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INTRODUCTION

The Hillsborough Transit Study aims to explore the benefits, tradeoffs and feasibility of creating a more robust transit concept to serve the mobility needs of residents in Hillsborough County. Based on previous studies, preliminary analyses and public comment, a Transit Needs and Opportunities map has been developed. The map identifies the major corridors and subareas to be considered for premium transit, and includes a range of technologies such as commuter rail, light rail and bus rapid transit. From this framework, a set of Alternative Transit System Concepts were developed and evaluated to facilitate the creation of a preferred transit scenario that best addresses the land use, economic, mobility and environmental goals of the community.

Each concept was focused on a primary transit and supporting land use theme, and comprised of prototypical station areas that respond to the context of the particular corridor and the transit technologies being considered. These concepts are designed to illustrate the cause and effect and tradeoffs of more transit oriented land use development patterns, transit technologies and transit concept configurations. Each Alternative Transit Concept was described in both graphic and narrative formats and included a set of quantifiable measures that were used to evaluate system performance, quality of life indicators, development and redevelopment potential, etc. Upon review and analysis of the Alternative Transit Concepts, a preferred transit scenario will be created for consideration and adoption by the MPO Board.

The following Alternative Transit Concepts were considered: Urban Core (Concept A), Urban Corridors (Concept B), and Urban Centers (Concept C). In addition, a Trend concept and a Composite (Concept ABC) concept were considered for analytical purposes. The following provides a brief summary of each concept as illustrated in the accompanying map series.

TREND

- Status quo land development policies (based on existing comprehensive plans)
- Transit limited to increased fixed route and express bus service
- Advances a primarily auto-dominated mobility strategy
**URBAN CORE (CONCEPT A)**

- Focuses on transit oriented land development policies concentrating growth and redevelopment in City of Tampa
- Transit focuses on Tampa Light Rail, including Light Rail to Airport, and supportive Premium Bus network
- Advances Premium Transit Mobility Strategy

*Figure 1: Urban Core (Concept A)*
**URBAN CORRIDORS (CONCEPT B)**

- Focuses on Transit Oriented Land Development Policies concentrating growth along major “spokes” or corridors
- Transit focuses on Light Rail along major corridors and supportive Premium Bus network
- Advances premium transit mobility strategy

*Figure 2: Urban Corridors (Concept B)*
**URBAN CENTERS (CONCEPT C)**

- Focuses on Transit Oriented Land Development Policies concentrating in major centers throughout the County
- Transit focuses on Commuter Rail connecting major centers to Downtown and supportive Premium Bus network
- Advances premium transit mobility strategy

*Figure 3: Urban Centers (Concept C)*
**COMPOSITE (CONCEPT ABC)**

- Consolidates all Transit Oriented Land Development Policies including growth and redevelopment in the City of Tampa, along extended corridors within the urbanized areas of the county, and in major centers throughout the county
- Transit considers both Light Rail and Commuter Rail as well as supportive Premium Bus network
- Advances premium transit mobility strategy

*Figure 4: Composite (Concept ABC)*
Figure 5: Transit Needs and Opportunities
ALTERNATIVE TRANSIT CONCEPTS ANALYSIS

The transit concepts were analyzed using the CorPlan Land Use Allocation Model. As the transit concepts were developed in CorPlan, corresponding 2050 TAZ/Socioeconomic data sets were produced for use with the region’s travel demand model (WCFRPM). To create the transit concepts, a series of transit station area prototypes were developed with varying assumptions concerning land use, percent redevelopment, site design characteristics, population and employment, and densities. Land use variations from the existing adopted comprehensive plans were limited primarily to station areas along a given corridor. Depending on the existing and future land use designation and available vacant land within the station areas, a certain level of redevelopment was assumed within the mile, half and quarter mile station area footprints. The following paragraphs describe key assumptions used in the CorPlan analysis for the concepts:

POPULATION PROJECTION AND CONTROL TOTALS

Each concept was developed with the same 2050 county population control total of 2,034,180 and employment control total of 1,430,199 based on FDOT Strategic Regional Transit Needs Assessment (SRNTA) Study from February 2007. This population projection assumes sustained growth within the county resulting in almost a doubling in population by 2050 from the 2005 population estimate of 1,131,546. Beyond the countywide population control totals, the 2050 Alternative Transit Concepts were not restricted by subregional or TAZ level control totals. In the case of the Trend concept, the 2025 increment of growth is consistent with the adopted 2025 TBRPM Socioeconomic Data and TAZs per FDOT.

LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

In order to model the concepts, Hillsborough County was subdivided into 0.15 acre grid cells by overlaying an 80 feet grid on the entire county. Each grid cell was allocated values as a proportion of the FDOT TAZ/Socioeconomic data for 2025. Land uses associated with each cell were generalized and designated as vacant (agricultural, vacant), redevelopment (commercial, industrial) or ‘neither’ (residential, institutional). Certain uses are traditionally not considered for future redevelopment, especially single family residential. This designation of cells as vacant, redevelopment, or ‘neither’ is intended to manage land availability and capacity by assuming the full potential development of vacant cells, partial capacity for redevelopment cells and no allocation on cells that are assigned ‘neither’ designation.
**STATION AREA PROTOTYPES**

A series of six primary and three special station area prototypes were used to explore each Alternative Transit Concept. The sphere of influence for each station area was allocated in ¼ mile, ½ mile and 1 mile increments. The level of redevelopment, intensity and use within each sphere would vary based on location along the transit corridor, the neighborhood context, and transit technology being considered. The station prototypes are a combination of scale (regional, community and neighborhood) and place (urban and suburban) and are as follows: **Urban Regional, Urban Community, Urban Neighborhood, Suburban Regional, Suburban Community, and Suburban Neighborhood. Central Business District** is a special designation for Downtown Tampa. **Special Categories A and B** are assigned to the area north of the airport (with residential restrictions due to flight path) and the airport respectively. The following table describes the unique intensity, density and mix of use characteristics associated with each station prototype:

*Figure 6: Station Area Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Areas</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td>Regional Employment, High Density Residential, High Intensity Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DENSITY - 40 to 60 DUs/Acre, 360 to 400 Jobs/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTENSITY - 8.0 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX - Residential: 20%, Retail: 20%, Office: 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN REGIONAL</strong></td>
<td>Office Center, High Density Residential, High Density Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DENSITY - 60 to 80 DUs/Acre, 240 to 260 Jobs/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTENSITY - 4.0 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX - Residential: 40%, Retail: 10%, Office: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN COMMUNITY</strong></td>
<td>Employment Centers, Retail, High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DENSITY - 80 to 100 DUs/Acre, 50 to 70 Jobs/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTENSITY - 2.0 to 4.0 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX - Residential: 90%, Retail: 5%, Office: 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD</strong></td>
<td>Residential, Neighborhood Retail, Light Office/Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DENSITY - 20 to 40 DUs/Acre, 15 to 60 Jobs/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTENSITY - 1.0 to 2.0 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX - Residential: 90%, Retail: 5%, Office: 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBURBAN REGIONAL</strong></td>
<td>Sub-regional Employment, Multi-family Housing, Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DENSITY - 20 to 40 DUs/Acre, 60 to 80 Jobs/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTENSITY - 2.5 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX - Residential: 70%, Retail: 10%, Office: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBURBAN COMMUNITY</strong></td>
<td>Mix of Residential, Sub-regional Employment, Retail Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DENSITY - 15 to 25 DUs/Acre, 5 to 15 Jobs/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTENSITY – 1.0 to 2.5 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX - Residential: 95%, Retail: 2 %, Office: 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Areas</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBURBAN NEIGHBORHOOD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Residential</td>
<td>DENSITY - 6 to 12 DUs/Acre, 10-20 Jobs/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Retail</td>
<td>INTENSITY - 0.5 to 1.0 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Office/Service</td>
<td>MIX - Residential: 98%, Retail: 1%, Office: 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>DENSITY - 0 DUs/Acre, 20-40 Jobs/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Service</td>
<td>INTENSITY - 1.0 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Retail</td>
<td>MIX - Residential: 0%, Retail: 10%, Office: 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>DENSITY - 0 DUs/Acre, 0 Jobs/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTENSITY - 0 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX - Residential: 0%, Retail: 0%, Office: 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The intensities and densities included in the table are net values for development on vacant sites.

**ANALYSIS**

In order to generate household and employment estimates, CorPlan translates the intensities, densities and mix of uses associated the station prototypes into household density (dwelling units/acre) and employment density (jobs/acre) and superimposes it on the generalized land use designations. As a result, the grid cells are assigned incremental household and employment values based on the vacant/redevelopment designation of each cell included in the allocation. Sites designated as redevelopment are allocated a percentage of the net development, ranging from 5% to 40% based on the station prototype.

The household and employment estimates are aggregated at various scales (TAZ, station area, subzones, and county) to quantify the land use impact of the suggested transit investment in each concept. Since the allocation of station prototypes was limited to ¼ mile and ½ mile radius for all transit stations and up to 1 mile radius for some select stations of regional impact, the household and employment increment for other parts of the county was assumed to at least represent the Trend projection for that area conditional to a minimum level of transit support such as fixed route or premium bus service. TAZs without any transit support were assumed to be ‘borrow’ areas required to maintain overall county control totals.

In order to compare the household and employment estimates for the Alternative Transit Concepts to the Trend, Hillsborough County was subdivided into six sub-zones (Tampa, Temple Terrace, Plant City, NW County, NE County, and SE County). The aggregation and comparison of household and employment estimates at county and sub-zone level is an indicator of future growth distribution in the county and provide the basis for the preferred growth scenario in the county.
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Figure 11: Trend 2050 Total Household Density
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Figure 16: Trend for 2050 Employment Density
ALTERNATIVE TRANSIT CONCEPTS SUMMARY

The objective of modeling the Alternative Transit Concepts in CorPlan was to generate household and employment estimates, and predict the growth pattern that would accompany each concept. An important component of the land use analysis is to illustrate potential future land consumption patterns in correlation to transportation or transit investments as well as growth management policies in the county.

While the City of Tampa currently represents the largest urbanized area in Hillsborough County with significant redevelopment capacity, the county continues to see new growth and development in NW County along the Veterans Expressway and in SE County along the I-75 corridor. This pattern of growth is predicted to continue through the year 2025 and 2050 based on trend projections and transportation investments, especially in SE County along the I-75 corridor. Trend projections for the year 2050 indicate that development in SE County will account for more than half of the projected regional growth for the county through the year 2050.

The Alternative Transit Concepts, especially Urban Core (Concept A) and Urban Corridors (Concept B), indicate that transit investments focused on the urbanized core and corridors will tap into the substantial redevelopment potential of these areas and allow the City of Tampa to accommodate a larger share of future growth in the County. The Urban Centers (Concept C) concept allows the regional centers and sub-centers (Downtown Tampa, Brandon, Westshore, USF, Westchase, Central Tampa, SouthShore/Apollo Beach and Plant City) to accommodate a larger share of regional growth as an offset from future transit investments.

The Composite Transit Concept illustrates a synergistic combination of continued growth within the urban core and corridors and new growth in regional centers and sub-centers with the mobility benefits and sustainability advantages of transit oriented growth patterns. This balanced growth scenario for the County demonstrates the value of a diversified transit concept that responds to existing and future land use and the mobility needs to support the wide cross section of growth patterns in the County. Variety in transit technologies and station area prototypes are key components in creating the framework for the Transit Concept for 2050.

Besides land use, the Alternative Transit Concepts represent differing benefits and trade-offs in terms of mobility, cost, environment, and system capacity and coverage. The maps and figures illustrating the Alternative Transit Concepts, including Trend, are included in the following pages:
The following illustrations are primarily for land use analysis and household/employment projection comparison of the Alternative Transit Concepts. The land use analysis uses **CorPlan Land Use Allocation Model** to generate Household and Employment estimates. All estimates for 2050 and the 2000 and 2025 socioeconomic data are based on TAZ (Transportation Analysis Zone) level data analysis and represent differing sizes based on existing development patterns.
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Summary: HH, Jobs and Potential Riders Increment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households Increment</th>
<th>Jobs Increment</th>
<th>Potential Riders Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>901,120</td>
<td>1,430,199</td>
<td>3,464,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.75%</td>
<td>25.71%</td>
<td>27.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.21%</td>
<td>15.11%</td>
<td>15.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.29%</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>20.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.46%</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
<td>9.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HH Increment Distribution by Community Element

Concept A
- Suburban Neighborhood: 8%
- Suburban Community: 49%
- Suburban Regional: 29%
- Urban Neighborhood: 14%
- Urban Community: 5%
- Urban Regional: 10%
- Central Business District: 7%

Concept B
- Suburban Neighborhood: 4%
- Suburban Community: 54%
- Suburban Regional: 20%
- Urban Neighborhood: 20%
- Urban Community: 4%
- Urban Regional: 7%
- Central Business District: 3%

Concept C
- Suburban Neighborhood: 4%
- Suburban Community: 40%
- Suburban Regional: 13%
- Urban Neighborhood: 4%
- Urban Community: 14%
- Urban Regional: 12%
- Central Business District: 8%

Concept C1
- Suburban Neighborhood: 8%
- Suburban Community: 23%
- Suburban Regional: 7%
- Urban Neighborhood: 3%
- Urban Community: 21%
- Urban Regional: 12%
- Central Business District: 8%
Summaries: HH Increment by Subzones

Concept A

- SE County: 73.90%
- Plant City: 5.50%
- NE County: 20.60%
- Temple Terrace: 2.29%
- Tampa: 0%
- NW County: 10%

Concept B

- SE County: 60.38%
- Plant City: 20.37%
- NE County: 6.03%
- Temple Terrace: 2.29%
- Tampa: 5.42%
- NW County: 20%

Concept C

- SE County: 37.40%
- Plant City: 22.36%
- NE County: 3.93%
- Temple Terrace: 2.31%
- Tampa: 6.69%
- NW County: 30%

Concept ABC

- SE County: 22.36%
- Plant City: 13.79%
- NE County: 13.79%
- Temple Terrace: 2.31%
- Tampa: 4.70%
- NW County: 40%
Sub Regional Shares
Total Households

1990 Census
- Northeast: 11%
- Northwest: 29%
- Plant City: 4%
- Southeast: 4%
- Tampa: 4%
- Temple Terrace: 4%

2000 TAZ
- Northeast: 9%
- Northwest: 29%
- Plant City: 4%
- Southeast: 29%
- Tampa: 4%
- Temple Terrace: 4%

2025 TAZ
- Northeast: 9%
- Northwest: 27%
- Plant City: 4%
- Southeast: 28%
- Tampa: 4%
- Temple Terrace: 5%

2050 Trend
- Northeast: 10%
- Northwest: 19%
- Plant City: 5%
- Southeast: 33%
- Tampa: 30%
- Temple Terrace: 30%
Summaries: Jobs Increment by Subzones

- **Concept A**
  - SE County: 86.36%
  - Plant City: 4.45%
  - NE County: 3.25%
  - Temple Terrace: 1.49%
  - Tampa: 16.61%
  - NW County: 100%

- **Concept B**
  - SE County: 70.83%
  - Plant City: 14.32%
  - NE County: 2.62%
  - Temple Terrace: 13.12%
  - Tampa: 72.53%
  - NW County: 58.53%

- **Concept C**
  - SE County: 9.19%
  - Plant City: 8.97%
  - NE County: 5.93%
  - Temple Terrace: 12.15%
  - Tampa: 5.93%
  - NW County: 16.61%

- **Concept ABC**
  - SE County: 0%
  - Plant City: 10%
  - NE County: 20%
  - Temple Terrace: 30%
  - Tampa: 40%
  - NW County: 50%
Sub Regional Shares
Total Population

1990 Census 2000 TAZ 2025 TAZ 2050 Trend
Northeast Northwest Plant City Southeast Tampa Temple Terrace