

**Appendix E-4**

**Letters from FDOT District Secretary**



## Florida Department of Transportation

RICK SCOTT  
GOVERNOR

11201 N. McKinley Drive  
Tampa, FL 33612

ANANTH PRASAD, P.E.  
SECRETARY

August 27, 2013

Ms. Michelle Baker  
County Administrator  
Pasco County  
7530 Little Road  
New Port Richey, FL 34654-5598

Re: Ridge Road Extension

Dear Ms. Baker:

The Department would like to reiterate its October 7, 2010 letter to Mr. Bipin Parikh, P.E. in regards to SR 52 and SR 54 Improvement Alternatives that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is requesting Pasco County to evaluate.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regulations requires the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Pasco County to work together on needed transportation facilities within the county. The required document is the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) which compiles the list of the needed transportation facilities. Currently, the LRTP shows SR 52 being widened to 6 lanes from US 19 to US 41, and 4 lanes from US 41 to I-75. Also, SR 54/56 is being shown as having 6 general use lanes from US 19 to I-75. As a result, the Department does not support any improvements inconsistent with the Pasco County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) LRTP.

In addition to supporting the LRTP, the Department seldom widens an arterial (such as SR 52, SR 54, US19, US 41, etc) to 8 lanes or beyond. Within a highly commercialized corridor that has frequent driveways such as Fowler Avenue in Tampa and SR 60 in Brandon you may see a continuous right turn lane to accommodate the right turning movements for numerous driveways. Consistently, research shows a network of roads and a grid system increases capacity and mobility through a region; whereas traffic focus on a limited number of wider corridors results in operational, safety, bicycle, and pedestrian issues.

Ms. Michelle Baker  
Page 2  
August 27, 2013

Pasco County is just over 18 miles from north end to south end and only has two east-west corridors (SR 54 and SR 52) to move people and goods and to facilitate traffic to the north south corridors (US 19, US 41, Suncoast Parkway, I-75, and US 301.)

Completing Ridge Road will appropriately space the east-west corridors for a reasonable flow of traffic in, around, and through Pasco County. An additional benefit would be for evacuation purposes. Currently, if an evacuation were to occur SR 54 and SR 52 would not only have to facilitate Pasco County residents, but also the northern communities of Pinellas and Hillsborough Counties and southern communities of Hernando County. An additional route, Ridge Road, would be necessary to fully accommodate the Pasco residents in the coastal communities.

In summary, the Department supports the Pasco County LRTP goals of providing mobility and evacuation alternatives through the building of the Ridge Road Extension.

I hope you find the above information helpful. If you need further clarification or have additional questions, please call Ms. Debbie Hunt at 813-975-6133.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Paul Steinman', written over a horizontal line.

Paul Steinman, P.E.  
District Seven Secretary



## Florida Department of Transportation

CHARLIE CRIST  
GOVERNOR

11201 N. McKinley Drive  
Tampa, FL 33612-6456

STEPHANIE C. KOPELOUSOS  
SECRETARY

October 7, 2010

Dev. Svc. Adm.

09/12/10

Received

Mr. Bipin Parikh, P. E.  
Assistant County Administrator  
Pasco County  
7530 Little Road  
New Port Richey, Fl. 34654-5598

Re: S. R. 52 and S. R. 54 Improvement Alternatives

Dear Mr. Parikh:

Thank you for meeting with the department on September 29, 2010 regarding Pasco County's intent to evaluate the following improvement alternatives for S.R. 52 and S.R. 54:

- Improving S.R. 52 to 10 lanes at-grade
- Improving S.R. 52 to 10 lanes (6 lanes at-grade and 4 lanes elevated)
- Improving S.R. 54 to 8 lanes and S.R. 52 to 8 lanes
- Improving S.R. 54 to 8 lanes and improving proposed Tower Road from 4 to 6 lanes

We understand the purpose of this evaluation effort is to address comments made by the U.S Army Corps of Engineers concerning Pasco County's Ridge Road extension project. The department is open to this evaluation effort; however, we must point out that these alternatives are inconsistent with the recently adopted Pasco County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) 2035 Cost Affordable Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). As part of your evaluation process, please carefully consider the fiscal impacts these alternatives would have on the MPO's LRTP. The department would not support any improvements that are not consistent with the MPO's LRTP.

Although there is not a department policy that restricts the number of lanes on a state highway facility, the department seldom widens an arterial beyond six lanes. The district does not have a ten-lane arterial and we are not aware of any on the state highway system. There are two 8-lane arterials (S.R. 60 and Fowler Avenue) on the

Mr. Bipin Parikh, P. E.  
Page 2  
October 7, 2010

state highway system in our district. Both facilities are within highly commercialized corridors where driveways frequently exist on both sides of the highway. The design intent of the two outside lanes is for these lanes to serve mainly as continuous right turn lanes for local traffic. Based on past experience, a wider roadway would require more signalized intersections along the corridor to accommodate side-street traffic. This would consequently reduce the service capacity of each travel lane. As part of your evaluation process, we recommend you also consider operational and safety issues that are often associated with wider roadways, such as traffic weaving and lengthy pedestrian crossings.

I hope you find the above information helpful. Should you wish to discuss your evaluation effort further, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,



Donald J. Skelton, P. E.  
District Seven Secretary