.46</td>
<td>$2,218.80</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Golden Gate Dr</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
<td>Golden Gate Dr</td>
<td>$710.76</td>
<td>$405.01</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$295.63</td>
<td>$53.90</td>
<td>$295.63</td>
<td>$2,511.76</td>
<td>$995.00</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Evergreen St</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
<td>Evergreen St</td>
<td>$127.25</td>
<td>$71.40</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$55.85</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$55.85</td>
<td>$534.25</td>
<td>$214.00</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Collier Blvd</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
<td>Collier Blvd</td>
<td>$168.88</td>
<td>$98.27</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$70.61</td>
<td>$12.90</td>
<td>$70.61</td>
<td>$801.88</td>
<td>$320.40</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Collier Blvd</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
<td>Collier Blvd</td>
<td>$168.88</td>
<td>$98.27</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$70.61</td>
<td>$12.90</td>
<td>$70.61</td>
<td>$801.88</td>
<td>$320.40</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Collier Blvd</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
<td>Collier Blvd</td>
<td>$168.88</td>
<td>$98.27</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$70.61</td>
<td>$12.90</td>
<td>$70.61</td>
<td>$801.88</td>
<td>$320.40</td>
<td>Collier Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Partially funded for construction
- FY Funding includes R&D and design
- Project End Date
- Right of Way
- Construction
- Year of Expenditure

Collier MPO 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan

Chapter 6 Cost Feasible Plan
### Table 6-9. Collier County 2045 LRTP - Unfunded Roadway Needs Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Blvd.</td>
<td>Painted Leaf Ln.</td>
<td>Green Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Veterans Memorial Blvd.</td>
<td>Strand Blvd.</td>
<td>I-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Big Cypress Parkway Intersection (new)</td>
<td>Oil Well Grade Rd.</td>
<td>Big Cypress Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Green Blvd. Extension</td>
<td>Everglades Blvd.</td>
<td>Collier Blvd. (CR 951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd. (CR 846) Intersection</td>
<td>Collier Blvd. (CR 951)</td>
<td>Big Cypress Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>I-75 (SR-93) Interchange (new)</td>
<td>Veterans Memorial Blvd.</td>
<td>Woods Edge Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Vanderbit Dr.</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd.</td>
<td>Woods Edge Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Golden Gate Parkway (Intersection)</td>
<td>Goodlette-Frank Rd.</td>
<td>Goodlette-Frank Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Road (Intersection)</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd.</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Collier Boulevard (Intersection)</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd.</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy.</td>
<td>Collier Blvd.</td>
<td>Collier Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Vanderbit Beach Rd.</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd.</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd.</td>
<td>Goodlette-Frank Rd.</td>
<td>Goodlette-Frank Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd.</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd.</td>
<td>Orange Blossom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd.</td>
<td>Orange Blossom</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd.</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy.</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd.</td>
<td>Radi Rd.</td>
<td>Radi Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discuss the project in the local jurisdiction's Capital Improvement Plan? (Attach page from CIP): Click here to enter text. This project is not budgeted in the Collier County CIP at this time. Full funding is being requested by this application.

**Project Description**

**Phase(s) requested:**

- Planning Study ✓
- PD&E □
- PE □
- ROW □
- CST □
- CEI □

**Project cost estimates by phase (Please include detailed cost estimate and documentation in back-up information):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase (PD&amp;E, ROW, PE, CST)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Matching Local Funds</th>
<th>Local Fund Source</th>
<th>Type of Match (Cash, In-kind)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Phase] [Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Phase] [Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Phase] [Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Cost: $ 300,000.00**

**Project Details:** Clearly describe the existing conditions and the proposed project and desired improvements in detail. Please provide studies, documentation, etc., completed
to-date to support or justify the proposed improvements. Include labeled photos and maps. (Add additional pages if needed):

VBR currently is classified as an Urban Major Collector that is Federal Aid Eligible. According to the adopted AUIR, this segment of VBR is currently a Level of Service (LOS) D and expected to fail in 2023. The road serves as a major east-west roadway and is the access point for several large residential communities and several shopping centers, businesses, standalone stores and out parcels. Currently, there are bicycle and pedestrian facilities on both sides of VBR to accommodate the volume of pedestrian traffic along the corridor. The posted speed limit within the project limit is 45 mph.

**Constructability Review**

For items 2-9 provide labeled and dated photos (add additional pages if needed)

1. Discuss other projects (ex. drainage, utility, etc.) programmed (local, state or federal) within the limits of this project?
   - If programmed by the MPO/FDOT, the study is expected to be approximately 5 years into the future. Transportation Planning has been and will continue to coordinate with the on-going stormwater and utility projects in the vicinity. Once fully funded, the study is expected to be completed within 12-18 months.

2. Does the applicant have an adopted ADA transition plan?  
   - Yes ✓  No □

Identify areas within the project limits that will require ADA retrofit. (Include GIS coordinates for stops and labeled photos and/or map.)

- There are no transit stops located within the project but there are two in the immediate vicinity of the project. They are located at the intersection of VBR and Airport-Pulling Rd.


3. Is there a rail crossing along the project?  
   - Yes □  No ✓

   What is the Rail MP?  
   Enter MP

4. Are there any transit stops/shelters/amenities within the project limits?  
   - Yes □  No ✓

   How many? Click here to enter text
   - There are no transit stops located within the project.
5. Is the project within 10-miles of an airport? Yes ☑ No □
   - The project is approximately 6 miles from the Naples Municipal Airport.

6. Coordinate with local transit and discuss improvements needed or requested for bus stops?
   (add additional pages if needed):
   - As discussed above, Collier Area Transit (CAT) bus Route #12 is in the vicinity of the project but not have stops within the project limits.

7. Are turn lanes being added? Yes □ No ☑
If yes, provide traffic counts, length, and location of involved turn lanes. Click here to enter text.

8. Drainage structures:

This is a planning study, additional specification and information regarding the project will be available after the design.

- Number of culverts or pipes currently in place:
  - This is a planning study; no drainage or treatment impacts are expected at this phase of the project.

- Discuss lengths and locations of each culvert along the roadway:
  - This is a planning study, additional information will be available after design, and are not known at this phase of the project.

- Discuss the disposition of each culvert and inlet. Which culverts are "to remain" and which are to be replaced, upgraded, or extended?
  - This is a planning study, additional information will be available after design, and are not known at this phase of the project.

- Discuss drainage ditches to be filled in? (Discuss limits and quantify fill in cubic yards)
  - Additional specifications and information to be determined during final design.

- Describe the proposed conveyances system (add additional pages if needed.)
  - Additional specifications and information to be determined during final design.

- Are there any existing permitted stormwater management facilities/ponds within the project limits? Yes ☐ No ☑

- If yes, provide the location and permit number (add additional pages if needed) Click here to enter text.

- Discuss proposed stormwater management permits needed for the improvements.
  - This is a planning study, additional information will be available after design, and are not known at this phase of the project.
• List specific utilities within project limits and describe any potential conflicts (add additional pages if needed):
  • This is a planning study, additional information will be available after design, and are not known at this phase of the project

• Discuss Bridges within project limits?
  • There are no bridges within the project limits.

• Can bridges accommodate proposed improvements?   Yes □   No □
  If no, what bridge improvements are proposed? (Offset and dimensions of the improvements, add additional pages if needed):

9. Has Right-of-way (ROW), easements, or ROW activity already been performed/acquired for the proposed improvements? If yes, please provide documentation

   Yes ✔   No □

   If ROW or Easements are needed detail expected area of need (acreage needed, ownership status):

      This is a planning study. No additional ROW or easements are anticipated as part of this project.

      Click here to enter text.

10. Discuss required permits (ERP, Drainage, Driveway, Right of Way, etc.): Please refer to the 2019 County Wide Pathway Constructability Study section 5.5 Permitting related to the SFWMD and Environmental.

   • This is a planning study, additional information will be available after design, and are not known at this phase of the project.

   If none are needed, state the qualified exemption:

   Click here to enter text.

11. Are there any wetlands within the project limits?   Yes □   No ✔

   If yes, list the type of wetlands, estimated acreage and if mitigation will be required. Please note whether the project is within the geographic service area of any approved mitigation banks. Provide any additional information:

   • This is a planning study, additional information will be available after design, and are not known at this phase of the project.
12. Are there any federal or state listed/protected species within the project limits? Yes □ No ✓
   If yes, list the species and what, if any mitigation or coordination will be necessary:
   - The maintained right-of-way generally does not provide optimal habitat for listed species utilization, in addition, this is a planning study, additional information will be available after design, and are not known at this phase of the project.

   If yes, discuss critical habitat within the project limits: Click here to enter text.

13. Discuss whether any prior reviews or surveys have been completed for historical and archaeological resources (include year, project, results)
   None.

14. Are any Recreational, historical properties or resources covered under section 4(f) property within the project limits? Yes □ No ✓
   (Provide details) Click here to enter text.

15. Discuss whether any prior reviews or surveys have been completed for sites/facilities which may have potential contamination involvement with the proposed improvements. This should include a discussion of locations which may directly impact the project location or be which may be exacerbated by the construction of the proposed improvements. None.

16. Are lighting improvements requested as part of this project? Yes □ No ✓
   Please provide a lighting justification report for the proposed lighting. Click here to enter text.

17. Is a mid-block crossing proposed as part of the project? Yes □ No ✓
   If yes, please provide the justification for mid-block crossing. Click here to enter text.

**Required Attachments**

A. Detailed Project Scope with Project Location Map with sufficient level of detail (Please include typical section of proposed improvements)
B. Project Photos – dated and labeled (this is important!)
C. Detailed Cost Estimates including Pay Items
D. LRTP and Local CIP page
E. Survey/As-built/ROW documentation/Utility/Drainage information
F. Detailed breakdown of ROW costs included in estimate (if ROW is needed/included in request or estimate)
Applicant Contact Information

Agency Name: Collier County Board of County Commissioners
Mailing Address: 2685 S. Horseshoe Dr., Suite 103, Naples, FL 34104
Contact Name and Title: Lorraine Lantz, AICP; Principal Planner
Email: Lorraine.Lantz@CollierCountyFL.gov Phone: (239) 252-5779

Signature: [Signature] Date: 12/23/20
Your signature indicates that the information included with this application is accurate.

Maintaining Agency: Collier County Board of County Commissioners
Contact Name and Title: Trinity Scott, Transportation Planning Manager
Email: Trinity.Scott@CollierCountyFL.gov Phone: (239) 252-5832

Signature: [Signature] Date: 12/23/20
Your signature serves as a commitment from your agency to maintain the facility requested.

MPO/TPO: Collier MPO
Contact Name and Title: Anne McLaughlin, Executive Director
Email: Anne.McLaughlin@CollierCountyFL.gov Phone: (239) 252-5884

Signature: [Signature] Date: 
Your signature confirms the request project is consistent with all MPO/TPO plans and documents, is eligible, and indicates MPO/TPO support for the project.
Additional required Questions and Answers

1. Project Relationship to Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP) (Demonstrate where/how project is identified in the Network Needs analysis (Chapter 5) – provide page number, table, map, appendices if relevant, and/or identified in local plan adopted by reference, specify which Plan)

As mentioned above regarding consistency, this project is included in the MPO’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, in the public comments. Citizens have requested this project because there are currently insufficient pedestrian facilities and for safety reasons.

2. If this is a design and/or construction project, describe how it addresses the Design Guidelines in Chapter 6 of the BPMP. (attach pages or documentation if needed.)

This is a Study. The ultimate design of this project will utilize the two FDOT publications, the current edition of the Florida Greenbook and the Florida Design Manual, mentioned in Chapter 6 of the BPMP.

3. Describe how this project is consistent with the policies contained in Chapter 7 of the BPMP. (Attach additional pages or documentation if needed.)

The study will focus on the feasibility of building a convenient multimodal network, public safety, and connectivity.

A. Detailed Project Scope with Project Location Map with sufficient level of detail (Please include typical section of proposed improvements)

A study of the corridor will look at the physical roadway capacity now and, in the future, and determine ways to enhance or improve the corridor. The study is intended to include intersection analysis as recommended in Action Item #2 on page 3-10 and will follow the FDOT Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) or the most current evaluation tools. The study tasks will include:

1. Traffic Data Collection
2. Land Use Data Collection
3. Existing Conditions and LOS Analysis
4. Future Conditions LOS Analyses
5. Identification and Evaluation of Alternatives
6. Public Involvement Activities
Intersections:

1. Airport-Pulling Rd.
2. Tiburon Dr.
3. Groves Rd.
4. Livingston Rd.

B. Detailed Cost Estimates including Pay Items

The cost is based on an estimated Planning Study cost.

C. Project Photos – dated and labeled (this is important!)

Please see above.

The following charts, graphs and information is derived from the Collier County Crash Data Management System in December 2020.
# Intersection Summary

## Top 40 Report

Click for Drill Down

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Total Crashes</th>
<th>Total Injuries</th>
<th>Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Inj Cap</th>
<th>Non Cap</th>
<th>Ped</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>Ped and Bike</th>
<th>Motorcycle</th>
<th>Angles</th>
<th>Head On</th>
<th>Intoxication</th>
<th>Speeding</th>
<th>Run Off</th>
<th>Vol. Users</th>
<th>Age Driving</th>
<th>Lane Report</th>
<th>At Int.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VANDERBILT BEACH RD (CR 6828) @ LIVINGSTON</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 31 @ PORTigrant RD</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANDERBILT BEACH RD (CR 6828) @ THURSTON RD</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANDERBILT BEACH RD (CR 6828) @ HICKORY RD</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANDERBILT BEACH RD (CR 6828) @ SCHOOL ST</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANDERBILT BEACH RD (CR 6828) @ CUSHMAN RD</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPM 548 S @ 17TH AVE NW</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINE RD (CR 6810) @ LIVINGSTON RD S</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 93 @ PORTigrant RD @ TRADE CENTER WAY</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANCER RD @ GROVES RD</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANDERBILT BEACH RD (CR 6828) @ BARNES RD</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRANDLES RD (CR 6810) @ WIND RD</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANDERBILT BEACH RD @ NAPLES WAKE ACCESS</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Bicyclists by Year of Crash

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Crash</th>
<th>Bicyclists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Severe Injuries by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Severe Injuries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 79</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 89</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

VBR from Airport to Livingston

CDMS - Crash Data Management System

Records Data Range: 09/04/2005 to 11/11/2020

1,457

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Pedals</th>
<th>Bikes</th>
<th>Motorcycle</th>
<th>Angles</th>
<th>Head On</th>
<th>Intoxication</th>
<th>Speeding</th>
<th>Run Off</th>
<th>Vol. Users</th>
<th>Age Driving</th>
<th>Lane Report</th>
<th>At Int.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table E5.6. Collier MPO 2015 LRTP Cost Feasible Plan Projects – FDOT Other Roads Projects and Local Roadway Projects

**Draft 11/12/2020 (in millions $)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Limiting Lane</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Project Cost (PCE 2015 $)</th>
<th>FY Funding 2020-21 (PCE)</th>
<th>FY Funding 2021-22 (PCE)</th>
<th>FY Funding 2022-23 (PCE)</th>
<th>FY Funding 2023-24 (PCE)</th>
<th>Total FY 2020-24 (PCE)</th>
<th>Start/End Date</th>
<th>Estimated Year of Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Georgia Blvd</td>
<td>Nokomis Blvd</td>
<td>West 80’ of Nokomis Blvd from Logan Blvd to US 41</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>09/27/23</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nokomis Blvd</td>
<td>West 80’ of Nokomis Blvd from Logan Blvd to US 41</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>09/27/23</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Georgia Blvd</td>
<td>Nokomis Blvd</td>
<td>Nokomis Blvd from Logan Blvd to US 41</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>09/27/23</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nokomis Blvd</td>
<td>West 80’ of Nokomis Blvd from Logan Blvd to US 41</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>09/27/23</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table continues with similar entries. The columns include Total Project Cost, FY Funding for each fiscal year, and Start/End Date with the Estimated Year of Completion.

**Additional Notes:**
- PCE: PCE includes PWE and Design
- Present Day: 09/27/23
- Start: 09/27/23
- Completion: 2023

---

### Table E5.6. Collier MPO 2015 LRTP Cost Feasible Plan Projects – FDOT Other Roads Projects and Local Roadway Projects (continued)

**Draft 11/12/2020 (in millions $)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Limiting Lane</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Project Cost (PCE 2015 $)</th>
<th>FY Funding 2020-21 (PCE)</th>
<th>FY Funding 2021-22 (PCE)</th>
<th>FY Funding 2022-23 (PCE)</th>
<th>FY Funding 2023-24 (PCE)</th>
<th>Total FY 2020-24 (PCE)</th>
<th>Start/End Date</th>
<th>Estimated Year of Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Georgia Blvd</td>
<td>Nokomis Blvd</td>
<td>West 80’ of Nokomis Blvd from Logan Blvd to US 41</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>09/27/23</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nokomis Blvd</td>
<td>West 80’ of Nokomis Blvd from Logan Blvd to US 41</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>09/27/23</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Georgia Blvd</td>
<td>Nokomis Blvd</td>
<td>Nokomis Blvd from Logan Blvd to US 41</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>09/27/23</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nokomis Blvd</td>
<td>West 80’ of Nokomis Blvd from Logan Blvd to US 41</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>09/27/23</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table continues with similar entries. The columns include Total Project Cost, FY Funding for each fiscal year, and Start/End Date with the Estimated Year of Completion.

**Additional Notes:**
- PCE: PCE includes PWE and Design
- Present Day: 09/27/23
- Start: 09/27/23
- Completion: 2023

---
## Attachment D
### Roads and Bridges
2021 5-Year Work Program
(Dollars shown in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60000</td>
<td>Ext 404 North</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60001</td>
<td>Ext 404 North (2)</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60002</td>
<td>Ext 404 North (3)</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State & Local Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60100</td>
<td>Ext 404 North</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60101</td>
<td>Ext 404 North (2)</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60102</td>
<td>Ext 404 North (3)</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Infrastructure Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60300</td>
<td>Ext 404 North</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60301</td>
<td>Ext 404 North (2)</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60302</td>
<td>Ext 404 North (3)</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60400</td>
<td>Ext 404 North</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60401</td>
<td>Ext 404 North (2)</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60402</td>
<td>Ext 404 North (3)</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

- All figures are in thousands of dollars.
- Projects are listed with their respective years and amounts allocated for each year.
F. Detailed breakdown of ROW costs included in estimate (if ROW is needed/included in request or estimate)

This Project is expected to keep within the existing right-of-way and not require any additional right-of-way acquisition.
Collier MPO Congestion Management - Project Concept Sheet

A. REQUIRED PROJECT INFORMATION:

1. Name of Project (ITS) Fiber Optic and FPL Infrastructure Improvement for mid-block ITS devices
2. Name of Applicant Pierre-Marie Beauvoir
3. Name of Submitting Jurisdiction Collier County
4. If this is a multi-jurisdictional application, please list the jurisdictions involved

5. Describe the project and its purpose, including the project limits (if applicable). Attachment? □
   The purpose of this project is to implement FPL power and Fiber Optics Network Connectivity to midblock ITS devices, such as Vehicle Traffic Count Systems and midblock PTZ Cameras on Collier County roadways.

6. Amount of CMC/ITS SU Box funds being requested $830,000 Estimated Total Project Cost $830,000 If SU Box funds are not requested, what funding source would be most appropriate?

7. Are there specific technical and/or monetary local contributions for this project? If yes, please explain.
   YES □ NO □
   If the project exceeds our estimated costs, we will require local funds for completion.

8. Anticipated time to complete the project 24 months

9. Does this project require the acquisition of Right-of-Way? YES □ NO □
10. Is this project on a congested corridor? Identify the corridor. YES □ NO □

This project will improve network communication between roadside ITS devices and the Traffic Management Center across some 1 linear miles of the most travelled County roadways. We have estimated the cost at approximately $8,650 per location to install a cabinet, network switch, fiber, and FPL power at 96 location (72 Wavetronix locations and 24 Mid-Block Camera locations) along the corridors listed below. This solution is good for 10 or more years. The County attempted to use wireless technology to transmit video streams at US 41 and SR 29, but found it prohibitively expensive. A live streaming camera at 1080p sends 5GB/hour @ a cost of $25. The cost for 45 Camera locations throughout the County, per hour is $1,000 and $24,000 per day or over $8.6M/year. The cost for Traffic Count Stations is significantly less.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Golden Gate Blvd - 11 miles</td>
<td>11. Rattlesnake Hammock Rd - 4 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Golden Gate Pkwy - 15 miles</td>
<td>12. Santa Barbara Rd - 7 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Goodlette Frank Rd - 10 miles</td>
<td>13. Vanderbilt Beach Rd - 10 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Immokalee Rd - 31 miles</td>
<td>14. Logan Blvd - 2 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Does this project address a documented safety problem? Explain.  YES ☐  NO ☐

12. Does this project address a strategy listed on the implementation matrix?  YES ☑  NO ☐

**COMMENTS:**
The project is eligible for funding because it is consistent with TSPR-Action Plan Strategies for ITS (see comments on performance measure matrix, attached).

13. Does this project maintain concurrency with FDOT Regional ITS architecture?  YES ☑  NO ☐

14. Does this project promote one or more multi-modal solutions by advancing recommendations from an adopted MPO study? Please identify.  YES ☐  NO ☑

**B. PROJECT SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION:**

CHECK ALL STATEMENTS BELOW THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT WITH EXPLANATION OF HOW IT APPLIES.  (If project is funded, you will be expected to provide data to the MPO with 2 years and 5 years of construction/implementation for performance measures selected.)

☐ 1. **Travel Demand** - Describe how the project addresses one or more of the following Performance Measures:
   a. Percent of roadway miles by volume to capacity (V/C) ratio
   b. Percent of vehicle miles traveled by volume to capacity (v/c) ratio
   c. Number of signalized intersections connected to ATMS

This project will improve network communication between roadside ITS devices and the Traffic Management Center across some 162 linear miles of the most travelled County roadways.

☐ 2. **Transit Travel** – Describe how the project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   a. Average bus route service frequency and number of routes
   b. Passenger trips (annual ridership)
   c. Passenger trips per revenue hour
   d. Transit on time performance
3. **Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following Performance Measures:
   a. Centerline miles of bicycle lanes
   b. Linear miles of connector sidewalks on arterial roadways
   c. Linear miles of Shared Use paths adjacent to roadways

4. **Goods Movement** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   a. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) on designated truck routes with V/C greater than 1/0
   b. Number of crashes involving heavy vehicles/trucks

5. **Safety** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   a. Total crashes
   b. Motor vehicle severe injury crashes
   c. Motor vehicle fatal crashes
   d. Pedestrian and bicycle severe injury and fatal crashes

This project will address staff safety in the maintenance of roadside ITS devices.

6. **TDM** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   a. Number of people registered in the FDOT Commute Connector database that have an origin in Collier County

7. **Accessibility** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   a. Share of regional jobs within ¼ mile of transit
   b. Share of regional households within ¼ mile of transit

8. **Incident Duration** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   a. Mean time for responders to arrive on scene after notification
b. Mean incident clearance time
c. Road Ranger stops

9. **Customer Service**— Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:

   a. Report on nature of comments/responses and customer satisfaction
Bayshore Corridor – 2 mid-block ITS Devices, indicated in red. The signals represent signalized intersections.
Livingston Corridor – 2 mid-block ITS Devices
Name of Applying Agency: Collier County

Project Name: (ITS) Fiber Optic and FPL Power Infrastructure

Project Category:
Congestion Management ☒ TRIP ☐ CIGP ☐ SU Bike-Ped ☐
Transportation Alternative ☐ Transit/Modal ☐ SCOP ☐ SCRAP ☐

For more information on State Grant Programs (CIGP, SCOP, SCRAP, TRIP) please click here.

Is applicant LAP certified? Yes ☒ No ☐

Is project on State Highway System? Yes ☐ No ☒

If the project is off the state system and the applicant is LAP certified the project will be programmed as a LAP project.

Is the roadway on the Federal Aid Eligible System? Yes ☐ No ☒
If yes, provide Federal Aid roadway number: Click here to enter text.
If no, give local jurisdiction: Collier County

Detailed Project Limits/Location:
Describe begin and end points of project, EX., from ABC Rd. to XYZ Ave. Limits run south to north or west to east. Include jurisdiction (city/county), project length, attach a labeled project, map.

Discuss how this project is consistent with the MPO/TPO Long Range Transportation Plan?

Page Number (attach page from LRTP): The MPO’s Congestion Management Process and funding amounts are referenced in the 2045 LRTP on pages 6-11 to 6-12 and on Table 6-7 SU Box Funds by Planning Year and Project Phase, on p 6-15. As stated in the LRTP, “Future congestion management projects will be prioritized through the MPO’s congestion management process (CMP).” The LRTP references the Transportation System Performance Report (TSPR) Action Plan. The project is eligible under Section 4.0 Congestion Management Strategies, Table 4-1 pages 4-1 & 4-2. Specifically, ITS & Access Management – Active Roadway Management. Strategies include: Traffic signal & monitoring equipment modernization; Traffic Center Operations Enhancements (through improved data collection in the field); Communications networks & roadway surveillance - ITS. See Attached pages

Discuss the project in the local jurisdiction’s Capital Improvement Plan?
(Attach page from CIP): See Project Proposal
Project Description

Phase(s) requested:
Planning Study ☐ PD&E ☐ PE ☐ ROW ☐ CST ☐ CEI ☐

Project cost estimates by phase (Please include detailed cost estimate and documentation in back-up information): (Not applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase (PD&amp;E, ROW, PE, CST)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Matching Local Funds</th>
<th>Local Fund Source</th>
<th>Type of Match (Cash, in-kind)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Phase] [Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Phase] [Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Phase] [Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Phase] [Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Cost: $ [830,000]

Project Details: Clearly describe the existing conditions and the proposed project and desired improvements in detail. Please provide studies, documentation, etc., completed to-date to support or justify the proposed improvements. Include labeled photos and maps. (Add additional pages if needed):

See Project Proposal

The questions below are not applicable, for our project entails the acquisition and installation of video detection cameras at specified signalized intersections along County roadways.

Constructability Review

For items 2-9 provide labeled and dated photos (add additional pages if needed)

1. Discuss other projects (ex. drainage, utility, etc.) programmed (local, state or federal) within the limits of this project? N/A

2. Does the applicant have an adopted ADA transition plan? Yes ☐ Identify No ☒ areas within the project limits that will require ADA retrofit. (Include GIS coordinates for stops and labeled photos and/or map.)
   N/A

3. Is there a rail crossing along the project?
   Yes ☐ No ☒
   What is the Rail MP?
   Enter MP

4. Are there any transit stops/shelters/amenities within the project limits?
   Yes ☐ No ☒
   How many? Click here to enter text.
   Stop ID number: Click here to enter text.
5. Is the project within 10-miles of an airport? Yes ☒ No ☐ (Not applicable)

6. Coordinate with local transit and discuss improvements needed or requested for bus stops? (add additional pages if needed):
   Click here to enter text.

7. Are turn lanes being added? Yes ☐ No ☒
   If yes, provide traffic counts, length, and location of involved turn lanes.
   Click here to enter text.

8. Drainage structures: (Not applicable)
   - Number of culverts or pipes currently in place: Click here to enter text.
   - Discuss lengths and locations of each culvert along the roadway: Click here to enter text.
   - Discuss the disposition of each culvert and inlet. Which culverts are “to remain” and which are to be replaced, upgraded, or extended? Click here to enter text.
   - Discuss drainage ditches to be filled in? (Discuss limits and quantify fill in cubic yards) Click here to enter text.
   - Describe the proposed conveyances system (add additional pages if needed.) Click here to enter text.
   - Are there any existing permitted stormwater management facilities/ponds within the project limits? Yes ☐ No ☐
   - If yes, provide the location and permit number (add additional pages if needed) Click here to enter text.
   - Discuss proposed stormwater management permits needed for the improvements. Click here to enter text.
   - List specific utilities within project limits and describe any potential conflicts (add additional pages if needed): Click here to enter text.
   - Discuss Bridges within project limits? Click here to enter text.
   - Can bridges accommodate proposed improvements? Yes ☐ No ☐
     If no, what bridge improvements are proposed? (Offset and dimensions of the improvements, add additional pages if needed):
     Click here to enter text.
9. Has Right-of-way (ROW), easements, or ROW activity already been performed/acquired for the proposed improvements? If yes, please provide documentation.
   Yes ☐ No ☐ (Not applicable)
   If ROW or Easements are needed detail expected area of need (acreage needed, ownership status):
   Click here to enter text. (Not applicable)

10. Discuss required permits (ERP, Drainage, Driveway, Right of Way, etc.):
    If none are needed, state the qualified exemption:
    Click here to enter text. (Not applicable)

11. Are there any wetlands within the project limits? Yes ☐ No ☐ (Not applicable)
    If yes, list the type of wetlands, estimated acreage and if mitigation will be required.
    Please note whether the project is within the geographic service area of any approved mitigation banks. Provide any additional information:
    Click here to enter text.

12. Are there any federal or state listed/protected species within the project limits?
    Yes ☐ No ☐ (Not applicable)
    If yes, list the species and what, if any mitigation or coordination will be necessary: Click here to enter text.
    If yes, discuss critical habitat within the project limits: Click here to enter text.

13. Discuss whether any prior reviews or surveys have been completed for historical and archaeological resources (include year, project, results)
    Click here to enter text. (Not applicable)

14. Are any Recreational, historical properties or resources covered under section 4(f) property within the project limits? Yes ☐ No ☐ (Provide details) Click here to enter text. (Not applicable)

15. Discuss whether any prior reviews or surveys have been completed for sites/facilities which may have potential contamination involvement with the proposed improvements. This should include a discussion of locations which may directly impact the project location, or be which may be exacerbated by the construction of the proposed improvements. Click here to enter text. (Not applicable)
16. Are lighting improvements requested as part of this project?  
   Yes ☐  No ☒
   Please provide a lighting justification report for the proposed lighting.
   Click here to enter text.

17. Is a mid-block crossing proposed as part of the project?  
   Yes ☐  No ☒
   If yes, please provide the justification for mid-block crossing.
   Click here to enter text.

**Required Attachments**

A. Detailed Project Scope with Project Location Map with sufficient level of detail (Please include typical section of proposed improvements)
B. Project Photos – dated and labeled (this is important!)
C. Detailed Cost Estimates including Pay Items
D. LRTP and Local CIP page
E. Survey/As-builts/ROW documentation/Utility/Drainage information
F. Detailed breakdown of ROW costs included in estimate (if ROW is needed/included in request or estimate)
Applicant Contact Information

Agency Name: 
Mailing Address: 2885 South Horseshoe Dr., Naples FL 34104
Contact Name and Title: Pierre-Marie Beauvoir | Signal Systems Network Specialist
Email: pierre.beauvoir@colliercountyfl.gov | Phone: (239) 252-6066

Signature: ____________________________ Date: _____________________
Your signature indicates that the information included with this application is accurate.

Maintaining Agency:
Contact Name and Title: Click here to enter text.
Email: Click here to enter text. | Phone: Click here to enter text.

Signature: ____________________________ Date: _____________________
Your signature serves as a commitment from your agency to maintain the facility requested.

MPO/TPO:
Contact Name and Title: Click here to enter text.
Email: Click here to enter text. | Phone: Click here to enter text.

Signature: ____________________________ Date: _____________________
Your signature confirms the request project is consistent with all MPO/TPO plans and documents, is eligible, and indicates MPO/TPO support for the project.
Figure 6-6 presents the total costs by project phase for the SIS cost feasible projects for this 2045 LRTP update. Figures 6-7 and 6-8 present the total costs by project phase and funding source, respectively, for the FDOT Other Roads and Local Roads cost feasible projects for this 2045 LRTP update.

Figure 6-6. Total Costs by Project Phase SIS Funded Projects 2026–2045 (YOE $ in millions)

Figure 6-7. Total Costs by Project Phase for FDOT Other Roads and Local Roads Funded Projects 2026–2045 (YOE $ in millions)

Funding of Other Roadway Needs

East of CR 951 Bridges

As noted in Chapter 4, there are 10 proposed canal crossing bridges that are the subject of the 2020 East of CR 951 Bridge Reevaluation Study. A 1-cent infrastructure surtax with specific funding earmarked for constructing these new bridges will be available within the next 7 years. A total of $19.7 million in TMA (or SU) Funds is dedicated for bridge projects in the 2045 LRTP update:

- Planning Period 2026 to 2030: $4.96 million for CST
- Planning Period 2031 to 2035: $4.94 million for CST
- Planning Period 2036 to 2045: $9.8 million for CST

Congestion Management Projects

Congestion management and ITS projects are generally short-term and immediate action projects. Therefore, their role in the LRTP process is modest and are more thoroughly addressed in the CMP. The current TIP includes several
improvements to the traffic management center, arterial monitoring cameras, and other traffic equipment improvements that address safety, active roadway management, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Table 6-4 presents congestion management projects funded for construction in the 2021–2025 TIP.

The Collier MPO identified congestion management priorities resulting from the TSPR and the Local Road Safety Plan (Collier MPO 2020e). Tables 6-5 and 6-6 present infrastructure and non-infrastructure multimodal strategies, respectively, that contribute to the MPO’s project selection process.

Table 6-4. Congestion Management Projects Funded in TIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITS Projects</th>
<th>Funded Amount</th>
<th>TIP/CIP Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Detection – City of Naples (refer to Figure 4-7 in Chapter 4)</td>
<td>$66,429</td>
<td>CST 2024/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Fiber Optic and FPL Power Infrastructure at 13 locations</td>
<td>$272,725</td>
<td>CST 2024/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Data Collection and Performance Measures</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>CST 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Updated School Flasher System</td>
<td>$353,250</td>
<td>CST 2024/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Vehicle Count Station Update (refer to Figure 4-7 in Chapter 4)</td>
<td>$311,562</td>
<td>CST 2023/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Adaptive Traffic Control System at 13 signalized locations along Santa Barbara Boulevard and Golden Gate Parkway (refer to Figure 4-7 in Chapter 4)</td>
<td>$893,000</td>
<td>PE 2023/24, CST 2024/25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Collier MPO 2020 Transportation System Performance Report & Action Plan

Future congestion management projects will be prioritized through the MPO’s congestion management process. A total of $40.45 million in TMA (or SU) Funds is dedicated for future congestion management projects in the 2045 LRTP update:

- Planning Period 2026 to 2030: $10.17 million for CST
- Planning Period 2031 to 2035: $10.13 million for CST
- Planning Period 2036 to 2045: $20.15 million for CST

Other Consideration for SU Funds

In addition to congestion management and bridge projects, the MPO allocates its TMA SU funds to planning, bicycle/pedestrian facilities, and safety projects. These five categories are often referred to as “SU Box” funds by the MPO. The Planning SU Box funds are used to supplement the MPO’s federal Planning (PL) funds to cover costs associated with updating the LRTP every 5 years. The MPO may also use SU Box funds to update the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, Transportation System Performance Report, Local Roads Safety Plan (LRSP), freight studies, and other plans and studies that are integral to updating the LRTP.

The MPO sets aside SU Box funds allocated to safety projects to implement the LRSP. The LRSP identifies priority projects that include engineering, enforcement, education, and emergency response. Safety projects will be vetted by the Congestion Management Committee, BPAC, TAC, and CAC before going to the MPO Board for adoption. The MPO may also choose to use Safety Box funds to supplement FDOT funding on safety projects that address the MPO’s and FDOT’s shared Vision Zero Safety Performance Targets. Table 6-7 presents the presents the SU funds by planning year and project phase. Figure 6-9 presents a summary of the allocation of SU Funds through 2045.
### Table 6-7. SU Box Funds by Planning Year and Project Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation Type</th>
<th>Plan Period 2: 2026-2030</th>
<th>Plan Period 3: 2031-2035</th>
<th>Plan Period 4: 2036-2045</th>
<th>Total Cost 2026-2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE-ENG</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>PRE-ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Supplemental Planning Funds</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Pedestrian Box Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Management/Intelligent Transportation Box Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Box Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 6-9. SU Fund Allocation Through 2045

- $3.10 MPO Supplemental Planning Funds
- $3.40 Bicycle Pedestrian Box Funds
- $19.70 Congestion Management/Intelligent Transportation Box Funds
- $40.45 Bridge Box Funds
- $40.45 Congestion Management/Intelligent Transportation Box Funds

---

*Collier MPO 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan*
4.0 Congestion Management Strategies

Federal guidance recommends that identification of congestion management strategies be based on their ability to support regional congestion management objectives, meet local context, and contribute to other regional goals and objectives. Strategies that effectively manage congestion and achieve congestion management goals and objectives established in the CMP process are selected to meet Collier County’s specific needs. In the 2020 CMP update process, new CMP strategies were identified and added to the existing strategies list based on the analysis that was conducted in the Baseline Conditions Report which identified causes and locations of congested corridors and the Action Plan which analyzed and identified congestion mitigation strategies for the specific corridors. The main additions include safety strategies and strategies to address school related congestion. Table 4-1 lists the category and respective congestion management strategies identified to mitigate congestion along the CMP network in Collier County.

Table 4-1: Collier MPO Congestion Management Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES: Demand Management (Programmatic), Transportation &amp; Land Use Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved incident management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool/Vanpool Assistance and Carpool/Vanpool Technology including School Carpooling Apps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Work Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/Housing Regional Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Complete Streets Policy All New Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Density &amp; Mixed-Use Fixed Route Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Dismissal timing (e.g. stagger dismissal times, dismissal automation software)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking, Biking, Transit and School Bus Awareness/Education campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School &amp; School Zone Traffic Congestion Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin-Destination Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES: Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signage and Pavement Markings (e.g. special emphasis crosswalks, yield/stop for pedestrian signs, advanced street signs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility and Sightline Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New and upgraded street lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic control devices (e.g. left turn signals, variable message signs, pedestrian hybrid beacons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New and Upgrade existing bicycle and pedestrian crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIES: Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| STRATEGIES: ITS & Access Management - Active Roadway Management | Expanded traffic signal timing & coordination - ITS |
|                                                               | Traffic Center Operations Enhancements              |
|                                                               | Traffic signal equipment modernization - ITS         |
|                                                               | Traveler information devices - ITS                    |
|                                                               | Communications networks & roadway surveillance - ITS |
|                                                               | Access management                                    |
|                                                               | School Zone Traffic Calming Measures                 |
|                                                               | School Zone pedestrian and traffic signal optimization |
|                                                               | School off-site waiting lots and curbing and parking zones |

| STRATEGIES: Physical Roadway Capacity Enhancement           | Intersection Improvements                           |
|                                                           | Replace intersections with round-abouts & other innovative designs |
|                                                           | Deceleration lanes and turn lanes                    |
|                                                           | New grade-separated intersections                     |
|                                                           | New travel lanes (general purpose)                     |
|                                                           | New roadway network connections                        |

| STRATEGIES: Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities                | New off-street pedestrian and multi-use facilities to close gaps in the transportation network and make connections to key destinations |
|                                                           | Integrated into TODs, High Density Corridors           |
|                                                           | Regional Bike/Ped Facilities                          |
|                                                           | Complete Streets on New Facilities & Retrofit or new on-street bicycle |
|                                                           | Supporting bicycle infrastructure (e.g. secure and convenient parking, bike repair and pumps) |
**Project Proposals**

**(ITS) Fiber Optic and FPL Power Infrastructure for mid-block ITS Devices**

**Purpose:**

The purpose of this project is to implement FPL power and Fiber Optics Network Connectivity to mid-block ITS devices, such as Vehicle Traffic Count Systems and mid-block PTZ Cameras on Collier County roadways.

**Amount Requested and Estimated Total Project Cost:**

$830,000

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport-Pulling Rd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$45,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier Blvd</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$100,925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Blvd</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$50,462.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$68,812.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$45,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immokalee Rd</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$142,212.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Rd</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$50,462.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Well Rd</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$73,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$45,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$22,937.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattlesnake Hammock Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$18,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$32,112.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$45,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Blvd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$9,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Blvd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$13,762.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everglades Blvd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$41,287.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Blvd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$18,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,587.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$830,337.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Project Duration:**

24 months

**Project Scope:**

Collier County Traffic Operations has deployed ITS devices, such as Vehicle Count Stations and CCTV/PTZ Cameras along various arterial corridors. Currently Traffic Ops utilizes wireless and radio technologies for network connectivity to these devices. This project will improve network communication between roadside ITS devices and the Traffic Management Center across some 12 linear miles of the most travelled County roadways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Golden Gate Blvd - 11 miles</td>
<td>11. Rattlesnake Hammock Rd - 4 miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy</td>
<td>15 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd</td>
<td>10 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd</td>
<td>31 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Livingston Rd</td>
<td>11 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Oil Well Rd</td>
<td>16 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Rd</td>
<td>7 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd</td>
<td>10 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Logan Blvd</td>
<td>2 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Randall Blvd</td>
<td>3 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Everglades Blvd</td>
<td>9 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bayshore Dr** – Currently, we have no visibility in this corridor. Our Encom radio system cannot transmit video for its bandwidth capacity is inadequate.
Livingston N Corridor – The County has identified two ITS Device locations on the North side of Livingston Rd.
Collier MPO Congestion Management - Project Concept Sheet

A. REQUIRED PROJECT INFORMATION:

1. Name of Project **ITS Vehicle Detection Update/Installation at Signalized Intersections in Collier County**
2. Name of Applicant **Pierre-Marie Beauvoir**
3. Name of Submitting Jurisdiction **Collier County**
4. If this is a multi-jurisdictional application, please list the jurisdictions involved

5. Describe the project and its purpose, including the project limits (if applicable). Attachment? □
   
   The purpose of this project is to upgrade the County’s Vehicle Detection System at signalized intersections on Collier County arterials, using the latest Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies. Vehicle detectors inform traffic signal controllers of the presence of motorized vehicles and bicycles at a signalized intersection, mitigate congestion, and promote the efficient flow of vehicle traffic along municipal roadways.

6. Amount of CMC/ITS SU Box funds being requested $991,100 Estimated Total Project Cost $991,100 If SU Box funds are not requested, what funding source would be most appropriate?

7. Are there specific technical and/or monetary local contributions for this project? If yes, please explain.
   
   YES □ NO □
   
   If the project exceeds our estimated costs, we will need local funds for completion

8. Anticipated time to complete the project **24 months**

9. Does this project require the acquisition of Right-of-Way? YES □ NO □

10. Is this project on a congested corridor? Identify the corridor. YES □ NO □
   
   **Immokalee Rd, Airport-Pulling Rd, Collier Blvd, Goodlette Frank Rd, Golden Gate Pkwy, Golden Gate Blvd, Livingston Rd, Oil Well Rd, Pine Ridge Rd, Vanderbilt Beach Rd, Santa Barbara Rd Rattlesnake Hammock Rd.**

11. Does this project address a documented safety problem? Explain. YES □ NO □
   
   **Will provides better detection, reduce the likelihood of vehicles breaching intersections when they are skipped due to detector malfunctions.**
12. Does this project address a strategy listed on the implementation matrix? YES ☑ NO ☐

13. Does this project maintain concurrency with FDOT Regional ITS architecture? YES ☑ NO ☐

14. Does this project promote one or more multi-modal solutions by advancing recommendations from an adopted MPO study? Please identify. YES ☐ NO ☑

---

**B. PROJECT SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION:**

CHECK ALL STATEMENTS BELOW THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT WITH EXPLANATION OF HOW IT APPLIES. (If project is funded, you will be expected to provide data to the MPO with 2 years and 5 years of construction/implementation for performance measures selected.)

- **Travel Demand** - Describe how the project addresses one or more of the following Performance Measures:
  - Percent of roadway miles by volume to capacity (V/C) ratio
  - Percent of vehicle miles traveled by volume to capacity (v/c) ratio
  - Number of signalized intersections connected to ATMS

The requested percentages in items “a.” and “b.” are not applicable to this proposal see signalized intersection list in Addendum “A”. The 73 signalized intersections in this proposal are specific locations across County arterials.

- **Transit Travel** – Describe how the project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
  - Average bus route service frequency and number of routes
  - Passenger trips (annual ridership)
  - Passenger trips per revenue hour
  - Transit on time performance

- **Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following Performance Measures:
  - Centerline miles of bicycle lanes
  - Linear miles of connector sidewalks on arterial roadways
  - Linear miles of Shared Use paths adjacent to roadways

- **Goods Movement** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
  - Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) on designated truck routes with V/C greater than 1/0
b. Number of crashes involving heavy vehicles/trucks

5. Safety– Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   a. Total crashes
   b. Motor vehicle severe injury crashes
   c. Motor vehicle fatal crashes
   d. Pedestrian and bicycle severe injury and fatal crashes

   This project promotes vehicle and pedestrian safety through improved detection across County arterials

6. TDM– Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   a. Number of people registered in the FDOT Commute Connector database that have an origin in Collier County

7. Accessibility– Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   a. Share of regional jobs within ¼ mile of transit
   b. Share of regional households within ¼ mile of transit

8. Incident Duration– Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   a. Mean time for responders to arrive on scene after notification
   b. Mean incident clearance time
   c. Road Ranger stops

9. Customer Service– Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
a. Report on nature of comments/responses and customer satisfaction

ADDENDUM “A”

ITS Vehicle Detection Update at Signalized Intersections in Collier County

**Project Scope:**
Although, Collier County Traffic Operations utilizes several types of vehicle detection to include, video detection, inductive loops, and radar sensors. We are currently looking to update our 292 video detection cameras at 73 signalized intersections. This is to further develop a state-of-the-art ITS infrastructure and better position the County for the introduction of future technologies. Traffic Operations continues to test various detection systems by various manufacturers to ensure these meet our requirements and function as advertised. The updated infrastructure will provide vehicle detection, vehicle traffic and turning movement counts, and allow for real-time configuration, monitoring and troubleshooting of these ITS devices, through the network from the Traffic Management Center (TMC).

The County’s current video detection system dates to 2007 with failing part having been replaced in 2016. Additionally considering, weather conditions in southwest Florida, these systems are in desperate need of upgrading due to age, system failures and continued development in detection technologies. We are requesting a Grant in the amount of $991,000 for this project.

**Amount Requested and Estimated Total Project Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detection Camera</td>
<td>$635,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessories</td>
<td>$146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Application</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servers</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disk Storage</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation and Configuration</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance – 5 years</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$991,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Project Duration:**
24 months

The project plan is to purchase and deploy vehicle detection camera systems at the signalized intersections on Collier County roadways, in the table below, to manage congestion.

1. Airport Pulling Rd at Carillon Plaza/Pine Ridge Crossing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Intersection Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd at Golden Gate Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd at Immokalee Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd at J &amp; C Blvd/Fountainview Cir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd at Pine Ridge Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd at Vanderbilt Beach Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Business Cir S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at City Gate Dr/Magnolia Pond Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Crystal Lake Dr/Oak Ridge MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Grand Lely Dr/Veronawalk Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Lely Cultural Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Rattlesnake Hammock Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Tree Farm Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Vanderbilt Beach Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Golden Gate Blvd @ Big Cypress ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Golden Gate Blvd at Max Hasse Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy at Coronado Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy at Goodlette Frank Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy at Livingston Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy at Santa Barbara Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at 22nd Ave N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Granada Blvd/Moorings Park Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Immokalee Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Ohio Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Orange Blossom Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Pine Ridge Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Solana Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Vanderbilt Bch Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Wilderness Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Green Blvd at Sunshine Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Gulf Coast HS/Dancing Wind Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Lakeland Ave/The Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Laurel Oaks ES/Preserve Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Livingston Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Logan Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Northbrooke Dr/Tarpon Bay Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Oil Well Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Orange Tree Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Palm River Blvd/Parnu St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Randall Blvd/4th St NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Strand Blvd/Juliet Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Valewood Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Wilson Blvd4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Livingston Rd at Grey Oaks Blvd E/Wyndemere Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Livingston Rd at Orange Blossom Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Livingston Rd at Osceola Trail/Sable Ridge Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Livingston Rd at Pine Ridge Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Livingston Rd at Vanderbilt Beach Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Livingston Rd at Veterans Memorial Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Naples Blvd at Hollywood Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Oil Well Rd at Corkscrew ES/MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Oil Well Rd at Everglades Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Oil Well Rd at Palmetto Ridge HS/Victory Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd at Naples Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd at Pine Ridge Crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd at Whippoorwill Ln/Kramer Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Radio Rd at San Marcos Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Radio Rd at Santa Barbara Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Rattlesnake Hammock Rd at Grand Lely Dr/Skyway Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Rattlesnake Hammock Rd at Saint Andrews Blvd/Santa Barbara Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Blvd at Berkshire Pines Rd/Devonshire Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Blvd at Calusa Park ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Blvd at Prince Andrew Blvd/Recreation Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Seagate Dr at Myra Janco Daniels Blvd/West Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Island Walk Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Logan Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Oakes Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Strada Pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Vanderbilt Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Village Walk Cir/Wilshire Lakes Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Vineyards Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Dr at 111th Ave N/Bluebill Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Dr at Wiggins Pass Rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please fill out this application completely. Please ensure all attachments are LEGIBLE. Applications containing insufficient information will not be reviewed by the FDOT.

Name of Applying Agency: Collier County

Project Name: ITS Vehicle Detection Update/Installation at Signalized Intersections in Collier County

Project Category:
- Congestion Management ☒
- TRIP ☐
- CIGP ☐
- SU Bike-Ped ___
- Transportation Alternative ☐
- Transit/Modal ☐
- SCOP ☐
- SCRAP ☐

For more information on State Grant Programs (CIGP, SCOP, SCRAP, TRIP) please click here.

Is applicant LAP certified? Yes ☒ No ☐

Is project on State Highway System? Yes ☐ No ☒

If the project is off the state system and the applicant is LAP certified the project will be programmed as a LAP project.

Is the roadway on the Federal Aid Eligible System? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, provide Federal Aid roadway number: Click here to enter text.
If no, give local jurisdiction: Collier County

http://www.fdot.gov/statistics/fedaid/

Detailed Project Limits/Location:
Describe begin and end points of project, EX., from ABC Rd. to XYZ Ave. Limits run south to north or west to east. Include jurisdiction (city/county), project length, attach a labeled project, map. See list of intersections attached.

Discuss how this project is consistent with the MPO/TPO Long Range Transportation Plan?
Page Number (attach page from LRTP): • The MPO’s Congestion Management Process and funding amounts are referenced in the 2045 LRTP on pages 6-11 to 6-12 and on Table 6-7 SU Box Funds by Planning Year and Project Phase, on p 6-15. As stated in the LRTP, “Future congestion management projects will be prioritized through the MPO’s congestion management process (CMP).” The LRTP references the Transportation System Performance Report (TSPR) Action Plan. The project is eligible under Section 4.0 Congestion Management Strategies, Table 4-1 pages 4-1 & 4-2. Specifically, ITS & Access Management – Active Roadway Management. Strategies include: Traffic signal [& monitoring] equipment modernization; Traffic Center Operations Enhancements (through improved data collection in the field); Communications networks & roadway surveillance - ITS. See attached pages.

Discuss the project in the local jurisdiction’s Capital Improvement Plan? (Attach page from CIP): ☐
Project Description

Phase(s) requested:
Planning Study ☐ PD&E ☐ PE ☐ ROW ☐ CST ☐ CEI ☐

Project cost estimates by phase (Please include detailed cost estimate and documentation in back-up information):  Project cost estimates are based on latest quote received from vendor plus 10-15% for inflation and anticipated enhanced functionality. See matrix attached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Phase] (PD&amp;E, ROW, PE, CST)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Matching Local Funds</th>
<th>Local Fund Source</th>
<th>Type of Match (Cash, in-kind)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Phase]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Phase]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Phase]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Phase]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Cost: $[991,100]

Project Details: Clearly describe the existing conditions and the proposed project and desired improvements in detail. Please provide studies, documentation, etc., completed to-date to support or justify the proposed improvements. Include labeled photos and maps. (Add additional pages if needed):

See attached.

The questions below are not applicable, for our project entails the acquisition and installation of video detection cameras at specified signalized intersections along County roadways.

Constructability Review

For items 2-9 provide labeled and dated photos (add additional pages if needed)

1. Discuss other projects (ex. drainage, utility, etc.) programmed (local, state or federal) within the limits of this project? N/A

2. Does the applicant have an adopted ADA transition plan? Yes ☐ Identify No ☒ areas within the project limits that will require ADA retrofit. (Include GIS coordinates for stops and labeled photos and/or map.)
   N/A

3. Is there a rail crossing along the project?
   Yes ☐ No ☒
   What is the Rail MP?
   Enter MP

4. Are there any transit stops/shelters/amenities within the project limits?
   Yes ☐ No ☒
   How many? Click here to enter text.
   Stop ID number: Click here to enter text.
5. Is the project within 10-miles of an airport? Yes ☒ No ☐ (Not applicable)

6. Coordinate with local transit and discuss improvements needed or requested for bus stops? (add additional pages if needed):
   Click here to enter text.

7. Are turn lanes being added? Yes ☐ No ☒
   If yes, provide traffic counts, length, and location of involved turn lanes.
   Click here to enter text.

8. Drainage structures: (Not applicable)
   - Number of culverts or pipes currently in place: Click here to enter text.
   - Discuss lengths and locations of each culvert along the roadway: Click here to enter text.
   - Discuss the disposition of each culvert and inlet. Which culverts are “to remain” and which are to be replaced, upgraded, or extended? Click here to enter text.
   - Discuss drainage ditches to be filled in? (Discuss limits and quantify fill in cubic yards) Click here to enter text.
   - Describe the proposed conveyances system (add additional pages if needed.) Click here to enter text.
   - Are there any existing permitted stormwater management facilities/ponds within the project limits? Yes ☐ No ☐
   - If yes, provide the location and permit number (add additional pages if needed) Click here to enter text.
   - Discuss proposed stormwater management permits needed for the improvements. Click here to enter text.
   - List specific utilities within project limits and describe any potential conflicts (add additional pages if needed): Click here to enter text.
   - Discuss Bridges within project limits? Click here to enter text.
   - Can bridges accommodate proposed improvements? Yes ☐ No ☐
     If no, what bridge improvements are proposed? (Offset and dimensions of the improvements, add additional pages if needed):
     Click here to enter text.
9. Has Right-of-way (ROW), easements, or ROW activity already been performed/acquired for the proposed improvements? If yes, please provide documentation
   Yes ☐ No ☐  *(Not applicable)*
   If ROW or Easements are needed detail expected area of need (acreage needed, ownership status):
   Click here to enter text.  *(Not applicable)*

10. Discuss required permits (ERP, Drainage, Driveway, Right of Way, etc.):
    If none are needed, state the qualified exemption:
    Click here to enter text.  *(Not applicable)*

11. Are there any wetlands within the project limits?  Yes ☐ No ☐  *(Not applicable)*
    If yes, list the type of wetlands, estimated acreage and if mitigation will be required.
    Please note whether the project is within the geographic service area of any approved mitigation banks. Provide any additional information:
    Click here to enter text.

12. Are there any federal or state listed/protected species within the project limits?
    Yes ☐ No ☐  *(Not applicable)*
    If yes, list the species and what, if any mitigation or coordination will be necessary: Click here to enter text.
    If yes, discuss critical habitat within the project limits: Click here to enter text.

13. Discuss whether any prior reviews or surveys have been completed for historical and archaeological resources (include year, project, results)
    Click here to enter text.  *(Not applicable)*

14. Are any Recreational, historical properties or resources covered under section 4(f) property within the project limits?  Yes ☐ No ☐  *(Provide details)*  *(Not applicable)*

15. Discuss whether any prior reviews or surveys have been completed for sites/facilities which may have potential contamination involvement with the proposed improvements. This should include a discussion of locations which may directly impact the project location, or be which may be exacerbated by the construction of the proposed improvements. Click here to enter text.  *(Not applicable)*
16. Are lighting improvements requested as part of this project?  
Yes ☐  No ☒  
Please provide a lighting justification report for the proposed lighting. 
Click here to enter text.

17. Is a mid-block crossing proposed as part of the project? 
Yes ☐  No ☒  
If yes, please provide the justification for mid-block crossing. 
Click here to enter text.

**Required Attachments**

A. Detailed Project Scope with Project Location Map with sufficient level of detail (Please include typical section of proposed improvements)

B. Project Photos – dated and labeled (this is important!)

C. Detailed Cost Estimates including Pay Items

D. LRTP and Local CIP page

E. Survey/As-builds/ROW documentation/Utility/Drainage information

F. Detailed breakdown of ROW costs included in estimate (if ROW is needed/included in request or estimate)
**Applicant Contact Information**

**Agency Name:**

**Mailing Address:** 2885 South Horseshoe Dr., Naples FL 34104

**Contact Name and Title:** Pierre-Marie Beauvoir | Signal Systems Network Specialist

**Email:** pierre.beauvoir@colliercountyfl.gov  
**Phone:** (239) 252-6066

**Signature:** Pierre-Marie Beauvoir  
**Date:** 15 2021

*Your signature indicates that the information included with this application is accurate.*

---

**Maintaining Agency:**

**Contact Name and Title:** Click here to enter text.

**Email:** Click here to enter text.  
**Phone:** Click here to enter text.

**Signature:** ____________________________  
**Date:** _____________________

*Your signature serves as a commitment from your agency to maintain the facility requested.*

---

**MPO/TPO:**

**Contact Name and Title:** Click here to enter text.

**Email:** Click here to enter text.  
**Phone:** Click here to enter text.

**Signature:** ____________________________  
**Date:** _____________________

*Your signature confirms the request project is consistent with all MPO/TPO plans and documents, is eligible, and indicates MPO/TPO support for the project.*
Figure 6-6 presents the total costs by project phase for the SIS cost feasible projects for this 2045 LRTP update. Figures 6-7 and 6-8 present the total costs by project phase and funding source, respectively, for the FDOT Other Roads and Local Roads cost feasible projects for this 2045 LRTP update.

**Figure 6-6. Total Costs by Project Phase SIS Funded Projects 2026–2045 (YOE $ in millions)**

- **PRE-ENG Phase**: $67.58
- **ROW**: $157.98
- **CST Phase**: $103.58

**Figure 6-7. Total Costs by Project Phase for FDOT Other Roads and Local Roads Funded Projects 2026–2045 (YOE $ in millions)**

- **PRE-ENG**: $175.05
- **ROW**: $93.64
- **CST**: $801.78

### Funding of Other Roadway Needs

#### East of CR 951 Bridges

As noted in Chapter 4, there are 10 proposed canal crossing bridges that are the subject of the 2020 East of CR 951 Bridge Reevaluation Study. A 1-cent infrastructure surtax with specific funding earmarked for constructing these new bridges will be available within the next 7 years. A total of $19.7 million in TMA (or SU) Funds is dedicated for bridge projects in the 2045 LRTP update:

- Planning Period 2026 to 2030: $4.96 million for CST
- Planning Period 2031 to 2035: $4.94 million for CST
- Planning Period 2036 to 2045: $9.8 million for CST

### Congestion Management Projects

Congestion management and ITS projects are generally short-term and immediate action projects. Therefore, their role in the LRTP process is modest and are more thoroughly addressed in the CMP. The current TIP includes several...
improvements to the traffic management center, arterial monitoring cameras, and other traffic equipment improvements that address safety, active roadway management, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Table 6-4 presents congestion management projects funded for construction in the 2021–2025 TIP.

The Collier MPO identified congestion management priorities resulting from the TSPR and the Local Road Safety Plan (Collier MPO 2020e). Tables 6-5 and 6-6 present infrastructure and non-infrastructure multimodal strategies, respectively, that contribute to the MPO’s project selection process.

Table 6-4. Congestion Management Projects Funded in TIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITS Projects</th>
<th>Funded Amount</th>
<th>TIP/CIP Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Detection – City of Naples (refer to Figure 4-7 in Chapter 4)</td>
<td>$66,429</td>
<td>CST 2024/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Fiber Optic and FPL Power Infrastructure at 13 locations</td>
<td>$272,725</td>
<td>CST 2024/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Data Collection and Performance Measures</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>CST 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Updated School Flasher System</td>
<td>$353,250</td>
<td>CST 2024/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Vehicle Count Station Update (refer to Figure 4-7 in Chapter 4)</td>
<td>$311,562</td>
<td>CST 2023/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Adaptive Traffic Control System at 13 signalized locations along Santa Barbara Boulevard and Golden Gate Parkway (refer to Figure 4-7 in Chapter 4)</td>
<td>$893,000</td>
<td>PE 2023/24 CST 2024/25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Collier MPO 2020 Transportation System Performance Report & Action Plan

Future congestion management projects will be prioritized through the MPO’s congestion management process. A total of $40.45 million in TMA (or SU) Funds is dedicated for future congestion management projects in the 2045 LRTP update:

- Planning Period 2026 to 2030: $10.17 million for CST
- Planning Period 2031 to 2035: $10.13 million for CST
- Planning Period 2036 to 2045: $20.15 million for CST

Other Consideration for SU Funds

In addition to congestion management and bridge projects, the MPO allocates its TMA SU funds to planning, bicycle/pedestrian facilities, and safety projects. These five categories are often referred to as “SU Box” funds by the MPO. The Planning SU Box funds are used to supplement the MPO’s federal Planning (PL) funds to cover costs associated with updating the LRTP every 5 years. The MPO may also use SU Box funds to update the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, Transportation System Performance Report, Local Roads Safety Plan (LRSP), freight studies, and other plans and studies that are integral to updating the LRTP.

The MPO sets aside SU Box funds allocated to safety projects to implement the LRSP. The LRSP identifies priority projects that include engineering, enforcement, education, and emergency response. Safety projects will be vetted by the Congestion Management Committee, BPAC, TAC, and CAC before going to the MPO Board for adoption. The MPO may also choose to use Safety Box funds to supplement FDOT funding on safety projects that address the MPO’s and FDOT’s shared Vision Zero Safety Performance Targets. Table 6-7 presents the presents the SU funds by planning year and project phase. Figure 6-9 presents a summary of the allocation of SU Funds through 2045.
**Table 6-7. SU Box Funds by Planning Year and Project Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation Type</th>
<th>Plan Period 2: 2026-2030</th>
<th>Plan Period 3: 2031-2035</th>
<th>Plan Period 4: 2036-2045</th>
<th>Total Cost 2026-2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE-ENG</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>PRE-ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Supplemental Planning Funds</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Pedestrian Box Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Management/Intelligent Transportation Box Funds</td>
<td>$10.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Box Funds</td>
<td>$4.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>$0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6-9. SU Fund Allocation Through 2045**
4.0 Congestion Management Strategies

Federal guidance recommends that identification of congestion management strategies be based on their ability to support regional congestion management objectives, meet local context, and contribute to other regional goals and objectives. Strategies that effectively manage congestion and achieve congestion management goals and objectives established in the CMP process are selected to meet Collier County’s specific needs. In the 2020 CMP update process, new CMP strategies were identified and added to the existing strategies list based on the analysis that was conducted in the Baseline Conditions Report which identified causes and locations of congested corridors and the Action Plan which analyzed and identified congestion mitigation strategies for the specific corridors. The main additions include safety strategies and strategies to address school related congestion. Table 4-1 lists the category and respective congestion management strategies identified to mitigate congestion along the CMP network in Collier County.

| STRATEGIES: Demand Management (Programmatic), Transportation & Land Use Policy | Improved incident management  
Carpool/Vanpool Assistance and Carpool/Vanpool Technology including School Carpooling Apps  
Flexible Work Hours  
Transit Vouchers  
Transit Oriented Development  
Jobs/Housing Regional Balance  
Implement Complete Streets Policy All New Development  
High-Density & Mixed-Use Fixed Route Corridor  
School Dismissal timing (e.g. stagger dismissal times, dismissal automation software)  
Walking, Biking, Transit and School Bus Awareness/Education campaigns  
Safe Routes to School & School Zone Traffic Congestion Study  
Origin-Destination Study |
|---|---|
| STRATEGIES: Safety | Signage and Pavement Markings (e.g. special emphasis crosswalks, yield/stop for pedestrian signs, advanced street signs)  
Visibility and Sightline Improvements  
New and upgraded street lighting  
Traffic control devices (e.g. left turn signals, variable message signs, pedestrian hybrid beacons)  
New and Upgrade existing bicycle and pedestrian crossings |
| STRATEGIES: Transit                          | Amenity to Attract New Ridership  |
|                                           | MPO transit service expansion and improvement (e.g. frequency, hours of operation, realign routes) |
|                                           | Regional Transit system Expansion |
|                                           | Bus rapid transit corridor        |
|                                           | Park & Ride facilities           |
|                                           | Intermodal Hubs                  |
|                                           | Transit ITS and MOD              |
|                                           | Arrival Prediction Technology    |
|                                           | Park-and-Ride lots               |

| STRATEGIES: ITS & Access Management - Active Roadway Management | Expanded traffic signal timing & coordination - ITS |
|                                                                | Traffic Center Operations Enhancements |
|                                                                | Traffic signal equipment modernization - ITS |
|                                                                | Traveler information devices - ITS |
|                                                                | Communications networks & roadway surveillance - ITS |
|                                                                | Access management |
|                                                                | School Zone Traffic Calming Measures |
|                                                                | School Zone pedestrian and traffic signal optimization |
|                                                                | School off-site waiting lots and curbing and parking zones |

| STRATEGIES: Physical Roadway Capacity Enhancement | Intersection Improvements |
|                                                  | Replace intersections with round-abouts & other innovative designs |
|                                                  | Deceleration lanes and turn lanes |
|                                                  | New grade-separated intersections |
|                                                  | New travel lanes (general purpose) |
|                                                  | New roadway network connections |

| STRATEGIES: Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities | New off-street pedestrian and multi-use facilities to close gaps in the transportation network and make connections to key destinations |
|                                           | Integrated into TODs, High Density Corridors |
|                                           | Regional Bike/Ped Facilities |
|                                           | Complete Streets on New Facilities & Retrofit or new on-street bicycle |
|                                           | Supporting bicycle infrastructure (e.g. secure and convenient parking, bike repair and pumps) |
Project Proposal

ITS Vehicle Detection Update at Signalized Intersections in Collier County

**Purpose:**
The purpose of this project is to upgrade the County’s Vehicle Detection System at signalized intersections on Collier County arterials, using the latest Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies. Vehicle detectors inform traffic signal controllers of the presence of motorized vehicles and bicycles at a signalized intersection, mitigate congestion, and promote the efficient flow of vehicle traffic along municipal roadways.

**Project Scope:**
Although, Collier County Traffic Operations utilizes several types of vehicle detection to include, video detection, inductive loops, and radar sensors. We are currently looking to update our 134 video detection cameras at signalized intersections. This is to further develop a state-of-the-art ITS infrastructure and better position the County for the introduction of future technologies. Traffic Operations continues to test various detection systems by various manufacturers and ensuring these meet our requirements. The updated infrastructure will provide vehicle detection, vehicle traffic and turning movement counts, and allow for real-time configuration, monitoring and troubleshooting of these ITS devices, through the network from the Traffic Management Center (TMC).

The County’s current video detection system dates to 2007 with failing part having been replaced in 2016. Additionally considering, weather conditions in southwest Florida, these systems are in desperate need of upgrading due to age, system failures and continued development in detection technologies. We are requesting a Grant in the amount of $991,000 for this project. The project additionally prepares the County for the arrival of connected vehicles (CV), both autonomous and semi-autonomous. The County currently is using analog cameras and is testing digital and radar cameras for detection. In the future we expect Thermal, Radar and Lidar cameras to enter this field, providing more accurate detection. The estimated cost per camera is $7,800 for 73 cameras, plus the additional costs depicted below.

**Amount Requested and Estimated Total Project Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detection Camera</td>
<td>$635,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessories</td>
<td>$146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Application</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servers</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disk Storage</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation and Configuration</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance – 5 years</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$991,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Project Duration:**
24 months

The project plan is to purchase and deploy vehicle detection camera systems at the signalized intersections on Collier County roadways, in the table below, to manage congestion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd at Carillon Plaza/Pine Ridge Crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd at Golden Gate Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd at Immokalee Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd at J&amp; C Blvd/Fountainview Cir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd at Pine Ridge Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Airport Pulling Rd at Vanderbilt Beach Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Business Cir S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at City Gate Dr/ Magnolia Pond Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Crystal Lake Dr/Oak Ridge MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Grand Lely Dr/Veronawalk Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Lely Cultural Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Rattlesnake Hammock Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Tree Farm Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Collier Blvd at Vanderbilt Beach Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Golden Gate Blvd @ Big Cypress ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Golden Gate Blvd at Max Hasse Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy at Coronado Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy at Goodlette Frank Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy at Livingston Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Golden Gate Pkwy at Santa Barbara Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at 22nd Ave N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Granada Blvd/Moorings Park Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Immokalee Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Ohio Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Orange Blossom Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Pine Ridge Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Solana Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Vanderbilt Bch Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Goodlette Frank Rd at Wilderness Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Green Blvd at Sunshine Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Gulf Coast HS/Dancing Wind Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Lakeland Ave/The Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Laurel Oaks ES/Preserve Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Livingston Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Logan Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Northbrooke Dr/Tarpon Bay Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Oil Well Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Orange Tree Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Palm River Blvd/Parnu St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Randall Blvd/4th St NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Strand Blvd/Juliet Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Valewood Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Immokalee Rd at Wilson Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Livingston Rd at Grey Oaks Blvd E/Wyndemere Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Livingston Rd at Orange Blossom Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Livingston Rd at Osceola Trail/Sable Ridge Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Livingston Rd at Pine Ridge Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Livingston Rd at Vanderbilt Beach Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Livingston Rd at Veterans Memorial Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Naples Blvd at Hollywood Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Oil Well Rd at Corkscrew ES/MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Oil Well Rd at Everglades Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Oil Well Rd at Palmetto Ridge HS/Victory Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd at Naples Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd at Pine Ridge Crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd at Whippoorwill Ln/Kramer Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Radio Rd at San Marcos Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Radio Rd at Santa Barbara Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Rattlesnake Hammock Rd at Grand Lely Dr/Skyway Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Rattlesnake Hammock Rd at Saint Andrews Blvd/Santa Barbara Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Blvd at Berkshire Pines Rd/Devonshire Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Blvd at Calusa Park ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Blvd at Prince Andrew Blvd/Recreation Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Seagate Dr at Myra Janco Daniels Blvd/West Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Island Walk Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Logan Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Oakes Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Strada Pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Vanderbilt Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Village Walk Cir/Wilshire Lakes Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Rd at Vineyards Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Dr at 111th Ave N/Bluebill Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Dr at Wiggins Pass Rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detection Camera issues due to aging.
A. REQUIRED PROJECT INFORMATION:

1. Name of Project (ITS) ATMS Retiming of Arterials

2. Name of Applicant Pierre-Marie Beauvoir

3. Name of Submitting Jurisdiction Collier County

4. If this is a multi-jurisdictional application, please list the jurisdictions involved

5. Describe the project and its purpose, including the project limits (if applicable). Attachment? □

   The purpose of this project is to perform retiming of arterials and isolated intersections in Collier County listed below and in Addendum "A". The work will entail, conducting vehicle traffic counts, and the development and implementation of timing plans.

6. Amount of CMC/ITS SU Box funds being requested $698,000

   Estimated Total Project Cost $698,000

   If SU Box funds are not requested, what funding source would be most appropriate?

7. Are there specific technical and/or monetary local contributions for this project? If yes, please explain.

   YES ✔ NO □

   If the project exceeds our estimated costs, we will need local funds for completion or reduce the scope.

8. Anticipated time to complete the project 24 months

9. Does this project require the acquisition of Right-of-Way? YES □ NO ✔

10. Is this project on a congested corridor? Identify the corridor. YES ✔ NO □

   The project will be carried out on the following corridors:

   (See Project Proposal and Addendum "A" below).
11. Does this project address a documented safety problem? Explain.  
YES ☑ NO ☐

The retiming of these intersection will reduce congestion and ensure the optimal flow of vehicle and pedestrian traffic along County roadways.

12. Does this project address a strategy listed on the implementation matrix?  
YES ☑ NO ☐

13. Does this project maintain concurrency with FDOT Regional ITS architecture?  
YES ☑ NO ☐

14. Does this project promote one or more multi-modal solutions by advancing recommendations from an adopted MPO study? Please identify.  
YES ☑ NO ☐

B. PROJECT SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION:

CHECK ALL STATEMENTS BELOW THAT APPLY TO THE PROJECT WITH EXPLANATION OF HOW IT APPLIES. (If project is funded, you will be expected to provide data to the MPO with 2 years and 5 years of construction/implementation for performance measures selected.)

☑  1. Travel Demand - Describe how the project addresses one or more of the following Performance Measures:

   a. Percent of roadway miles by volume to capacity (V/C) ratio
   b. Percent of vehicle miles traveled by volume to capacity (v/c) ratio
   c. Number of signalized intersections connected to ATMS

This project will improve travel times on the selected arterials.

☐  2. Transit Travel – Describe how the project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:

   a. Average bus route service frequency and number of routes
   b. Passenger trips (annual ridership)
   c. Passenger trips per revenue hour
   d. Transit on time performance

☐  3. Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following Performance Measures:

   a. Centerline miles of bicycle lanes
b. Linear miles of connector sidewalks on arterial roadways

c. Linear miles of Shared Use paths adjacent to roadways

This project will enhance the flow of traffic for vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians, through the optimization of traffic signals in the selected corridors.

**Bay Shore**

4. **Goods Movement** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   
a. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) on designated truck routes with V/C greater than 1/0
   
b. Number of crashes involving heavy vehicles/trucks

5. **Safety** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   
a. Total crashes
   
b. Motor vehicle severe injury crashes
   
c. Motor vehicle fatal crashes
   
d. Pedestrian and bicycle severe injury and fatal crashes

   This project will address staff and motorist safety through the reduction in congestion.

6. **TDM** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   
a. Number of people registered in the FDOT Commute Connector database that have an origin in Collier County

7. **Accessibility** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   
a. Share of regional jobs within ¼ mile of transit
   
b. Share of regional households within ¼ mile of transit

8. **Incident Duration** – Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:
   
a. Mean time for responders to arrive on scene after notification
b. Mean incident clearance time

c. Road Ranger stops

☐ 9. **Customer Service**– Describe how project addresses one or more of the following performance measures:

a. Report on nature of comments/responses and customer satisfaction
Please fill out this application completely. Please ensure all attachments are LEGIBLE. Applications containing insufficient information will not be reviewed by the FDOT.

Name of Applying Agency: Collier County

Project Name: (ITS) ATMS Retiming of Arterials and Isolated Intersections

Project Category:
- [x] Congestion Management
- [ ] TRIP
- [ ] CIGP
- [ ] SU Bike-Ped
- [ ] Transportation Alternative
- [ ] Transit/Modal
- [ ] SCOP
- [ ] SCRAP

For more information on State Grant Programs (CIGP, SCOP, SCRAP, TRIP) please click here.

Is applicant LAP certified? [x] Yes [ ] No

Is project on State Highway System? [ ] Yes [x] No

If the project is off the state system and the applicant is LAP certified the project will be programmed as a LAP project.

Is the roadway on the Federal Aid Eligible System? [ ] Yes [x] No

If yes, provide Federal Aid roadway number: Click here to enter text.

If no, give local jurisdiction: Collier County


Detailed Project Limits/Location:
Describe begin and end points of project, EX., from ABC Rd. to XYZ Ave. Limits run south to north or west to east. Include jurisdiction (city/county), project length, attach a labeled project, map.

Discuss how this project is consistent with the MPO/TPO Long Range Transportation Plan?
Page Number (attach page from LRTP): The MPO’s Congestion Management Process and funding amounts are referenced in the 2045 LRTP on pages 6-11 to 6-12 and on Table 6-7 SU Box Funds by Planning Year and Project Phase, on page 6-15. As stated in the LRTP, “Future congestion management projects will be prioritized through the MPO’s congestion management process (CMP).” The LRTP references the Transportation System Performance Report (TSPR) Action Plan. The project is eligible under Section 4.0 Congestion Management Strategies, Table 4-1 pages 4-1 & 4-2. Specifically, ITS & Access Management – Active Roadway Management. Strategies include: Traffic signal [& monitoring] equipment modernization; Traffic Center Operations Enhancements (through improved data collection in the field); Communications networks & roadway surveillance - ITS.

Discuss the project in the local jurisdiction’s Capital Improvement Plan? (Attach page from CIP):
Project Description

Phase(s) requested:
Planning Study ☐ PD&E ☐ PE ☐ ROW ☐ CST ☐ CEI ☐

Project cost estimates by phase (Please include detailed cost estimate and documentation in back-up information): *(Not applicable)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase (PD&amp;E, ROW, PE, CST)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Matching Local Funds</th>
<th>Local Fund Source</th>
<th>Type of Match (Cash, in-kind)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Phase]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Phase]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Phase]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Phase]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[Fund Source]</td>
<td>[Match Type]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Cost: $ [698,000]

Project Details: Clearly describe the existing conditions and the proposed project and desired improvements in detail. Please provide studies, documentation, etc., completed to-date to support or justify the proposed improvements. Include labeled photos and maps. (Add additional pages if needed):

*See Project Proposal and Addendum "A" below.

The questions below are not applicable, for our project entails the acquisition and installation of video detection cameras at specified signalized intersections along County roadways.

Constructability Review

For items 2-9 provide labeled and dated photos (add additional pages if needed)

1. Discuss other projects (ex. drainage, utility, etc.) programmed (local, state or federal) within the limits of this project? N/A

2. Does the applicant have an adopted ADA transition plan? Yes ☐ Identify No ☒ areas within the project limits that will require ADA retrofit. (Include GIS coordinates for stops and labeled photos and/or map.)
   N/A

3. Is there a rail crossing along the project?
   Yes ☐ No ☒
   What is the Rail MP?
   Enter MP

4. Are there any transit stops/shelters/amenities within the project limits?
   Yes ☐ No ☒
   How many? Click here to enter text.
   Stop ID number: Click here to enter text.
5. Is the project within 10-miles of an airport? Yes ☒ No ☐ (Not applicable)

6. Coordinate with local transit and discuss improvements needed or requested for bus stops?
   (add additional pages if needed):
   Click here to enter text.

7. Are turn lanes being added? Yes ☐ No ☒
   If yes, provide traffic counts, length, and location of involved turn lanes.
   Click here to enter text.

8. Drainage structures: (Not applicable)
   • Number of culverts or pipes currently in place: Click here to enter text.
   • Discuss lengths and locations of each culvert along the roadway: Click here to enter text.
   • Discuss the disposition of each culvert and inlet. Which culverts are “to remain” and which are to be replaced, upgraded, or extended? Click here to enter text.
   • Discuss drainage ditches to be filled in? (Discuss limits and quantify fill in cubic yards) Click here to enter text.
   • Describe the proposed conveyances system (add additional pages if needed.) Click here to enter text.
   • Are there any existing permitted stormwater management facilities/ponds within the project limits? Yes ☐ No ☒
   • If yes, provide the location and permit number (add additional pages if needed) Click here to enter text.
   • Discuss proposed stormwater management permits needed for the improvements. Click here to enter text.
   • List specific utilities within project limits and describe any potential conflicts (add additional pages if needed): Click here to enter text.
   • Discuss Bridges within project limits? Click here to enter text.
   • Can bridges accommodate proposed improvements? Yes ☐ No ☐
     If no, what bridge improvements are proposed? (Offset and dimensions of the improvements, add additional pages if needed): Click here to enter text.
9. Has Right-of-way (ROW), easements, or ROW activity already been performed/acquired for the proposed improvements? If yes, please provide documentation

- Yes ☐ No ☐  (Not applicable)

If ROW or Easements are needed detail expected area of need (acreage needed, ownership status):

Click here to enter text. (Not applicable)

10. Discuss required permits (ERP, Drainage, Driveway, Right of Way, etc.):

If none are needed, state the qualified exemption:

Click here to enter text. (Not applicable)

11. Are there any wetlands within the project limits?   Yes ☐   No ☐  (Not applicable)

If yes, list the type of wetlands, estimated acreage and if mitigation will be required. Please note whether the project is within the geographic service area of any approved mitigation banks. Provide any additional information:

Click here to enter text.

12. Are there any federal or state listed/protected species within the project limits?

- Yes ☐ No ☐  (Not applicable)

If yes, list the species and what, if any mitigation or coordination will be necessary: Click here to enter text.

If yes, discuss critical habitat within the project limits: Click here to enter text.

13. Discuss whether any prior reviews or surveys have been completed for historical and archaeological resources (include year, project, results)

Click here to enter text. (Not applicable)

14. Are any Recreational, historical properties or resources covered under section 4(f) property within the project limits?   Yes ☐   No ☐  (Provide details) Click here to enter text.  (Not applicable)

15. Discuss whether any prior reviews or surveys have been completed for sites/facilities which may have potential contamination involvement with the proposed improvements. This should include a discussion of locations which may directly impact the project location, or be which may be exacerbated by the construction of the proposed improvements. Click here to enter text. (Not applicable)
16. Are lighting improvements requested as part of this project? Yes ☐ No ☒
   Please provide a lighting justification report for the proposed lighting.
   Click here to enter text.

17. Is a mid-block crossing proposed as part of the project? Yes ☐ No ☒
   If yes, please provide the justification for mid-block crossing.
   Click here to enter text.

**Required Attachments**

A. Detailed Project Scope with Project Location Map with sufficient level of detail (Please include typical section of proposed improvements)
B. Project Photos – dated and labeled (this is important!)
C. Detailed Cost Estimates including Pay Items
D. LRTP and Local CIP page
E. Survey/As-builts/ROW documentation/Utility/Drainage information
F. Detailed breakdown of ROW costs included in estimate (if ROW is needed/included in request or estimate)
Applicant Contact Information

Agency Name: Mailing Address: 2885 South Horseshoe Dr., Naples FL 34104
Contact Name and Title: Pierre-Marie Beauvoir | Signal Systems Network Specialist
Email: pierre.beauvoir@colliercountyfl.gov Phone: (239) 252-6066

Signature: Pierre-Marie Beauvoir Date: 1/4/2021
Your signature indicates that the information included with this application is accurate.

Maintaining Agency:
Contact Name and Title: Click here to enter text.
Email: Click here to enter text. Phone: Click here to enter text.

Signature: ____________________________ Date: _____________________
Your signature serves as a commitment from your agency to maintain the facility requested.

MPO/TPO:
Contact Name and Title: Click here to enter text.
Email: Click here to enter text. Phone: Click here to enter text.

Signature: ____________________________ Date: _____________________
Your signature confirms the request project is consistent with all MPO/TPO plans and documents, is eligible, and indicates MPO/TPO support for the project.
Figure 6-6 presents the total costs by project phase for the SIS cost feasible projects for this 2045 LRTP update. Figures 6-7 and 6-8 present the total costs by project phase and funding source, respectively, for the FDOT Other Roads and Local Roads cost feasible projects for this 2045 LRTP update.

Figure 6-6. Total Costs by Project Phase SIS Funded Projects 2026–2045 (YOE $ in millions)

Figure 6-7. Total Costs by Project Phase for FDOT Other Roads and Local Roads Funded Projects 2026–2045 (YOE $ in millions)

Funding of Other Roadway Needs

East of CR 951 Bridges

As noted in Chapter 4, there are 10 proposed canal crossing bridges that are the subject of the 2020 East of CR 951 Bridge Reevaluation Study. A 1-cent infrastructure surtax with specific funding earmarked for constructing these new bridges will be available within the next 7 years. A total of $19.7 million in TMA (or SU) Funds is dedicated for bridge projects in the 2045 LRTP update:

- Planning Period 2026 to 2030: $4.96 million for CST
- Planning Period 2031 to 2035: $4.94 million for CST
- Planning Period 2036 to 2045: $9.8 million for CST

Congestion Management Projects

Congestion management and ITS projects are generally short-term and immediate action projects. Therefore, their role in the LRTP process is modest and are more thoroughly addressed in the CMP. The current TIP includes several
improvements to the traffic management center, arterial monitoring cameras, and other traffic equipment improvements that address safety, active roadway management, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Table 6-4 presents congestion management projects funded for construction in the 2021–2025 TIP.

The Collier MPO identified congestion management priorities resulting from the TSPR and the Local Road Safety Plan (Collier MPO 2020e). Tables 6-5 and 6-6 present infrastructure and non-infrastructure multimodal strategies, respectively, that contribute to the MPO’s project selection process.

**Table 6-4. Congestion Management Projects Funded in TIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITS Projects</th>
<th>Funded Amount</th>
<th>TIP/CIP Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Detection – City of Naples (refer to Figure 4-7 in Chapter 4)</td>
<td>$66,429</td>
<td>CST 2024/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Fiber Optic and FPL Power Infrastructure at 13 locations</td>
<td>$272,725</td>
<td>CST 2024/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Data Collection and Performance Measures</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>CST 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Updated School Flasher System</td>
<td>$353,250</td>
<td>CST 2024/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Vehicle Count Station Update (refer to Figure 4-7 in Chapter 4)</td>
<td>$311,562</td>
<td>CST 2023/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Adaptive Traffic Control System at 13 signalized locations along Santa Barbara Boulevard and Golden Gate Parkway (refer to Figure 4-7 in Chapter 4)</td>
<td>$893,000</td>
<td>PE 2023/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CST 2024/25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Collier MPO 2020 *Transportation System Performance Report & Action Plan*

Future congestion management projects will be prioritized through the MPO’s congestion management process. A total of $40.45 million in TMA (or SU) Funds is dedicated for future congestion management projects in the 2045 LRTP update:

- Planning Period 2026 to 2030: $10.17 million for CST
- Planning Period 2031 to 2035: $10.13 million for CST
- Planning Period 2036 to 2045: $20.15 million for CST

**Other Consideration for SU Funds**

In addition to congestion management and bridge projects, the MPO allocates its TMA SU funds to planning, bicycle/pedestrian facilities, and safety projects. These five categories are often referred to as “SU Box” funds by the MPO. The Planning SU Box funds are used to supplement the MPO’s federal Planning (PL) funds to cover costs associated with updating the LRTP every 5 years. The MPO may also use SU Box funds to update the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, Transportation System Performance Report, Local Roads Safety Plan (LRSP), freight studies, and other plans and studies that are integral to updating the LRTP.

The MPO sets aside SU Box funds allocated to safety projects to implement the LRSP. The LRSP identifies priority projects that include engineering, enforcement, education, and emergency response. Safety projects will be vetted by the Congestion Management Committee, BPAC, TAC, and CAC before going to the MPO Board for adoption. The MPO may also choose to use Safety Box funds to supplement FDOT funding on safety projects that address the MPO’s and FDOT’s shared Vision Zero Safety Performance Targets. Table 6-7 presents the presents the SU funds by planning year and project phase. Figure 6-9 presents a summary of the allocation of SU Funds through 2045.
Table 6-7. SU Box Funds by Planning Year and Project Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation Type</th>
<th>Plan Period 2: 2026-2030</th>
<th>Plan Period 3: 2031-2035</th>
<th>Plan Period 4: 2036-2045</th>
<th>Total Cost 2026-2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE-ENG</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>PRE-ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Supplemental Planning Funds</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Pedestrian Box Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Management/Intelligent Transportation Box Funds</td>
<td>$10.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Box Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6-9. SU Fund Allocation Through 2045
4.0 Congestion Management Strategies

Federal guidance recommends that identification of congestion management strategies be based on their ability to support regional congestion management objectives, meet local context, and contribute to other regional goals and objectives. Strategies that effectively manage congestion and achieve congestion management goals and objectives established in the CMP process are selected to meet Collier County’s specific needs. In the 2020 CMP update process, new CMP strategies were identified and added to the existing strategies list based on the analysis that was conducted in the Baseline Conditions Report which identified causes and locations of congested corridors and the Action Plan which analyzed and identified congestion mitigation strategies for the specific corridors. The main additions include safety strategies and strategies to address school related congestion. Table 4-1 lists the category and respective congestion management strategies identified to mitigate congestion along the CMP network in Collier County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES: Demand Management (Programmatic), Transportation &amp; Land Use Policy</th>
<th>STRATEGIES: Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved incident management</td>
<td>Signage and Pavement Markings (e.g. special emphasis crosswalks, yield/stop for pedestrian signs, advanced street signs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool/Vanpool Assistance and Carpool/Vanpool Technology including School Carpooling Apps</td>
<td>Visibility and Sightline Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Work Hours</td>
<td>New and upgraded street lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Vouchers</td>
<td>Traffic control devices (e.g. left turn signals, variable message signs, pedestrian hybrid beacons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Development</td>
<td>New and Upgrade existing bicycle and pedestrian crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/Housing Regional Balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Complete Streets Policy All New Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Density &amp; Mixed-Use Fixed Route Corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Dismissal timing (e.g. stagger dismissal times, dismissal automation software)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking, Biking, Transit and School Bus Awareness/Education campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School &amp; School Zone Traffic Congestion Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin-Destination Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-1: Collier MPO Congestion Management Strategies
## STRATEGIES: Transit
- Amenities to Attract New Ridership
- MPO transit service expansion and improvement (e.g. frequency, hours of operation, realign routes)
- Regional Transit system Expansion
- Bus rapid transit corridor
- Park & Ride facilities
- Intermodal Hubs
- Transit ITS and MOD
- Arrival Prediction Technology
- Park-and-Ride lots

## STRATEGIES: ITS & Access Management - Active Roadway Management
- Expanded traffic signal timing & coordination - ITS
- Traffic Center Operations Enhancements
- Traffic signal equipment modernization - ITS
- Traveler information devices - ITS
- Communications networks & roadway surveillance - ITS
- Access management
- School Zone Traffic Calming Measures
- School Zone pedestrian and traffic signal optimization
- School off-site waiting lots and curbing and parking zones

## STRATEGIES: Physical Roadway Capacity Enhancement
- Intersection Improvements
- Replace intersections with round-abouts & other innovative designs
- Deceleration lanes and turn lanes
- New grade-separated intersections
- New travel lanes (general purpose)
- New roadway network connections

## STRATEGIES: Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities
- New off-street pedestrian and multi-use facilities to close gaps in the transportation network and make connections to key destinations
- Integrated into TODs, High Density Corridors
- Regional Bike/Ped Facilities
- Complete Streets on New Facilities & Retrofit or new on-street bicycle
- Supporting bicycle infrastructure (e.g. secure and convenient parking, bike repair and pumps)
Project Proposal

ATMS Retiming of Arterials in Collier County

Purpose:
The purpose of this project is to perform retiming of arterials and isolated intersections in Collier County listed below and in Addendum “A”. The work will entail, conducting vehicle traffic counts, the development and implementation of timing plans.

Amount Requested and Estimated Total Project Cost: (See cost table below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retiming of Arterials and Isolated Intersections</td>
<td>$881,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$881,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Project Duration:
24 months

Project Scope:
The project includes the retiming of Arterials and Isolated Intersections at approximately 40 intersections listed below and will include conducting traffic counts, the development and implementation of timing plans, as well as fine tuning each signalized intersection for optimum performance and the deployment of necessary technologies, required to ensure optimum intersection performance. The work will also include a before and after snapshot of the project arterials.

Collier Blvd

1. Collier Blvd @ Magnolia Blvd/White Utility Rd
2. Collier Blvd @ I-75N
3. Collier Blvd @ I-75S
4. Collier Blvd @ Davis Blvd
5. Collier Blvd @ Business Cir

Rattlesnake Hammock Rd

6. Rattlesnake Hammock Rd @ County Barn Rd
7. Rattlesnake Hammock Rd @ Santa Barbara Blvd
8. Rattlesnake Hammock Rd @ Grand Lely Dr
9. Rattlesnake Hammock Rd @ Collier Blvd
10. Rattlesnake Hammock Rd @ Lely Cultural Pkwy

Immokalee Rd/Oilwell Rd

11. Immokalee @ Collier Charter School
12. Immokalee @ Wilson Blvd N
13. Immokalee @ Randall Blvd/4th St NE
Project Proposal

14. Immokalee @ Orange Tree
15. Immokalee @ Oilwell
16. Oilwell Rd @ Corkscrew ES/MS
17. Oilwell Rd @ Palmetto HS/Victory Ln

Goodlette Frank Rd/Golden Gate Pkwy
18. Goodlette Frank @ Granada Dr/Moorings Park Dr
19. Goodlette Frank @ Solana Rd
20. Goodlette Frank @ Ohio Dr
21. Goodlette Frank @ Wilderness Dr
22. Goodlette Frank @ 22nd Ave N
23. Goodlette Frank @ Golden Gate Pkwy
24. Goodlette Frank @ Fleishman Blvd
25. Goodlette Frank @ 14th Ave N
26. Goodlette Frank @ 13th Ave N
27. Golden Gate Pkwy @ Naples HS/Coastland Center Mall

Radio Rd
1. Radio Rd @ Devonshire Blvd

Santa Barbara Blvd
2. Santa Barbara Blvd @ Radio Rd
3. Santa Barbara Blvd @ Devonshire Blvd/Berkshire Pines Rd
4. Santa Barbara Blvd @ Prince Andrew Blvd/Recreation Ln
5. Santa Barbara Blvd @ Golden Gate Blvd
6. Santa Barbara Blvd @ Coronado Pkwy
7. Santa Barbara Blvd @ Greene Blvd

Golden Gate Pkwy
8. Golden Gate Pkwy @ 53rd St
9. Golden Gate Pkwy @ 50th St
10. Golden Gate Pkwy @ Tropicana Blvd
11. Golden Gate Pkwy @ Coronado Pkwy
12. Golden Gate Pkwy @ Sunshine Blvd/47th St
13. Golden Gate Pkwy @ 44th St

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinated Signalization Retiming Cost Estimates (Adjusted for Inflation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflation Adjusted Year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Adjusted Cost:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Controller Programming:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Time Savings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Final Report:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost for 40 Intersections: $881,948.58
Collier Blvd - 5 Intersections to be re-timed to address I-75 traffic flow.
**Rattlesnake Hammock Rd** - 5 Intersections to be re-timed for improved traffic flow.

**Immokalee Rd/Oilwell Rd** - 8 Intersections to be re-timed, to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion.
Goodlette Frank Rd/Golden Gate Pkwy - 10 Intersections to be re-timed, improving the flow of traffic.
Golden Gate Blvd and Santa Barbara Corridors - 13 Signalized Intersections, numbered 1-13. This is a highly traveled corridor both in the morning and evening for access to and from the Estates.
## Multimodal Performance Measures

**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**

### Travel Demand
- **Project ID #1**
  - Project Name: Vanderbilt Beach Road Corridor Study
  - County: Collier County
  - Project Type: A study of the corridor will look at the physical roadway capacity now and, in the future, and determine ways to enhance or improve the corridor. The study is intended to include intersection analysis as recommended in Action Item 2 on page 3-11 and will follow the FDOT Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) or the most current evaluation tool. Results of the study will be recommendations for implementation based on analysis of existing traffic, land use, population, etc., and may include adaptive and connected signal intersections, innovative intersections, and physical roadway improvements to enhance capacity, etc.

### Safety
- **Project ID #2**
  - Project Name: Vanderbilt Beach Road Corridor Study
  - County: Collier County
  - Project Type: A study of the corridor will look at the physical roadway capacity now and, in the future, and determine ways to enhance or improve the corridor. The study is intended to include intersection analysis as recommended in Action Item 2 on page 3-11 and will follow the FDOT Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) or the most current evaluation tool. Results of the study will be recommendations for implementation based on analysis of existing traffic, land use, population, etc., and may include adaptive and connected signal intersections, innovative intersections, and physical roadway improvements to enhance capacity, etc.

### Transit Travel
- **Project ID #3**
  - Project Name: ITS Vehicle Detection Update/Installation at Signalized Intersections in Collier County
  - County: Collier County
  - Project Type: Validates improved performance measures but does not address performance measures that do not address TSPR Action Plan Congestion Management Strategies, Table 4-1 in pages 6-1 and 6-2 under ITS and Access Management - Active Roadway Management: Traffic signal equipment modernization, Traffic control strategies implementation.

### Ped/Bicycle Facilities
- **Project ID #4**
  - Project Name: ITS Vehicle Detection Update/Installation at Signalized Intersections in Collier County
  - County: Collier County
  - Project Type: Validates improved performance measures but does not address performance measures that do not address TSPR Action Plan Congestion Management Strategies, Table 4-1 in pages 6-1 and 6-2 under ITS and Access Management - Active Roadway Management: Traffic signal equipment modernization, Traffic control strategies implementation.

### Goods Movement
- **Project ID #5**
  - Project Name: Traffic Operations will submit a report analyzing before/after traffic and turning movement counts, V/C ratios and average a.m./p.m. peak hour speed.

### TDM
- **Project ID #6**
  - Project Name: The project will replace radio and wireless technologies at midblock locations with FPL power and fiber optics network connectivity to midblock ITS devices on Collier County roadways to improve stability and functionality of the system. The project does comply with a strategy listed in TSPR - Action Plan, p4-2, Table 4-1: Communications networks & roadway surveillance - ITS. Provide additional information justifying change to cable from wireless - is does FDOT recommend going with cable instead of wireless?

### Accessibility
- **Project ID #7**
  - Project Name: A study of the corridor will look at the physical roadway capacity now and, in the future, and determine ways to enhance or improve the corridor. The study is intended to include intersection analysis as recommended in Action Item 2 on page 3-11 and will follow the FDOT Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) or the most current evaluation tool. Results of the study will be recommendations for implementation based on analysis of existing traffic, land use, population, etc., and may include adaptive and connected signal intersections, innovative intersections, and physical roadway improvements to enhance capacity, etc.

### Incident Duration
- **Project ID #8**
  - Project Name: Traffic Operations will submit a report analyzing before/after traffic and turning movement counts, V/C ratios and average a.m./p.m. peak hour speed.

### Customer Service
- **Project ID #9**
  - Project Name: Traffic Operations will submit a report analyzing before/after traffic and turning movement counts, V/C ratios and average a.m./p.m. peak hour speed.
### Evaluation Criteria and Scores

#### General Project Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Submitting Agency/Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Supported by Multiple Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Local Monetary Contribution?</th>
<th>Requires Acquisition of ROW</th>
<th>Uses TSM Approach</th>
<th>Uses TDM Approach</th>
<th>Increases Safety</th>
<th>Protects Environmental Resources</th>
<th>Protects Economic Development or Freight Movement</th>
<th>TOTAL POINTS</th>
<th>RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>91st Ave N (Construction of a 5’ wide sidewalk along the south side of the road)</td>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>Yes (3 pts)</td>
<td>Yes (3 pts)</td>
<td>Yes (3 pts)</td>
<td>Yes (3 pts)</td>
<td>Yes (3 pts)</td>
<td>Yes (3 pts)</td>
<td>Yes (3 pts)</td>
<td>Yes (3 pts)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Beach Road Corridor Study</td>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ITS Optic and DPL Fiber Infrastructure - 13 Locations</td>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ITS Vehicle Detection (implementation at specific intersections in a single County)</td>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ITS ATM at 5 Locations</td>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>No (0 pts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Specific

- **General Project Evaluation**
  - **Evaluation Criteria and Scores**
    - **Environmental Scoring**
      - **High**: reduces air quality emissions; reduces fuel consumption by including vehicle configuration
      - **Medium**: reduces fuel consumption by including specific transportation decisions
      - **Low**: cannot promote overall economic development
    - **Economic Development/Freight Movement Scoring**
      - **High**: located at and directly affects access to airports, major activity or freight centers
      - **Medium**: located near and affects access to airports, high employment areas, freight activity centers
      - **Low**: cannot promote overall economic development
    - **Multimodal Scoring**
      - **High**: improves at least 3 modes or increases connectivity between motorized and non-motorized modes
      - **Medium**: enhances at least 2 modes
      - **Low**: enhances 1 mode or increases connectivity on a specific corridor
    - **Regional Connectivity Scoring**
      - **High**: increases existing connectivity, targeting; transit or a Park & Ride facility
      - **Medium**: adds new transit route or new Park & Ride facility or integrates with regional ITS program
      - **Low**: increases overall connectivity of highways or transit
    - **Traffic Flow Scoring**
      - **High**: includes documented safety problems, reduces risk for vehicles, public or related criteria as increase injuries, increases crash safety of high traffic locations and/or increases improvement of emergency responder or reduces number of emergency incidents resulting from primary
      - **Medium**: adds new bicycle or pedestrian facilities
      - **Low**: is a facility identified in an unserved condition

- **General Project Evaluation**
  - **Evaluation Criteria and Scores**
    - **Environmental Scoring**
      - **High**: reduces air quality emissions; reduces fuel consumption by including vehicle configuration
      - **Medium**: reduces fuel consumption by including specific transportation decisions
      - **Low**: cannot promote overall economic development
    - **Economic Development/Freight Movement Scoring**
      - **High**: located at and directly affects access to airports, major activity or freight centers
      - **Medium**: located near and affects access to airports, high employment areas, freight activity centers
      - **Low**: cannot promote overall economic development
    - **Multimodal Scoring**
      - **High**: improves at least 3 modes or increases connectivity between motorized and non-motorized modes
      - **Medium**: enhances at least 2 modes
      - **Low**: enhances 1 mode or increases connectivity on a specific corridor
    - **Regional Connectivity Scoring**
      - **High**: increases existing connectivity, targeting; transit or a Park & Ride facility
      - **Medium**: adds new transit route or new Park & Ride facility or integrates with regional ITS program
      - **Low**: increases overall connectivity of highways or transit
    - **Traffic Flow Scoring**
      - **High**: includes documented safety problems, reduces risk for vehicles, public or related criteria as increase injuries, increases crash safety of high traffic locations and/or increases improvement of emergency responder or reduces number of emergency incidents resulting from primary
      - **Medium**: adds new bicycle or pedestrian facilities
      - **Low**: is a facility identified in an unserved condition
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Distribution Items
Item 10A

Draft 2021 MPO Calendar

OBJECTIVE: For the Committee to receive a copy of the 2021 MPO Calendar.

CONSIDERATIONS: The 2021 MPO Calendar is provided in Attachment 1. Subsequent changes will be noted and distributed on an as-needed basis.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: For the Committee to receive a copy of the 2021 MPO Calendar.

Prepared By: Anne McLaughlin, MPO Director

Attachment 1: 2021 MPO Calendar
## Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) – Monthly at 9:00 a.m.

All MPO Board Meetings are held on the second Friday of the month. MPO Board Meetings will be held at the Board of County Commissioners Chambers, 3299 E. Tamiami Trail, Naples, unless otherwise noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>February 12, 2021</th>
<th>March 12, 2021</th>
<th>*April 9, 2021</th>
<th>May 14, 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 2021</td>
<td>September 10, 2021</td>
<td>October 8, 2021</td>
<td>October 15, 2021**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 2021</td>
<td>December 10, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is the Collier MPO road-show meeting held at 10:00 a.m. in Immokalee

** This a JOINT MEETING with Lee MPO, location TBD

## Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) – Monthly at 9:30 a.m.

All TAC Meetings are held on the last Monday of the month. TAC Meetings will be held at the Collier Growth Management Department, Planning & Regulation Building Conference Rooms 609/610, 2800 North Horseshoe Drive, Naples, unless noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 24, 2021</td>
<td>August 30, 2021</td>
<td>September 27, 2021</td>
<td>October 25, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** October XX, 2021</td>
<td>November 29, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** This a JOINT MEETING with Lee MPO, location TBD

## Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) – Monthly at 2:00 p.m.

All CAC Meetings are held on the last Monday of the month. CAC Meetings will be held at the Collier County Growth Management Division, Planning & Regulation Building Conference Rooms 609/610, 2800 North Horseshoe Drive, Naples, unless noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 24, 2021</td>
<td>August 30, 2021</td>
<td>September 27, 2021</td>
<td>October 25, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** October XX, 2021</td>
<td>November 29, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is a JOINT MEETING with Lee CAC, location and date TBD

## Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) – Monthly at 9:00 a.m.

All BPAC Meetings are held on the third Tuesday of the month. BPAC Meetings will be held at the Collier County Growth Management Division, Planning & Regulation Building Conference Rooms 609/610, 2800 North Horseshoe Drive, Naples, unless noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 19, 2021</th>
<th>February 16, 2021</th>
<th>March 16, 2021</th>
<th>April 20, 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 18, 2021</td>
<td>August 17, 2021</td>
<td>*August XX, 2021</td>
<td>September 21, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 19, 2021</td>
<td>November 16, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is a JOINT MEETING with Lee BPCC, location and date TBD

## Congestion Management Committee (CMC) – Bi-Monthly at 2:00 p.m.

All CMC Meetings are held on the third Wednesday of every other month. CMC Meetings will be held at the Collier County Growth Management Division, Planning & Regulation Building Conference Rooms 609/610, 2800 North Horseshoe Drive, Naples, unless noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 20, 2021</th>
<th>March 17, 2021</th>
<th>May 19, 2021</th>
<th>July 21, 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*September 15, 2021</td>
<td>November 17, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Location for this meeting will be held at the Collier Growth Management Department Construction and Maintenance Building, Main Conference Room, 2885 South Horseshoe Drive, Naples

## Local Coordinating Board (LCB) for the Transportation Disadvantaged – Quarterly at 1:30 p.m.

All LCB Meetings are held quarterly on the first Wednesday of the corresponding month. LCB Meetings will be held will be held at the Board of County Commissioners Chambers, 3299 E. Tamiami Trail, Naples, unless otherwise noted.

| March 3, 2021 | May 5, 2021 | September 1, 2021 | December 1, 2021 |