

**FINAL
I-10 MASTER PLAN**

District 2 Interstate Master Plan Study

Florida Intrastate Highway System

I-10: I-75 (Columbia County) to CR 125 (Baker County)

Segment 2

Prepared for:

Florida Department of Transportation – District 2

Prepared by:

Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan, Inc.
In Association with
Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc.

April 2006

Table of Contents

I-10 MASTER PLAN

Section	Title	Page
1.0	Introduction.....	1-1
1.1	Purpose of Master Plan.....	1-1
1.2	Project Study Area.....	1-2
1.3	Tier Selection Process.....	1-2
1.4	Report Organization.....	1-4
2.0	Existing Conditions.....	2-1
2.1	General Description.....	2-1
2.1.1	Functional and Operational Classification.....	2-1
2.1.2	Affected Jurisdictions.....	2-1
2.1.3	Primary Features of the I-10 Corridor.....	2-2
2.1.4	Surrounding Transportation Network.....	2-2
2.2	Existing Physical Features.....	2-3
2.2.1	Typical Section.....	2-4
2.2.2	Design Speed.....	2-4
2.2.3	Horizontal Alignment.....	2-4
2.2.4	Vertical Alignment.....	2-5
2.2.5	Right-of-Way.....	2-5
2.2.6	Interchange and Ramp Design.....	2-6
2.2.7	Utilities.....	2-7
2.2.8	Drainage.....	2-8
2.2.9	Traffic Control.....	2-10
2.2.10	Intelligent Transportation System (ITS).....	2-11
2.2.11	Structures.....	2-11
2.2.12	Traffic Volumes and Roadway Capacity Analysis.....	2-12
2.2.13	Roadway Operating Conditions.....	2-13
2.3	Existing Environmental Characteristics.....	2-15
2.3.1	Cultural and Land Use Features.....	2-15
2.3.2	Wetlands.....	2-24
2.3.3	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	2-27
2.3.4	Soils.....	2-32
2.3.5	Floodplains and Drainage.....	2-37
2.3.6	Air Quality.....	2-37
2.3.7	Potential Contamination Sites.....	2-37

Table of Contents (continued)

I-10 MASTER PLAN

Section	Title	Page
3.0	Basis for the Corridor Master Plan.....	3-1
3.1	Functional Performance.....	3-1
3.1.1	Level of Service.....	3-1
3.1.2	Geometric Design Elements.....	3-1
3.2	Need for Improvements.....	3-5
3.2.1	Design Deficiencies.....	3-5
3.2.2	Mobility Deficiencies.....	3-7
3.2.3	Safety Deficiencies.....	3-11
3.2.4	Environmental Deficiencies.....	3-11
3.2.5	Hurricane Evacuation.....	3-12
3.3	Corridor Improvement Goals and Alternatives Evaluation Criteria.....	3-13
3.3.1	Improvement Goals.....	3-13
3.3.2	Measures of Effectiveness and Evaluation Criteria.....	3-14
4.0	Tier 1 Analysis.....	4-1
4.1	Background.....	4-1
4.2	Purpose.....	4-1
4.3	Tier 1 Alternatives.....	4-1
4.3.1	CMEA No. 1: General Purpose Lanes.....	4-2
4.3.2	CMEA No. 2: General Purpose Lanes (4 lanes) from I-75 to CR 229, General Purpose Lanes (6 lanes) from CR 229 to CR 125.....	4-2
4.4	TIER 1 Evaluation.....	4-5
4.4.1	CMEA No. 1: General Purpose Lanes.....	4-5
4.4.2	CMEA No. 2: General Purpose Lanes (4 lanes) from I-75 to CR 229, General Purpose Lanes (6 lanes) from CR 229 to CR 125.....	4-5
4.5	Tier 1 Matrix Summary.....	4-8
4.5.1	Mobility.....	4-8
4.5.2	Commerce.....	4-9
4.5.3	Land Use.....	4-9
4.5.4	Environment.....	4-9
4.5.5	Affordability / Constructability.....	4-10
4.6	Recommendations for Tier 2 CMEA Development.....	4-11

Table of Contents (continued)

I-10 MASTER PLAN

Section	Title	Page
5.0	Tier 2 Analysis.....	5-1
5.1	Background.....	5-1
5.2	Interchange Alternatives.....	5-1
5.2.1	I-75.....	5-1
5.2.2	US 41 (SR 25).....	5-3
5.2.3	US 441 (SR 47).....	5-3
5.2.4	US 90 (Baker County).....	5-7
5.2.5	CR 229.....	5-7
5.3	Interchange Evaluation.....	5-14
5.3.1	Mobility.....	5-16
5.3.2	Regional Commerce.....	5-19
5.3.3	Land Use.....	5-19
5.3.4	Environmental.....	5-20
5.3.5	Affordability / Constructability.....	5-21
5.4	Tier 2 Evaluation.....	5-22
5.4.1	I-75.....	5-22
5.4.2	US 41 (SR 25).....	5-23
5.4.3	US 441 (SR 47).....	5-23
5.4.4	US 90 (Baker County).....	5-30
5.4.5	CR 229.....	5-33
5.5	Recommendations For Tier 2 Interchanges.....	5-4
6.0	Public Involvement.....	6-1
6.1	Public Involvement Opportunities.....	6-1
6.1.1	Internet Access.....	6-1
6.1.2	Public Meetings.....	6-1
6.1.3	Daily Interaction.....	6-2
6.2	Public Involvement Results.....	6-3
7.0	Preferred Mobility Enhancement Alternative.....	7-1
7.1	Mainline Preferred Mobility Enhancement Alternative.....	7-1
7.2	Interchange Preferred Mobility Enhancement Alternative.....	7-1
7.2.1	I-75.....	7-1
7.2.2	US 41 (SR 25).....	7-1
7.2.3	US 441 (SR 47).....	7-1
7.2.4	US 90 (Baker County).....	7-2
7.2.5	CR 229.....	7-2

Table of Contents (continued)

I-10 MASTER PLAN

Section	Title	Page
7.3	Other Elements.....	7-2
7.3.1	ITS.....	7-2
7.3.2	Hurricane Evacuation.....	7-3
8.0	Implementation Plan	8-1
8.1	Preferred Mobility Enhancement Alternative.....	8-1
8.2	Implementation Plan.....	8-1
8.2.1	Phasing and Improvement Program Requirements.....	8-1
8.2.2	Agency and Public Coordination.....	8-6
8.2.3	Potential Sources of Funding.....	8-6
8.3	Conclusions and Next Steps.....	8-7

List of Appendices

I-10 MASTER PLAN

Appendix	Title	Page
A	Existing Roadway Geometric and Cross Section Data.....	A-1
	Existing Horizontal Geometry.....	A-2
	Existing Vertical Geometry.....	A-4
	I-10 Bridges.....	A-8
	Bridges Over I-10.....	A-10

List of Tables

I-10 MASTER PLAN

Table	Title	Page
2-1	Functional Classification	2-1
2-2	Affected Jurisdictions	2-2
2-3	Construction Plans	2-3
2-4	Current FDOT Design Criteria	2-4
2-5	Interchange Types	2-6
2-6	Existing Lane Lengths on Interchange Ramps	2-8
2-7	Summary of Cross Drains	2-9
2-8	LOS Standard.....	2-13
2-9	Historical Sites Within or Adjacent to the Study Corridor	2-18
2-10	Archaeological Sites Within or Adjacent to the Study Corridor	2-18
2-11	Medical Facilities Within or Adjacent to the Study Corridor.....	2-18
2-12	Educational Facilities Within or Adjacent to the Study Corridor.....	2-18
2-13	Government Buildings Within or Adjacent to the Study Corridor	2-19
2-14	Enterprise Zones Within or Adjacent to the Study Corridor	2-19
2-15	Parks, Forests, Trails, Boat Ramps Within or Adjacent to the Study Corridor	2-19
2-16	Religious Institutions Within or Adjacent to the Study Corridor	2-20
2-17	Cemeteries Within or Adjacent to the Study Corridor.....	2-20
2-18	Federal and State Protected, Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species	2-27
3-1	2001 Existing Conditions LOS	3-1
3-2	I-10 Roadway Design Standards.....	3-2
3-3	2030 No-Build LOS.....	3-9
3-4	Policy Elements and Improvement Goals.....	3-13
3-5	Tier Evaluation Goals and Objectives Matrix	3-14
3-6	Tier 1 Corridor Evaluation Objectives and Measures of Effectiveness.....	3-15
4-1	CMEA No. 1 Corridor Evaluation Summary	4-6
4-2	CMEA No. 2 Evaluation Summary	4-7
4-3	Construction Cost Estimate – CR 229 to CR 125.....	4-10

List of Tables (continued)

I-10 MASTER PLAN

Table	Title	Page
5-1	Tier 2 - Interchange Evaluation Objectives And Measures of Effectiveness	5-15
5-2	I-75 - Level 1 Concept, Tier 2 Matrix.....	5-24
5-3	I-75 - Level 2 Concept, Tier 2 Matrix.....	5-25
5-4	US 41 (SR25) – Level 1 Concept, Tier 2 Matrix.....	5-27
5-5	US 441 – Level 1 Concept, Tier 2 Matrix	5-28
5-6	US 90 (Baker County) – Level 1 Concept, Tier 2 Matrix	5-30
5-7	US 90 (Baker County) – Level 2 Concept, Tier 2 Matrix	5-32
5-8	CR 229 – Level 1 Concept, Tier 2 Matrix	5-33
5-9	CR 229 – Level 2, Alternative 1 Concept Tier 2 Matrix	5-1
5-10	CR 229 – Level 2, Alternative 2 Concept Tier 2 Matrix	5-2
5-11	Tier 2 Summary Matrix	5-4
8-1	Summary of Implementation Costs by Phase - Total Corridor.....	8-3
8-2	Summary of Implementation Costs By Phase - Segment	8-4

List of Figures

I-10 MASTER PLAN

Figure	Title	Page
1-1	Study Corridor	1-3
2-1	2001 Existing Traffic LOS.....	2-14
2-2	Community Facilities, Parks, and Recreation Sites.....	2-16
2-3	Land Use	2-21
2-4	Hydrologic Features.....	2-25
2-5	Strategic Habitats and Conservation Lands	2-30
2-6	Biodiversity Hotspots.....	2-33
2-7	Hydric Soils	2-35
2-8	Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Zones.....	2-38
2-9	Potential Contamination Sites.....	2-40
3-1	2030 Design Year Traffic LOS.....	3-10
4-1	CMEA Typical Section 1	4-3
4-2	CMEA Typical Section 2.....	4-4
5-1	I-75 Level 1 Concept	5-2
5-2	I-75 Level 2 (Hurricane Evacuation Alternative) Concept.....	5-4
5-3	US 41 (SR 25) Level 1 Concept	5-5
5-4	US 441 (SR 47) Level 1 Concept	5-6
5-5	US 90 (Baker County) Level 1 Concept.....	5-8
5-6	US 90 (Baker County) Level 2 Concept.....	5-9
5-7	CR 229 Level 1 Concept.....	5-10
5-8	CR 229 Level 2, Alternative 1 Concept.....	5-12
5-9	CR 229 Level 2, Alternative 2 Concept.....	5-13
8-1	Summary of Implementation Costs and By Phase - Total Corridor.....	8-5
8-2	Summary of Implementation Costs and By Segment.....	8-5

List of Acronyms

I-10 MASTER PLAN

AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
CMEA	Conceptual Mobility Enhancement Alternative
DASR	Draft Analysis Summary Report
DCA	Department of Community Affairs
FAQ	Frequently Asked Questions
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FDLE	Florida Department of Law Enforcement
FDOT	Florida Department of Transportation
FFWCC	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
FGDL	Florida Geographic Data Library
FHP	Florida Highway Patrol
FIHS	Florida Intrastate Highway System
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FNAI	Florida Natural Areas Inventory
GPL	General Purpose Lane
HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle
ITS	Intelligent Transportation System
LA	Limited Access
LOS	Level of Service
MOE	Measures of Effectiveness
OFW	Outstanding Florida Waters
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
PD&E	Project Development and Environment
PMEA	Preferred Mobility Enhancement Alternative
PPM	Plans Preparation Manual
ROW	Right of Way
RRR	Resurfacing, Restoration, and Rehabilitation

List of Acronyms (continued)

I-10 MASTER PLAN

SHS	State Highway System
SIS	Statewide Intermodal System
SJRWMD	St. Johns River Water Management District
SOV	Single Occupant Vehicle
VHT	Vehicle Hours of Travel
VMT	Vehicle Miles of Travel