Meeting of the MPO Board & Public Hearing
Tuesday, February 6, 2018, 9:00 a.m.
Hillsborough County Center, 601 E. Kennedy Blvd., 26th Floor

Watch the HTV live-stream. Send comments in advance on Facebook.*

I. Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance & Invocation

II. Approval of Minutes – January 10, 2018

III. Committee Reports, Online Comments (Gena Torres, MPO Staff)

IV. Public Hearing on Long Range Transportation Plan Amendment for I-275 Operational Improvements at Howard Frankland Bridge

A. Overview of Amendment (Rich Clarendon, MPO Assistant Director)
B. Public Comment (3 minutes per speaker, please)
C. Board Discussion & Action (roll-call vote)
D. Adjourn Public Hearing & Call Regular Meeting to Order

V. Public Comment on Non-Public Hearing Items - 3 minutes per speaker, 30 minutes total; as needed, additional time may be provided later in the agenda

VI. Consent Agenda

A. Committee Appointments
B. MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee Interlocal Agreement Update
C. General Planning Consultant Agreement Amdt.: Kittelson & Associates
D. Letter Requested by Citizens Advisory Committee Thanking Katharine Eagan, former HART CEO

VII. Roll-Call Vote: Transportation Improvement Program Amendment for I-4 Resurfacing

VIII. Action Item

A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment for Performance Measure Target-Setting: Safety (Johnny Wong, MPO Staff) (roll-call vote)

IX. Status Reports

A. Tampa Bay Next Quarterly Update (FDOT Representative)
B. Regional Transit Feasibility Plan (Jacobs Engineering Representative)
X. Executive Director’s Report
   A. PlanHillsborough Strategic Planning Retreat for Planning Commissioners and MPO and River Board members, Friday, March 23, noon–5:00 p.m.
   B. Next MPO Meeting: Tuesday, March 6, 2018, 9:00am, 26th Floor
   C. Tampa Bay TMA Leadership Group: February 9, 9:30am, PSTA

XI. Old Business & New Business

XII. Adjournment

XIII. Addendum
   A. MPOAC Legislative Update for the week ending 1/26/2018
   B. Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit Flyer
   C. Commuter Challenge Flyer
   D. Project Fact Sheets
      1. SR 580/Busch Blvd from E. of Armenia Ave to W. of Florida Ave
   E. Correspondence
      1. From Forward Pinellas on Legislative Priorities
   F. Articles Relating to MPO Work
      1. Light Rail’s Out, Rapid Buses Are In
      2. First Look: How BRT Would Work
      3. Taking the BRT to the Future
      4. Too Soon to Settle for Buses over Light Rail in Tampa Bay
      5. More Lighting, Sidewalks Possible After Crashes Involving Students
      6. A Vision Zero Tactic That Works: Leading Pedestrian Intervals
      7. How Washington DC Built a Bike Boom

The full agenda packet is available on the MPO’s website, www.planhillsborough.org, or by calling (813) 272-5940.

The MPO does not discriminate in any of its programs or services. Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Learn more about our commitment to non-discrimination.

Persons needing interpreter services or accommodations for a disability in order to participate in this meeting, free of charge, are encouraged to contact Johnny Wong, 813-273-3774 x370 or wongj@plancom.org, three business days in advance of the meeting. Also, if you are only able to speak Spanish, please call the Spanish helpline at (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

Si necesita servicios de traducción, el MPO ofrece por gratis. Para registrarse por estos servicios, por favor llame a Johnny Wong directamente al (813) 273-3774, ext. 370 con tres días antes, o wongj@plancom.org de cerro electronico. También, si sólo se puede hablar en español, por favor llame a la línea de ayuda en español al (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.
In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, materials attached are for research and educational purposes, and are distributed without profit to MPO Board members, MPO staff, or related committees or subcommittees the MPO supports. The MPO has no affiliation whatsoever with the originator of attached articles nor is the MPO endorsed or sponsored by the originator. Persons wishing to use copyrighted material for purposes of their own that go beyond ‘fair use’ must first obtain permission from the copyright owner.

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.
The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Regular Meeting, scheduled for Wednesday, January 10, 2018, at 9:00 a.m., in the 26th Floor Conference Room, Frederick B. Karl County Center, Tampa, Florida.

The following members were present:

Harry Cohen, Vice Chairman
Charles Klug for Paul Anderson
Theodore Trent Green
Ken Hagan
Mel Jurado
Pat Kemp
Joe Lopano
Guido Maniscalco (arrived at 9:49 a.m.)
David Mechanik
Sandra Murman (arrived at 9:41 a.m.)
Luis Viera

The following members were absent:

Lesley Miller Jr., Chairman
Rick Lott
Cindy Stuart
Joseph Waggoner
Stacy White

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairman Cohen called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m., led in the pledge of allegiance to the flag, and requested a moment of silence.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Samuel Gibbons opined on the bus rapid transit (BRT) proposal and regional transportation options before urging the MPO Board to consider Mr. Joshua Frank’s Highways to Boulevards proposal.
III. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ONLINE COMMENTS

Ms. Gena Torres, MPO, summarized the reports and online comments from Ms. Amanda Brown urging increased transit spending, generating transit funds by placing a fee on Uber and Lyft, and greater MPO Board activity in the Tampa Bay Next process; Messrs. Dale Tindale on Howard Frankland Bridge congestion/Interstate 275 concerns; Robert Sawallesh regarding Bruce B. Downs traffic and access to the James A. Haley Veteran’s Hospital; and Jose Menendez on County bicycle/pedestrian fatalities. Commissioner Kemp suggested the MPO Board study the Vision Zero project in New York.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Minutes – December 5, 2017
B. Committee Appointments
C. Legislative Message for Transportation Disadvantaged Day

Mr. Green so moved, seconded by Commissioner Kemp, and carried nine to zero. (Members Maniscalco and Murman had not arrived; Chairman Miller and Members Lott, Stuart, Waggoner, and White were absent.)

V. STATUS REPORTS

A. St. Petersburg Central Avenue BRT Project

Ms. Cassandra Borchers, Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA), gave a presentation contained in background material; answered inquiries on the transit stations, service wait time, station platform levels, smart device tracking applications, and Wi-Fi access; and continued the presentation. Commissioner Kemp asked about electric busses, the total project cost, and existing/projected ridership. After Mr. Lopano confirmed the Transit App application website, Mr. Green wanted to know about anticipated operational challenges and articulated bus stations. Mr. Mechanik pondered eliminating/retaining service routes. Commissioner Kemp considered possible traffic lane difficulties. Vice Chairman Cohen sought answers on public opposition to the traffic lane concepts.
B. MPO Regional Coordination and Best Practices Research

Mr. Ramond Chiaramonte, executive director, Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority, gave a presentation shown in background material. Ms. Beth Alden, MPO Executive Director, added remarks.

C. Freight Logistics Zone Follow-Up

Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Freight Program Overview

Mr. Brian Hunter, FDOT, provided an overview displayed in background material.

U.S. Highway 41 (U.S. 41) Improvement Project

Mr. Lilliam Escalera, FDOT, relayed background material. Following dialogue on federal/State funding opportunities and project enthusiasm/scope, Commissioner Murman asked about any project development and environment work to widen certain areas of U.S. 41, to which Mr. Edward McKinney, FDOT, supplied comments.

D. 2045 Growth: Forecasts and Scenario Planning

Mr. Shawn College, MPO, deferred to Mr. Kevin Tilbury, Cambridge Systematics Incorporated, who relayed the presentation contained in background material. Councilman Maniscalco opined on past/present area transportation challenges. Commissioner Kemp wondered if the presentation data coincided with the Tampa Bay Partnership Incorporated regional competitiveness report.

VI. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

A. Plan Hillsborough 2018 Strategic Planning Retreat, Date to be Determined

B. Next MPO Meeting: Tuesday, February 6, 2018, 9:00 a.m., 26th Floor

C. Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group: January 19, 2018, 9:30 a.m., PSTA

D. Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit: February 27, 2018, 8:30 a.m. – 6:30 p.m., Glazer Children’s Museum and Franklin Manor

Ms. Alden reviewed background material.

VII. OLD BUSINESS AND NEW BUSINESS – None.
VIII. ADDENDUM

A. Legislative Update

B. Project Fact Sheets
   1. State Road 579 (Fletcher Avenue) Resurfacing, from Florida to Nebraska Avenues
   2. U.S. 41 Resurfacing, from Bullfrog Creek to Denver Street
   3. Florida Transit Fast Facts

C. Correspondence
   1. From FDOT on MPO Comments, Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 through FY 2023 Work Program
   2. To Hillsborough County Sheriff Chad Chronister and Tampa Police Chief Brian Dugan on Speed Enforcement in School Zones
   3. To Representative Jake Raburn on MPO Legislative Positions
   4. From American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, American Public Transportation Association, and Association of MPOs on Performance Measure Reporting
   5. From FDOT on FDOT-Owned Vacant Structures
   6. Approval of National Highway System Designation Changes

D. Articles Relating to MPO Work
   1. Hillsborough County Moving Forward to Make Brandon Safer for Pedestrians
   2. Moody’s Warns Cities to Address Climate Risks or Face Downgrades
   3. A New Traffic Safety Paradigm
IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:13 a.m.

READ AND APPROVED: ______________________________

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
PAT FRANK, CLERK

By: _______________________
Deputy Clerk

jh
Committee Reports

Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on January 17

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- TIP Amendment for I-4 Resurfacing
- TIP Amendment for Safety Performance Measure & Target Setting. The committee concurred with starting with a baseline but hope to see the target moved lower as we move forward.
- LRTP Amendment for I-275 Operational Improvements & Howard Frankland Bridge, with clarification on whether the express lane is slated to be a toll lane, general use lane, or other type of lane.

They also passed motions on the following:

- **Expressing concern about a lack of transparency** in the Regional Transit Feasibility Plan process, and requesting a presentation from HART and their consultant at the next CAC meeting.
- ** Recommending that the MPO send a letter to Katharine Eagan** thanking her for her service to HART and Hillsborough County.

They also heard a report on the MPO's Health Atlas, and after a review of attendance records for the past year, declared the CAC seats vacant for the Expressway Authority and the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board.

Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on January 22

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- TIP Amendment for I-4 Resurfacing
- TIP Amendment - Safety Performance Measure & Target Setting. The committee concurred with starting with a baseline but hope to see the target moved lower as we move forward.
- LRTP Amendment – I-275 Operational Improvements & Howard Frankland Bridge. There were some questions on timing of the improvements.

They also held an election of officers:

- Jeff Sims, Chair
- Mike Williams, Vice-Chair
- Amber Dickerson, Officer at large

The TAC also received presentations on:

- FDOT’s Complete Streets Corridor Screening - The approach of classifying roadways by their context was supported by the committee as a better way to design than one-road fits all.
- MPO’s Health Atlas - The representative from the Health Department expressed appreciation of working with staff to create this very helpful tool. Members agreed the easy access to maps overlaying transportation, health and environmental can have wide-spread use.
Meeting of the Policy Committee on January 30

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- TIP Amendment for I-4 Resurfacing
- General Planning Consultant Agreement Amendment for Kittelson & Associates
- MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee Interlocal Agreement Update

They also discussed the process for the annual evaluation of the executive director with the MPO attorney, who will administer it; and they had a long conversation about the upcoming TMA Leadership Group meeting, at which some members would like to have more detailed information about the Regional Transit Feasibility Plan’s cost effectiveness calculations, opportunities for transit oriented development, and implications for HART and PSTA operations as well as local government financial commitments.

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on January 10

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- TIP Amendment - Safety Performance Measure & Target Setting. The committee concurred with starting with a baseline but hopes to see the target moved lower as we move forward, trending toward zero.

They also declared two citizen at-large seats vacant, and elected officers:

- Patrick Thorpe, Chair
- Tony Monk, Vice Chair
- James Shirk, Officer at Large

They also received presentations on:

- The Gasparilla Children’s Parade Bike Rodeo
- Walk Bike Tampa’s 2017 Goal Review
- The vision for the Long-Range Transportation Plan
- The MPO’s Health Atlas Mapping Tool
- Sunshine Law and Public Records Requirements

Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee (LRC) on January 24

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- TIP Amendment for Safety Performance Measure & Target Setting.

The committee also approved a motion to request the MPO to send a letter of opposition to the Dockless Bicycle Sharing bill.

They received presentations on:

- Bike Share 2017 Update and Dockless Bicycle Sharing
- Complete Streets Corridor Screening
- Hillsborough County Health Atlas

They also reviewed attendance for the past year and vacated the City of Temple Terrace position until such time the city provides a new member.

Meeting of the Intelligent Transportation Committee (ITS) on January 11

The committee approved the attendance report for 2017 and elected officers:

- Vik Bhide, Chair
- Mike Flick, Vice-Chair
- Jeff Sims, Officer at-large
They also received presentations on:
  o THEA’s Tampa Connected Vehicle Pilot - Members were encouraged to participate as drivers, pedestrians or fans. The committee requested if before and after data could be presented after the study.
  o Pasco County’s Connected Cities - The committee found the idea of having zoning in place for a connected community an interesting economic and technical approach to growth.
  o Ride Flag Application - Members were very interested in this well-fashioned application for personal ridesharing opportunities.

Meeting of the School Transportation Working Group (STWG) on January 24

The working group heard presentations on:
  o City of Tampa School Related Projects Update
  o Data-Driven Approaches to Crime and Traffic Safety (DDACTS) and Road Safety Audits (RSA)
  o Sulphur Springs K-8 Community School SR2S Grant Application

The group also provided typical monthly updates from the school district, jurisdictions and health partners. Given there will be special state guest speakers in March, the group agreed to pursue a joint meeting with the Community Traffic Safety team so that both groups would mutually benefit.

Meeting of the TBARTA MPO Directors on January 12

The MPO staff directors reviewed arrangements for the Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit; followed up on actions taken at the December MPO Chairs Committee meeting; and reviewed a draft of the regional tasks to be included in this spring’s updates of the MPO Unified Planning Work Programs. News about the tri-county growth scenarios project was also shared, including timing, and coordination with the Tampa Bay Next initiative and Regional Transit Feasibility Plan.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Long Range Transportation Plan Amendment – I-275 Operational Improvements & Howard Frankland Bridge Project

**Presenter**
Rich Clarendon, MPO staff

**Summary**
To alleviate recurring congestion at the north end of the Howard Frankland Bridge, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has proposed 1) operational improvements to add general use lanes in the Westshore area and 2) adding express lane transitions (ramps) coming on and off the bridge.

FDOT has the funding to make the operational improvements as early as 2019, and expects to have funding to build the express lane transitions as part of the bridge project in 2020-2024. The effect would be to add a general use lane in each direction, and ramps to/from two express lanes in each direction on the bridge. The attached diagrams illustrate these two projects.

The proposed projects can be built within the existing footprint of I-275 and will not require additional right-of-way.

Since the MPO’s Imagine 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) does not identify the express lane ramps, it needs to be amended to add them. Attached is the page from the LRTP showing the proposed amendment in strike-through and underline format.

The amendment must be approved by the MPO at an advertised public hearing, scheduled to be held as part of the MPO board meeting at 9:00 AM on February 6, 2018.

**Recommended Action**
Approval of the proposed LRTP amendment.

**Prepared By**
Rich Clarendon, AICP

**Attachments**
- Westshore Area Lane Additions and Transitions Diagram
- Howard Frankland Bridge Illustrations
- Page from Imagine 2040 LRTP showing proposed additions.
I-275 Operational Improvements
This is our upcoming project to reduce congestion on I-275 at SR 60.
Construction Scheduled 2019-2020

Howard Frankland Bridge Project
This is how express lanes will transition into the Westshore area after the new bridge is built.
Construction Scheduled 2020-2024
In 2020, FDOT plans to rebuild the existing northbound bridge, which was originally constructed in 1960. The new bridge will:

- Improve incident management
- Improve Express Bus Service
- Better accommodate the possibility of future transit
- Better prepare for Autonomous Vehicles
- Anticipate Future Demand
- Cost Effective
- Bike/Ped Facility
Howard Frankland Bridge
This is what we are proposing to build in 2020.

New Bridge with Bike/Ped Trail on the Outside and 2 Express Lanes in each Direction

Existing Southbound Converts to Northbound

Howard Frankland Bridge
This is how we would accommodate rail transit in the future.

Southbound Bridge with Express Lanes and Rail Transit

Northbound Widened to Outside to Accommodate Express Lanes
# Figure 5-15 Cost Feasible FDOT Strategic Intermodal System Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>2040 Needs</th>
<th>Design Costs (in Millions)</th>
<th>Right Of Way Costs (in Millions)</th>
<th>Construction Costs (in Millions)</th>
<th>Total Cost (in Millions)</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>I-275 @ I-4</td>
<td>ROME AVE</td>
<td>I-275 MLK SELMON CONNECTOR</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>TIP $3.00</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>I-275 @ I-4</td>
<td>ROME AVE</td>
<td>I-275 MLK SELMON CONNECTOR</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>2021 - 2025</td>
<td>$65.14</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$2,133.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>I-275</td>
<td>S OF LOIS AVE</td>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH RIVER BRIDGE</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>2 Express Toll Lanes</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$3.23</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$137.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>I-275</td>
<td>JEFFERSON / ORANGE ST</td>
<td>N OF BEARSS AVE</td>
<td>4F/ 6F</td>
<td>2 Express Toll Lanes</td>
<td>2021 - 2025</td>
<td>$3.80</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$161.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>I-275</td>
<td>N OF MLK BLVD</td>
<td>N OF BUSCH BLVD</td>
<td>4F/ 6F</td>
<td>2 Express Toll Lanes</td>
<td>2026 - 2030</td>
<td>$14.47</td>
<td>2026 - 2030</td>
<td>$1.59</td>
<td>$81.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>I-275</td>
<td>N OF HOWARD FRANKLAND</td>
<td>S OF LOIS AVE</td>
<td>SR 60</td>
<td>SR 60 INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>TIP $16.58</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$244.89</td>
<td>$261.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>I-275 / SR 60</td>
<td>CYPRESS STREET BRIDGE</td>
<td>I-275 GENERAL USE LANES</td>
<td>SR 60 INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>TIP $35.67</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$35.67</td>
<td>$35.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>I-275 NB EXPRESS</td>
<td>N OF HOWARD FRANKLAND</td>
<td>S OF TRASK ST</td>
<td>SR 60 INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>TIP $7.64</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$106.24</td>
<td>$113.88</td>
<td>State: SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>I-275 NB FLYOVER</td>
<td>SR 60 EB</td>
<td>I-275 NB</td>
<td>SR 60 INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>TIP $3.34</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$49.91</td>
<td>$53.25</td>
<td>State: SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>I-275 SB</td>
<td>N OF REO ST</td>
<td>S OF LOIS AVE</td>
<td>SR 60 INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>TIP $9.17</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$131.58</td>
<td>$140.75</td>
<td>State: SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>SR 60</td>
<td>N OF INDEPENDENCE</td>
<td>I-275 AT WESTSHORE</td>
<td>SR 60 INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>TIP $9.19</td>
<td>2021 - 2025</td>
<td>$46.00</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$138.10</td>
<td>$193.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Includes new or discretionary Federal and/or state funding sources.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Committee Appointments

Presenter
None – Consent Agenda

Summary
The HART Board of Directors appointed Mr. Adam Harden as HART’s alternate on the MPO Board.

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) shall be responsible for providing information and overall community values and needs into the transportation planning program of the MPO; evaluating and proposing solutions from a citizen’s perspective concerning alternative transportation proposals and critical issues; providing knowledge gained through the CAC into local citizen group discussions and meetings; and establishing comprehension and promoting credibility for the MPO Program. The following individuals have been nominated for CAC membership:

Cheryl Thole, nominated by Councilman Viera

The purpose of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board (TDCB) is to assist the MPO in identifying local service needs and providing information, advice, and direction to the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) on the coordination of services to be provided to the transportation disadvantaged pursuant to Section 427.0157, Florida Statutes. The following citizen has been recommended by the TDCB:

Commissioner Sandra Murman appointed to serve as HART’s Board appointee on the TDCB Board of Directors. Mr. John Melendez will serve as HART’s alternate.

Recommended Action
That the MPO confirm the above appointments

Prepared By
Wanda West

Attachments
None
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee (CCC) Interlocal Agreement Update

**Presenter**
Beth Alden, MPO Director

**Summary**
In 2017, the Florida legislature amended the statute establishing a MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee for west central Florida. The previous year, also by statute, the CCC was merged with the Tampa Bay Regional Transportation Authority (TBARTA) and renamed as the TBARTA CCC. In 2017, the word “transportation” in the name was replaced with “transit,” in both the CCC statute and the TBARTA statute. TBARTA’s geographic area was also changed, but not the CCC’s.

An interlocal agreement among the region’s MPOs provides more detail than the statute about the CCC’s goals, procedures, and financial arrangements. Among other things, it establishes the ability for MPOs to share the cost of regional projects, such as contracting with a neutral facilitator for TMA Leadership Group meetings, or hiring a public outreach coordinator for the upcoming tri-county long range transportation plan growth scenarios project. Jointly-funded regional projects must be listed in each contributing MPO’s Unified Planning Work Program.

On December 1, the CCC reviewed and approved the attached update to its interlocal agreement. The TBARTA Board is slated to review it on January 26. The next step is for each member MPO to individually approve and sign the updated agreement.

**Recommended Action**
Support updating the Interlocal Agreement for Regional Transportation Planning Coordination in West Central Florida to reflect the legislature’s nomenclature change

**Prepared By**
Beth Alden, MPO Director

**Attachments**
Interlocal Agreement for Regional Transportation Planning and Coordination in West Central Florida (draft update)
THIRD FOURTH AMENDED AND RESTATED INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND COORDINATION IN WEST CENTRAL FLORIDA

This THIRD FOURTH AMENDED AND RESTATED INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT (herein the "Agreement" or "Third Amended and Restated Agreement") is made and entered into by and between the Hernando/Citrus Metropolitan Planning Organization, an entity created and operated pursuant to Interlocal Agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes (herein, the Hernando/Citrus MPO); the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization, an entity created and operated pursuant to Interlocal Agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes (herein, the Hillsborough MPO); the Pasco County Metropolitan Planning Organization, an entity created and operated pursuant to Interlocal Agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes (herein, the Pasco MPO); the Pinellas County Metropolitan Planning Organization, an entity created and operated pursuant to Interlocal Agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes (herein, the Pinellas MPO); the Polk Transportation Planning Organization, an entity created and operated pursuant to Interlocal Agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes (herein, the Polk TPO); and, the Sarasota/Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization, an entity created and operated pursuant to Interlocal Agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes (herein, the Sarasota/Manatee MPO).

WHEREAS, the Hernando MPO, the Hillsborough MPO, the Pasco MPO, the Pinellas MPO, the Polk TPO, and the Sarasota/Manatee MPO entered into an agreement to form a regional entity, the West Central Florida MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee (herein, the CCC), to coordinate transportation planning activities in the urbanized areas of Hernando, Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Sarasota Counties, such original agreement having been signed on March 17, 2004; and hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement"; and,

WHEREAS, in 2005 the Florida legislature created the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) for the purpose of providing funds to improve regionally significant transportation facilities in regional transportation areas created pursuant to s. 339.155(4); and

WHEREAS, the CCC on June 9, 2006 executed Amendment No. 1 to amend the original March 17, 2004 Agreement, by allowing Citrus County a voting membership for the purposes of participating in TRIP and to incorporate the adopted CCC Conflict Resolution Process in the Agreement, and

WHEREAS, after the initial 5-year term the parties to the original Agreement and Citrus County examined the terms of the original Agreement, as amended, and agreed to amend the provisions of the original Agreement, as amended, consistent with Section 10 of the original Agreement; and
WHEREAS, on July 8, 2010 the Citrus County TPO was created by virtue of an interlocal agreement between the Florida Department of Transportation, Citrus County, the City of Inverness, and the City of Crystal River to participate in a coordinated and comprehensive transportation planning process; and

WHEREAS, the CCC on July 12, 2011 executed Amendment No. 2 to remove the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners from limited CCC membership and to accept the Citrus County TPO into the West Central Florida MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee with full member rights in an effort to further regional transportation planning; and

WHEREAS, the Citrus County TPO and the Hernando MPO have been merged, with the approval of the Governor and created pursuant to an Interlocal Agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes to form the Hernando/Citrus MPO; and

WHEREAS, the CCC on December 13, 2013 voted to merge into and consolidate its transportation planning activities with those of the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority, for a streamlined and unified regional planning process; and

WHEREAS, on July 1, 2016, pursuant to Section 339.175(6)(i), Florida Statutes, the West Central Florida MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee was renamed the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee; and

WHEREAS, on July 1, 2017, pursuant to Section 343.92, Florida Statutes, the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transit Authority, and the TBARTA MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee similarly renamed pursuant to Section 339.175(6)(i); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 343.92, Florida Statutes, TBARTA shall coordinate plans and projects with the CCC, to the extent practicable, and participate in the regional M.P.O planning process to ensure regional comprehension of TBARTA’s mission, goals, and objectives;

WHEREAS this Third Fourth Amended and Restated Agreement, once effective, supersedes the Second Third Amended and Restated Agreement which would have automatically renewed but for the Parties entering into this Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the covenants made to by each Party to the other and of the mutual advantages to be realized by the Parties hereto, the Hernando Citrus MPO, the Hillsborough MPO, the Pasco MPO, the Forward Pinellas MPO, the Polk TPO, and the Sarasota/Manatee MPO agree as follows:

Section 1. Authority – This Interlocal Agreement is entered into pursuant to the general authority of Sections 339.175, 339.155 and 163.01, Florida Statutes, relating to Interlocal Agreements.
Section 2. Purpose – The purpose of this Agreement is to provide a forum for continuing coordination and communication among the member CCC Metropolitan Planning Organizations, District One and District Seven Offices of the Florida Department of Transportation, the Florida Turnpike Enterprise, the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Transit Authority (TBARTA), and the affected Regional Planning Councils and to address those tasks necessary to conduct an ongoing regional transportation planning process in accordance with Sections 339.175, 339.155 and 339.2819, Florida Statutes, and in accordance with the requirements under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, or successor legislation.

Pursuant to the language of Section 339.175 (6) (i), Florida Statutes, the powers and duties of the CCC are to coordinate transportation projects deemed to be regionally significant by the Committee, review the impact of regionally significant land use decisions on the region, review all proposed regionally significant transportation projects in the respective transportation improvement programs which affect more than one of the MPOs represented on the Committee, and institute a conflict resolution process to address any conflict that may arise in the planning and programming of such regionally significant projects.

Pursuant to the language of Section 339.2819, Florida Statutes there is created within the Florida Department of Transportation a Transportation Regional Incentive Program for the purpose of providing funds to improve regionally significant transportation facilities in regional areas created pursuant to Section 339.155(4), Florida Statutes. This Interlocal Agreement meets the requirements of Section 163.01, Florida Statutes.

Section 3. Name of Entity – The entity created pursuant to this Interlocal Agreement shall be called the TBARTA Metropolitan Planning Organization Chairs Coordinating Committee (herein the CCC).

Section 4. Organization and Membership

(a) Voting Members: The voting membership of the CCC shall consist of the Chair of each of the six member Metropolitan Planning Organizations. An alternate, who is an elected official, may represent the respective Metropolitan Planning Organization member if so designated by the respective Metropolitan Planning Organization. Each member shall have one vote. Except as indicated in Sections 11 and 12, a simple majority of the voting membership shall be required to pass motions.

(b) Nonvoting Partner Entities: The Secretaries for Districts One and Seven of the Florida Department of Transportation; representatives of the Florida Turnpike Enterprise and of the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Transit Authority; and Chairs (or designees) of the Tampa Bay, Withlacoochee, Southwest Florida, and Central Florida Regional Planning Councils shall be nonvoting partner entities of the CCC. It is the intent of the CCC to enter into separate agreements to define the roles and responsibilities of these nonvoting entities to the CCC.
Section 5. Conduct of Meetings – Meetings shall be held at least annually on a rotating basis with the meeting Host rotating each year among the CCC voting members. The order of rotation shall be the Hernando/Citrus MPO, the Pasco MPO, the Hillsborough MPO, the Polk TPO, the Sarasota/Manatee MPO, and the Forward Pinellas MPO. Responsibility for serving as the Chair of each meeting shall alternate among the CCC members. The Chair of the meeting shall conduct the meetings but have no extraordinary membership powers or responsibilities. At the last meeting of the calendar year, meeting date(s) shall be approved for the following year. Meeting dates shall be posted on the CCC website. Special meetings may be called by a majority of the members. The Host for all special meetings will follow the rotational order. Reasonable notice must be provided to all members for special meetings. The Host member shall be responsible for ensuring that notice requirements of §286.011 have been met, and that meetings are held in a facility accessible to persons with disabilities in compliance with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Meetings shall be conducted pursuant first to any applicable statute, then to any procedural rules adopted by the CCC, then finally to the most recent edition of Robert’s Rules of Order.

As an alternative to the provisions of this Section, a Party or Parties may enter into an agreement with TBARTA to provide professional services and organizational and meeting support that is at a minimum consistent with this Section. In such an event, a lead member of said Party shall be designated each year to administer such an agreement with TBARTA.

Section 6. Staffing, Professional Services and Financial Support of Entity – The Parties agree that the Directors and Managers of the CCC members will be responsible for carrying out the regional work programs and coordinating process as directed by the CCC, provided, however, that should a direction of the CCC directly conflict with the officially-adopted policy direction of a CCC member, staff of that member may ask that the work in question be performed by staff of some other member. Expenses concerning projects assigned to a lead CCC member may be paid by the regional set-aside as specified in its Unified Planning Work Program. The provision of professional services to the administrative entity, including legal review, shall be as agreed by the CCC members from time to time, with the exception that no legal counsel shall be required to render advice to the entity or representation to the members thereof absent each individual member's waiver of any conflict and authorization of joint representation, as provided for by Florida Bar Rule 4-1.7. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the CCC members do not authorize this administrative entity to incur for itself any cost or expense, nor to obtain or retain funds from any source. The entity created by this Agreement is not authorized to conduct any banking or other financial transactions of any kind, nor to receive or disburse any funds. Instead, all financial support for this entity, including the payment of costs and expenses related to its operation, shall be borne by CCC members, on an equitable basis taking into account the relative size of the member as measured by budget and population. The voting Members of the CCC may, as authorized by each member or agencies’ governing board, adopt more specific financial support allocation methods as
may be deemed necessary, and may appoint a lead member to receive and administer funds for the entity. Specifically, one member or partner agency of the CCC may take the lead on a portion of any projects and programs of the CCC and be reimbursed by another member or partner agency of the CCC without creation and execution of a new Interlocal Agreement consistent with approval by each respective member or agencies governing board and MPOs Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) authorization. Such governing board approval shall be deemed an addendum to this agreement, which shall be a financial obligation of the member enforceable by the lead member. The CCC members agree to work together to seek new sources of funding to assist the members with the added costs and expenses associated with the operations of this new administrative entity.

Section 7. Record Keeping – Staff of the host CCC member or TBARTA, as applicable, shall provide a recording secretary for public meetings. Record keeping and other clerical responsibilities shall be the duty of the host member staff consistent with the rotation for hosting the meeting or TBARTA as applicable. All minutes shall be distributed to members prior to the next quarter. Records shall be maintained in accordance with the public records law, Chapter 119, Florida Statutes.

Section 8. Conflict Resolution – A conflict resolution process is adopted which will be used to resolve disagreements regarding interpretation of the interlocal agreement or disputes relating to the development or content of the regional plan. If the Parties to this Agreement fail to resolve any conflicts related to issues covered in the Agreement, such dispute will be resolved in accordance with the "West Central Florida Metropolitan Planning Organizations Memorandum of Understanding for a Conflict Resolution Process (June 2001)."

Section 9. Risk of Loss – The Parties acknowledge that as a mere administrative entity, the CCC cannot sue, be sued, nor bear any legal liability. Therefore, the Parties agree that each shall continue to maintain such insurance coverage as may be required to cover the additional risks associated with membership and participation in the CCC entity. Members covered by a self-insurance program shall notify their respective covering-entities of this agreement so that any added risk may be factored. The Parties further agree that under no circumstances shall any member of the CCC seek to recover against any other member for any loss associated with this Agreement or the work of the CCC.

Section 10. Duration of Agreement – This Agreement shall have a term of five years from the effective date and shall automatically renew at the end of said five years for another five-year term and every five years thereafter. At the end of the five-year term and at least every five years thereafter, the Parties here to shall examine the terms hereof and agree to amend provisions or reaffirm the same. However, the failure to amend or to reaffirm the terms of this Agreement shall not invalidate or otherwise terminate this Agreement.

Section 11. Termination – This Agreement shall continue in force until terminated with or without cause by a unanimous vote of the MPOs.
Section 12. Modification – This Agreement may only be modified by a unanimous vote of the MPOs. Amendments or modifications to the Agreement shall not become effective until executed and recorded in the public records of the counties of each participating MPO.

Section 13. Rescission – Any MPO may terminate its participation in this Agreement upon thirty (30) days written notice. Notice of intent to terminate shall be given to the other member agencies. Said notice shall be transmitted to the official office of the member agencies by certified mail, return receipt requested. The 30-day notice requirement shall commence upon giving of the notice.

Section 14. Filing and Recording – As required by §163.01(11), Florida Statutes, this Interlocal Agreement shall be filed with the Clerks of the Circuit Courts of Hernando, Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Sarasota and Citrus Counties, Florida.

This Third Amended and Restated Agreement does not become effective until recorded in each county and shall continue to be effective thereafter in accordance with Section 10 of this Agreement. Until the Third Amended and Restated Agreement becomes effective, the Second Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement shall remain in effect.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties herein have executed this Agreement by their duly authorized officials as of the day and year written.

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, an entity created and operated pursuant to interlocal agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes

By: ________________________________

Les Miller, Chairperson

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this ________ day of _________, 2017, by Les Miller, as Chairperson of the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization, an entity created and operated pursuant to interlocal agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes, who is personally known to me or has produced ______________ as identification.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties herein have executed this Agreement by their duly authorized officials as of the day and year written.

HERNANDO/CITRUS METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, an entity created and operated pursuant to interlocal agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes

By: __________________________________

Ronald Kitchen, Jr., Chairperson

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this ________day of _________, 2017, by Ronald Kitchen, Jr., as Chairperson of the Hernando/Citrus Metropolitan Planning Organization, an entity created and operated pursuant to interlocal agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes, who is personally known to me or has produced __________________ as identification.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties herein have executed this Agreement by their duly authorized officials as of the day and year written.

PASCO COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, an entity created and operated pursuant to interlocal agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes

By: ________________________________

Camille Hernandez, Chairperson

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this ________ day of _________, 2017, by Camille Hernandez, as Chairperson of the Pasco County Metropolitan Planning Organization, an entity created and operated pursuant to interlocal agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes, who is personally known to me or has produced __________ as identification.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties herein have executed this Agreement by their duly authorized officials as of the day and year written.

PINELLAS COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, an entity created and operated pursuant to interlocal agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes

By: _______________________________

John Morroni, Chairperson

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this ________ day of _________, 2017, by John Morroni, as Chairperson of the Pinellas County Metropolitan Planning Organization, an entity created and operated pursuant to interlocal agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes, who is personally known to me or has produced ______________ as identification.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties herein have executed this Agreement by their duly authorized officials as of the day and year written.

POLK COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION, an entity created and operated pursuant to interlocal agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes

By: _______________________________

   Don Selvage, Chairperson

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this ________ day of _________, 2017, by Don Selvage, as Chairperson of the Polk County Transportation Planning Organization, an entity created and operated pursuant to interlocal agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes, who is personally known to me or has produced __________________ as identification.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties herein have executed this Agreement by their duly authorized officials as of the day and year written.

SARASOTA/MANATEE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, an entity created and operated pursuant to interlocal agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes

By: ____________________________

Willie Shaw, Chairperson

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _______ day of __________, 2017, by Willie Shaw, as Chairperson of the Sarasota/Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization, an entity created and operated pursuant to interlocal agreement and Section 339.175, Florida Statutes, who is personally known to me or has produced __________ as identification.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
General Planning Consultant (GPC) Agreement Amendment: Kittelson & Associates

**Presenter**
Beth Alden, MPO Director

**Summary**
One of the MPO’s general planning consultants, Kittelson & Associates, has notified the MPO of the loss of key personnel; specifically, Mr. Bill Oliver has left the firm in order to begin a private practice.

It is proposed that the MPO’s contract with Kittelson & Associates be amended in order to add W.E. Oliver, PE, LLC as a sub-consultant, thereby maintaining the personnel available to the MPO.

The MPO attorney has advised that this requires a board action, and has reviewed the draft amendment which is attached.

**Recommended Action**
Support the proposed amendment

**Prepared By**
Beth Alden and Rich Clarendon, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
- Second Amendment to Hillsborough County MPO Professional Services Agreement with Kittelson & Associates (draft)
- Letter of request from proposed subconsultant
SECOND AMENDMENT TO
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

On this 6th day of February, 2018, the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (hereinafter, the "MPO") and Kittelson & Associates, Inc (hereinafter, the "CONSULTANT") hereby agree to amend the Professional Services Agreement (hereinafter, the “Agreement”) that was entered into on October 6, 2015, by and between the MPO and the CONSULTANT.

WHEREAS, on October 6, 2015, the MPO and the CONSULTANT entered into the Agreement; and

WHEREAS, since the execution of the Agreement, the CONSULTANT has notified the DIRECTOR of the loss of certain key personnel listed the CONSULTANT’s written proposal; and

WHEREAS, the CONSULTANT desires to subcontract with W.E. Oliver, P.E., LLC to replace the key personnel; and

WHEREAS, the agreement identifies the CONSULTANT’s subcontractors and their Approved Hourly Rates per Classification and Additive Percentages in Exhibit “C”;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual terms, covenants and conditions contained herein, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, it is mutually agreed as follows:

1. **Exhibit “C” of the Agreement is amended to include W.E. Oliver, P.E., LLC, attached**

2. **Except as expressly modified as provided herein, the remainder of the Agreement shall remain unchanged.**

IN WITNESS WHEREIN the parties hereto have executed this Second Amendment to the Agreement this 6th day of February, 2018.

ATTEST:

Hillsborough County
Metropolitan Planning Organization

By:

_________________________________
MPO Chairman
LEGAL REVIEW:

By: __________________________
MPO Attorney

ATTEST:

CONSULTANT

By: __________________________  By: __________________________

__________________________  __________________________
(title)  (witness)

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH

On this ___ day of _____________, _____, before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared __________________________, to me known to be the individual described in and who executed the foregoing instrument as ______________________, of ______ ___________________________, a ______________ corporation, and who severally and duly acknowledged the execution of such instrument as such an officer aforesaid, for and on behalf of and as the act and deed of said corporation, pursuant to the powers conferred upon said officer by the corporation's Board of Director's or other appropriate authority of said corporation, and who, having knowledge of the several matters stated in said foregoing instrument, certified the same to be true in all respects. He/she is personally known to me or has produced ______________________ as identification and did (did not) take an oath.

WITNESS my hand and official seal the date aforesaid.

____________________________________
(Signature of Person Taking Acknowledgment)

_________________________________
(Name of Acknowledger Typed, Printed or Stamped)

________________________________ (Title or Rank)

________________________________ (NOTARY'S SEAL)
Exhibit “C”
APPROVED HOURLY RATES PER CLASSIFICATION AND ADDITIVE PERCENTAGES

W.E. Oliver, P.E., LLC
(Name of Consultant/Subconsultant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>HOURLY RATES¹</th>
<th>YEAR 1²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Engineer</td>
<td>$73.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Unburdened, does not include overhead, fringe benefits, facility capital cost of money, operating margin or out-of-pocket expenses
(2) Future year rates will become effective February 1st of each year and will be escalated based on the annual percent increase of the CPI-W, all items, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics mid-January each year.

Additive Percentages:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>+ 147.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCCM</td>
<td>+ 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Margin</td>
<td>+ 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdened Salary³</td>
<td>= 259.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Burdened Salary not to exceed: $189.40/hr.
January 5, 2018

Ms. Jennifer Musselman, EI, Project Manager
Kittelson and Associates, Inc.
100 North Tampa Street, Suite 2670
Tampa, Florida 33602

Re: Addition to Hillsborough County MPO General Services Contract

Dear Ms. Musselman,

I am pleased to submit this letter in support of adding my firm, W.E. Oliver, P.E., LLC, (WEO-PE) to Kittelson’s Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) General Services Contract. For your use, I have attached my resume, letter of pre-qualification from Florida DOT, and a justification worksheet for my proposed hourly rate of $189.40.

I am looking forward to working with you and the consultant team. Should you have any questions regarding the attached materials, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

W.E. Oliver, P.E., LLC

William E. Oliver, P.E., PTOE
President

Enclosures:
- Resume
- Florida DOT Letter of Pre-Qualification
- Hourly Rate Justification Worksheet

F:\WEO-PE\Projects\106.03 KAI-Hillsborough MPO\1. Admin\WEO-PE Contract Addition Letter.docx
William E. ("Bill") Oliver, P.E., PTOE

Bill Oliver has practiced professional traffic engineering and transportation planning in Florida since 1978, earning a reputation for versatility, sound transportation analyses, practical solutions to client issues, and an understanding of Florida's growth management processes. He has built strong relationships with his clients, whether private or public sector, and has worked effectively with neighborhood groups and agency staff to find practical solutions to transportation issues that meet the needs of interested parties.

Bill's areas of practice and project management include:
- long-range transportation systems planning,
- sub-area transportation network planning,
- development of growth management policies and regulations relating to development impacts on the transportation system,
- land use plan amendments,
- development of regional impact (DRI), rezoning, concurrency, and site access permitting,
- developing transportation mobility and impact fees,
- roadway improvement design traffic and traffic operations analysis,
- roadway typical section development, including “complete streets”,
- access management,
- safety and street lighting analyses, and
- intersection conceptual design (traffic signals, roundabouts).

He has supplemented these activities with expert testimony at public hearings, certificate of need proceedings, and neighborhood meetings; presentations at professional organization conferences; providing input to legislative task forces; and by publishing related articles – demonstrating excellent communications skills.

Education:
- B.S. Civil Engineering, University of Virginia, 1978, with high distinction
- M.S. Civil Engineering, University of Virginia, 1979

Professional Registrations:
- Professional Engineer, Florida, 31157
- Professional Traffic Operations Engineer, 129

Member:
- Institute of Transportation Engineers
**Previous Employment:**

1/2015 – 11/2017 Senior Principal Engineer, Kittelson and Associates, Inc. Opened branch office for Kittelson in Tampa, secured multiple MPO and private sector contracts, directed roadway PD&E study, impact/mobility fee studies, land development planning studies.

2/1989 – 2/2014  Senior Vice-President, Tindale-Oliver and Associates, Inc. Directed traffic engineering and transportation staff of up to 9-10 fte staff supporting land development, transportation planning, roadway project development and design studies. Responsible for business development, employee development, and production for the group.


10/1978-7/1981  Traffic Engineer, City of Tampa, Florida. Served as City representative to MPO Technical Advisory Committee, reviewed land development proposals.

**Professional Affiliations/Task Advisory Committees:**
- Institute of Transportation Engineers (National and Florida Section)
- Tampa Bay Applications Group

**Representative Projects and Clients:**
- Multi-Modal Mobility Fee Studies, Pasco County, Lake County, City of Orlando, Florida
- Long Range Transportation Plan, Charlotte County MPO/Florida DOT
- Long Range Transportation Plan, Volusia County MPO
- Livingston Road PD&E Study, Collier County, FL
- Goodlette-Frank Road PD&E Study, Collier County, FL
- Golden Gate Boulevard PD&E Study, Collier County, FL
- Bonita Beach Road Design Study, Lee County, FL
- US 41 Roundabouts Study, City of Sarasota, FL
- US 19: 66th Avenue North to 118th Avenue North PD&E Update Study, HW Lochner/Florida DOT
- Morrison Avenue Area Traffic Calming Study, City of Tampa, FL
- 22nd Avenue North Multi-Modal Corridor Study, Pinellas County MPO
- Development Site Due Diligence Reviews, TaylorMorrison
- Tampa Palms DRI, Lennar Homes
- Tampa Downtown DRI, Tampa, FL
- St. Petersburg Times Forum ("Ice Palace") DRI, Lightning Partners
- DRI analysis for over 170 million s.f. and 150,000 dwellings of development.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Letter of Thanks to Katharine Eagan

**Presenter**
None - Consent Agenda

**Summary**
Last month, the Citizens Advisory Committee passed a motion to thank former HART CEO Katharine Eagan for her service to Hillsborough County.

Staff has drafted the attached letter for the MPO Board's approval.

**Recommended Action**
Authorize Chairman to sign letter of thanks to Katharine Eagan

**Prepared By**
Rich Clarendon, AICP

**Attachments**
Letter of Thanks - Draft
February 6, 2018

Ms. Katharine Eagan, CEO
Port Authority of Alleghany County
Heinz 57 Center, Third Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Dear Ms. Eagan:

On behalf of the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization, I would like to express our thanks for your years of service to the citizens of Hillsborough County. We especially want to thank you for your diligence in pursuing better transit service for HART’s patrons, and willingness to explore new technologies and service concepts to provide cost-effective and innovative transit for our visitors and residents.

Best wishes in your new position and future endeavors.

Sincerely,

Beth Alden, AICP
MPO Executive Director

Commissioner
Lesley “Les” Miller, Jr.
Hillsborough County
MPO Chairman

Councilman Harry Cohen
City of Tampa
MPO Vice Chairman

Paul Anderson
Port Tampa Bay

David Mechanik
HART

Trent Green
Planning Commission

Commissioner Ken Hagan
Hillsborough County

Commissioner Pat Kemp
Hillsborough County

Mayor Mel Jurado
City of Temple Terrace

Joe Lopano
Hillsborough County
Aviation Authority

Mayor Rick A. Lott
City of Plant City

Commissioner
Guido Maniscalco
City of Tampa

Commissioner
Sandra Murman
Hillsborough County

Cindy Stuart
Hillsborough County
School Board

Councilman Luis Viera
City of Tampa

Joseph Waggoner
Expressway Authority

Commissioner
Stacy R. White
Hillsborough County

Beth Alden, AICP
Executive Director

Plan Hillsborough
planhillsborough.org
planner@plancom.org
813 - 272 - 5940
601 E Kennedy Blvd
18th Floor
Tampa, FL, 33602
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment – I-4 Resurfacing from East of 50th St to East of McIntosh Rd

Presenter
Joe Price, MPO Staff

Summary
The TIP is an active document, effective October 1st thru September 30th, and is amended throughout the fiscal year to update costs, add, remove, and/or move forward projects. The document reflects all the projects within the 5-year work program, detailing phases and funding.

The following TIP amendment was initiated by Florida Department of Transportation to update the total funding amount for the resurfacing of I-4 from east of 50th St to east of McIntosh Rd. This project is currently in the TIP with construction funded in 2018 at $22.3 million. The cost has been updated based on current construction costs to $27.4 million, a net change of about $5.1 million. This project is for resurfacing only and does not add any lanes or other capacity to the facility.

Recommended Action
Recommend approval of the TIP amendment to increase the funding to resurface I-4 from East of 50th St to East of McIntosh Rd.

Prepared By
Joe Price, MPO Staff

Attachments
STIP/TIP Report
Comparative Report
On Tuesday, February 06, 2018, the Hillsborough MPO Metropolitan Planning Organization amended the Transportation Improvement Program that was developed and adopted in compliance with Title 23 and Title 49 in a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process as a condition to the receipt of federal assistance. By signature below, the MPO representative certifies that the TIP amendment was adopted by the MPO Board as documented in the supporting attachments. This amendment will be subsequently incorporated into the MPOs TIP for public disclosure.

The amendment does not adversely impact the air quality conformity or financial constraints of the STIP.

The STIP Amendment is consistent with the Adopted Long Range Transportation Plan. (Page Number: tbd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>#436588-1</th>
<th>4/50TH ST TO E OF MCINTOSH</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Original STIP</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Funding Source After Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; FY 2018</td>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>FY 2019</td>
<td>FY 2020</td>
<td>FY 2021</td>
<td>FY 2022</td>
<td>&gt; FY 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original STIP</td>
<td>436588-1</td>
<td>IAD</td>
<td>4/50TH ST TO E OF MCINTOSH</td>
<td>6 LANES</td>
<td>MANAGED BY FDOT</td>
<td>22,260,769.00</td>
<td>6 LANES</td>
<td>MANAGED BY FDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACNP CST</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,260,769.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,260,769.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source After Change</td>
<td>190437-1</td>
<td>IAD</td>
<td>STATEWIDE CONTINGENCY FUND</td>
<td>MANAGED BY FDOT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>54,387,199.00</td>
<td>40,380,823.00</td>
<td>23,093,355.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACNP CST</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>54,387,199.00</td>
<td>40,380,823.00</td>
<td>23,093,355.00</td>
<td>18,000,000.00</td>
<td>52,931,505.00</td>
<td>229,515,674.00</td>
<td>418,308,556.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change to Project</td>
<td>-2,771,327.00</td>
<td>5,150,564.00</td>
<td>2,379,237.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change to Funding Source</td>
<td>2,771,327.00</td>
<td>-5,150,564.00</td>
<td>-2,379,237.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change to Proposed Project</td>
<td>-2,771,327.00</td>
<td>5,150,564.00</td>
<td>2,379,237.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change to STIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5 Year TIP

### Hillsborough County, District 7

### HIGHWAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
<th>Adopted Date: 6/22/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Item Number:** 436588 1  
**Description:** I-4/SR 400 FROM E OF 50TH ST TO E OF MCINTOSH  
**Related Project:** 4365881  
**Extra Description:** 6 LANES  
**Project Length:** 24.762  
**Type of Work:** RESURFACING  
**LRTP:** System preservation, p. 161

### PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING - MANAGED BY FDOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2018</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>&gt;2022</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>$383,234</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$383,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIH</td>
<td>$22,034</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACNP</td>
<td>$2,771,327</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,771,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>$5,211</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>$9,128</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>$3,340,934</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,340,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONSTRUCTION - MANAGED BY FDOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2018</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>&gt;2022</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACNP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22,260,769</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22,260,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22,260,769</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22,260,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 436588 1 Totals:** $3,340,934 | $22,260,769 | $0   | $0   | $0   | $0   | $0   | $25,601,703 |

## Status  
**Amended:** 25  
**Amendment Date:** 12/5/2017  
**Amendment Number:** 25  
**Item Number:** 436588 1  
**Description:** I-4/SR 400 FROM E OF 50TH ST TO E OF MCINTOSH  
**Related Project:** 4365881  
**Extra Description:** 6 LANES  
**Project Length:** 24.762  
**Type of Work:** RESURFACING  
**LRTP:** System preservation, p. 161

### PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING - MANAGED BY FDOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2018</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>&gt;2022</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>$383,234</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$383,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIH</td>
<td>$22,034</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACNP</td>
<td>$2,771,327</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,771,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 436588 1 Totals:</th>
<th>$3,340,934</th>
<th>$27,411,333</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$30,752,267</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION - MANAGED BY FDOT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified ACNP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,411,333</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,411,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,411,333</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,411,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>$5,211</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>$9,128</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>$3,340,934</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,340,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment – Safety Performance Measures

**Presenter**
Johnny Wong, PhD (MPO Staff)

**Summary**
The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has made a push toward performance-based planning and recently added a requirement for each MPO to adopt safety performance targets. This amendment is to update the narrative of the TIP to include the five safety performance measures required by FHWA, and provide a baseline by which to track progress toward improving safety.

In 2017, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) set a statewide target of zero traffic deaths. Whereas achieving zero traffic deaths is the long-term aspirational goal of the Hillsborough MPO, the FHWA has encouraged MPOs to select realistic targets based on data analysis. Staff has worked with other regional partners to establish a methodology for projecting safety targets through calendar year 2018. Baseline targets were developed as follows:

- Number of Fatalities: 184
- Number of Serious Injuries: 1,618
- Number of Nonmotorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries: 243
- Rate of Fatalities per 100 MVMT: 1.40
- Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 MVMT: 12.35

The MPO Board prioritizes projects for funding, many of which meet the criteria for safety projects under the *Reduce Crashes & Vulnerability* category of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The 2017-18 TIP has numerous funded projects that enhance the safety of facilities including: sidewalks connecting to schools, complete streets along Collins Street, George Road and Floribraska Avenue, the Green Spine Cycle Track extension, the Heights Mobility Plan, and road diets along Himes Avenue, 46th Street and 34th Street. These projects will make progress toward improving safety in future years.

**Recommended Action**
Recommend Approval of CY2018 Baseline Safety Performance Targets

**Prepared By**
Johnny Wong, PhD (MPO Staff)

**Attachments**
Safety Performance Measure Text to be added to the TIP
Background

The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) requires State DOTs and MPOs to conduct performance-based planning by tracking performance measures and setting data-driven targets to improve those measures. Performance-based planning ensures the most efficient investment of federal transportation funds by increasing accountability, transparency, and providing for better investment decisions that focus on key outcomes related to seven national goals:

- Safety;
- Infrastructure preservation;
- Congestion reduction;
- System reliability;
- Freight movement and economic vitality;
- Environmental sustainability; and,
- Reduced project delivery delays.

The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act supplements the MAP-21 legislation by establishing timelines for State DOTs and MPOs to comply with the requirements of MAP-21.

Safety is the first national goal identified in the FAST Act. In March of 2016, the Highway Safety Improvement Program and Safety Performance Management Measures Rule (Safety PM Rule) was finalized and published in the Federal Register. The rule requires MPOs to set targets for the following safety-related performance measures and report progress to the State DOT:

- Fatalities;
- Serious Injuries;
- Nonmotorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries;
- Rate of Fatalities per 100M Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT); and
- Rate of Serious Injuries per 100M VMT.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requires the Hillsborough MPO to establish safety targets and report progress toward achieving those targets on an annual basis, beginning on February 27, 2018. The Hillsborough MPO may either agree to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the FDOT targets or establish its own quantifiable performance targets for the metropolitan planning area for calendar year 2018 (January 1, 2018 – December 31, 2018). State DOTs and MPOs are able, however, to revise and adjust targets on an annual basis.

Florida DOT Safety Targets

In August of 2017, the FDOT declared the State’s safety performance targets as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Measure</th>
<th>CY2018 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmotorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities per 100M VMT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries per 100M VMT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These annual targets are expressed as five-year rolling averages, comprising the five calendar years ending prior to the year the targets are due.

**Hillsborough MPO Safety Targets**

In preparation for the initial safety target-setting effort, to be concluded by February 27, 2018, coordinated target-setting among the FHWA, FDOT, and Hillsborough MPO occurred through a series of webinars, target-setting workshops, teleconferences, and a meeting of the Florida Metropolitan Planning Partnership.

The Hillsborough MPO has committed to a quantifiable target\(^1\)\(^2\) for each of the safety-related performance measures, and are declared as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Measure</th>
<th>CY2018 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>1,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmotorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities per 100M VMT</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries per 100M VMT</td>
<td>12.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All five targets are linear projections made for CY2018 using five years of historical data on a rolling average, beginning in 2012 and ending in 2016, which is consistent with Federal reporting requirements. The targets apply to all public roads in the designated Metropolitan Planning Area of Hillsborough County.

\(^1\)The VMT estimate is published by the FDOT Office of Transportation Data and Analytics on an annual basis, http://www.fdot.gov/planning/statistics/mileage-rpts/.

\(^2\)Fatality and serious injury counts are published by the FDOT State Safety Office's Crash Analysis Reporting (CAR) database. Figures used were current as of October 2, 2017.
Annual Serious Injury Count, projected to CY2020

Nonmotorized Fatal and Serious Injury Counts, projected to CY2020

Fatality Rate per 100MVMT, projected to CY2020
Progress Toward Targets

The investment priorities of the Hillsborough MPO are outlined in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP Priorities consider candidate projects that fall into one of five investment programs established by the Imagine 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, including Reduce Crashes & Vulnerability, which evaluates projects that have the anticipated effect of reducing both total crashes, and fatal and nonmotorized crashes. The MPO's goal of reducing crashes by 21-50% (to achieve a level comparable to peer cities by 2040) is linked to this investment program.

By making Reduce Crashes & Vulnerability the MPO’s second highest priority – following only System Preservation – Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds are now frequently allocated toward safety projects, and priorities are determined based on crash history. There are several STBG-funded safety projects in the FY2017-18 TIP, including the following, and more on the priority list to be considered next year:

- Floribraska Ave from N Tampa St to Nebraska Ave;
- E Columbus Dr from N Nebraska Ave to 14th St;
- N Rome Ave from W Kennedy Blvd to W Columbus Dr;
- 46th St from SR580/Busch Blvd to SR582/Fowler Ave;
- Old Big Bend Rd from E of Covington Garden Dr to E of East Bay HS;
- US92/SR580/Hillsborough Ave from Town ‘n’ Country Blvd to E of Dale Mabry Hwy; and,
- Several projects related to Safe Routes to School.

The Hillsborough MPO has furthermore approved the expenditure of $14.4M in Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds to support safety projects in 2018, and has adopted a Vision Zero Action Plan with a long-term goal of achieving zero traffic fatalities. HSIP projects include:

- 34th St N from Columbus Dr to US92/Hillsborough Ave;
- Himes Ave from SR60/Kennedy Blvd to Columbus Dr;
- US41/SR45/50th St from Denver St to N of S 30th Ave;
- Morris Bridge Rd from Fletcher Ave to Fowler Ave;
- Morris Bridge Rd from Davis Rd to Fowler Ave; and,
- Green Spine Cycle Track PH 2B from Willow Ave to Doyle Carlton Dr.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Tampa Bay Next Quarterly Update

**Presenter**
FDOT Representative

**Summary**
Tampa Bay Next is a program to modernize Tampa Bay’s transportation infrastructure and prepare for the future. FDOT will provide an update on recent activities.

**Recommended Action**
None; for information only

**Prepared By**
Wanda West

**Attachments**
Website: tampabaynext.com
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Regional Transit Feasibility Plan

Presenter
Jacobs Engineering Representative

Summary
The Regional Transit Feasibility Plan builds on decades of planning, to clarify Tampa Bay's vision for transit throughout the region, and define the transit projects that are most competitive for federal grant funding.

An evaluation process using clearly defined criteria identifies the top transit corridors in the region, and ultimately one "catalyst project" that can be implemented first, followed by other projects around the region.

Recommended Action
None; for information only

Prepared By
Wanda West

Attachments
Presentation to the Tampa Bay TMA Leadership Group, January 19, 2018

"Bus-only shoulders move you past congestion" (MetroTransit webpage)
- “A big return with a smaller price tag”
- “When is traffic congested enough for shoulder use?”
- “Safety first! Shoulder use is up to the driver”
Overview

42 Days until session ends, 9 days until the Super Bowl, 13 days left in the Federal Government budget continuing resolution, 62 days until Major League Baseball opening day and 284 days until the general election.

Bills are still advancing through committees, but at a slower pace and with more debate. It almost seems like we are settling into a rhythm. As you can guess from the opening to this paragraph, this week was relatively quiet on many fronts, each chamber introduced their proposed budgets and that was the big news – and seemingly the only big news. Sure, there was talk about the work of the Constitutional Revision Commission and some budget drama in Washington, maybe those two things overshadowed anything in the Capitol. The only constitutionally requirement of the legislature is to pass a budget and present it to the Governor. Last year the budgets of the House and Senate were a couple of Billion dollars apart and many feared it would be a roadblock to departing on time. This year the two chambers are much closer and so is the Governor. House is proposing a budget of $87.2 Billion, the Senate proposes $87.3 Billion and the Governor has proposed a budget of $87.4B. The Senate’s Transportation portion of the budget is proposed at $10.8 Billion with about $100 Million of that as earmarks and a $200 Million sweep. I will go back to the sweep in a moment. The House and Governor proposed budgets of $10.8 Billion for Transportation and no funding sweeps. For the earmarks, please see last week’s newsletter regarding the impacts they can have to the Florida DOT District budgets and to an individual project if it is vetoed by the Governor.

So, what about those sweeps when they happen? $200 Million out of a $10.8 Billion budget sounds small, right? It’s a much bigger deal than one might think. Here is part of how transportation funding works. Funds available this year are used to pay for bonds issued in years past, payments are made for P3 agreements (Public-Private Partnerships) which require annual payments, and construction projects that are already underway must be paid. These are all items that come off the top of the transportation funds that are available. Then we must maintain our transportation system, there are always guardrails to be replaced, roads to be resurfaced/repaved, mowing and a whole host of other activities that quietly take place to insure our transportation system functions properly. What is left after that is what can be used to start new projects. So, after all those expenditures, the new projects portion of the budget is a small portion of the overall budget. If there are multiple years of sweeps then projects for new construction will become scarce. The $200 Million sweep is actually a big impact to the transportation program, it will mean deferring new construction projects to prevent a cash flow problem.

Discuss HB33 and SB90. Some good news this week! Senate Bill 90 (Perry) and House Bill 33 (Toledo and Slosberg – with many Co-Sponsors) each advanced this week. The committees passed and next steps are later in this newsletter, but the important part to share with you here is that there has been a push to
change the bills from simply banning texting while driving to making these bills “hands free driving” bills. The bill sponsors for both bills recognize that this may be too much for the full House or full Senate to bear and asked that the bills stay their original course. Our compliments to Senator Perry and Representatives Toledo and Slosberg for advancing these bills and aiming for a much-wanted result that is attainable. Maybe next year we can go after hands-free, but let’s take these bills across the finish line this year.

Wrapping up, we all have been watching HB 575 with baited breath. The news this week is no news. As of writing Friday evening, nothing official has happened with the bill and the Senate companion bill SB 1516 has no change in status. I suppose no news is good news, right?

I am traveling tomorrow morning, time to take the kids for a weekend trip so you are getting your newsletter on Friday night instead of Saturday morning. It will be waiting patiently for you to enjoy Saturday morning with your coffee. Here is an update on the other bills we are tracking……..

Grab a cup of coffee and enjoy this edition of the MPOAC Legislative Update.

**Important Dates for the 2018 Legislative Session**

- August 01, 2017 – Deadline for filing claim bills
- November 17, 2017 - Deadline for submitting requests for drafts of general bills and joint resolutions, including requests for companion bills
- January 5, 2018 – Deadline for approving final drafts of general bills and joint resolutions, including companion bills
- January 9, 2018 - Regular Session convenes, deadline for filing bills for introduction
- February 24, 2018 - All bills are immediately certified, motion to reconsider made and considered the same day
- February 27, 2018 - 50th day, last day for regularly scheduled committee meetings
- March 9, 2018 - 60th day, last day of Regular Session

**Legislation of interest to the membership**

This is a summary of bills filed and published on the legislature’s website as of January 26, 2018. The bills are listed in numerical order for your convenience. As the session and bills progress, this ordering of bills will make it easier to follow the status of any bill you are tracking.

Changes from last update are shown in RED

**HB 33: Texting While Driving** – (Toledo; Slosberg – Co-Introducers: Ahern; Burgess; Fitzenhagen; Jacobs; Metz; Stark; Altman; Asencio; Berman; Beshears; Boyd; Clemons; Cortes, J.; Cruz; Daniels; Diaz, M.; Donalds; Drake; Duran; Edwards-Walpole; Grant, M.; Gruters; Hager; Harrell; Harrison; Ingoglia; Killebrew; Leek; Mariano; McClain; McClure; Miller, M.; Moskowitz; Olszewski; Payne; Perez; Plasencia; Raschein; Russell; Smith; Spano; Stevenson; Stone; Watson, C.; White; Willhite; Williams) – Similar Bill SB 90. Revises legislative intent; requires law enforcement officer to inform motor vehicle operator of certain rights; prohibits certain actions by such officer; removes requirement that enforcement be accomplished as secondary action. The bill has added many cosponsors and gained the support of the Speaker of the House. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Judiciary Committee; Government Accountability Committee. Passed the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; YEAS 14 NAYS 0, now in Judiciary Committee. Passed Judiciary
Committee, 17 Yeas, 1 Nay. It now needs to pass Government Accountability and then can head to the House floor for a full vote.

SB 72: Use of Wireless Communications Devices While Driving – (Garcia – Co-Introducers: Rodriguez; Mayfield) – Withdrawn. Identical to SB 90.

CS/SB 90: Use of Wireless Communications Devices While Driving – (Perry – Co-Sponsor: Garcia; Mayfield; Rodriguez; Campbell; Baxley Stewart; Taddeo) – Identical to SB 72. Similar to HB 33. Revising the legislative intent relating to the authorization of law enforcement officers to stop motor vehicles and issue citations to persons who are texting while driving; requiring deposit of fines into the Emergency Medical Services Trust Fund, etc. Referred to Communications, Energy, and Public Utilities; Transportation; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations. Committee Substitute (amendment) and passed by Communications, Energy and Public Utilities (Yeas 7, Nays 1). This bill also picked up three more co-sponsors. Now in Transportation. The bill now has seven co-sponsors. The bill passed the Transportation Committee with a vote of 5 Yeas, 0 Nays. The bill now moves to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation on a vote of 11 Yeas, 0 Nays. Pending review of Committee Substitute. Now in Appropriations.

SB 116: Operation of Vehicles – (Baxley – Co-Introducers: Passidomo; Book) - Requiring drivers to vacate lanes closest to, or reduce speed and pass, vulnerable road users, authorized emergency, sanitation, and utility service vehicles or workers, and wrecker operators under certain circumstances, subject to certain requirements, etc. Referred to Transportation; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.

HB 117: Operation of Vehicles – (Stone – Co-Introducers: Hahnfeldt; Jacobs; Killebrew; Stark) - Companion Bill to SB 116. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Government Accountability Committee. Committee Substitute passed Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on a vote of 11 Yeas, 0 Nays. Pending review of Committee Substitute. Now in Government Accountability Committee.

HB 121: Texting While Driving – (Slosberg; Stark) – Similar to SB 72 and SB 90. Revises short title & legislative intent; revises penalties for violations of provisions re: texting while driving; provides enhanced penalties for violations committed in school zones & crossings; requires law enforcement agencies to adopt policies prohibiting racial profiling in enforcement; removes requirement that enforcement be accomplished as secondary action. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Judiciary Committee; Government Accountability Committee. This bill was withdrawn and the bill sponsor (Slosberg) is a cosponsor of the newly filed HB 33: Texting While Driving bill.

SB 176: Traffic Infraction Detectors – (Hutson) – Similar to HB 6001 - Repealing provisions relating to the installation and use of traffic infractions detectors to enforce specified provisions when a driver fails to stop at a traffic signal, provisions that authorize the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, a county, or a municipality to use such detectors, and the distribution of penalties collected for specified violations, etc. Referred to Transportation; Community Affairs; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.

SB 182: Small Business Roadway Construction Mitigation Grant Program – (Rodriguez) – Similar Bill HB 567. Requiring the Department of Transportation to create a Small Business Roadway Construction Mitigation Grant Program; requiring the program to disburse grants using funds allocated to
the department by the Legislature to certain qualified businesses for the purpose of maintaining the businesses during a construction project of the department, etc. Referred to Transportation; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.

**SB 188: Public School Transportation – (Steube)** – Companion bill is HB 1299. Requiring district school boards to provide transportation to certain students; revising the speed and road conditions that meet the requirements for a hazardous walking condition; requiring a district school superintendent to request a review of a hazardous walking condition upon receipt of a written request from a parent of a student, etc. Referred to Education; Appropriations Subcommittee on Pre-K - 12 Education; Appropriations.

**SB 206: Highway Memorial Markers – (Perry)** – Requiring the Department of Transportation to establish a process, including the adoption of any forms deemed necessary by the department, for submitting applications for installation of a memorial marker; authorizing the department to install a certain sign at no charge to an applicant; authorizing an applicant to request an emblem of belief not specifically approved by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs National Cemetery Administration for incorporation in a memorial marker, subject to certain requirements, etc. Referred to Transportation; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.

**HB 215: Autocycles – (Payne)** – Related bill SB 504 (Perry). Defines "autocycle" & revises definition of "motorcycle"; requires safety belt usage by autocycle operator/passenger; authorizes autocycle operation without motorcycle endorsement; provides applicability. Definition of an autocycle: A three-wheeled motorcycle that has two wheels in the front and one wheel in the back; is equipped with a roll cage or roll hoops, a seat belt for each occupant, antilock brakes, a steering wheel, and seating that does not require the operator to straddle or sit astride it; and is manufactured in accordance with the applicable federal motorcycle safety standards provided in 49 C.F.R. part 571 by a manufacturer registered with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Not knowing from the description what an autocycle looks like, I thought it best to share with you a picture of one. The image of an autocycle is shown below. Bill referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee; Government Accountability Committee. Bill passed the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee (Yeas 12, Nays 2) and is now on the Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee agenda for 11/15/2017. Bill passed the Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee, now in Government Accountability Committee. The bill passed the Government Accountability Committee with 19 Yeas, 2 Nays. The Bill has now been placed on the Calendar for a full House vote on 01/24/2018. Passed the House with 105 Yeas and 1 Nay.

**HB 243: Charter County and Regional Transportation System Surtax – (Avila; Perez)** – Companion Bill is SB 688. Requires certain counties to use surtax proceeds for specified purposes related to fixed guideway rapid transit systems & bus systems; authorizes use of surtax proceeds for refinancing existing bonds; prohibits use of such proceeds for certain purposes. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Ways and Means Committee; Government Accountability Committee. The bill was amended by the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee to define eligible uses of surtax monies. The bill as written does not allow for surtax monies to be used for salaries or other personnel expenses.
The bill passed 12 Yeas, Zero Nays. The bill has passed the Ways and Means Committee with a vote of 14 Yeas, 6 Nays. It is now in the Government Accountability Committee.

**SB 272: Local Tax Referenda - (Brandes)** – Companion bill HB 317. Revises the voter approval threshold required to pass a referendum to adopt or amend local government discretionary sales surtaxes when the referendum is held at any date other than a general election. During a general election a simple majority would be required to pass a change to a sales tax, in a non-general election the threshold would be 60 percent. Referred to Community Affairs; Appropriations Subcommittee on Finance and Tax; Appropriations; and Rules. Passed Community Affairs, now in Appropriations Subcommittee on Finance and Tax. On the Committee agenda for 01/16/2018 at 10:00AM in room 401 Senate Office Building. Passed Appropriations Subcommittee on Finance and Tax with an amendment, 6 Yeas, Zero Nays, now in Appropriations.

**HB 317: Local Tax Referenda – (Ingoglia)** – Companion bill SB 272. Requires local government discretionary sales surtax referenda to be held on specified dates & approved by specified percentage of voters. During a general election a simple majority would be required to pass a change to a sales tax, in a non-general election the threshold would be 60 percent. Referred to Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee; Ways and Means Committee; Government Accountability Committee. Passed Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee. Bill is now in Ways and Means Committee. Bill passed Ways and Means Committee, 18 Yeas, Zero Nays. Now in Government Accountability Committee. An amended version of the bill passed Government Accountability Committee with 17 Yeas, 3 Nays. The amendment removes the ability to hold a local tax referenda item on a non-general election ballot. The bill is on the House Calendar to be heard (and voted upon) 01/31/2018.

**SB 346: Motorcycle and Moped Riders – (Perry)** – Increasing the age (from age 16 to age 21) at which persons who are operating or riding upon a certain motorcycle are exempt from protective headgear requirements, etc. Bill referred to Transportation; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations. On Transportation Committee agenda for 11/14/2017. Passed Transportation Committee, now in Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism and Economic Development.

**HB 353: Autonomous Vehicles – (Fisher; Brodeur – Co-introducers: Jacobs; Payne)** – Related to SB 712. Authorizes person to operate, or engage autonomous technology to operate, autonomous vehicle in autonomous mode; provides that autonomous technology is deemed operator of autonomous vehicle operating in autonomous mode; provides construction & applicability; defines "human operator." Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Appropriations Committee; Government Accountability Committee. Passed Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee, now in Appropriations Committee. On Appropriations Committee agenda for 01/22/2018, 3:00PM, Webster Hall. Passed Appropriations Committee with 20 Yeas and Zero Nays. Next stop is Government Accountability Committee.

**SB 384: Electric Vehicles – (Brandes)** – Companion bill is HB 981. Requiring the Florida Transportation Commission to review all sources of revenue for transportation infrastructure and maintenance projects and prepare a report to the Governor and the Legislature when the commission determines that electric vehicles make up a certain percentage or more of the total number of vehicles registered in this state; requiring a long-range transportation plan to consider infrastructure and technological improvements necessary to accommodate the increased use of autonomous technology and electric vehicles, etc. Bill referred to Transportation; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations. Bill was amended to add hybrid vehicles, when hybrid and electric vehicles comprise 2% of the total number of vehicles registered in the state, the Florida Transportation Commission must conduct a study of the fiscal impact to transportation funding. Bill as amended passed Transportation Committee 7 Yeas, Zero Nays.
SB 504: Autocycles – (Perry) – Related bill HB 215 (see HB 215 for an image of an autocycle). Defining the term “autocycle”; requiring safety belt or, if applicable, child restraint usage by an operator or passenger of an autocycle; including an autocycle in the definition of the term “motorcycle”; authorizing a person to operate an autocycle without a motorcycle endorsement, etc. Referred to Transportation; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations. On agenda for Transportation Committee 11/14/2017. Passed Transportation Committee, now in Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism and Economic Development.

HB 525: High-Speed Passenger Rail – (Grall; Magar) – Similar bill SB 572. Requires railroad companies operating high-speed passenger rail system to be responsible for certain maintenance, improvement, & upgrade costs; specifies that governmental entity is not responsible for such costs unless it consents in writing. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee; Government Accountability Committee.

HB 535: Statewide Alternative Transportation Authority – (Avila) – Companion bill is SB 1200. Please see the 11/17/2017 MPOAC Legislative Update Newsletter Overview for more information on this bill. Renames Florida Rail Enterprise as Statewide Alternative Transportation Authority; revises annual allocations for Transportation Regional Incentive Program; specifies annual allocations to TBARTA & authority for certain purposes; provides requirements for use of funds provided to authority; requires enterprise contracts to remain with authority; provides requirements for funding requests & county matching funds; revises & provides definitions; replaces powers & duties of enterprise re: high-speed rail system with powers & duties of authority re: alternative transportation system; exempts proposed projects funded under authority from certain development requirement. The bill was referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee; Government Accountability Committee. Bill was amended by Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee, passed 13 Yeas, Zero Nays.

SB 542: Public Financing of Construction Projects – (Rodriguez) – Prohibiting state-financed constructors from commencing construction of certain structures in coastal areas without first conducting a sea level impact projection study and having such study published and approved by the Department of Environmental Protection; requiring the department to publish such studies on its website, subject to certain conditions, etc. Referred to Environmental Preservation and Conservation; Governmental Oversight and Accountability; Appropriations Subcommittee on the Environment and Natural Resources; Appropriations.

SB 544: Procurement Procedures – (Brandes) – Specifying the applicability of procedures for the resolution of protests arising from the contract solicitation or award process for certain procurements by specified transportation, expressway, and bridge authorities, etc. Referred to Transportation; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations. On Transportation Committee agenda for 11/14/2017. Was Temporarily Postponed. Passed Transportation, now in Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development.

SB 548: Traffic Infraction Detectors – (Campbell) – Companion Bill is HB 6001. Repealing provisions relating to the definitions of “local hearing officer” and “traffic infraction detector,” respectively and relating to the installation and use of traffic infraction detectors to enforce specified provisions when a driver fails to stop at a traffic signal, provisions that authorize the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, a county, or a municipality to use such detectors and that cap fines and provide for the deposit and use of fines, and the distribution of specified penalties, respectively, etc. Referred to Transportation; Community Affairs; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.
HB 567: Small Business Roadway Construction Mitigation Grant Program – (Richardson) – Similar Bill SB 182. Requires DOT to create Small Business Roadway Construction Mitigation Grant Program; requires disbursement of grants to qualified businesses; limits grant amount; provides application & eligibility requirements; requires assistance by DEO; provides for award prioritization; requires report & rulemaking. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee; Government Accountability Committee. Bill was amended by Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee, passed 12 Yeas, Zero Nays.

SB 572: High-Speed Passenger Rail – (Mayfield; Co-Introducer: Gainer) – Similar bill HB 525. Designating the "Florida High-Speed Passenger Rail Safety Act"; providing powers and duties of the Florida Department of Transportation; requiring the Florida Division of Emergency Management to offer, under certain circumstances, the local communities and local emergency services located along the rail corridor training specifically designed to help them respond to an accident involving rail passengers or hazardous materials; requiring a railroad company operating a high-speed passenger rail system to be solely responsible for certain maintenance, improvement, and upgrade costs, etc. Referred to Transportation; Community Affairs; Appropriations. On Transportation Committee agenda for 11/14/2017. Passed Transportation Committee 6 Yeas, Zero Nays. Now in Community Affairs. The bill will be presented in a workshop forum at the Community Affairs Committee on 01/23/2018 at 5:00PM, Room 301, Senate Office Building.

HB 575: Metropolitan Planning Organizations – (Beshears) – Revises MPO voting membership requirements according to population; prohibits entire county commission from being members of governing board; revises percentage of membership which may be composed of county commissioners; requires adoption of certain bylaws; revises member reappointment provisions; requires compliance with certain provisions by specified date. MPOs with an urbanized population under 500,000 must have a board of between 5 and 11 members, MPOs with an urbanized population over 500,000 must have a board of between 5 and 15 members. The bill does not affect the Miami-Dade TPO. The bill bans weighted voting and places term limits on Governing Board Members. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee; Government Accountability Committee. Passed Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee with 13 Yeas, Zero Nays. Now in Local, Federal and Veteran Affairs Subcommittee. The bill passed Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee with a vote of 13 Yeas, 1 Nay. The bill now moves to the Government Accountability Committee.

HB 633: Florida Smart City Challenge Grant Program – (Fischer; Co-Introducer: Jacobs) – Companion bill is SB 852. Creates Florida Smart City Challenge Grant Program within DOT; provides program goals & grant eligibility requirements; requires DOT to issue request for proposals; provides proposal requirements, grant award requirements, & requirements for use of grant funds; requires reports; requires administrative support by DOT; provides appropriation. Annual amount: $15,000,000.00. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee; Government Accountability Committee. On the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee agenda, 01/23/2018 at 9:00AM, Reed Hall. The bill passed Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee with 13 Yeas and Zero Nays. Now in Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee.

SB 688: Charter County and Regional Transportation System Surtax – (Garcia) – Companion bill is HB 243. Requiring counties, except under certain circumstances, to use surtax proceeds only for specified purposes; prohibiting the use of such proceeds for non-transit purposes, etc. Referred to Community Affairs; Appropriations Subcommittee on Finance and Tax; Appropriations. Passed Community Affairs with 5 Yeas, Zero Nays. Now in Appropriations Subcommittee on Finance and Tax. On the agenda for Appropriations Subcommittee on Finance and Tax, 01/29/2018 at 1:30PM in Room 401, Senate Office Building.
SB 712: Autonomous Vehicles – (Brandes) – Related to HB 353. Exempting an autonomous vehicle being operated in autonomous mode from a certain prohibition on the operation of a motor vehicle if the vehicle is actively displaying certain content that is visible from the driver’s seat while the vehicle is in motion; authorizing a fully autonomous vehicle to operate in this state regardless of whether a licensed human operator is physically present in the vehicle; authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to enroll the state in any federal pilot program or project for the collection and study of data for the review of automated driving systems, etc. Referred to Transportation; Banking and Insurance; Rules.  Passed Transportation with 7 Yeas and Zero Nays.  The next stop is Banking and Insurance.

SB 782: Bollards Grant Program – (Rodriguez) - Requiring the Department of Transportation to develop the Bollards Grant Program in order to provide grants to municipalities and counties for the installation of bollards in their jurisdictions; requiring a county or municipality to specify in its application the area, which may include private property, where it intends to install bollards and why the installation is needed, etc. Annual amount: $250,000.00. Referred to Transportation; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.

HB 807: Metropolitan Planning Organizations – (Diamond) – Companion Bill is SB 984. Allows MPOs designated after July 01, 2018 as the result of a merger of two or more existing MPOs to have at least 5 Governing Board members. The bill does not place an upper limit on the number of Governing Board members for MPOs designated after July 01, 2018 as a result of the merger of two or more existing MPOs. Assigned to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee; Government Accountability Committee. On the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee agenda for 01/23/2018 at 9:00AM, Reed Hall.  Passed Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee with 13 Yeas and Zero Nays.  On the Committee Agenda for Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee on 01/29/2018 at 3:00PM in Room 12 of the House Office Building.

HB 815: County and Municipal Public Officers and Employees – (Avila; Co-Introducers: La Rosa) – Companion bill is SB 1180. This bill does a number of things, of importance to MPOs are two requirements related to travel in the bill. First, out of state travel for public officials must be approved by the full governing body of the county of municipality at a publicly noticed meeting and must be on the meeting agenda with an itemized list detailing all anticipated travel expenses. The public official travel must be approved by a majority vote of the governing body. This may create problems for MPO board members to attend events/conferences and USDOT led events given that short notice travel would be virtually impossible to be approved in advance. The second issue for MPOs is the cap of lodging expenses in excess of $120 per night. For MPOs that are administratively housed within a County or Municipality, the lodging cap of $120 per night would apply to you. Foreign travel by county or municipal officers cannot be paid by their government body. Travel expenses incurred by public officers and employees may only be paid for if it is incurred 24 hours before, during and after the event necessitating the travel. Travel expenses outside those timeframes cannot be paid for by the government entity. The bill has been referred to Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee; Public Integrity and Ethics Committee; Government Accountability Committee. Passed Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee with 12 Yeas and 2 Nays. Now in Public Integrity and Ethics Committee.

SB 852: Florida Smart City Challenge Grant Program – (Brandes; Co-Introducer: Taddeo) – Companion bill is HB 633. Creates Florida Smart City Challenge Grant Program within DOT; provides program goals & grant eligibility requirements; requires DOT to issue request for proposals; provides proposal requirements, grant award requirements, & requirements for use of grant funds; requires reports; requires administrative support by DOT; provides appropriation. Annual amount: $15,000,000.00. Referred to Transportation; Transportation, Tourism and Economic Development Appropriations Subcommittee; Appropriations. On the Transportation Committee agenda for 01/18/2018 at 10:00AM in Room 401 of the Senate Office Building.  Passed Transportation Committee with 7 Yeas, Zero Nays.  Now in Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism and Economic Development.
HB 981: Electric Vehicles – (Olszewski) – Companion bill is SB 384. Requiring the Florida Transportation Commission to review all sources of revenue for transportation infrastructure and maintenance projects and prepare a report to the Governor and the Legislature when the commission determines that electric vehicles make up a certain percentage or more of the total number of vehicles registered in this state; requiring a long-range transportation plan to consider infrastructure and technological improvements necessary to accommodate the increased use of autonomous technology and electric vehicles, etc. Bill referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee; Government Accountability. Bill passed Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee 13 Yeas, Zero Nays. Now in Transportation and Tourism Subcommittee. On Committee agenda-- Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee, 01/29/18, 3:00 pm, Reed Hall.

SB 984: Metropolitan Planning Organizations – (Brandes) – Companion Bill is HB 807. Allows MPOs designated after July 01, 2018 as the result of a merger of two or more existing MPOs to have at least 5 Governing Board members. The bill does not place an upper limit on the number of Governing Board members for MPOs designated after July 01, 2018 as a result of the merger of two or more existing MPOs. The bill has been filed but not yet assigned to committees.

SB 1012: Alligator Alley Toll Road – (Passidomo) – Requiring fees generated from tolls to be used to reimburse, by interlocal agreement effective for a specified period of time, a county or another local governmental entity for the direct actual costs of operating a specified fire station, which may be used by a county or another local governmental entity to provide fire, rescue, and emergency management services to the public, etc. Referred to Transportation; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism and Economic Development; Appropriations. On Transportation Committee agenda for 01/18/2018 at 10:00AM in room 401 of the Senate Office Building. Passed Transportation Committee with 7 Yeas, Zero Nays. Now in Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism and Economic Development.

HB 1033: Dockless Bicycle Sharing – (Toledo) – Companion bill is SB 1304 by Young. Providing insurance requirements for a bicycle sharing company; providing requirements for dockless bicycles made available for reservation by such company, etc. Bill referred to Careers and Competition Subcommittee; Commerce Committee. On the agenda for Careers and Competition Subcommittee for 01/16/2018 at 3:00PM in room 216 in the Capitol Building. Amended version passed Careers and Competition Subcommittee with 13 Yeas, 1 Nay. Now in Commerce Committee.

SB 1180: County and Municipal Public Officers and Employees – (Steube) – Companion bill is HB 815. This bill does a number of things, of importance to MPOs are two requirements related to travel in the bill. First, out of state travel for public officials must be approved by the full governing body of the county of municipality at a publicly noticed meeting and must be on the meeting agenda with an itemized list detailing all anticipated travel expenses. The public official travel must be approved by a majority vote of the governing body. This may create problems for MPO board members to attend events/conferences and USDOT led events given that short notice travel would be virtually impossible to be approved in advance. The second issue for MPOs is the cap of lodging expenses in excess of $120 per night. For MPOs that are administratively housed within a County or Municipality, the lodging cap of $120 per night would apply to you. Foreign travel by county or municipal officers cannot be paid by their government body. Travel expenses incurred by public officers and employees may only be paid for if it is incurred 24 hours before, during and after the event necessitating the travel. Travel expenses outside those timeframes cannot be paid for by the government entity. The bill has been referred to Ethics and Elections; Community Affairs; Rules.
SB 1188: Strategic Intermodal System – (Rouson) – Companion Bill is HB 1277. Specifies that the Strategic Intermodal System and the Emerging SIS shall include existing or planned corridors that are managed lanes of transit. Referred to Transportation; Community Affairs; Rules.

SB 1200: Statewide Alternative Transportation Authority – (Young; Co-Introducer: Galvano) – Companion bill is HB 535. Please see the 11/17/2017 MPOAC Legislative Update Newsletter Overview for more information on this bill. Renames Florida Rail Enterprise as Statewide Alternative Transportation Authority; revises annual allocations for Transportation Regional Incentive Program; specifies annual allocations to TBARTA & authority for certain purposes; provides requirements for use of funds provided to authority; requires enterprise contracts to remain with authority; provides requirements for funding requests & county matching funds; revises & provides definitions; replaces powers & duties of enterprise re: high-speed rail system with powers & duties of authority re: alternative transportation system; exempts proposed projects funded under authority from certain development requirement. The bill was referred to Transportation; Transportation, Tourism and Economic Development Appropriations Subcommittee; Appropriations.

HB 1277: Strategic Intermodal System – (Willhite) – Companion Bill is HB 1188. Specifies that the Strategic Intermodal System and the Emerging SIS shall include existing or planned corridors that are managed lanes of transit. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee; Government Accountability.

HB 1299: Public School Transportation – (Raburn) – Companion bill is HB 188. Requiring district school boards to provide transportation to certain students; revising the speed and road conditions that meet the requirements for a hazardous walking condition; requiring a district school superintendent to request a review of a hazardous walking condition upon receipt of a written request from a parent of a student, etc. Referred to PreK-12 Innovation Subcommittee; PreK-12 Appropriations Subcommittee; Education. Passed PreK-12 Innovation Subcommittee with 10 Yeas and Zero Nays. Now in PreK-12 Appropriations Subcommittee.

SB 1304: Dockless Bicycle Sharing – (Young) – Companion bill is HB 1033 by Toledo. Providing insurance requirements for a bicycle sharing company; providing requirements for dockless bicycles made available for reservation by such company, etc. Bill referred to Banking and Insurance; Community Affairs; Rules.

SB 1350: Airports – (Perry) – Increasing eligibility for certain funding by the DOT to include airports that have fewer than a specified number of commercial passenger enplanements annually. Bill referred to Transportation; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.

SB 1516: Metropolitan Planning Organizations – (Perry) – This is a companion bill to HB 575, at this time the two bills are identical – HB 575 is likely to undergo revisions. Revises MPO voting membership requirements according to population; prohibits entire county commission from being members of governing board; revises percentage of membership which may be composed of county commissioners; requires adoption of certain bylaws; revises member reappointment provisions; requires compliance with certain provisions by specified date. MPOs with an urbanized population under 500,000 must have a board of between 5 and 11 members, MPOs with an urbanized population over 500,000 must have a board of between 5 and 15 members. The bill does not affect the Miami-Dade TPO. The bill bans weighted voting and places term limits on Governing Board Members. The bill was filed on 01/04/2018, on 01/12/2018 it was referred to Transportation, Community Affairs and Rules.

HB 6001: Traffic Infraction Detectors – (Avila; Ingoglia) – Similar to SB 176. Companion Bill is SB 548. Repeals provisions relating to installation & use of traffic infraction detectors to enforce specified
provisions when driver fails to stop at traffic signal, provisions that authorize DHSMV, county, or municipality to use such detectors, & provisions for distribution of penalties collected for specified violations. Referred to Appropriations Committee, on the Committee agenda for 10/10/2017. Bill passed Appropriations Committee (Yeas 16, Nays 10). Bill has been placed on Calendar for Full House Vote. The Bill passed the full House on a vote of 83 Yeas, 18 Nays. This bill has been sent to the Senate.
Encouraging the implementation of Complete Streets that are safe and accessible for all!

This event brings people from across the Gulf Coast to learn about transportation safety from one another and from national leaders. As we elevate our individual efforts, sister communities will work together to create cohesive linkages and make a difference in the region.

All modes.

All ages.

All abilities.

February 27, 2018
8:30am - 6:30pm

Register for $60
tinyurl.com/gulfcoastsummit

Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit

Glazer Children's Museum
110 W Gasparilla Plaza, Tampa 33602

planhillsborough.org/gulf-coast-safe-streets-summit
Join us for the first-ever
Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit!

Speakers include:

Rick Kriseman, Mayor, St. Petersburg, FL
Leah Shahum, President, Vision Zero Network
Ryan Gravel, Founder, Atlanta Beltline
David Gwynn & L. K. Nandam
FDOT District Secretaries
Melissa Wandall, President, National Coalition for Safe Roads
Laura Cantwell, AARP Florida

Schedule:

08:30 - Optional Walk/Cycle on the Riverwalk, led by Tampa By Bike (TampaByBike.com)
10:00 - Opening Address
10:30 - Mayors Panel
12:00 - Lunch and Keynote
01:30 - Advocates Panel
02:45 - Secretaries Panel
05:00 - Reception & Awards at Franklin Manor, 912 N Franklin Street

planhillsborough.org/gulf-coast-safe-streets-summit
Plan Hillsborough invites you to join us for Commuter Challenge Week 2018. Give your car some time off and challenge yourself to use transportation options other than driving alone to get to and from work and meetings. Join in for a trip, a day, or the entire week. Burn some calories, improve air quality, avoid traffic hassles, and save money!

How will you give your car some time off?
SR 580/West Busch Boulevard
from east of North Armenia Avenue to west of Florida Avenue
Hillsborough County
Financial Project ID: 437530-1-52-01

Project Description:
This project consists of milling and resurfacing of SR 580/West Busch Boulevard from east of North Armenia Avenue to west of Florida Avenue. The project also includes sidewalk enhancements, minor drainage improvements, and updates to signing and pavement markings.

Project Location:
The project is located on SR 580/West Busch Boulevard from east of North Armenia Avenue to west of Florida Avenue, in Hillsborough County.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Underway (PH II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Construction</td>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Cost Estimate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 1.6 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that cost estimates may change as the project progresses.

FDOT Project Manager
Farzin Zafaranian, PE
11201 N. McKinley Drive, MS 7-600
Tampa, FL 33612
Office Phone: (813) 975-6155
farzin.zafaranian@dot.state.fl.us

Public Information Officer
Kristen Carson
11201 N. McKinley Drive, MS 7-110
Tampa, FL 33612
Office Phone: (813) 975-6060
Kristen.Carson@dot.state.fl.us
January 12, 2018

The Honorable Rep. Larry Ahern
222 The Capitol
402 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300

Dear Representative Ahern:

Transportation plays a critical role in economic growth, community character and individual quality of life, and it is a priority issue facing Pinellas County and the Tampa Bay region in 2018. As the countywide land use and transportation planning agency that also helps define regional transportation priorities, the Forward Pinellas Board adopted the following legislative position statements at its meeting on January 10, 2018:

- Clarify the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transit Authority’s (TBARTA’s) role and responsibilities relative to the system planning and project priority-setting responsibilities of metropolitan planning organizations. While there is a need for strong leadership in regional transportation planning and project development, it should respect the complementary roles different agencies play in terms of planning for land use and transportation, funding, operating and outcome-driven evaluation. The TBARTA Regional Transit Development Plan should reflect project priorities established through the metropolitan planning organizations’ (MPOs) long range transportation plans. We believe that the Regional Transit Development Plan and TBARTA should serve to prioritize, advance, implement and operate transit projects or programs that are officially recognized in the MPO long range plan and on the regional transportation priority list adopted by the MPO.

- Develop and provide funding for a regional express transit network that provides competitive travel times to get workers to their destinations throughout Tampa Bay. This is a relatively low-cost initiative that TBARTA can advance through its Regional Transit Development Plan with application of technology (e.g. regional fare card, transit signal priority, and vehicle automation) and use of express toll lanes on major corridors.

- Adapt existing state transportation funding sources to recognize the increasing need for transit in fast-growing or established urbanized areas. The Forward Pinellas Board supports expanding the eligibility of Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) funds to cover regional transit operating and capital costs for service within SIS corridors like I-275 and US 19 that connect major activity centers. Other programs like the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) can also be expanded to provide statewide transit matching dollars and the regulatory barriers reduced to fund transit projects. An example of this is SB 1200 and related HB 535 that revise the annual allocations in the TRIP program to include alternative transportation systems.
• **Make texting while driving a primary offense.** The Forward Pinellas Board urges the Florida Legislature to enact legislation, such as SB 90 and HB 33, which would make texting while driving a primary offense. In 2015, distracted driving accounted for nine deaths and 569 injuries in Pinellas County alone, with an estimated economic impact of $72,293,100.

• **Oppose legislation for Dockless Bicycle Sharing.** Forward Pinellas is not opposed to dockless bikeshare, per se. However, SB 1304 and HB 1033 would preempt local control of system implementation, operations and safety, which undermines Pinellas County's existing and future bike sharing systems. Bikeshare is not a one-size-fits-all solution. The success of bikeshare depends on local knowledge and expertise. Local decision-makers must have the ability to enact requirements for bikeshare that best meet their needs while allowing them to achieve their cities' goals.

• Forward Pinellas requests that any legislative changes to the **organizational structure of MPOs** be postponed until after this year to allow the Regional Best Practices Study now underway to proceed and develop its recommendations for consideration at the end of the 2018 calendar year. SB 757 would reduce the allowed number of MPO members while increasing the percentage of members that represent Boards of County Commissioners, and SB 984/HB 807 would allow MPOs that merge to maintain their existing representation beyond existing statutory limits on total membership after the merger. Both bills undercut the development of impartial, evidence-based policy recommendations that will be considered for Tampa Bay's regional transportation planning process in 2019.

• **Support the continuation of Community Redevelopment Agencies (CRAs) as a local economic development tool.** CRAs are used to support economic development, including the redevelopment of blighted areas. Monies used in financing CRAs are locally generated, must be spent in ways that are consistent with local government comprehensive plans, and are often used as a match for state and federal funds. They are a valuable tool for communities to invest in areas of high need. HB 17 would severely limit the effectiveness of this important local government tool.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me or Forward Pinellas Executive Director Whit Blanton if further information is needed.

Sincerely,

John Morroni
Chair

Cc: Delegation members
Beth Alden, Hillsborough MPO
Craig Casper, Pasco MPO
Ray Chiaramonte, TBARTA
Tampa Bay's transit future: Light rail's out. Rapid buses are in.

An ongoing study is poised to name a bus rapid transit system as the highest-ranking option for improving transit in the Tampa Bay area. The preferred route would travel alongside Interstate 275 from Wesley Chapel, to the University of South Florida to Tampa, before crossing the bay to St. Petersburg. The system could use updated vehicles similar to this mockup for another BRT route planned from downtown St. Petersburg to the beaches. [Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority]

Published: January 11, 2018
Updated: January 11, 2018 at 11:40 AM

Watch out, Tampa Bay: light rail is out, and buses are in. For now, anyway.

Transit leaders appear ready to scrap their dream of building a light rail line connecting Pasco, Hillsborough and Pinellas counties in favor of a bus rapid transit system that would run alongside Interstate 275 from Wesley Chapel to Tampa to St. Petersburg.

Also known as BRT, the plan to bring that form of transit to the bay area is being drawn up by Jacobs Engineering, which was hired to conduct a regional study of premium transit options that can one day become a reality.

**TAMPA BAY TIMES REPORT:** Tampa Bay has one of the worst public transit systems in America. Here's why. (Feb. 16, 2017)
The plan will be unveiled to the public at the Jan. 19 meeting of the Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group (TMA), a group of political and transportation leaders from the three counties. But the planners said they could not discuss the details before next week’s public meeting.

However, they’ve already started explaining the plan to public officials. Tampa Mayor Bob Buckhorn, Tampa City Council member Harry Cohen, and St. Petersburg Mayor Rick Kriseman said they were recently briefed on the 40-mile bus route that has emerged as the lead option from that ongoing regional transit study.

“This is a real, live proposal,” Cohen said. "This is the first time in a long time that we're going to have a real project with a blue print in front of us that we can sink our teeth into.”

Kriseman said he and other political and business leaders would still like one day to see a light rail system take shape. But the reality, he said, is that BRT is more affordable, easier to build and quicker to get up and running.

"Unless we are willing to ask the public to tax themselves significantly in order to make it happen," Kriseman said, "then realistically light rail is really not going to happen.”

PREVIOUS COVERAGE: Long-awaited Tampa Bay transit study identifies five corridors for future transportation systems (April 22, 2017)

The buses are expected to have a dedicated lane for at least a majority of the route, allowing them to bypass regular traffic. And they might not even look like traditional busses, Cohen said, instead favoring smaller or more agile vehicles.

“I think the idea is to get vehicles that don’t look like your standard bus, that have more of a rail feel to them, but the technology is still rubber tire,” Kriseman said. “So you’re kind of combining the feel of rail with the cost and flexibility of BRT.”

That system would ideally be able to accommodate autonomous vehicle technology in the future. However, those details and many others, including the cost to build and maintain such a system, are still being worked out.

But while the specifics are still unknown, it’s becoming more clear that an enhanced bus system, not a rail line, will likely be the first major regional transit project that Tampa Bay leaders pursue.

"The numbers don’t lie," Buckhorn said. "When you look at the cost and the ridership numbers and the likelihood of state and federal matches, I think it made a lot of sense.”

Buckhorn has long been a proponent of rail, particularly connecting urban areas, but said he wasn’t interested in waiting any longer while people continued to debate the merits of a light rail line.
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Creating one transportation planning agency for all of Tampa Bay won’t be easy (May 12, 2017)

Goodbye Tampa Bay Express, hello Tampa Bay Next; but toll lanes aren’t going anywhere (May 22, 2017)

Depend on a HART bus to get around? Life could get harder. (Oct. 6, 2017)

The Cross Bay Ferry won’t come back this fall. What about 2018? (Nov. 10, 2017)

Express lanes set to open on Veterans. They’re free — for now. (Dec. 8, 2017)

Elected officials and citizens have tried for decades in Tampa Bay to gain enough support for rail, failing most recently in Hillsborough in 2016 and Pinellas in 2014. Rail has also lacked support from local legislators.

"Candidly, I’m tired of talking about it,” Buckhorn said. "We need a victory ... I can say with a great deal of certainty if we move toward a BRT model using the existing interstate, we can get this done much more quickly than another prolonged debate in a political referendum about whether or not rail is appropriate for our area or not."
The Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority has a plan to build a BRT system that would connect downtown St. Petersburg to the beaches, but the 11-mile route depends on federal funds coming through in the next few years.

The Jan. 19 meeting will see the third significant update in the regional premium transit feasibility plan, a cumbersome term for a process to identify specific transit projects that will best serve the region. It’s all part of a 2½-year study, paid for with $1.5 million from the Florida Department of Transportation and overseen by the Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority.

Neither Buckhorn nor Cohen was surprised by the selection of BRT over light rail, but said they suspect some in the community might be. The last update from Jacobs in September listed a light rail line along that corridor as the leading option.

“I do think there may be people in the public who might be surprised that they didn’t land squarely on a light rail project,” Cohen said. “They very much think its a good long-term play, as well as something that could be implemented quickly and more affordably than the other options.”

Contact Caitlin Johnston at cjohnston@tampabay.com or (727) 893-8779. Follow @cljohnst.
First look: How BRT would work

Transit planners unveil the rapid bus plan, which is less expensive than rail.

BY CAITLIN JOHNSTON
Times Staff Writer

ST. PETERSBURG — The newest hope for transportation in the Tampa Bay area is a bus rapid transit system projected to cover the 41-miles separating St. Petersburg from Wesley Chapel and attract 4,500 new riders at a fraction of the cost of light rail.

Also known as BRT, it was identified as the bay area's best bet to bring mass transit to the region by a 23-year study conducted by Jacobs Engineering at the behest of state and local officials. The plan was unveiled Friday to political and business leaders and the public.

But that would be just the start of a transportation makeover for the region, supporters said. "This is not the ultimate endgame for transit in the Tampa Bay region," Florida Department of Transportation local secretary David Gwynn said. "It's nothing even close to that.... What this will hopefully be is a first step."

Jacobs also outlined what kind of system the bay area should build after BRT: a passenger rail system connecting downtown Tampa to the University of South FL. See TRANSIT, 13A
**TRANSPORT continued from 1A**

BRT is a transit system where buses use dedicated lanes to pass traffic, but passengers and at train-like stations, so would be expensive, high-speeds buses, said Jacobs Executive Brett Pringle.

"We're not talking about your everyday bus," he said. "We're talking about something that looks like a train, behaves like a train." But it would cost far less than rail. That's why many local leaders have given up on their dream of building a light rail system in focus on BRT. They're also looking to attract federal dollars to help pay for it.

Referendums to bring BRT to Tampa Bay failed in Hillsborough County in 2010 and in Pasco County in 2014. In 2016, Hillsborough County Commission decided to not even give voters a choice and killed it before it could go to the ballot.

BRT money-saver for this version of BRT is that it would utilize the interstate shoulders to double bus lanes. Using existing right-of-ways, Jacobs engineers project the cost would drop about $455 million. That's about $2 billion cheaper than if the buses ran in the median of the interstate, and it $4 billion cheaper than the fixed cost of light rail.

"When we incorporate that shoulder running concept, you can see we're dramatically reducing our overhead costs ... easily dropping over a billion dollars of infrastructure," Pringle said.

The longest trip projected along the route would be about 90 minutes to travel the full 41 miles from the Wesley Chapel station to the downtown St. Petersburg station.

The new system could attract 4,500 new riders — that is, people who aren't using the counties' existing bus systems. They would have their choice of 21 stations along the 41-mile route.

The buses would run along the interstate shoulder in Pinellas, then cross the Howard Frankland Bridge using the state's proposed toll lanes on a future eight-lane rebuild of one of the spans.

Once in Hillsborough, they'd travel in the expansive median of I-275 between the West Shore area and downtown Tampa. That corridor was set aside during the recent interstate expansion for a transit system.

There could also be elevated stations near West Shore Boulevard and at Howard and Armenia avenues inside that corridor. The BRT buses could exit the interstate in downtown Tampa to connect with the streetcar system.

For those heading north, the bus would then get back on I-275 and use the Interstate shoulder to reach USF. To continue the journey to Pasco County, it could join regular traffic or use the shoulder of I-75.

The consultant said a BRT line could become a reality as soon as five years from now. However, the new eight-lane Howard Frankland — which will add managed toll lanes the new buses could use — won't be completed until 2024 at the earliest, according to DOT.

Friday's rollout was the start, not the end of the plan. Now Jacobs will take its show on the road, present it to the public and gather feedback on the concept. That input will be used to shape the final plan.

Then if government leaders are willing to move forward, each county will have to decide how it wants to pay its share. Pinellas, Hillsborough and Pasco would have to split the annual $38.6 million in capital and operating costs.

Initial reaction was positive but cautious.

"This is relatively low cost. This doesn't mean we have to do a sales (tax)," Hillsborough County Commissioner Pat Kemp said. "We do need to put our general dollars in this. We don't need to be afraid of a sales tax. But a sales tax can be over and above."

Forward Pinellas executive director Whit Blanton, who leads that county's transportation planning agency, said this project has a better shot of earning federal funding.

"When we talk about going for federal money it is not only a very competitive but risky process," he said. "We've got a project that really does lower the risks."

Tampa City Council member Harry Cohen said this project has a better shot of earning federal funding.

Financial perspective.

"It is not so expensive that it really is out of the realm of us figuring out how to pay for it," Cohen said.

Those who have opposed past transit proposals watched the presentation warily.

Hillsborough Tea Party co-founder Sharon Calvery urged leaders not to apply for federal funding.

"Once federal money is taken, you're really tied to what you have," she said. She added: "We need flexibility to move forward with it. Flexible enough to eliminate it, reduce it and change it."

Barbara Haselden, who organized No Tax For Tracks and helped defeat the Greenlight Pinellas transportation sales tax in 2014, said she hoped this meant rail was officially off the table in Tampa Bay.

But other members of the public encouraged leaders to press on.

"Don't be swayed," Safety Harbor resident Dave Koval said. "Listen to the good."

Pringle reiterated that BRT project is only the first step. Jacobs is studying other transit options that could also be built in the bay area.

"It's not a one-and-done proposition," he said.

Contact Caitlin Johnston at cjohnston@tampabay.com or (727) 893-8779. Follow @cjohnst.
Taking the BRT to the future

Perhaps it was that noted existentialist philosopher Ken Kesey Rogers, or maybe it was the post-modernist French thinker Michel Foucault, who first said, "You need to know when to hold 'em and when to fold 'em". But let's not quibble. If you're one of those transportation geeks (read: transit chak, Ed) who have long advocated for the creation of a light rail system linking greater Tampa Bay, it is time to put a fork in your vision. Light rail will never be implemented in our fair hamlet. It has now become too cost prohibitive. Too complicated. Too political. Too difficult.

The rail apologist gives it a good try. They did their best. And they came up short - by oh, a few billions of dollars and hundreds of miles.

It is time to move on. And that might mean moving on aboard BRT, which is the latest near transit plan unveiled in a $4 million study prepared by Jacobs Engineering that could mark the first real effort to create a regional transit model linking Pinellas, Pasco and Hillsborough counties. It's about time.

As reported by the Tampa Bay Times' Caitlin Johnston, the Regional Premium Transit Feasibility Study (catchy title) envisions the creation of a modified bus system closely resembling light rail corridors that would service a 60-mile route connecting Wesley Chapel to the University of South Florida, to downtown Tampa, to the West Shore area and into downtown St. Petersburg among Interstate 275.

The BRT would travel along mostly dedicated lanes and would (or if) fully implemented, that could link up with other transit modes to get people where they need to go.

But at first blush, the BRT concept has a long way to go for it, not the least of which is that it would cost far less to launch and operate than the disruption that would be caused by the construction of rail lines throughout the proposed service area.

As well, politically, Tampa Mayor Bob Buckhorn supports the concept of BRT, as does St. Petersburg Mayor Rick Kriseman. And even Tampa Bay Lightning owner...
Too soon to settle for buses over light rail in Tampa Bay

The good news on the transportation front is that Tampa Bay’s government and business leaders are working together like never before to connect the region’s largest cities, attractions and employment centers with a more robust mass transit system. They are wisely focusing on a direct route across Tampa Bay as the first major project toward improving regional service. But they are prematurely embracing a rapid bus system and dismissing light rail because buses are less expensive and more politically expedient.

The consultant hired by the Florida Department of Transportation, Jacobs Engineering, presented its recommendation Friday for what it envisions as a “catalyst” project for improving regional connections. It proposed a bus rapid transit system connecting downtown St. Petersburg and Tampa with Wesley Chapel as the preferred first step. The proposed system, known as BRT, is nothing new and has been widely accepted for years as a likely component of a regional transit plan. But in suggesting BRT as its first priority, the recommendation effectively sidelines light rail — despite rail’s standing for years as the most desirable transit option, its potential to spark redevelopment and create jobs and its earlier tasking.

The Jacobs study names bus rapid transit as the most forward-looking and competitive for state and federal funding. In contrast to rail, the study found BRT would be cheaper, easier and quicker to build and offer more bang for the buck. The 41-mile route would use managed toll lanes on the new Howard Frankland Bridge, expected to be built by 2024, and a transit corridor in the median in parts of 1-75 into downtown Tampa. On other parts of the interstate, buses would use the shoulder or breakdown lanes, and even the general use lanes. The DOT will spend the next phase of the study soliciting public feedback.

Express buses are an integral part of mass transit systems. While the costs vary depending on the route and the need to buy right-of-way construction and start-up expenses could be one-third or half the cost of rail. The DOT study estimates the regional bus line could cost $460 million to construct, compared to $2.2 billion to $4.2 billion for rail. Bus routes also are easier to move than fixed rail lines, though changing express routes could also hurt demand if riders lose confidence that the buses will be there. But the false choice of buses over rail is like choosing apples over oranges. They are two distinct systems with their own advantages, drawbacks and customer bases. That’s why the ideal transit plan would include a mix of each.

The reality is that this proposal isn’t even a robust bus proposal. While some communities operate buses in the shoulder, or in toll lanes, these proposed lanes are not reserved entirely for mass transit. Buses would still share much of the road with vehicles, and they could travel only as fast as the slowest car ahead of them.

The transit mode — whether it is bus, light rail or whatever — is less important now than acknowledging the need for dedicated corridors and a generous new revenue stream to build and operate them. Light rail should have a role in moving the tens of thousands of people who cross county lines in the bay area to work every day. Rapid buses could fill the medium-range gaps by offering fewer stops to commuters traveling across the county. Traditional bus systems, bike and pedestrian programs and other options such as downtown trolleys could take it from there. The point is that no one form of transportation operates in a vacuum. The best primary transit — BRT or rail — will work unless local transit service is robust enough to move people between stations and their final destinations.

It’s understandable that the change of heart about rail comes after failed voter initiatives for light rail in both Hillsborough and Pinellas counties over the last eight years. Tampa Mayor Bob Buckhorn and St. Petersburg Mayor Rick Kriseman have cited political fatigue as a factor in their formal embrace of BRT. But while rapid bus may be cheaper, this region doesn’t have the money at the moment for BRT or rail. It cannot even adequately fund its existing bus system. And any meaningful improvement in mass transit in the bay area today will require more revenue from the federal and state governments, and from local taxpayers. There is no free ride here and no easy path toward securing a new revenue source.

Tampa Bay has a history of making political decisions for smart planning. The move away from rail contradicts the arguments that area leaders have made for some two decades — that rail is a long-term investment that will move people more efficiently, reduce urban core and share the environment further damage from gas. The argument that the region is more competitive for BRT because we don’t have rail now is self-defeating. The study says a rail line in Tampa could come at a later date. But moving away from rail as a regional solution is a shortsighted approach that reflects a lack of confidence in years of planning and ignores the area’s growth coming this way.

The chairman of the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority, Pinellas County Commissioner Janice Long, summed it up right this month when she told the Tampa Bay Times editorial board she was disappointed in the shift from rail. “I think we need to keep all the options on the table,” she said, “while we figure out what the needs are.” That’s a sound approach. It doesn’t prejudge rail, BRT or any other option. It doesn’t interfere with the region’s ability to take advantage of new technology such as autonomous vehicles.

The DOT study reflects a regional consensus that the existing transit system desperately needs work. It focuses on the correct priority of crossing the bay and linking the major cities. But Tampa Bay should be bold in seeking solutions rather than declaring victory by settling for the cheapest option that risks the least political capital.
TAMPA, Fla. — Streets surrounding ten schools with a record of crashes involving students could soon see massive safety improvements to protect Hillsborough County kids.

The Hillsborough MPO School Transportation Working Group has hired a consultant team, which includes engineers and planners to assess what’s needed to make kids safe. Engineers have now completed all the background work for each of the “top ten” schools, including:

- Chamberlain High School
- Coleman Middles School
- Ferrell Middle Magnet + Middleton High School + Young Middle Magnet School
- King High School
- Leto High School
- Miller Elementary Magnet School
- Plant High School
- Sulphur Springs K-8 Community School
- Van Buren Middle School

Sulphur Springs K-8 Community School has had 17 school-related crashes within two miles of the school over just four years, according to the Hillsborough MPO School Safety Study.

Laurent Burgess walks his four-year-old son, Izaiah, to school there every day, but says the streets are often not lit up.

"I carry my phone with me in some areas can be a little dark," Burgess said. "I need to shine a light to just see what I’m walking into."

Middleton High School had 19 school-related crashes. This means the crashes occurred involving school-age kids, when school was in session and during typical arrival and dismissal times.

Chamberlain High School had 14 school-related crashes over four years, according to the study.

This week, consultants are reaching out to the school administrations at each school, to seek local perspectives and insights, asking what have the schools heard from the parents and what have the teachers observed, said Beth Alden, MPO Executive Director.

Next, they will visit each school site and walk the roadways and will come up with some specific recommendations of things that can be done.

Improvement types to be considered include, but are not limited to:
Lighting/lighting enhancements
Crossing guards
School speed zones
Crosswalk/intersection improvements
Sidewalk gaps
Advancing unfunded projects previously identified by the Cities, County, or FDOT
Bicycle facilities
Off-road trails and side paths
A Vision Zero Tactic That Works: Leading Pedestrian Intervals

Laura Bliss

Say it with me: Leading pedestrian intervals.

To rebuild a street with safety in mind, there are a few basic principles—narrow lanes for cars, wide sidewalks for pedestrians, and protected pathways for cyclists.

It’s not rocket science, but it is expensive. In downtown San Francisco, an effort to build a raised bike path and special bus boarding islands along one mile of Second Street—which is part of the city’s “high-injury corridor”—is pegged at $20 million. And, as with most public projects, years of planning, community outreach, and political fanfare have preceded the start of construction itself.

The value of a life may transcend any dollar figure. But at least one traffic intervention can save lives, at low cost and little time: That’s “leading pedestrian intervals,” or LPIs. In traffic-engineering-speak, these are streetlights that give walkers a head-start before cars venture into an intersection. Given even a few seconds of priority, most people wind up at least halfway into the crosswalk—where they’re plenty visible to drivers—before cars are allowed to go straight or make turns (including the ultra-dangerous left).

San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Seattle have all boosted the number of LPIs in busy intersections since adopting “Vision Zero” traffic safety platforms in recent years. But New York City has been a leader, adding 2,201 since 2014 for a total of 2,483 across the boroughs. Now, nearly 20 percent of signalized intersections citywide have LPIs, according to a report by the advocacy group Transportation Alternatives. They give pedestrians a 7- to 10-second head start. Most are located in the city’s highest-risk traffic corridors; a city map shows their remarkable spread over time.

“Dollar for dollar, this is a really smart, life-saving investment that ought to be a part of any city’s effort to eliminate traffic deaths.”

According to a New York City DOT spokesperson, the average cost to reconfigure a crosswalk for an LPI is $1,200. They don’t require any trench digging, concrete pouring, or lane closures. Sometimes new push buttons and controllers are needed; often engineers simply study local traffic patterns and reprogram existing lights.
For such a small cost, the results can be transformative: One paper published by the Transportation Research Board found LPIs can reduce pedestrian-vehicle collisions by as much as 60 percent. In San Francisco, the intersection with the highest rate of pedestrian injuries from left-turn vehicle crashes saw those incidents drop to zero after an LPI was installed. And a 2016 study of 104 intersections by the NYC Department of Transportation found that pedestrian and bike fatalities and severe injuries declined by nearly 40 percent at locations where LPIs have been installed.

What’s more, the dramatic uptick of these head-start lights may be what’s driving a broader decline in pedestrian deaths in New York City, as evidenced by a significant decline in fatal crashes caused by a failure to yield, according to the Transportation Alternatives report.

“The proliferation of LPIs at crash-prone intersections has been among the most effective actions that New York City has taken since Vision Zero was adopted,” said Paul Steely White, the executive director of Transportation Alternatives. “Dollar for dollar, this is a really smart, life-saving investment that ought to be a part of any city’s effort to eliminate traffic deaths.”

New York City has been criticized for stalling on its Vision Zero campaign efforts. Although pedestrian fatalities have significantly declined since 2013, cyclist deaths and injuries are on the rise.

If one project shows what’s needed to protect all commuters, it might be the $100 million ongoing overhaul of Queens Boulevard, the seven-mile, ultra-wide artery known locally as the “Boulevard of Death” for its staggering toll: 185 deaths between 1990 and 2015. Since New York City started a multi-year makeover of the thoroughfare—narrowing lanes, widening sidewalks, and protecting cyclists—guess what? Zero pedestrians or cyclists have died.

**About the Author**
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The center bike lanes on Pennsylvania Avenue are a key spine of Washington’s downtown network. // Courtesy of the Washington Area Bicyclist Association

How Washington, D.C., Built a Bike Boom

ANDREW SMALL  DEC 26, 2017
Cycling has taken off in the American capital. Nearly 17,000 cyclists regularly rode their bikes to work in Washington, D.C. in 2016, according to Census estimates, which is about 5 percent of the city’s commuters. That’s nearly triple the “mode share” it had in 2006, putting it in second place on the list of top biking cities in the U.S., just behind famously gear-friendly Portland, Oregon.

In absolute numbers, D.C. is still a dwarf compared to, say, New York, where 48,000 people pedal to work every week (which is only one percent of commuters there). But D.C.’s growth has exploded since the city piloted one of the country’s first modern bikeshare programs, and started building an ambitious network of bike lanes.

Cycling numbers may keep climbing, with the recent boom in private companies spreading “dockless” shared bicycles around the city. But there’s no guarantee. Bikes may be a passing trend in a young and transient city. And as housing becomes less affordable, the bike’s advantages as a mode for everyone may have diminishing returns, even as lanes expand.

What shaped D.C.’s bike renaissance? How can it maintain its progress from here?

The planner: Build infrastructure for everyday people

When Jim Sebastian joined D.C.’s Department of Transportation in 2001, the city’s master bike plan hadn’t been updated since the 1970s. But with downtown densifying, gas prices peaking, and traffic worsening, “people wanted more bike facilities,” Sebastian, now the associate director for planning and sustainability at DDOT, said.

To hatch fresh bike plans, Sebastian and his colleagues traveled to famously bike-friendly European cities like Amsterdam and Copenhagen. One takeaway from over the pond: treat cycling as an activity for everybody rather than some specialized hobby for everyone else to drive around. “This whole idea of ‘the cyclist’ is almost passé,” said Sebastian. “What we’ve got is people on bikes.” Treating them accordingly meant building lanes that help everyone feel safe, not just the Spandex-clad few.

"Once some people ride on a separated lane, it gets their confidence up
In 2010, DDOT carved out two key spines of what would become a downtown cycling network: the center bike lanes on Pennsylvania Avenue and a protected cycle track on 15th Street. This created safe routes for day-trippers near the National Mall and forged a path for daily commuters in neighborhoods close to the urban core. Their effect on biking can be felt throughout the city. “Once some people ride on a separated lane, it gets their confidence up and they become able to ride on unprotected lanes or just the streets in the city,” Sebastian said.

Another key project gave an option to commuters who might want the option of, say, riding a bike to work, but taking Metro home. Capital Bikeshare, one of the first modern bikeshare programs in the United States, was launched in 2010, drawing about 115,000 trips in its first year. It ballooned from there: By the end of 2017, the program celebrated its 19 millionth trip.

Meanwhile, the city continued to expand bike lanes at about five miles per year. Some neighborhoods have seen their cycling commute share increase to over 20 percent. With 80 miles of bike lanes built since 2000, the city has a goal of expanding to 136 miles by 2040, the majority of them fully protected.

**The advocate: D.C. built “human infrastructure”**

It takes people to change behavior, according to Nelle Pierson, a longtime D.C. bike advocate—not just infrastructure, not just policy, but feet on the ground, hands on the handlebars, and faces on the sidewalk. “You have to have a network of people who are showing you that this is normal, and connecting you to the knowledge to overcome barriers to access,” she said. She cites Adonia Lugo’s concept of “human infrastructure” to describe the constellation of repeated small interventions that it takes required to get more people on bikes.

In some cases, this comes from the top. Pierson credits the work of Mayor Adrian Fenty between 2007 and 2011 for dedicating time and resources to make bike plans work. Every day, city politicians have to balance a diversity of citizen interests, including those in direct competition to bikes, like protecting parking spots and road space. But Fenty helped push the lanes through, Pierson said.
Some advocates worry the current mayor, Muriel Bowser, isn’t as strongly committed as previous administrations to making D.C. a bike city. They’ve stepped up their work in the meantime: As a former outreach and events coordinator at the Washington Area Bicycling Association, Pierson created initiatives to reach people beyond the urban core where lanes were getting built, especially in lower-income neighborhoods and suburbs. No program drew more acclaim than Women and Bicycles, which uses workshops, rides, and mentoring programs to draw women to cycling. Pierson said that stubborn perceptions, especially surrounding gender, take concerted effort to dislodge. But the cycling gender gap has decreased: In 2006, women made up less than 30 percent of the city’s bike commuters; today they make up nearly 42 percent.

From left to right: Jim Sebastian, Nelle Pierson, and Sterling Stone.

Capital Bikeshare also helped universalize the image of cycling for more District residents, Pierson said, by opening up convenient rides for suited professionals, students, and baristas alike. Now, the District is charting new frontier in open-access cycling, with a six-month trial for five new “dockless” bike-sharing companies. About 1,850 shared bikes are sprinkled around D.C. streets, unconstrained by stations or docks, but still rentable by smartphone or pre-paid account to all. Pierson, who is now working as the director of external affairs for Jump, one of the companies involved in the pilot, believes dockless bikes can speed up the spread of cycling to more neighborhoods and new riders. "This is where we all benefit from the competition," she said. "Everyone is seeing this."

**The shopkeeper: Bikes are still a cultural battlefield**

Clearly, the city has succeeded in getting more bodies on bikes. But there’s one standout statistic that shows D.C.’s cycling boom isn’t reaching everyone: In 2015, only about 2 percent of black commuters biked to work, compared to 8 percent of whites. And surveys show that the city’s black residents are less likely than other groups to view bikes as an ideal mode of transport.
The reasons for this are complicated, and touch on job barriers, class perceptions, and social norms. Sterling Stone thinks it also has something to do with D.C.’s rapid gentrification. “It goes beyond bikes,” he said.

Stone is the executive director of Gearin’ Up Bicycles, a nonprofit shop that refurbishes used bikes to sell and trains local kids as bike mechanics. Bike commuting began to gain prominence in the late 2000s, when an influx of Millennials arrived, he said. Once known as the “Chocolate City” for its majority-black population, D.C. rapidly gentrified during this period, displacing many longtime black families. Bikes became a symbol of the D.C.’s changing demographics, said Stone, who is black and a Pittsburgh transplant himself. New lanes became a rallying point against gentrification for many residents of color. That potent symbolism delayed projects like a protected bike lane in a gentrifying neighborhood, which was vigorously opposed by a local black church.

The city has a ways to go to address the needs of communities of color. African American youth have been especially overlooked, according to Stone, even when riding a bike is a rite of passage for other kids growing up in the city. That doesn’t mean they’re not interested in biking, though. In 2012, as part of the Boys and Girls Club summer program he ran at the time, Stone took a group of local kids a a build-your-own-bike workshop. It was the smash hit of the year.
“It’s still the first thing I hear about when I see the kids,” he said. The idea gave root to Stone’s store, which sits in a former church in the neighborhood of Eckington, near the recently rehabbed Metropolitan Branch Trail. But of the 67 bike shops in the greater Washington region, there are none in the predominately African American Wards seven and eight. This year, Gearin’ Up received a grant from the city to run bike repair clinics in neighborhoods without access to shops.

Stone is encouraged by these kinds of partnerships, but he still worries about the future. The question in his mind is, who will be around by the time a bike network is complete? “It’s hard to tell,” he said. “A lot of the families are already gone. The young people in my store likely won’t be counted later if they can’t afford to live here… even though [it’s where] they learned to bike.”

Displacement touches on race, income, housing access, and many thorny issues—which is to say, it goes way beyond bikes. At the very least, Stone said, if D.C. were more proactive about extending cycling amenities into diverse neighborhoods that aren’t already saturated with Millennials, they might carry less baggage—not to mention reach more people of color. “Advocates are starting to see where there’s more need for infrastructure,” he said. “Once we have a bike trail in one part of the city, people start to say, ‘I want that in my neighborhood, too.’”
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