

**HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
2035 PLAN REVISIT - INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP (IWG)  
APRIL 8, 2011 (FRIDAY) AT 1:30 P.M.  
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY CENTER, 601 E. KENNEDY BLVD.  
18th FLOOR BOARD ROOM**

**MEEETING SUMMARY**

IWG members and alternates attending:

Ming Gao:	FDOT 7
Bob Campbell (alt)	Hillsborough County
Nadine Jones	Aviation Authority
Charles Stephenson	Temple Terrace
Ben Money (alt)	City of Tampa
Bob Campbell (alt)	Hillsborough County
Kim Pierce	Tampa Bay Partnership
Brian Smith	Pinellas County MPO
Tim Palermo (alt)	HART
Sheila Martin (alt)	TBARTA
Sean McGinnis	HCEPC
Lorraine Duffy	SDHC

Others attending:

Matt Wey	Ben Walker
Chris Weber	Phil Compton
Karen Kress	Chris Bridges
Vivian Bacca	Arlene Brown

Staff and consultant team:

Ray Chiaramonte	Hillsborough County MPO
Beth Alden	Hillsborough County MPO
Wally Blain	Hillsborough County MPO
Gena Torres	Hillsborough County MPO
Scott Pringle	Jacobs
Ned Baier	Jacobs
Ben Kelly	Kenney Group

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 pm by Ray Chiaramonte, MPO Director. All attending introduced themselves. There were no public comments.

Ben Kelly, The Kenney Group, presented the results of the focus group research to the Interagency Working Group (IWG). The objectives of the focus groups included:

- Explore community values around transportation, traffic congestion and quality of life.
- Gauge concerns about transportation locally and regionally.
- Understand the transportation needs of county residents.
- Assess resident's willingness to pay for transportation improvements.

Mr. Kelly indicated that the focus groups were randomly selected registered voters from Hillsborough County, including the three cities. Their commonality within each focus group was geographic, as the focus groups were selected to represent eight different areas from around the County. The Kenney Group attempted to select the focus groups based upon party affiliation and age, representing the geographic area as much as possible. All of the focus group members were employed.

Key findings from the focus group research include the following:

- Traffic congestion is viewed as a by-product of a failure to plan ahead for transportation infrastructure.
- The most popular strategies to address traffic congestion included better signal timing and more dedicated turn lanes.
- There was a near universal agreement that bicycle and pedestrian facilities are inadequate.
- The common perception is that the Tampa area is too car-centric and dispersed for mass transit to work here.
- There is a perception that the current transit system does not work due to the fact that there are not enough routes, hours are limited and it takes too many transfers to get to a destination.
- There was confusion among the research participants on the rail modes themselves such as light rail versus high speed rail. This included confusion on what they were actually voting for in the November, 2010 election.
- There was concern regarding if we did have rail transit, what one would do when they reached their destination, e.g. how they would get from the train to their final destination.
- Very few of the participants had any tangible experience with rail transit.

Participants who were somewhat supportive of transit believed an incremental approach, a demonstration project, would be a better way to start.

After his presentation Mr. Kelly was asked whether any participants discussed how new growth areas should be planned and what type of transportation should serve them? He responded that was beyond the basic framework of the discussions. One participant indicated that it's hard to trust government to build such a massive project when they still have a hard time just getting signal timing and intersections working correctly.

Scott Pringle, Jacobs, provided the IWG with information on technology cost comparisons for light rail, commuter rail, bus rapid transit and diesel multiple unit (DMU). For purposes of apples to apples comparison the assumptions included:

- Double track, at-grade
- Similar frequencies,
- Comparative capacities
- Federal Railroad Administration compliant vehicles where applicable

Mr. Pringle showed capital and operating and maintenance costs for eight corridors in the LRTP Transit Plan.

Brandon to Downtown Tampa

Lower cost strategy: BRT

Viable alternatives: LRT

Busch Boulevard/Linebaugh Avenue Corridor East

Lower cost strategy: Diesel Multiple Unit

Viable alternatives: LRT, BRT

Busch Boulevard/Linebaugh Avenue Corridor West

Lower cost strategy: Diesel Multiple Unit

Viable alternatives: LRT, Commuter Rail, BRT

Carrollwood Area to TIA

Lower Cost Strategy: BRT

Viable alternative: LRT

Downtown Tampa to South Tampa

Lower cost strategy: BRT

Viable alternative: LRT

Downtown Tampa to USF

Lower cost strategy: DMU

Viable alternative: LRT

USF to Wesley Chapel

Lower cost strategy: BRT

Viable alternative: LRT

Westshore Area to Pinellas County

Lower cost strategy: BRT

Viable alternative: LRT

Mr. Pringle indicated that additional study would be necessary on all of the corridors relative to ridership and appropriate technology due to the cost ranges for all technologies.

Ned Baier, Jacobs, provided the IWG with a synopsis on current funding sources available for transportation projects. These include gas taxes, fares and tolls, special assessment districts, community redevelopment area/tax incremental financing, state infrastructure bank, and public/private partnerships.

Discussion at the end of the meeting centered around how to get the next message out to the residents of Hillsborough County. Vivian Bacca stated that YouTube and other social media are an excellent format. Kim Pierce, Tampa Bay Partnership, agreed and said the Partnership is moving in that direction as well preparing a visualization video portraying transit in the region.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:40 pm.