

V.5 Efficient Transportation Decision Making

With the adoption of the Cost Feasible Plan, the coordination with FDOT occurred to determine which projects required a Need and Purpose statement for entry into the Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) system. These projects included the proposed Quincy Loop in Gadsden County and the proposed service roads along US 319 in Wakulla County. The ETDM Need and Purpose Statements, found in [Appendix J](#), for each of the projects were completed for submittal into the ETDM system.

VI. Public Outreach

“Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.”

- Margaret Mead

The development of the RMP incorporated an extensive and intensive public involvement effort that included significant coordination and input with the CRTPA planning partners, representatives of other state, regional and local agencies, stakeholders, and members of the general public. There were also several visioning initiatives underway in the region during the development of the RMP and the process also incorporated the coordination with these efforts.

The first step in the RMP planning process was the development of the RMP Public Participation Plan, found in [Appendix K](#), which was developed within the framework of the CRTPA Public Participation Plan. This plan provided the blueprint for compliance with the requirements of SAFETEA-LU and to ensure that all federal, state, and local planning requirements and mandates were met.

The development of the RMP was non-traditional and because of this nature, required non-traditional approaches to the involvement of the planning partners, the organizational structure and the participation activities. Because the study was regional in scope, there were a large number of political jurisdictions involved, which greatly increased the number of planning partners involved. In addition, because of the diversity of the region, the participation activities needed to be tailored to meet the needs of both large urban communities, as well as smaller, rural areas.

The development of the RMP involved a wide range of citizens from throughout the region, different local governments and other interested parties. In an effort to provide an organized approach to the wide and diverse stakeholder involvement, a multi-layered committee structure was developed.

The project team was identified which included representatives from CRTPA; StarMetro; local planning departments from each county; other stakeholder organizations such as Tall Timbers and Commuter Services of North Florida; the Apalachee Regional Planning Council; BluePrint 2000; local public works departments; the consultant team; and any other interested parties. This

project team met on a monthly basis over the course of the project. **Tables 4 - 6** include the project team meeting dates and the project components that were discussed.

Table 4. Project Team Meetings: 2009

January 15, 2009	Project kick-off and review of upcoming activities
February 19, 2009	Regional Transit Study (RTS) overview; public participation coordination; travel demand and transit modeling discussion
March 16, 2009	Data collection status and update; travel demand and transit modeling discussion; Jefferson County TAZ and socio-economic data status; public participation activities and coordination
April 16, 2009	Existing Conditions development; transit planning update: Transit Development Plan (TDP) and RTS; public meeting review and results; brainstorming for increased involvement; formation of public participation sub-committee
May 21, 2009	Data collection update; TDP outline and schedule; public participation and marketing review and discussion; technical subcommittee meetings and protocols
June 19, 2009	Data collection update; TDP update; public participation discussion: participation subcommittee meeting results; technical subcommittee results
July 16, 2009	Data collection and Existing Conditions Report update; GIS coordination; public participation discussion and upcoming meetings; Goals and Objectives discussion and formation of working committee
September 24, 2009	Goals and Objectives working committee update; model status review; public participation: public meeting results; discussion to increase participation
October 15, 2009	Overview of Goals and Objectives; Board Retreat agenda review; model update; TDP update
December 1, 2009	Future growth scenario discussion; Goals and Objectives discussion; coordination with other ongoing planning efforts; corridor planning update; transit discussion: TDP, RTS and TBEST modeling;

Table 5. Project Team Meetings: 2010

January 19, 2010	Growth scenario update; Goals and Objectives discussion; Transit update: TDP and TBEST; future socio-economic projections; Project Advisory Committee update
February 18, 2010	Project strategies discussion; scenario planning and analysis update; corridor planning update
March 18, 2010	Project strategies review and discussion; TDP update; sector planning update; potential Board Retreat agenda
April 15, 2010	Scenario analysis results; TDP update; Board Retreat agenda review; sector planning update
May 20, 2010	Project identification and prioritization discussion; updates on sector and corridor planning; public meeting review; TDP update
June 17, 2010	Sector and corridor planning update; TDP review; project identification and assessment; public meeting results

July 15, 2010	Needs Plan review; project assessment; sector plan review; TDP; financial resources
August 19, 2010	Project assessment; financial resources and cost estimates; sector plan review: Quincy, Crawfordville, Midway; corridor planning update
October 21, 2010	Sector plan review: Monticello; corridor planning update; trails planning update; local government tools update; Cost Feasible Plan review; Board Retreat review and results

Table 6. Project Team Meetings: 2011

January 20, 2011	ETDM update; sector plan review: MMTD; trails plan update; TDP status
February 17, 2011	Update of remaining project activities: Trails Master Plan; TDP procedural steps for adoption

A Project Advisory Committee (PAC) was also established in an effort to maintain a workable committee size and met periodically throughout the plan development. This PAC was comprised of one representative from each Technical Subcommittee. These subcommittees had a broad and diverse representation of all elements of the community to ensure that the full range of perspectives was incorporated into the planning process. The Technical Subcommittees included:

- **Environmental** – representatives from the growth management departments, Florida Department of Community Affairs, Tall Timbers, Water Management District, Audubon Society, Sierra Club, Canopy Roads Committee, National Forest Service, 1,000 Friends of Florida, Big Bend Scenic By-ways, energy conservation departments
- **First Responders** – representatives from local law enforcement agencies, fire departments, local and state emergency management agencies, emergency medical services, and Red Cross
- **Community Health** – representatives from hospitals, state and local health departments, Council on Physical Fitness, and the American Heart Association
- **Education/School Access** – representatives from school boards, charter schools, parents and private schools on an as needed basis
- **Economic Development** – representatives from economic development councils, chambers of commerce, banking and finance industry, builders and developers, realtors, small business associations, other business associations, tourist development associations, and community redevelopment agencies
- **Neighborhood/Community** – representatives from the Councils of Neighborhood Association, downtown associations, business associations, church affiliates, historic preservation and the State Historic Preservation Office
- **Underserved Populations** – representatives from the educational sector, Department of Children and Families, Department of Elder Affairs, minority communities, and Lighthouse of Big Bend
- **Intermodal/Freight** – representatives from CSX, trucking association, warehouse and distribution sector, airports, and Weight and Motion
- **Utilities** – representatives from electric providers, water and sewer services, and solid waste

- ***Bicycle/Pedestrian*** – representatives from Bike Walk, parks and recreation departments, Office of Greenways and Trails, state and local trails groups, and Multimodal Advisory Committee representatives
- ***Transit Providers*** – representatives from StarMetro, Big Bend Transit, other transportation disadvantaged providers
- ***Land Use*** – representatives from planning staff and planning commissions; CRTPA Board
- ***Peer Review*** – representatives from professional organizations, such as Institute of Transportation Engineers, Florida Chapter of American Planning Association and transportation professionals

In addition to these technical committees, local focus groups were also established. These local groups provided input into the sector planning process, as well as providing local input on community values, needs and desires throughout the RMP planning process.

The first event held in the process was a Transportation Forum, which was the project kick-off and also provided the first opportunity for the various committees to meet and discuss the project. This forum provided an overview of the plan development, the project schedule and anticipated roles for participants. The forum was held in April, 2009.

The technical committees met periodically throughout the course of the project, with some committees being much more active in their participation than others. The committees which met most frequently and remained engaged throughout the process included the Bicycle/Pedestrian committee, the Land Use committee, and the Environmental committee. Input was obtained from the other committees which did not meet as frequently through individual contact to obtain input. The Project Advisory Committee met at strategic times during the planning process to provide input and guidance on the development of the plan.

Public Meeting # 1

Public meetings were structured to provide convenient opportunities for residents throughout the region to participate. There were four public meetings during the project and each public meeting was held in each county. The first public meeting was held at the following times:

April 14, 2009: Jefferson and Leon Counties

April 16, 2009: Gadsden and Wakulla Counties

At this first public meeting, an overview of the project was provided and each participant took a Community Choices Survey. In addition, to the survey, each participant was asked to write on an index card their five (5) favorite things about the region. An overview of the Regional Transit Study was also provided. Participants broke into small discussion groups to identify the issues within the region and were then asked to prioritize those issues. The results of the survey from the meeting are found in [Appendix L](#).

Public Meeting # 2

The second public meeting included a status report of the project to date, as well as a report from StarMetro on their planned Nova2010 service. The participants were asked to break into small

groups to provide input on the development of the RMP goals. In addition, the groups reviewed the future growth scenarios and identified the type of land use for each scenario in conjunction with appropriate mobility options. The group participants were also asked to identify the location of future growth centers. The participants were also given CRTPA “bucks” to spend on specific types of transportation projects. The results of this exercise are found in Appendix L.

The second round of public meetings were held at the following times:

September 1, 2009: Leon and Jefferson Counties

September 3, 2009: Wakulla and Gadsden Counties

Public Meeting # 3

The third public meeting included a status report of the project to date, including the goals and objectives, the future growth scenarios, and the sector plans. Maps and project lists were displayed for participants to review. Participants were asked to add any projects they felt were missing, either by noting the project on the list or drawing on the maps. The third round of public meetings were held at the following times:

June 7, 2010: Gadsden County

June 8, 2010: Jefferson and Wakulla Counties

June 10, 2010: Leon County

Public Meeting # 4

The fourth and final public meeting provided participants with the opportunity to review and comment on the draft Cost Feasible Plan. The Needs Plan projects were displayed on a regional map and for each individual county. Additionally, the draft Cost Feasible Plan was also displayed on maps. An overview of the project, including a recap of the goals and objectives, the growth scenarios, and the project assessment strategies was provided. The financial information was also reviewed, as well as the Transit Development Plan. Participation at the last meetings held in Gadsden and Jefferson Counties was low. In order to address that issue, the display boards and information sheets were set up outside of the regularly scheduled County Commission meetings. This approach resulted in much more participation and input from those citizens. The meetings in Leon and Wakulla Counties were held as separate events from any other scheduled meeting.

The meetings were held at the following times:

October 5, 2010: Gadsden and Jefferson Counties

October 7, 2010: Wakulla and Leon Counties

In addition to these regularly scheduled public meetings, a number of other opportunities were provided for input. These opportunities included the CRTPA Board retreats held in April and October, 2009 and 2010. Separate presentations were made to the Gadsden County Commission, the Tallahassee Leon County Planning Commission, and the Wakulla County Commission. Project team members also participated in neighborhood association meetings to provide project overviews and receive specific input. Other opportunities were also based on coordination with

stakeholder organizations, such as the participation in the Transportation Fair hosted by the Commuter Services of North Florida. A survey was provided to participants who provided significant information and input into the development of the goals and objectives for the plan.

In addition, continuous coordination occurred with local planning staff throughout the development of the plan. A special subcommittee was also formed to determine strategies to address poor public participation in some areas of the region. This resulted in the change in the meeting process for Gadsden and Jefferson Counties, which was successful in the last meeting.

The sector planning process also incorporated opportunities for local input. Interviews were held with local elected officials and administrators, as well as with identified citizens and stakeholders to ensure that the planning process was coordinated with local goals, aspirations and desires. Continuous coordination also occurred with the local planning officials in the development of the sector plans.

VII. Coordination

"If everyone is moving forward together, then success takes care of itself."

-Henry Ford

VII.1 Planning Efforts

During the development of the RMP, there were a number of other planning initiatives that were underway. In order to ensure the success of the RMP, extensive coordination was required between the RMP process and these associated planning efforts related to transportation.

Regional Transit Study

The Regional Transit Study was focused on the development of a long term vision for transit within the CRTPA region. The study included the preparation of an assessment of future transit needs for the region; the identification and assessment of realistic funding strategies; the identification of potential organizational structures to promote seamless regional transit; and the development of an implementation strategy. The study developed near and long term recommendations and many of these recommendations for regional transit were incorporated into the Cost Feasible Plan.

Multimodal Transportation District

The Tallahassee Multimodal Transportation District (MMTD) incorporates the downtown and mid-town areas of Tallahassee. In the designation process as a MMTD, a large amount of work was accomplished in identifying multimodal transportation needs and projects to address those needs. The Sector Plan was undertaken in an effort to fully coordinate these local multimodal transportation needs and proposed improvements with the RMP.

Crawfordville Master Plan

Crawfordville and Wakulla County, unlike the majority of the State, have continued to grow in population over the last several years. As the area continues to grow, increasing demands are

placed on the transportation system, and particularly along US 319 in the Crawfordville area. As part of the RMP, a sector plan for US 319 was developed. Concurrently with the development of this sector plan, Wakulla County is also developing an overlay district for the Crawfordville area and US 319. With input from the local government officials and stakeholders, the focus of this sector plan is coordinated with the overlay district effort and is targeted to address the access issues between Linzy Mill Road, near WalMart, to the southern terminus of the study area at Council Moore Drive. This Sector Plan includes an analysis of the access points within the 3.3 mile section and includes recommendations to address the congestion and access management issues. As stated in the 2008 *Wakulla County Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR)*, there is a need to focus on the provision of transportation options that extend beyond the single occupant driver and private auto use. With the inclusion of viable modal options, as well as addressing the access issues, the US 319 corridor will support the planning efforts and goals of the future overlay district.

Woodville Highway Corridor Study

The Woodville Highway Corridor Study, being accomplished in two segments, began during the RMP process. The coordination with these studies was incorporated during the development of the Trails Master Plan, where recommendations from the corridor study was incorporated into the Cost Feasible Plan.

Local Comprehensive Plans

Continuous and intensive coordination with the local government comprehensive plans was a critical element in the development of the RMP. These comprehensive plans provided the foundation and the “reality check” for the development of the future growth scenarios and the identification of the growth centers within each county.

Local/Regional Visioning Efforts

There are several visioning initiatives that are currently underway in the region and coordination with these efforts is critical. *Our Region Tomorrow*, undertaken by the Greater Tallahassee Chamber of Commerce, is focused on crafting a unified vision for the future for Tallahassee-Leon County and the eight surrounding counties, transcending local and state political jurisdictions. Growth and development patterns and trends do not recognize political boundaries, and this regional effort is an attempt to develop a cohesive plan to address issues, such as transportation, water, wastewater and energy.

A second effort led by the City of Tallahassee Mayor’s Office is the Big Bend Regional Partnership (BBRP). This effort is taking a more focused look at the City of Tallahassee, Leon County and the surrounding counties in North Florida. This initiative is examining the services provided by local governments and the opportunities for collaboration and cooperation. These issues include regional mass transit, fire service, utilities, and broadband internet technology. Because of the significant intrinsic resources in the area, that include natural, historic, and cultural assets, this initiative is also examining a regional approach to, and the promotion of, ecotourism to diversify the region’s economy. The *Our Region Tomorrow* effort and the BBRP initiative will provide a basic framework for the transportation vision of the region.

Capital Legacy Project

The establishment of an overall vision and the development of community values focused on mobility and transportation will be accomplished in the Capital Legacy Project, which is a joint project between the Tallahassee-Leon County Planning Department, the CRTPA, and StarMetro. The project grew out of the need to update several long range planning documents as required by the state and federal governments. Rather than embarking on an exercise to merely meet the minimum requirements, the efforts were seen as an opportunity for the community to determine where it should be in the future and to incorporate that vision into the documents guiding the future growth and development in the community.

Local Planning Staff

Continuous coordination with local planning staff from the jurisdictions within the CRTPA region occurred throughout the project. This coordination was crucial to the acceptance of the RMP on a regional basis and ensured that all planning partners were vested in the planning process.

VII. 2 Agency Consultation and Coordination

The development of the RMP has complied with Section 6001[G] of SAFETEA-LU. This directive requires states to consult “as appropriate” with “State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation” as well as economic development in planned growth, in the development of transportation plans and transportation programs. The purpose of this consultation is to identify potential environmental and social impacts of the RMP, and who or what that may affect.

The CRTPA has traditionally maintained a comprehensive list of elected officials, planning and engineering professionals, other governmental agencies, and members of the general public. To ensure compliance with the legislative requirement for coordination and consultation, the mailing list also includes state and local environmental resources agencies, land management agencies, and historic preservation groups. These agencies are notified of meetings and the availability of planning documents, and are also provided the opportunity to review and comment on the recommendations. These agencies were also included within the membership of the RMP committee structure on several levels and representatives were active participants in the planning process. In addition to this coordination with staff, all existing plans, programs and other pertinent data was gathered from these agencies in the development of the RMP.

These agencies from the federal, state and local levels are identified in **Table 7**.

Table 7. Agencies Consulted for Regional Mobility Plan

Federal Level
Federal Highway Administration
Federal Transit Administration
National Forest Service
State Level
Florida Department of Transportation: District Three and Central Office
Florida Department of Environmental Protection; Office of Greenways and Trails

Florida Department of Community Affairs
Florida Department of Management Services
State Historic Preservation Officer
Florida State University; Florida A&M University; Tallahassee Community College

Table 7. Agencies Consulted for Regional Mobility Plan (Continued)

Local and Regional Level	
CRTPA Board, Committees and Staff	Tall Timbers Research Station and Land Conservancy
Local Planning Commissions	1,000 Friends of Florida
Apalachee Regional Planning Commission	Canopy Roads Committee
Commuter Services of North Florida	Local law enforcement agencies
StarMetro	Local fire departments
Local Emergency Management Agencies	Community Redevelopment Agencies
Tallahassee Memorial Hospital	Tourist Development Agencies/Associations
Local Health Departments	Council of Neighborhood Associations
Local school boards and parent representatives	Local historic preservation agencies
Big Bend Transit	Parks and Recreation Departments
Local Growth Management departments	Trail groups
Municipal and County Administrators	Tallahassee Regional Airport
Local Planning Department Staff	Local Public Works Departments
Chambers of Commerce	CSX Transportation/Rail Engineering representative
Economic Development Agencies	Lighthouse of the Big Bend
BluePrint 2000	

Coordination with Emergency Management Agencies

Federal guidance requires that the transportation planning process independently consider the security of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users. As the agency responsible for transportation planning, the CRTPA is responsible for preparing the regional transportation plan and the Transportation Improvement Program, and is not the appropriate lead agency in security planning. To achieve the security objective, the CRTPA included the emergency management agencies, law enforcement agencies, and fire departments as members of the committees providing direct input into the development of the RMP. The CRTPA coordinates with and supports the agencies responsible for emergency management and providing them with any transportation-related information that is needed. In addition, the CRTPA’s plans and programs are all available for review and comment by these agencies. With this coordination, the CRTPA ensures that the security goals and objectives in the RMP will be met.