Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Wednesday, November 14, 2018, 9:00 AM

I. Call to Order & Introductions

II. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

III. Members’ Interests

IV. Approval of Minutes – October 10, 2018

V. Action Items
   A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: HART FTA Section 5307, 5309/5337 & 5339 Funding (Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff)
   B. It’s Time Tampa Bay Survey Results & Recommendations (Lisa Silva, MPO Staff)
   C. MPO Comments on Strategic Intermodal System 2045 Cost Feasible Plan (Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff)
   D. Health in All Policies Resolution (Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff)
   E. 2019 Committee & MPO Schedule (Rich Clarendon, MPO Staff)

VI. Status Reports
   A. SouthShore Transit Study Reevaluation (Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff)

VII. Old Business & New Business
   A. TBARTA CAC Report (Rick Richmond)
   B. Follow-up: Regional Transportation Leadership Study
   C. Special Briefing on Tampa Interstate Study: Community Impacts of Tampa’s Downtown and Westshore Interchanges, November 27th
   D. Next meeting: Combined meeting with TAC December 17th at 12 PM

VIII. Adjournment

IX. Addendum
   A. MPO Meeting Summary & Committee Reports
   B. Correspondence:
      i. FDOT Response on W. Busch Blvd. Corridor Study
   C. Upcoming Events:
      i. Westshore/W. Tampa Community Working Group, November 15th
      ii. Cleveland Elementary Mural, December 15th
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.
I. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bill Roberts at 9:06 a.m. and was held in the Plan Hillsborough Room on the 18th floor of the County Center Building. Member introductions were made.

Members present: Ricardo Fernandez, Ray Alzamora, David Bailey, Nicole Rice, Dennis LeVine, Bill Roberts, Diane Stull, Dayna Lazarus, Cliff Reiss, Amy Espinosa, Rick Richmond, Barbara Kennedy Gibson.

Others present: Rich Clarendon, Johnny Wong, Wanda West, Beth Alden, Sarah McKinley, Michele Ogilvie – MPO Staff; Jay Collins – Planning Commission Staff; Brian Pessaro – CUTR; Bob O’Malley – Brightline; Linda Walker – HART.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

III. MEMBERS’ INTERESTS

Ms. Espinosa stated that she sent an email to Ms. Price at FDOT regarding a request for PD&E Studies: redesign of the interchange going from 275 to I-4 and the Leroy Selmon to I-4. To date, she has not received a response. Mr. Clarendon said he would provide site navigation information to Ms. Espinosa to access the studies.

Ms. Rice requested a presentation clarifying policy and legislative impetus from the state level all the way down on the concept of tri-regionalization in order to give the committee a better understanding of what happened with TBARTA and the TMA, and the committee’s role if the 1¢ Surtax to Fund Transportation Improvements passes. The presentation should include the chain of command and what it means ultimately.

Mr. Clarendon suggested that members attend the upcoming Regional Transportation Leadership Workshop #3, being held on October 29 at the Port Tampa Bay. Regionalization and collaboration will be discussed. If questions are not answered at the workshop, the requested presentation can be scheduled.

Ms. Alden, MPO Executive Director, responded to Ms. Rice’s questions and stated that they are awaiting the consultant team to complete the study and they may have three different concepts. There will be a Board workshop that will be open to the public that will take place in the evening in January. The meeting is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, January 15, 2019. The meeting will be an opportunity for committee members to ask questions and talk to the consultant team about their ideas. The MPO Board will not act on recommendations at the meeting.

Following
the workshop, if board members decide to explore the recommendations, ideas of interest will be presented at MPO Committee meetings and then back to the MPO Board at a workshop in April.

Ms. Rice wanted to know if things can change once new administration is in place.

Ms. Alden stated that things could change and said that there have been requests from Tallahassee that MPOs in the area should consider merging. The TMA Leadership group was created to improve regional coordination.

Ms. Lazarus wanted to know which agency in Tallahassee is suggesting the merger. Ms. Alden could not recall if the correspondence came from the Secretary of Transportation or directly from the governor’s office.

Mr. Alzamora inquired about the basis of the request. Ms. Alden stated that the urbanized areas have continued to grow into each other and transportation systems should be more cross county focused.

Chair Roberts suggested placing an update on the topic on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Fernandez would like for Ms. Alden or Dr. Wong to provide a report on takeaways/benefits, at the next meeting or two, on information they received from the AMPO Conference in San Antonio on metropolitan areas that are considering highway to boulevard conversions.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: Approval of the CAC minutes for September 12, 2018 (Alzamora-Bailey). The motion passed unanimously.

V. ACTION ITEMS

A. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments:

Ms. Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, presented information on two TIP amendments: (1) Project 437639-1: Bloomingdale at US 301 Ave Intersection. This amendment will advance design of an operational improvement along Bloomingdale Avenue at US 301, adding a west-bound through lane. It will help alleviate bottlenecks at intersection with traffic traveling to US 301 to I-75 to the Selmon Expressway; and (2) Project 441896-1: HART Computer-Aided Dispatch(CAD)/Automatic Vehicle Location(AVL) Bus Equipment Replacement. This is for all the technology that is on the bus. The project was funded as a MPO Priority in FY2023 and due to the urgency of the need to upgrade the equipment, HART has requested to move funds forward by swapping with bus replacement funds.

Mr. Alzamora inquired about the life cycle of the CAD/AVL equipment. Ms. McKinley stated that the life cycle is typically ten years for the new equipment.

Motion: Recommend a TIP Amendment for approval of the HART CAD/AVL Equipment Replacement and approval of the Bloomingdale Avenue Operational Improvements to the MPO Board. (Alzamora-Richmond). The motion passed unanimously.

B. MPO Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for USF Campus
Mr. Brian Pessaro, Senior Research Associate with CUTR, provided an overview of a study to bring autonomous shuttles to the USF Campus.

Following the presentation, Mr. Alzamora expressed concerns about the sample size for the surveys and wanted to know if the vehicles would cross Fletcher or remain on USF’s Campus. Mr. Alzamora also wanted to know if the CAC was being asked to approve the project or funding.

Mr. Clarendon stated that the recommended action is for approval of the concept as presented and that an allocation of dollars is not being requested.

Mr. Pessaro stated that the survey was not intended to be a statistically significant sample size but was to obtain feedback from students. They will get additional data when they conduct the two-week demo, tentatively set for some time in November, on campus. Mr. Pessaro also stated that the vehicles that are being discussed will be restricted to the campus. An attendant on board will have to push a button when he sees that it is safe to go through an intersection on campus.

Ms. Rice suggested that it would have been more advantageous to extend the Bull Runner Services and wanted to know if a cost comparison was completed. Mr. Pessaro stated that the purpose of the study was not to look at filling in gaps for Bull Runner Services but looked at areas on campus where it would make sense to utilize the autonomous shuttles. They are not competing with the limited funds that the Bull Runner has available to use. If they move forward, they will look for a separate funding source to operate the shuttles on campus.

Ms. Lazarus expressed several concerns as a USF student and wanted to know what the advantage is for having the AV Technology. She suggested emphasis be placed on bike lanes and bike mobility. She wanted to know if students have an opportunity to provide input on how funds should be utilized for with the USF Student Green Energy Fund. Mr. Pessaro indicated that a fifteen-member council, made up of students and administrative staff, reviews proposals and makes decisions regarding the Fund. Ms. Lazarus suggested that the CAC not approve the study.

Mr. Pessaro stated that the full report, which can be found at http://www.planhillsborough.org/usf-campus-autonomous-transit-feasibility-study/ includes the full survey and responses.

Ms. Espinosa inquired about the percentage of people with disabilities on campus and commented on the vehicles stopping every time a bike is near. Mr. Pessaro stated that the information was also provided in the report.

Mr. Fernandez wanted to know if the vehicles will run in dedicated lanes or just in the general population. Mr. Pessaro stated that the vehicles will run in mixed traffic.

Mr. Bailey wanted to know if there is any data was available on the impact on traffic for other tested locations. Mr. Pessaro stated that they did not look at that information and he felt that it would not be much of a difference in traffic impact.

Mr. Roberts inquired about the propulsion system and passenger capacity of the vehicles. Mr. Pessaro stated that the vehicles maintain a 10-hour battery charge and hold up to 15-passengers.

Motion: Accept the USF Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study as a proposal for a concept study Recommend a TIP Amendment for approval of the HART CAD/AVL Equipment Replacement and

VI. STATUS REPORTS

A. North Alexander Street Corridor Land Use & Marketing Study

Mr. Jay Collins, Planning Commission Staff, provided the status update on the North Alexander Street extension.

Following the presentation, Ms. Espinosa asked about the potential impacts natural preserve area. Mr. Collins indicated not because of the study and there was brief discussion on preserving natural environments.

B. Brightline Proposal for Rail to Orlando, Miami

Mr. Bob O’Malley, Brightline’s VP of Government Affairs, provided a brief update. Brightline has been very successful in South Florida. In March, Brightline submitted an unsolicited proposal to the FDOT to lease the right of way to build intercity rail between Orlando and Tampa. The State is currently in the RFP process. If the State decides to move forward with Brightline then they will enter a negotiation period. Construction from Orlando to Tampa would take approximately thirty-six months. They are asking for letters of support from community organizations. The Tampa Chamber, Tampa Bay Partnership, Tampa Downtown Partnership, University of Central Florida, and the Orlando Economic Partnership have all provided letters to FDOT stating do not miss an opportunity for intercity rail again. He is available to provide tours or can arrange for someone to provide tours of a station to individuals or groups wanting to visit or ride on Brightline. Mr. O’Malley offered to make presentations to any interested group. He can be reached at 407-803-3969 or bob.omalley@gobrightline.com

Following the presentation, there was brief discussion of Brightline’s background, utilization of existing rail corridor, definition of high-speed rail, competition, privatized rail service, trip costs, financing, and safety measures around tracks.

C. Long Range Transportation Plan Goals Update

Mrs. Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff, provided the update. The purpose of the update is to plan for approximately one million new residents that are expected to live in the Tampa Bay area in 2045.

Following the presentation, there was discussion about further community input for the It’s Time Tampa Bay survey, growth plans and including sustainability and equity in the goals.

D. SouthShore Transit Study Reevaluation

In Ms. McKinley’s absence, Mr. Clarendon provided the update. The final community input meeting will be held November 15, 5:30 – 7:00 p.m. at the SouthShore Regional Service Center. A full presentation the South Shore Transit Study Reevaluation will be placed on the next meeting agenda. The reevaluation has built upon the previous study and created a phased implementation plan that will be finalized in December.
The item was deferred to the next meeting.

VII. OLD BUSINESS & NEW BUSINESS

A. Response to Veteran’s Expressway Questions

Mr. Jim Martin, Florida’s Turnpike Enterprise Liaison, provided additional comments to his letter that was distributed at the meeting.

Mr. Fernandez stated that the letter really did not answer his ongoing questions. Following discussion, it was clarified that there will not be managed toll lanes on the Veterans Expressway until the completion of interchange improvements at I-275, SR 60 and the Veterans Expressway, and FTE is not monitoring the use by citizens of the express lanes, but the infrastructure does exist.

Mr. Roberts suggested that the Turnpike Enterprise do a better job of signage informing motorists that there is no additional charge.

Mr. Martin informed the group that Ms. Carol Scott will be returning to the Turnpike Enterprise as Planning Manager.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Roberts informed the group that Mr. Rick Richmond will be attending the TBARTA CAC meeting. TBARTA has selected a new Executive Director.

Ms. Lazarus expressed concerns regarding the vote on the MPO Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for USF Campus. There was brief discussion of why members voted for or against the study.

Dr. Wong informed the CAC of the MPO Board’s decision to defer the vote on the TIP Amendment on Performance Targets for Pavement, Bridges Transit Assets & Travel Time Reliability.

B. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for November 14th.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: For adjournment (Alzamora-Fernandez). The motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:48 a.m.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
TIP Amendment – HART FTA 5307, 5309/5337 and 5339 Section Funding

**Presenter**
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

**Summary**
The following item is three Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendments to the FY 2019-2023 TIP. These amendments will allow Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART) to apply for and receive programmed Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding for 2017, 2018 and 2019. The funding programs included allow for capital assistance, fixed guideway state of good repair, and bus and bus facility related expenses. This will also amend the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) so that HART will have the appropriate reference needed for FTA applications.

**Recommended Action**
Recommend approval to the MPO Board

**Prepared By**
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
TIP Comparative Reports
## Adopted FY 2018/2019 - 2022/2023 TIP

### Hillsborough County, District 7

## TRANSIT

### Item Number: 4081091

**Description:** Operating & Capital Related Assistance

**LRTP:** Choices when not driving, p. 166

**Extra Description:** ADA Paratransit, Preventive Maintenance, Capital Leases, Associated Transit Improvements, and Security Projects

**Type of Work:** CAPITAL FOR FIXED ROUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2019</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>&gt;2023</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL - Managed by Hillsborough County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>$145,246,402</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$227,887,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>$145,246,402</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$227,887,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 408109 1 Totals:</strong></td>
<td>$145,246,402</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$16,528,240</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$227,887,602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item Number: 4081091

**Description:** HART SECTION 5307

**LRTP:** Choices when not driving, p. 166

**Extra Description:** ADA Paratransit, Preventive Maintenance, Capital Leases, Associated Transit Improvements, and Security Projects

**Type of Work:** CAPITAL FOR FIXED ROUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2019</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>&gt;2023</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL - Managed by Hillsborough County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified FTA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,804,527</td>
<td>$14,080,618</td>
<td>$14,632,230</td>
<td>$14,649,474</td>
<td>$14,642,464</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$71,539,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,804,527</td>
<td>$14,080,618</td>
<td>$14,632,230</td>
<td>$14,649,474</td>
<td>$14,642,464</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$71,539,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 408109 1 Totals:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,804,527</td>
<td>$14,080,618</td>
<td>$14,632,230</td>
<td>$14,649,474</td>
<td>$14,642,464</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$71,539,313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FDOT 5 Year TIP
### Hillsborough County, District 7

### TRANSIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amended</th>
<th>Amendment Date: 12/04/2018</th>
<th>Amendment Number: 34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Number:</td>
<td>415172 1</td>
<td>Description: HART FIXED GUIDEWAY</td>
<td>LRTP: System preservation, p. 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Project:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extra Description: SECTION 5309/5337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Length:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Work</td>
<td>TRANSIT IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2019</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>&gt;2023</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL - Managed by HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,999,310</td>
<td>$713,772</td>
<td>$728,047</td>
<td>$742,608</td>
<td>$757,460</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals: $0</td>
<td>$1,999,310</td>
<td>$713,772</td>
<td>$728,047</td>
<td>$742,608</td>
<td>$757,460</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,941,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 415172 1 Totals: $0</td>
<td>$1,999,310</td>
<td>$713,772</td>
<td>$728,047</td>
<td>$742,608</td>
<td>$757,460</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,941,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FDOT 5 Year TIP

**Hillsborough County, District 7**

#### TRANSIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amended</th>
<th>Amendment Date: 10/30/2018</th>
<th>Amendment Number: 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Number: 4343661</td>
<td>Description: HART SECTION 5339 CAPITAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>LRTP: System preservation, p. 161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Project: 4343661</td>
<td>Extra Description: Vehicle Acquisition, Facilities Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Length: 0</td>
<td>Type of Work: PURCHASE VEHICLES/EQUIPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2019</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>&gt;2023</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL - MANAGED BY HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added FTA</td>
<td>$1,297,193</td>
<td>$6,829,972</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,127,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td><strong>$1,297,193</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,829,972</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,127,165</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4343661 Totals:</td>
<td><strong>$1,297,193</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,829,972</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,127,165</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amended</th>
<th>Amendment Date: 12/04/2018</th>
<th>Amendment Number: 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Number: 4343661</td>
<td>Description: HART SECTION 5339 CAPITAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>LRTP: System preservation, p. 161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Project: 4343661</td>
<td>Extra Description: Vehicle Acquisition, Facilities Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Length: 0</td>
<td>Type of Work: PURCHASE VEHICLES/EQUIPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2019</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>&gt;2023</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL - MANAGED BY HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified FTA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,793,732</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,793,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,793,732</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,793,732</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4343661 Totals:</td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,793,732</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,793,732</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
It's TIME Tampa Bay Survey Results and Recommendations

**Presenter**
Lisa K. Silva or Committee Liaison (MPO Staff)

**Summary**
It's TIME Tampa Bay, is a collaboration of the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) of Hillsborough, Pasco, and Pinellas counties. Federal law requires MPOs to evaluate trends, project future growth, and identify fiscally constrained multimodal transportation investments for at the next 20 years as part of their Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) update.

It’s TIME Tampa Bay represents the first tri-county planning initiative the three counties have undertaken as part of the 2045 LRTP planning process. Together, the MPOs are addressing regional mobility needs to ensure that connections to jobs, universities, healthcare, airports, state parks, and the beaches are accessible to everyone. Each MPO will utilize the results of the tri-county public outreach effort to help identify county-specific and cross-county, projects that support and enhance regional mobility.

MetroQuest, an online survey platform, was selected as the primary public outreach tool for the It’s TIME Tampa Bay initiative. The survey provided the public the opportunity to weigh in on transportation and growth priorities, exaggerated future year growth scenarios and a variety of potential roadway and transit projects, community development and funding options. The results of this survey will help the MPOs identify the best ideas, projects, and policies to evaluate further as we develop the 2045 LRTP hybrid regional scenario that will feed into the Hillsborough LRTP to be completed in 2019.

Based on the survey results, staff has drawn the following conclusions to be used as guidance for the hybrid scenario:

**Growth/Land Use Elements**
- Encourage in local government comprehensive plans
  - Reinvest in neighborhoods
  - Strengthen downtowns, create more downtown-like places
  - Minimize outward growth

**Transportation Elements - Transit**
- Consider options for incorporating rail in the 2045 Plan
  - Brightline connection to Orlando and other Florida metro areas
  - Streetcar
  - Other rail or fixed guideway transit services
Plan should include express bus and BRT connections

**Transportation Elements – Roads & Highways**
- Continue to explore elevated express lane projects
  - Possible strategy for Downtown Tampa interchange (i.e. alternatives C & D)
  - Possible strategy for SR 54 / US 41 interchange area in Pasco
    - Explore connection between them via I-75 and I-4, not I-275
  - Tolls should be used for congestion management rather than raising revenue
  - New, expanded interchange ramps

**Transportation Elements - Other**
- Walk and bike modes are important to include and address
- Public support not present for I-275 boulevard conversion
- Demonstrate how technology advances can be implemented realistically and safely

**Recommended Action**
Approve Guidance for 2045 Plan “Hybrid Scenario” from the It’s Time Tampa Bay Outreach

**Prepared By**
Lisa K. Silva, AICP, PLA (MPO Staff)

**Attachments**
- [It's TIME Tampa Bay Survey Results and Recommendations Presentation](link)
- [2045 Tri-County Transportation Plan Survey Results Report](link)
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
MPO Comments on SIS 2045 Cost Feasible Plan

Presenter
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

Summary
The following presentation will cover the projects that are included in the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) 2045 Cost Feasible Plan (CFP) for the Tri-county Region (Hillsborough, Pasco, and Pinellas Counties). The SIS network consist of roadways of regional significance and this presentation will take a regional look at the SIS 2045 CFP prepared by FDOT.

The presentation will include comments provided by to the Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group and give the committee and boards members a chance to ask further question or provide comments to FDOT.

Some of these projects within Hillsborough County include interchange improvements along I-275 north of Downtown Tampa and I-75 at Gibsonton Dr and Big Bend Road. The SR 60/Memorial interchange in the Westshore district is included with funding beyond Fiscal Year (FY) 2029. There are capacity projects along US 41 near the Port of Tampa and SR 60 in eastern Hillsborough County.

Recommended Action
Provide questions and/or comments for FDOT to be included as part of the SIS 2045 CFP review.

Prepared By
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

Attachments
SIS 2045 Cost Feasible Plan and Staff Comments Presentation
2045 SIS Cost Feasible Plan

What are the facilities?

- Highest priority for economy and mobility statewide
- FDOT prioritizes projects
- MPOs include projects in the LRTP so they can advance
What are the projects?

- Interchanges on US 19 in Pinellas
- Lane continuity on I-275 in Pinellas
- Gandy Bridge Replacement
- Gateway Express connection to Roosevelt Blvd.

What are the projects?

- I-275 Innovation Corridor (sec.7/ part 2)
- Interchanges:
  - SR 60/Memorial
  - I-275 (MLK to Bearss)
  - I-4 (Mango Rd to Park Rd)
  - I-75 at Gibsonton Dr and Big Bend Rd
What are the projects?

- Managed Lanes:
  - I-75 (Manatee Co. to Pasco Co.)
  - I-4 (Selmon Connector to Polk Co.)

- Road Widening:
  - SR 60 (Dover Rd to Polk Co.)
  - US 41 (Pendola Pt Rd to S of Causeway Blvd)

- Gandy Bridge PD&E

What are the projects?

- Intersections:
  - U.S. 41/S.R. 54
  - S.R. 54/Collier Parkway

- Interchange/Ramp/Bridge:
  - I-75/S.R. 56

- PD & E/Managed Lanes:
  - I-75 from Hillsborough County Line to Hernando County Line

- PD & E:
  - Turnpike from Van Dyke to S.R. 52
Comments - 2024-2028

- US 19 - Klosterman interchange
  - Modify plans or remove
- Gandy Blvd. - Brighton Bay interchange
  - Not included in the Plan - should be added

Comments - Year 2029-2045

- US 19 - interchanges at Alderman and Tarpon
  - Modify plans or remove
- Gateway Express @ Roosevelt
  - Advance construction
- Gandy Bridge
  - Advance construction
Comments - Year 2029-2045

- Interchange construction needs to be advanced:
  - I-275/SR 60 Westshore interchange: top priority!
  - I-75 at Gibsonton Dr
  - I-75 at Big Bend Rd
- SR 60 widening, Dover Rd to Polk Co. Line - please clarify need; there are other higher priorities
- US 41, Pendola Pt Rd to S of Causeway Blvd - may need comprehensive plan amendment for 6 lanes south of Denver St, currently on Constrained Roads list

Transit

SIS Funding should be available for transit in the SIS ROW
- Capital and Operating
- Including in managed lanes
- Expanded from just fixed guideway

CSX Line in Pasco County
- Should be added to the SIS

-Pasco and Pinellas sent comments
-Hillsborough will wait for the results the It’s TIME Tampa Bay Survey to make comments.
TMA Direction

- Consensus on staff comments
- Any additional comments?
Agenda Item
Health in All Policies Resolution and Report

Presenter
Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff

Summary
Good health begins in the places where we live, learn, work and play. Although medical care is critically important, things like the quality of our schools, affordability and stability our housing, access to good jobs with fair pay, and the safety of our neighborhoods can keep us healthy in the first place. (Robert Woods Johnson Foundation, 2015).

Public health and urban planning are quite interconnected where the urban environment clearly influences the health and wellbeing of individuals. At the beginning of the 20th Century, we learned how a series of issues including industrialization, lack of sanitation, rapid urbanization, inadequate water supplies, waste collection, high levels of pollution and lack of control measures, and inadequate housing for the poor could cause the spread of disease and unhealthy environments. Our understanding of how planning can affect health outcomes has grown to include health impacts such as obesity, asthma, cardiovascular disease and cancer.

Transportation does more than just move us around. Transportation is a critical factor that influences people’s health and the health of a community. Investments in sidewalks, bike lanes, trails, public transit, and other infrastructure that supports physical activity can result in improvements to individuals’ health and decreased health care costs.

Health in All Policies (HiAP) is an approach to planning whereby decision-makers consider how plans and policies will impact human health. Health in All Policies is a collaborative way to connect and integrate health considerations in policies or system practice.

Key HiAP principles include promoting health, equity and sustainability; supporting inter-sectoral collaboration; benefitting multiple partners; engaging stakeholders; and creating structural or procedural change. The Department of Health - Hillsborough County with the Metropolitan Planning Organization and Planning Commission staffs have developed a Transportation and Health Indicators Matrix which highlights agency cross-sectoral alignments.
At the MPO’s direction, the Department of Health, Planning Commission and MPO staff have also prepared a report analyzing the land use and transportation linkage for potential impacts of costs, growth, and other implications of the proposed Resolution.

**Recommended Action**
That the MPO adopt the Health in All Policies Resolution.

**Prepared By**
Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff

**Attachment**
Health in All Policies Resolution and Report
April 11, 2018

Commissioner Les Miller, Chairman
Metropolitan Planning Organization Board
601 E. Kennedy Blvd
Tampa, FL 33602

RE: Transportation and Health

Dear Mr. Miller and Members of the Metropolitan Planning Organization Board:

On behalf of the Florida Department of Health in Hillsborough County, we are thrilled to support the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (MPO) recent work showing the links between transportation and health. Their work reflects a growing recognition that community health depends on all community partners, including partners that influence the physical and built environments in which we live.

The conditions of the places where people live, learn, work, and play that affect overall health are the social determinants of health. These social determinants include transportation factors like air quality, the availability of sidewalks, trails, crosswalks, lighting, public transit, where major and minor corridors are placed, and who has access to them or who is affected by them. In some locations, transportation policies and decisions have had major negative impacts on entire communities, affecting long-term economic opportunities and asset building, which ultimately affects health. Health outcomes that can be affected by transportation decisions include problems like poor mental health, chronic diseases like overweight and obesity, and decreased length of life, among others.

Health in All Policies is a collaborative strategy for improving the health of communities by incorporating health considerations into decision-making across sectors and policy areas. We encourage adoption of the MPO resolution establishing Health in All Policies as an approach to transportation planning. This approach, adopting the resolution, and using the supporting health indicators matrix will help planners prioritize projects that mirror other growth, sustainability, and vibrancy leaders across the country. We welcome the opportunity to continue working with the MPO on Health in All Policies projects to increase the health and livability of Hillsborough County.

Sincerely,

Douglas Holt, M.D.
Director
Florida Department of Health in Hillsborough
RESOLUTION establishing a Health in All Policies approach to Transportation Planning.

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the designated and constituted body responsible for the transportation planning and programming process for Hillsborough County; and

WHEREAS, the MPO desires to promote, maintain and enhance the livability of unincorporated Hillsborough County, Plant City, Tampa and Temple Terrace; and

WHEREAS, policy, planning and programming decisions made by non-health agencies significantly impact social and environmental factors and health, and can have a disproportionate impact on vulnerable populations; and

WHEREAS, Health in All Policies is a cross-sector collaborative approach that incorporates health into the decision-making process of government agencies; and

WHEREAS, an individual’s zip code and conditions in the environment where they live, work, learn and play have a greater impact on an individual’s health and quality of life than their genetic code; and

WHEREAS, making community conditions more equitable, including roadway safety and connectivity to resources and public transportation, improves health equity; and

WHEREAS, communities of color, lower income individuals, older adults, persons with disabilities, children at risk and individuals and communities who are pedestrian, bicycle and public transportation-dependent experience higher rates of health disparities, preventable differences in health status and outcomes resulting from social and environmental factors and historic policy decisions; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization seeks to provide transportation system wide choices for all users including motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users, and to make unincorporated Hillsborough County, Plant City, Tampa and Temple Terrace more livable, healthy, and economically robust.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization that:

1. The Hillsborough County MPO will continue to work with the Florida Department of Health in Hillsborough County (DOH-Hillsborough) to implement Health in All Policies strategies taking into account the health impacts of MPO decisions that include but are not limited to chronic and acute health outcomes, mental and physical wellbeing, health behaviors such as physical activity, measures of social cohesion and community connectedness, access to healthcare, employment and educational opportunities and the physical and built environment.

2. The MPO will consider the health outcomes/impacts in the project prioritization process based on the Transportation and Health Indicators Matrix (attached)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO PRIORITY AREA</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>HEALTH PRIORITY AREA*</th>
<th>MPO PROGRAM APPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction/ Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Recovery time for critical <strong>transportation links</strong> after a Category 3 storm</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Total crashes reduced, fatal crashes reduced, bicycle/pedestrian crashes reduced</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP, LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Number street lights installed in high crash corridors</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Number of miles of sidewalk present in high pedestrian crash areas/ complete network</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Crash &amp; Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>Pedestrian intersection improvements (example-high visibility crosswalks, ADA compliant sidewalks, median pedestrian refuge and bulb-outs) 1/4 mile from transit stops</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Minimize Congestion</td>
<td>Pedestrian friendly intersections for Communities of Concern</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Minimize Congestion</td>
<td>Population or households adjacent (500 feet) to congested or high-volume roads (30,000 ADT or a volume to capacity ratio of 1.0 or greater)</td>
<td>CD, HE, LHL</td>
<td>Regional Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. System Preservation/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Span and frequency of transit service</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. System Preservation/Investment for Economic Growth</td>
<td>Highway centerline miles within 1/2 miles of major healthcare (hospitals), recreation (regional parks, entertainment venues), education (universities and colleges)</td>
<td>BH, CD, HE</td>
<td>Regional Scenario; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Investment for Economic Growth/Real Choices</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage to areas of Essential Destinations (map attached)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Investment for Economic Growth/Real Choices</td>
<td>Ratio of sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Investment for Economic Growth/Real Choices</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage to behavioral health and chronic disease services</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Miles of sidewalk and trails present within 1/4 mile of populations identified with high rates of behavioral health and chronic disease conditions</td>
<td>AC, IM, BH, CD</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Sidewalk coverage (both side of street) within 1/4 mile of transit stops</td>
<td>LHL, HE</td>
<td>LRTP; TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Sidewalk coverage (both side of street) for block groups within 1/4 mile of restorative and social activities, e.g. parks, recreation, and community centers</td>
<td>LHL, CD, BH, HE</td>
<td>Regional Scenario; TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Transit service route miles within 1/4 miles of high proportion of elderly population (over 500 per square mile)</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>LRTP; TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Percent of Environmental Justice population living within 1/4 mile of a trail/side path</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Transit and sidewalk coverage within designated USDA Food Deserts</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Real Choices when Not Driving</td>
<td>Percent of Community of Concern population living within 1/4 mile of transit service (map attached)</td>
<td>HE, LHL, AC, CD</td>
<td>TIP; LRTP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AC- Access to Care; BH- Behavioral Health; CD- Chronic Disease; HE- Health Equity; LHL- Long Healthy Life; IM- Infant Death

**DRAFT 4/16/17**
Communities of Concern measure more than one standard deviation above the county’s median in two or more characteristics: low income, disability, youth, elderly, limited English proficiency, minorities, and carless households.

Extreme Poverty 85 percent or more of households have an annual household income of $37,000 or less.
Health in All Policies Resolution Report

INTRODUCTION

This report is in response to two motions made by first, the Policy Committee and second by the MPO Board.

1. Motion: Councilman Cohen moved to request staff work with the Health Department to research and draft health in all policies resolution, seconded by Commissioner Murman. After remarks, the motion carried five to zero. (POLICY COMMITTEE-8/30/16)

2. After sharing potential capital/operating concerns and wanting to see municipal/County/PC feedback, Commissioner White moved to send that to the County administration, the administration of the three municipalities, and the PC, to look at the land use and transportation linkage for potential impacts of costs, growth, and any other implications, and have that resolution come back accompanied by a report on that review for the MPO’s consideration at that time, seconded by Commissioner Kemp, and carried eleven to zero. (MPO BOARD-5/01/18)

CONTEXT

Good health begins in the places where we live, learn, work and play. Although medical care is critically important, things like the quality of our schools, affordability and stability our housing, access to good jobs with fair pay, and the safety of our neighborhoods can keep us healthy in the first place. (Robert Woods Johnson Foundation, 2015).

Public health and urban planning are quite interconnected where the urban environment clearly influences the health and wellbeing of individuals. At the beginning of the 20th Century, we learned how a series of issues including industrialization, lack of sanitation, rapid urbanization, inadequate water supplies, waste collection, high levels of pollution and lack of control measures, and inadequate housing for the poor could cause the spread of disease and unhealthy environments (Kenzer, 2000). Our understanding of how planning can affect health outcomes has grown to include health impacts such as obesity, asthma, cardiovascular disease and cancer.

Health in All Policies (HiAP) is an approach to planning whereby decision-makers consider how plans and policies will impact human health. Key HiAP principles include promoting health, equity and sustainability; supporting inter-sectoral collaboration; benefitting multiple partners; engaging stakeholders; and creating structural or procedural change (Rudolph, Caplan, Ben-Moshe, & Dillon, 2013). The Department of Health - Hillsborough County with the Metropolitan Planning Organization and Planning Commission staffs have developed a health priorities matrix which highlights agency cross-sectoral alignments from ongoing HiAP work.

DEFINITIONS:

Public Health is the science of increasing the health and safety of communities through education, policy making and research for disease and injury prevention.
Health in All Policies is a collaborative way to connect and integrate health considerations in policies or system practice.

Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.

Transportation does more than just move us around. Transportation is a critical factor that influences people’s health and the health of a community. Investments in sidewalks, bike lanes, trails, public transit, and other infrastructure that supports physical activity can result in improvements to individuals’ health and decreased health care costs.

SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH:
Social determinants of health are conditions in the environments in which people are born, live, learn, work, play, worship, and age that affect a wide range of health, functioning, and quality-of-life outcomes and risks. By working to establish policies that positively influence social and economic conditions and those that support changes in individual behavior, we can improve health for large numbers of people in ways that can be sustained over time. Improving the conditions in which we live, learn, work, and play and the quality of our relationships will create a healthier population, society, and workforce.

THE PROBLEM - TRANSPORTATION’S IMPACT ON HEALTH:
The Hillsborough County Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan reports that nearly 1/3 of the population of Hillsborough County is Transportation Disadvantaged (TD). 'Transportation disadvantaged' means those persons who because of physical or mental disability, income status, or age are unable to transport themselves or to purchase transportation and are, therefore, dependent upon others to obtain access to health care, employment, education, shopping, social activities, or other life-sustaining activities, or children who are handicapped or high-risk or at-risk as defined in Florida Statute 411.202."

Transportation systems can provide access to physical activity opportunities, improve safety, lower emotional stress, link poor people to opportunity, connect isolated disabled and older Americans to crucial services and social supports and stimulate economic development.

Elderly and disabled populations drive less and therefore must rely more on other transportation options to get around: More than 1 in 5 Americans age 65 and older do not drive. More than 50% of elderly non-drivers (3.6 million Americans) stay home on any given day in part due to lack of transportation options and more than half of this group (1.9 million) is disabled. Older non-drivers take 15% fewer trips to the doctor; 59% fewer trips to shops and restaurants; and 65%
fewer trips for family, social and religious activities than their counterparts who drive. (CITYLAB- Older People Will Need Much Better Transit, August 2017)

- Transportation costs create a barrier for many: U.S. households earning $20,000 to $35,000 and living far from employment centers, spend approximately 37% of their income on transportation, while the average U.S. household spends about 18% of its income on transportation. The more a household spends on transportation, the less it has left over for food, medical expenses, childcare, housing and other essential costs. (AARP- Waiting for a Ride: Transit and America’s Aging Population, 2011)

In Hillsborough County the concentrations of residents living in households with no vehicles are in areas greater than the median (5 percent), those that are one standard deviation above the median (15 percent), and those that are two standard deviations above the median (26 percent).

The Hillsborough County Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan reports that the lack of continuous sidewalks and bicycle facilities impact a TD individual’s ability to navigate transportation corridors in a comfortable and safe manner. Issues that impact comfortable and safe travel include:

- Overall access impacted by poles, benches, or other elements blocking the clear space on sidewalks, especially for persons who make use of wheelchairs, scooters, or other mobility aids.
- Varying widths of sidewalks and bike lanes
- Incomplete sidewalk systems and bicycle facility network.
- The mismatch of sidewalks, bike lanes, and transit stops.
- Problematic intersections due to:
  - High traffic volume,
  - Large number of turning movements at an intersection’
  - Lack of pedestrian signalization

These factors are barriers to pedestrian and bicyclist safety and put an undue stress on the TD population. These barriers were confirmed as a result of the 2016 TDSP Human Services Transportation Survey and Forum. Eighty percent of the respondents said that their clients walk and 60 percent of the respondents stated that their clients bike. It is known that every fixed-route transit rider is either a pedestrian or a bicyclist at the beginning and end of each trip. Lack
of coordination between pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure with the needs of the TD community is a barrier to providing safe and efficient travel for the TD population.

It is well established that physical activity promotes longevity and is beneficial for health (CDC, 2011; CDC, 2015b; American Heart Association [AHA], 2015). Access to an active living system can improve a community’s health through promoting physical activity and recreational activity while reducing poor health outcomes. An active living system that is used for commuting can help to reduce cardiovascular risk by 11%, increase daily steps, and increase time spent walking (American Public Health Association, 2010). Researchers have correlated communities that report higher rates of walking and cycling to work with more daily physical activity and lower rates of obesity and diabetes (Pucher, Buehler, Bassett, & Dannenberg, 2010). Cycling and walking have been recognized as an important means to promote health since they are the most common forms of physical activity as well as active transport. An increase of one-hundred minutes of cycling per week, reduces the mortality risk by 10% when compared to non-cyclists (Schepers et al., 2015). An increase of one-hundred and sixty-eight minutes of walking per week, reduces the risk of early mortality by approximately 11% (Schepers et al., 2015).

Providing safe streets for all users is an important component of a healthy and economically vibrant community. Pedestrian and bicycling infrastructure improvements (such as wayfinding, crosswalk improvements, wider sidewalks, lighting) to connect to transit and transit-oriented development can provide large but often overlooked health benefits. Studies have shown that 43 percent of people with safe places to walk within ten minutes of home achieve their daily physical activity targets, compared to just 27 percent for residents of less walkable areas achieving physical activity targets (Littman, 2010).

Transit supportive infrastructure improvements can be achieved with the implementation of Complete Streets policies. Complete Streets is a set of policies and planning practices intended to ensure that roadways accommodate all users and uses including walking, cycling, transit and automobile travel. Complete Streets are designed with its community context- in a rural setting a Complete Street will look much different than a Complete Street in an urban setting.
Roadways traditionally have been designed primarily for motor vehicles. A personal vehicle-centric design approach potentially could pose barriers to use by pedestrians, bicyclists and public transportation users, thus limiting active transportation opportunities and potential resulting health benefits. Complete Streets policies can support planners and engineers in developing roadway designs that improve the safety of all users and provide additional opportunities for physical activity from transportation. The connections between physical activity and public health have been widely documented. Research suggests that physically active adults “have lower rates of all-cause mortality, coronary heart disease, high blood pressure, stroke, type 2 diabetes, metabolic syndrome, colon cancer, breast cancer, and depression” than their physically inactive peers (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1996). Active transportation, or trips made by walking or bicycling, was identified by Healthy People 2020 as a target for measuring progress for healthier people (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2010). Additionally, Healthy People 2020 listed “increased legislative policies for the built environment that enhance access to and availability of physical activity opportunities” as a specific travel and transportation policy.

Active transportation and physical activity is more likely to occur in places with a variety of land uses, a comprehensive network of pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation facilities, inviting street design for all users, and safety measures; and Complete Streets policies address all four of those factors (Fenton, 2012). Complete Streets also promote increased roadway connectivity, which has been shown to reduce VMT per capita (Moreland-Russell et al., 2013), and they have been found to improve safety and mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists (U.S. DOT, 2010; Handy, Tal, Boarnet, 2010).

Shifts towards using Complete Streets provide a measure of how approaches to planning and engineering are shifting over time. The focus of road design is no longer about auto-mobility but creating an overall network that serves all users (LaPlante, McCann, 2011). Complete Street policies are a component of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) transportation recommendations. Complete Streets can enhance physical activity and reduce injury. Setting a Complete Streets policy in place is a foundational step towards improving infrastructure by providing accessible, safe, and connected roadways (CDC, 2010).

A recent survey of implemented Complete Street policies suggests this type of strategy is applicable to communities that vary in geography and socio-demographic factors (Marshall, Garrick, 2011), which suggests that it can be a useful tool for various regions. Complete Streets strategies include retrofitting existing arterials to accommodate multi-modal users or building new facilities that support multi-modal transportation and complementary roadside uses. Complete Streets elements may include pedestrian and bicyclist accommodations, public transportation access, accommodations for persons with disabilities, landscape elements, and traffic calming. Controlling and reducing vehicular speed can be done through reducing the number of lanes, adding curb parking, or installing raised medians (LaPlante, McCann, 2011). Decision makers can search the National Complete Streets Coalition Policy Atlas for model language and for other assistance in developing Complete Streets policies. This is an opportunity for health and transportation professionals to work with advocates and decision makers in setting
forth policy strategies to shape the future of land use, growth, and development in ways that encourage use of alternate modes and opportunities for physical activity from transportation, while enhancing safety for all users. Enhanced health and safety of the broader population is tightly connected with the built environment and small steps now can lead to significant benefits in the future. (FHWA)

**HEALTH INDICATORS:**
A growing body of scientific evidence has shown that the built environment can have significant effects on both physical and mental health, particularly among minority and low-income populations already burdened with disproportionate rates of illness and morbidity. The combination of lack of infrastructure (e.g., sidewalks, bike paths, and parks), affordable housing, and supermarkets with access to healthy food increases the risks of both physical and mental illnesses.

The conditions of the place where people live, learn, work and play that affect overall health are the determinants of health. These social determinants include transportation factors like air quality, the availability of sidewalks, trails, crosswalks, lighting, public transit, where major and minor corridors are placed, and who has access to them or is affected by them. In some locations, transportation polices, and decisions have had major negative impacts on entire communities, affecting long term economic opportunities and asset building, which ultimately affects health. Health outcomes that can be affected by transportation decisions include problems like poor mental health, chronic diseases like overweight and obesity, and decreases length of life.

Health data can provide a picture of current health conditions, trends and disparities within any community. This information can help inform planners and community leaders on the best ‘infrastructure’ solutions for their communities and can allow them to track how changes to the built environment are helping or harming their communities.

In 2017, the Hillsborough County MPO created a Health Atlas web-based mapping tool to provide a baseline context of health and health-related indicators within Hillsborough County as well as to visualize the interconnectedness of health, transportation, economic development, and the environment.

The catalyst for the Health Atlas is the MPO’s involvement in the Healthiest Cities & Counties Challenge. The Challenge is a partnership between the Aetna Foundation, the American Public Health Association and the National Association of Counties. The partnership has “challenged” 50 cities and counties to create a positive health
impact through a small seed money grant. Hillsborough County’s Challenge project is called Garden Steps; the purpose being to establish community gardens in food deserts within Tampa, as a case study, evaluating transportation conditions surrounding sites.

The Health Atlas provides a baseline profile for obesity and chronic illness such as asthma, cardiovascular disease, and diabetes within Tampa neighborhoods, as well as demographic, transportation, health care access, food environment, emergency preparedness, and environmental indicators which span Hillsborough County. Health practitioners report that in the Unites States, chronic diseases such as diabetes and cardiovascular disease, are on the rise. The built environment has become an important aspect of health-promotion strategies. Health is viewed as not merely the absence of disease or infirmity, but also includes “a state of physical, mental, and social well-being”. Well planned and designed transportation investments can go beyond a primary purpose of moving people to positively influencing the future health of communities and the residents, workers, and businesses.

Ingredients of our HiAP also include aging, disability, safety and access to jobs, schools, health care, healthy food and recreation.

THE HEALTH IN ALL POLICIES MATRIX:
As part of this process, Hillsborough MPO staff worked with partners at FDOH – Hillsborough to determine a list of indicators to monitor the performance of our transportation system with regard to health outcomes and supporting healthy behaviors. This was accomplished through the comparison of FDOH – Hillsborough’s Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) and the priorities outlined in the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

In coordination with the performance measures in the 2040 LRTP, the TIP Priorities consider candidate projects that fall into one of the five investment programs, ranked in the following order per criteria established in the LRTP:

1. Preserve the System, including projects such as:
   a. Bridge repair & replacement
   b. Road resurfacing
   c. Transit vehicle replacement

2. Reduce Crashes & Vulnerability, including safety and resilience projects evaluated by their effect on:
   a. Total, fatal & bike/ped crashes
   b. Recovery time & economic impacts from flooding or major storm surge

3. Manage Congestion for Drivers & Shippers, including intersection, signalization, freeway incident management and ITS projects, evaluated by their impact on:
   a. Travel time reliability on heavily congested arterials
   b. Peak period V/C ratio
4. Real Choices When Not Driving, including alternatives such as transit, multi-use trails and services for the transportation disadvantaged, evaluated by:
   a. Density of jobs and population in 2040 within ¼ mile of proposed transit service
   b. Density of jobs and population in 2040 within ¼ mile of proposed trail/sidepath

5. Major infrastructure improvements, including road and transit capacity projects for economic growth:
   a. Key economic spaces (job clusters > 5,000)
   b. 2040 jobs served per mile of improvement
   c. 2040 delay reduced per mile of improvement

To ensure continuity with previous priorities, any project already programmed for construction funding is given priority over new candidates for funding.

The TIP also incorporates projects prioritized by the Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area (TMA, which includes the Hillsborough, Pasco and Pinellas MPOs) Leadership Group and the TBARTA CCC for inclusion in the 2040 Regional LRTP. It also includes priority projects for the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) authorized through state legislation.

The CHIP includes the six major health concerns for the county, which are:
   - Access to Care
   - Behavioral Health
   - Chronic Diseases
   - Health Equity
   - Long Healthy Life
   - Infant Death.

Where these priorities intersected, staff looked at models in other communities to track performance, then compared those to existing data sources available in Hillsborough County. Staff then narrowed that larger list of indicators to those that most directly impact health outcomes and where data is readily available. The result is a list of 19 indicators/performance measures. These will be tracked over time to measure the performance of transportation investments as related to the health of the community.

The measures were chosen to represent a wide cross section of the importance of transportation in health outcomes, including vulnerability to natural disasters, vehicle crashes, walkability, access to care, access to daily needs, access for vulnerable populations, and safety. These measures also include the MPO priority areas as well as in the application to the MPO’s plans and programs.
HEALTH AUDIT:

For its LRTP update, scheduled for completion in 2019, the Hillsborough MPO and Health Department staffs are interested in expanding its approach to identifying and addressing the transportation needs of the Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) in the region. The MPO staff, through their previous planning and public involvement efforts, indicated a need for a greater variety of analysis measures and methods to better define and locate TD and Community of Concern groups (COCs), as well as accessibility of pedestrians, cyclists and transit-users to jobs and services. A Community of Concern is a census block group that has a high proportion of two or more protected classes, such as racial minorities, low-income groups, persons with disabilities, and those with limited English proficiency. The MPO further indicated interest in methods to evaluate public health, safety and the distributional equity of investments.

To begin, we needed to know how do existing planning documents perform when viewed through a health lens? To answer this question, we analyzed three Imagine 2040 documents: Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Projects Prioritized for Funding, and the FY 19-23
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). They were examined for how they addressed health concerns. As we pursue a Health in all Policies through transportation planning approach, this information is a baseline for measuring progress.

Key Findings:

**TIP**: Over $400 million will be spent in the next five years to support healthy behaviors. Over the next five years, dollars will continue to be spent to improve walking, biking. Local and state governments are implementing projects to improve safety, increase access and mobility, maintain air quality standards and promote economic development. These funds will increase walking, biking, and transit opportunities.

**Analysis of Existing Priorities Funded for Construction** shows that jurisdictions are submitting projects that increase opportunities to walk, bike, or use transit. 41 of the 54 projects advanced from the LRTP in 2018/2019 supported one or more health indicators. **HART** continues to plan for an expanded, reliable and frequent public transit system. In the current TIP, we spend $420 million on transit, which is 9.7% of total funding. To determine money spent on the transit components in the TIP, projects with a transit component were selected, including those for capital purchases, maintenance, operations, equipment, pilot projects, vanpools, and administration. This amount was then divided by the total money allocated in the TIP for all funding.

To determine funding with a pedestrian or cycling component, all projects with a pedestrian or cycling component were selected. These include trails, sidewalk programs, bridge replacements with a pedestrian or cycling component, new roads incorporating cycling and pedestrians, roadway expansions that will include multimodal facilities, enhancements to existing multimodal facilities, traffic calming projects, complete streets projects, ADA projects, and intersection projects with a pedestrian safety component. This list includes all phases of a project including, planning, engineering, design, and construction. The total was then divided by the overall TIP funding.

This study provides the MPO with potential methods and measures for identifying COCs and more systematically monitoring the long-term impacts of the regional plan and projects, using indicators related to affordability, accessibility and safety. Results of the study were presented to various MPO committees and the MPO Board to help inform future planning efforts.
Local Agency Capital Improvements

The Hillsborough MPO is now using this equity analysis to screen TIP projects for impacts and benefits to COCs. In particular, the MPO is identifying areas with low access to food and other services, such as healthcare, and using additional tools, such as health impact assessments, to prioritize projects to help COCs facing these challenges. The 2045 update to the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan and Title VI plan will include details from, and expansion of, this equity analysis. Other projects include a recently concluded Transportation Disadvantaged Summit, which brought together providers and recipients to discuss transportation disadvantaged needs.

PROJECT EVALUATION:

As an example of how this might be used in the prioritization of projects for funding in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), staff has applied the health indicators matrix performance measures to two projects already funded in the TIP. While this is not intended to replace the existing TIPP prioritization process, it can help identify projects that have health benefits.

Sulphur Springs Elementary Safe Routes to School

The Sulphur Springs Elementary Safe Routes to School project identifies a number of elements including high visibility crosswalks and filling sidewalk gaps around the school, which is also in an area of high chronic disease and has been identified as a Community of Concern. Applying the indicators in the Health Matrix to this project, the following indicators are met:

- Indicator 2 – Total crashes reduced
- Indicator 4 – Number of miles of sidewalk present
- Indicator 5 – Pedestrian Intersection Improvements
- Indicator 6 – Pedestrian friendly intersections for COCs
• Indicator 11 – Ratio of Sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area
• Indicator 13 – Miles of sidewalk present within ¼ miles of populations with high rates of chronic health conditions
• Indicator 14 – Sidewalk coverage within ¼ mile of transit stops
• Indicator 15 – Sidewalk coverage for block groups within ¼ mile of restorative and social activities
• Indicator 18 – Sidewalk coverage within designated food deserts

This total of 9 out of 19 measures could then be compared against other projects to determine which may have the greatest health benefits for the community.

**Morris Bridge Road**
This project is proposed to add paved shoulders, sidewalks, and a multi-use trail to connect existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities north and south of the project. It also offers safety improvements for all users including motorists and can improve active transportation options, thereby helping in the reduction of chronic diseases in the long-term. In this case, the following indicators are met:

• Indicator 2 – Total crashes reduced
• Indicator 4 – Miles of sidewalk present
• Indicator 5 – Pedestrian Intersection Improvements
• Indicator 11 – Ratio of sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area

With four out of 19 measures met, this project could be helped in prioritization by its performance on the health indicators.

**LAND USE:**
Transportation and land use are significant factors in the built environment that affect (a) rates of injury and death caused by traffic crashes, (b) ease and safety of physical activity, (c) air quality, (d) greenhouse gas emissions, and (e) access to key community resources such as health care and healthy food. Land-use policies pertain not only to the movement of people but also to the movement of freight and goods from ships through ports and on trucks and trains, which affects communities and workers across the country.

The FDOH staff has considered a pilot assessment for how the Tampa Comprehensive Plan (TCP) addresses health. The comprehensive plan is a locally adopted document designed to guide the future actions of a jurisdiction. It presents a vision for the future, with long-range goals, objectives and policies for all activities that affect the local government. This includes guidance on how to make decisions on public and private land development proposals. Plans are written to provide direction for future activities over a 20-year period after plan adoption.
The ChangeLab Solutions’ framework was ultimately chosen to evaluate the TCP. The Healthy Comprehensive Plan Assessment Tool (HCPAT) calls for utilizing keyword searches, within four health related domains: (1) Complete Streets, (2) Complete Neighborhoods, (3) Healthy Food Systems, and (4) Environmental Health. The FDOH staff also decided to compare the TCP to the Orlando Growth Management Plan (OGMP) as Orlando is a municipality similar in size and demographics to Tampa. The OGMP is also similarly structured with no stand-alone health element and containing approximately 600 pages and over 1,000 GOPs.

For the evaluation, two searches were conducted. The initial search identified goals, objectives and policies that contained key terms associated with the CLS health related domains. Additionally, OHE staff proposed additional terms to include in the initial search. Terms that were added by OHE staff were taken from the HiAP matrix developed during collaborative efforts between the MPO and DOH-Hillsborough previously, and relate specifically to transportation and local health priorities. The search was conducted on both the TCP and the OGMP. Terms used in the initial search from the CLS domains are included.

From this quantitative analysis, it is evident the TCP addresses health and substantiates the qualitative-findings made by Planning Commission staff earlier in 2018. Nevertheless, with the TCP format, readers are left to infer the priority of health within the plan, since it is dispersed in bits and pieces and not discussed directly as an over-arching theme or element. While it may be that integrating health throughout the TCP, as it is currently written, is preferable to authoring a stand-alone element, this format does make assessing the plan for the inclusion of health challenging. And, while certainly more is better than less, there are no established benchmarks or standards to guide planners and public health professionals on a sufficient number or ratio of health-related terms and references that are needed to address health within a plan.

In considering the TCP’s potential utility in impacting health within the community the authors conclude that it is not possible without additional methods of measurement. Other comprehensive plan analyses have performed similar quantitative assessments in the past and have noted the need for tracking effectiveness, plan performance, plan conformance, or impact over time as the true measure of a valuable comprehensive plan (Berke, Spurlock, Hes, & Band, 2013; Feitelson, Felsenstein, Razin, & Stern, 2017; Frew, Baker, & Donehue, 2016). Specifically, without understanding baseline health benchmarks or developing measurable goals, a comprehensive plan can have no real ability to deliver on its healthy vision.

In 2017 the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) released its Context Classification system. The context classification system broadly identifies the various built environments existing in Florida. FDOT’s context classification system describes the general characteristics of the land use, development patterns, and roadway connectivity along a roadway, providing cues
as to the types of uses and user groups that will likely utilize the roadway. The context classification of a roadway will inform FDOT’s planning, PD&E, design, construction, and maintenance approaches to ensure that state roadways are supportive of safe and comfortable travel for their anticipated users. Identifying the context classification is a step-in planning and design, as different context classifications will have different design criteria and standards.

The context classification system supports in developing roadway designs that improve the safety of all users and provide additional opportunities for physical activity from transportation. The connections between physical activity and public health have been widely documented. Research suggests that physically active adults “have lower rates of all-cause mortality, coronary heart disease, high blood pressure, stroke, type 2 diabetes, metabolic syndrome, colon cancer, breast cancer, and depression” than their physically inactive peers (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1996).

COSTS & ECONOMIC IMPACTS:
In 2011, the American Heart Association (AHA) published a review of more than 200 studies and concluded that most cardiovascular disease can be prevented or at least delayed until old age through a combination of direct medical care and community-based prevention programs and policies. Some of the key findings included:

- Every $1 spent on building biking trails and walking paths could save approximately $3 in medical expenses.
- For every $1 spent in wellness programs, companies could save $3.27 in medical costs and $2.73 in absenteeism costs.
- Some interventions have been shown to help improve nutrition and activity habits in just one year and had a return of $1.17 for every $1 spent.
- Participants in community-based programs who focused on improving nutrition and increasing physical activity had a 58 percent reduction in incidence of type 2 diabetes compared with drug therapy, which had a 31 percent reduction.

The Trust for America’s Health (TFAH) and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) conducted by the National Heart Forum (NHF) found that if Florida could reduce the average body mass index (BMI) of its residents by only 5 percent, the state could help prevent thousands of cases of type 2 diabetes, coronary heart disease and stroke, hypertension, cancer and arthritis, while saving millions of dollars. BMI, is used as a screening tool for overweight or obesity.
FDOT, Hillsborough County, its cities, and HART already spend considerable amounts on achieving positive health outcomes.

While walk/bike improvements are represented in the charts above as small percentages, other categories also go toward improving mobility for nonmotorized users. For example, Hillsborough County is installing modern cycling facilities such as separated trails, bike lanes with innovative intersection treatments, and sidewalks as they widen roads or extend new roads.

The City of Tampa has passed a Complete Streets policy where, as roads are resurfaced, they are evaluated for whether there is room to add bike lanes or other facilities that would benefit cyclists and pedestrians.

Even funds for bridges can contribute to these efforts, as Hillsborough County plans to add a trail with the reconstruction of the Maydell Bridge and FDOT has committed to the addition of a trail along the Howard Frankland Bridge when it is reconstructed in the coming years.

To summarize, the charts above contain greater walk/bike improvements than are documented specifically in those categories. Additional facilities are constructed using funds from the road widening, bridges and maintenance, and intersections/interchanges categories. These collectively make up 28.55% of the local agency capital improvements and 44.66% if the FDOT work program. That does not mean that nearly half of the funds spent by FDOT go toward nonmotorized improvements, but it does show a higher level of investment than the 0.77% that is identified in the FDOT work program for walk/bike improvements.

**GROWTH:**
Hillsborough County is projected to add another 1 million new residents by 2045. Robert Woods 2017 report on obesity rates shows that Florida’s rate is 27.4. The rate has been growing, and as the population grows, the trend may continue if not addressed. To accelerate progress in addressing obesity, the Trust for America’s Health (TFAH) and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation urge policymakers to:

- **Invest in community-based policies and programs,** including nutrition assistance programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and **transportation,** housing, and community development policies and programs that support **physical activity.**

Physical activity helps people reduce or maintain their BMI and could help prevent thousands of cases of type 2 diabetes, coronary heart disease and stroke, hypertension, cancer and arthritis, while saving millions of dollars. Our current health outlook has been examined and moving forward, well planned and designed transportation investments can go beyond a primary purpose of moving people to positively influencing the growth of future health of communities for residents, workers, and businesses.
MOVING FORWARD.

Currently, projects in the TIP are prioritized based on the 2040 Long Range Plan performance measures:

Priorities for the TIP were developed by drawing on the extensive prioritization of the County’s transportation needs defined in the Long Range Transportation Plan (known as the Imagine 2040 Plan). Prior to establishing priorities for all new projects, on-going projects - such as road projects where Right-of-Way had been acquired - were moved to the top of the priority list to ensure continuity in the project priorities and implementation. Consistent with FAST Act, projects are selected based on their ability to meet key performance measures identified in the Imagine 2040 Plan. These measures address system preservation, reducing crashes and vulnerability, minimizing traffic for drivers and shippers, providing real choices when not driving, and making investments for economic growth. These investments fund major highway reconstruction, arterial roadway and intersection improvements, maintenance and expansion of the public transit system, bicycle path construction, and improvements for pedestrians.

Active transportation is any self-propelled, human-powered mode of transportation, such as walking or bicycling. The Center for Disease Control reports that physical inactivity is a major contributor to the steady rise in rates of obesity, diabetes, heart disease, stroke, and other chronic health conditions in the United States. Many Americans view walking and bicycling within their communities as unsafe due to heavy traffic and a scarcity of sidewalks, crosswalks, and bicycle facilities. Improving these elements could encourage active transportation such as children biking to school or employees walking to work. Safe and convenient opportunities for physically active travel also expand access to transportation networks for people without cars, while also spurring investment in infrastructure to increase the comfort of the on-road experience to improve the appeal of active modes to all people. (Center for Disease Control, Transportation Health Impact Assessment Toolkit)

Regardless of their abilities, people need the ability to travel, whether for work, school, medical care and other social services, as well as to shop, visit family and friends, and otherwise pursue life’s needs and interests. Many low income or persons with a disability, including retired military, rely on public transit for these needs. The need for improved mobility for these special population groups is particularly apparent in rural and exurban areas where distances are greater, and where fixed-route bus service is limited or unavailable.
Including public health metrics in a transportation planning framework is a way to consider the health co-benefits from transportation projects. Public health performance metrics can become indicators not only of the co-benefits but of the intrinsic benefits of transportation projects. Just as transportation projects are evaluated for congestion relief, the evaluation of projects in terms of the physical activity stimulated can also be evaluated.

With the help of public health professionals, a health lens has been developed for transportation investments similar to other health interventions, to quantify how the investment helps achieve the desired health outcome. Possible considerations include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the project help improve recovery time for critical transportation links after a Category 3 storm?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project help to reduce severe crashes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase the number of street lights installed in high crash corridors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase the number of miles of sidewalk present in high pedestrian crash areas/complete network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project include pedestrian intersection improvements (example-high visibility crosswalks, ADA compliant sidewalks, median pedestrian refuge and bulb-outs) 1/4 mile from transit stops?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project include pedestrian friendly intersections within Communities of Concern?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project reduce the population or households adjacent (500 feet) to congested or high-volume roads (30,000 ADT or a volume to capacity ratio of 1.0 or greater)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase the span and/or frequency of transit service?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase highway centerline miles within 1/2 miles of major healthcare (hospitals), recreation (regional parks, entertainment venues), education (universities and colleges)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project improve transit and/or sidewalk coverage to areas of Essential Destinations (map attached)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase the ratio of sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase transit and/or sidewalk coverage to behavioral health and chronic disease services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase the number of miles of sidewalk and trails present within 1/4 mile of populations identified with high rates of behavioral health and chronic disease conditions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project increase sidewalk coverage (both sides of street) within 1/4 mile of transit stops?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project increase sidewalk coverage (both side of street) for block groups within 1/4 mile of restorative and social activities, e.g. parks, recreation, and community centers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Does the project increase transit service route miles within 1/4 miles of high proportion of elderly population (over 500 per square mile)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Does the project increase the percentage of Environmental Justice population living within 1/4 mile of a trail/side path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Does the project increase transit and/or sidewalk coverage within designated USDA Food Deserts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Does the project increase the percentage of the Community of Concern population living within 1/4 mile of transit service (map attached)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES ADDRESSED**

---

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION:**

There is a rapidly growing awareness of both the positive and negative links between current transportation behavior and public health. Collaboration between transportation and public health officials is pointing towards the significant aggregate and individual benefits that can result from transportation policies that promote active transportation, reduce mobile source pollutant emissions, and improve safety for travelers.

- Local governments are implementing projects that do support good health outcomes.
- Complete Streets projects improve safety, increase access and mobility, maintain air quality standards and promote economic development.
- Every $1 spent on building biking trails and walking paths/sidewalks could save approximately $3 in medical expenses.
- The inclusion of a Health Lens would be an additional factor that would indicate our continued support of the health benefits our transportation system has to all people in Hillsborough County.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
2019 MPO and Committee Meeting Calendar

**Presenter**
Committee Staff

**Summary**
Staff has prepared a calendar of meetings for 2019. We ask that each MPO advisory committee review and approve its meeting dates. Upon approval by the MPO board, this calendar will be published and posted online to provide the public with ample notice of meeting schedules.

**Recommended Action**
Review and approve the 2019 MPO and Committee Meeting Calendar

**Prepared By**
Rich Clarendon, AICP, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
DRAFT 2019 MPO Meeting Calendar
### 2019 Schedule of Monthly Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
<th>MPO 9:00 AM</th>
<th>CAC 9:00 AM</th>
<th>TAC 1:30 PM</th>
<th>POLICY 9:00 AM</th>
<th>BPAC 5:30 PM</th>
<th>LRC 9:00 AM</th>
<th>ITS 1:30 PM</th>
<th>TDCB 9:30 AM</th>
<th>TMA 9:30 AM</th>
<th>TBARTA CCC 10 AM</th>
<th>TBARTA MPO DIRECTORS 1:30 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANUARY</strong></td>
<td>3 or 8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEBRUARY</strong></td>
<td>5 or 6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8 (e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARCH</strong></td>
<td>6 Wednesday</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APRIL</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TBD - Pinellas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAY</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNE</strong></td>
<td>11 (a) @ 6PM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TBD - Pasco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY</strong></td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12 (d)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUGUST</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPTEMBER</strong></td>
<td>4 Wednesday</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCTOBER</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOVEMBER</strong></td>
<td>5 (a) @ 6PM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD - Pinellas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECEMBER</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Joint Mtg. 16 @ 12 PM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 (d)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acronyms
- **BPAC**: Bicycle - Pedestrian Advisory Committee of the MPO Board
- **CAC**: Citizens Advisory Committee of the MPO Board
- **CCC**: TBARTA MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee
- **ITS**: Intelligent Transportation Systems Committee of the MPO Board
- **MPO**: Metropolitan Planning Organization Board
- **POLICY**: Policy Committee of the MPO Board
- **TAC**: Technical Advisory Committee of the MPO Board
- **TDCB**: Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board
- **LRC**: Livable Roadways Committee of the MPO Board
- **TMA**: Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group
- **STWG**: School Transportation Working Group

### Meeting Locations
- (a) BOCC Chambers, County Center, 601 East Kennedy Blvd., 2nd Floor
- (b) Plan Hillsborough Committee Room, County Center, 601 East Kennedy Blvd., 18th Floor
- (c) 26th Floor, Rooms A&B, County Center Building, 601 E. Kennedy Blvd.
- (d) Call (813) 282-8200 or [www.tbarta.com](http://www.tbarta.com) for meeting location - TBARTA Office, 4350 W. Cypress St. #700, Tampa
- (e) Planning Commission Boardroom, County Center, 601 East Kennedy Blvd., 18th Floor
Agenda Item
SouthShore Transit Study Reevaluation

Presenter
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

Summary
In 2014, the Hillsborough MPO conducted and adopted the SouthShore Transit Study, and recently was asked by HART to revisit the study to update costs and create an implementation plan. Through a series of four meetings, staff worked with the community to update the plan to meet the revised needs of the community.

SouthShore is the fastest growing part of Hillsborough County and includes communities such as Gibsonton, Apollo Beach, Ruskin and others. The area has developed in a very suburban nature, which is typically difficult to serve with traditional fixed-route transit. This area also saw a reduction in service when routes were updated as part of HART’s Mission Max reorganization. Through meetings with the public, feedback made it clear that the community wants to restore the connection to downtown and increase service locally to allow better circulation throughout the area. We have also looked into first-mile last-mile solutions to expand network coverage throughout the area.

The reevaluation has built upon the previous study and proposes a phased implementation plan that will be finalized after the final public meeting scheduled for November 15th from 5:30 to 7:30 PM at the Southshore Regional Service Center, located at 410 30th St. SE in Ruskin.

Recommended Action
None; for information only.

Prepared By
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

Attachments
SouthShore Transit Study Reevaluation Project Page
MPO Board Meeting Summary
Tuesday, October 2, 2018

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

Chairman Les Miller called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance and gave the invocation. The meeting was convened on the 26th floor of the County Center.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 5, 2018

A motion was made by Commissioner Sandra Murman to approve the September minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilman Guido Maniscalco and carried unanimously.

Commissioner Miller read for the record a memo from Councilman Luis Viera stating that he was unable to attend due to a conflict.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Gary Cloyd, transit advocate, spoke regarding the Westshore Action Plan, the three transit initiatives, and thanked elected officials for their advocacy as projects move forward.

Mr. Jim Davison commented on the response that the MPO provided to his presentation last month on the comparison of the All for Transportation Petition Category Funding versus the Hillsborough County MPO 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Category Funding. Mr. Davison provided several handouts regarding funding scenarios and studies.

Ms. Charlotte Greenberg provided comments on the MPO’s 2045 Plan survey and stated that the MPO should distance itself from the rail tax. She expressed concerns if the proposal passes. She stated voters will see a basket full of empty promises that will never take place. Rail will eat up all of the money and there will not be enough money for operating expenses.

Ms. Sharon Calvert, with Fix Our Roads First, commented on the 2040 LRTP, and the 1% Surtax to fund transportation improvements. She stated that the proposal does not include new technology, and it is a requirement by both State and Federal Agencies. She expressed concerns regarding a presentation that MPO Executive Director, Beth Alden, made at the Tampa City Council. She felt that the presented information was misleading, and she stated that the MPO needs to be credible to the public.

Ms. Josephine Amato, with Safe Bus for Us, provided statistics on safe school bus transportation and holding the school district accountable for the hazardous walking conditions children are being subjected to. Instead of supporting the elimination of school buses, the County should help to solve the problem.

COMMITTEE REPORTS, ONLINE COMMENTS

Ms. Gena Torres, MPO staff, presented the committee reports. Committees approved and forwarded to the MPO Board the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment for the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Grant for Streetcar Free Fares. In addition, they approved the TIP Amendment for...
Transit Asset Management, Pavement & Bridge, and System Performance Measures. A couple members would like to see more aspirational, definitive plans on how to reach higher targets when the targets are reassessed in a couple of years.

The Policy Committee recommended that HART address how they are going to promote the Free Fare Program.

The Westshore Transportation Action Plan, on the Consent Agenda, was supported at the August committee meetings.

The committees also received reports on Tampa Bay Next, Tri-County Travel Market Analysis, Vision Zero, and Nebraska Avenue.

The MPO’s Attorney, Mr. Cameron Clark, spoke to the Policy Committee in response to questions about providing donated prizes for survey responses. Mr. Clark noted several examples of other public agencies in Florida who provided donated prizes.

The TBARTA MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee Staff Directors discussed the performance target setting process that is underway for all MPOs. Once the MPOs have met the requirements of coordinated target setting, discussion can take place regarding regionwide targets. The group also made plans for the December 14th meeting of the MPO Chairs and discussed the MPO Advisory Council position opposing transportation earmarks.

There were no Facebook comments. Ms. Torres summarized email comments received from citizens. Copies of emails were provided in full to board members in their meeting folders.

There were no questions following the report.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Committee Appointments
B. Westshore Transportation Action Plan

A motion was made by Commissioner Murman to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Councilman Maniscalco and carried unanimously.

ROLL-CALL VOTE: TIP Amendment for FDOT Grant for Streetcar Free Fares

This item was discussed at the Policy Committee and brought back to the MPO Board for approval. There was no additional discussion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Murman to approve the TIP Amendment for FDOT Grant for Streetcar Free Fares. The motion was seconded by Councilman Cohen and carried with a roll-call vote (Commissioner Kemp, Commissioner Hagan, Councilman Viera, and Mrs. Cindy Stuart were not in attendance during the vote).

ACTION ITEMS

A. TIP Amendment – Transit Asset Management, Pavement & Bridge, and System Performance Measures

Dr. Johnny Wong, MPO staff, provided an overview of the TIP Amendment. MPOs and DOTs are required to establish performance targets for transit asset management, pavement & bridge condition, and system performance. The three rules originate from Federal Law, MAP-21 and the FAST Act. These legislative
acts relate to ensuring government accountability and a push for performance-based planning. The rules prescribe specific performance measures that DOTs and MPOs must track to establish a benchmark baseline to rate performance in three areas and monitor progress as program funding continues for specific projects. The targets are data driven. Once every four years, the targets are updated and reported in the TIP.

Following the presentation, Mayor Mel Jurado inquired about Information Technology (IT) not being covered under transit asset management, and she wanted to know how it would impact future justification for system upgrades. Cyndy Zambella, HART Director of Budget, Grants, and Fixed Assets addressed Mayor Jurado’s concerns and stated that IT was assessed in the measurements. CAD/AVL was excluded from the evaluation because HART knew that it was an imminent need and has an aggressive plan to replace their CAD/AVL system in the upcoming year.

Under pavement and bridges, Mayor Jurado wanted clarification on the logic behind setting a lower goal. If the goal for safe bridges is currently being exceeded, she is uncomfortable with lowering the metric. Dr. Wong stated the reason for supporting the statewide target established by FDOT was because the performance measures are new to the MPOs, and they are not well positioned to see how specific investments by FDOT will improve conditions in such a small geographic area. Mayor Rick Lott agreed with Mayor Jurado that setting goals less than 100% and lower than current conditions does not make sense.

Mayor Jurado inquired about reliability listed under system performance. How can travel time reliability be maintained, progressively pursued, measured and monitored? Dr. Wong stated that the performance targets for the TIP are based on the improvements that can be expected from transportation projects that were programmed in the past. This process is an initial assessment to set benchmarks. Mayor Lott confirmed that the performance measure information is based on funding decisions made five years ago.

Ms. Beth Alden attempted to provide clarification and stated that funding is already committed to many projects in the TIP to improve performance. The projects in the TIP must be able to show progress towards the MPO’s targets. Setting a higher target means that funds should be allocated differently in the TIP. The Federal Government is setting MPOs up to create an ongoing performance-based planning process, and more information will be brought back during development of the long-range transportation plan (LRTP), as required in the new Federal rules. The Hillsborough MPO was one of four MPO pilots working with FDOT to review data sets for performance measures, and the financial scenarios in the current LRTP show that there is not a lot of progress being made on the performance targets at the existing spending levels. There are a lot of deficiencies in the spending categories.

Mayor Jurado inquired about changing funding in the TIP and wanted to know if funding has been taken away from bridges. Ms. Alden asked Secretary Gwynn if the Department would have any concerns if the MPO established a higher target for bridge conditions in Hillsborough County, for bridges that are on the National Highway System (NHS) and are rated on a statewide basis and dependent on FDOT funding? Secretary Gwynn stated that he would have to check with FDOT’s Bridge Maintenance Department since it is handled statewide. Additional coordination will be done with the FDOT District office and the MPO.

Mr. Waggoner wanted to know if staff coordinated the analysis with FDOT prior to the meeting and expressed concerns about lowering performance measures. He also wanted to know if all of the roads being discussed are owned by FDOT? Secretary Gwynn stated that they are not. Mr. Waggoner wanted to know what portion of the NHS Roadway System is owned by FDOT and their ratings? He stated that this information is important to know if it is going to be used to allocate funds. He also wanted to know what funds will be allocated? Additional information would be helpful in order to make decisions on adopting measures.

Councilman Cohen agreed with the questions that were asked and stated that he would need to know
what funding difference will be made to Hillsborough County if the standards are adopted.

Dr. Wong stated there are no penalties for failing to meet the targets that are set. The targets are set based on current conditions in order to set the bar and establish the status so progress can be tracked in the future.

Commissioner Miller suggested deferring the item to the next board meeting based on numerous concerns expressed by members.

Mr. Mechanik would like to understand whether the requirements are Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) or Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA), and if there are consequences for failing to meet a standard. He would like to understand what the legal framework is before the group votes on the item. He also stated that there are red flags in the presentation. If the information is going to be useful it should be plugged into future decision-making and allocation of funding. He stated that the goal on travel time reliability for truck traffic sounds horrific.

Commissioner Miller spoke with Ms. Alden and a decision was made to postpone the action item until the next meeting. He requested an email be sent out to board members requesting their concerns and questions, so they can be answered and brought back to the next meeting for discussion.

Commissioner Kemp expressed concerns about the importance of HART’s transit operations and maintenance center needing a $40 million update.

Mr. Waggoner stated he does not understand the idea of setting a goal based on where you are going and it is below standard. How does setting a goal of failing promote making better decisions in the future?

Mayor Lott wanted to know if thirty days would be enough time for staff to answer member’s questions in preparation for the next meeting. Ms. Alden will coordinate with staff.

Commissioner White would like to see a sampling of potential budget amendments in which funding is decommitted in certain categories to enhance funding to get metrics up to speed.

Commissioner Murman agreed with comments that were made and stated we should never settle for less than 100%. She suggested a message go back to FDOT’s home office stating the standards are unrealistic and recommended a transcript of the conversation be sent to them.

**STATUS REPORTS**

**A. BRT & Economic Development: Orlando’s Experience**

Ms. Laura Minns, WSP, provided an overview of housing and commercial development around Orlando’s bus rapid transit (BRT) system. Their ridership continues to grow as the area develops.

Following the presentation, Commissioner Kemp thanked Ms. Minns for an excellent presentation and thanked Ms. Alden for scheduling the presentation. Commissioner Kemp encouraged members to visit Orlando and utilize street-level BRT.

Mr. Waggoner inquired about capital cost. Ms. Minns stated the initial investment was $20 million for the first 2½ mile line and then there was an approximate $25 million investment on the Grapefruit and Parramore BRT lines. Approximately $40 million over twenty years was spent. The City pays Lynx a little less than $3 million per year in operating costs. Annual ridership is around 700,000 - 800,000 per year.
B. Smart Cities/Integrated Corridor Management

Dr. Wong introduced Mr. Ron Chin, FDOT’s Chief Traffic Engineer, who provided information on Integrated Corridor Management and operational strategies to improve travel time reliability. Mr. Joe Bugel, FDOT’s Arterials Manager, provided information on current operations and technology that are being added. Corridors of focus include I-4 and I-275, and parallel and connecting major roads.

Commissioner Murman hopes that the technology can quickly be implemented.

Commissioner Kemp wanted to know if the integrated technology will make traffic queue-jumping possible for buses? Mr. Bugel stated it will and transit is a major component in achieving the maximum efficiency and capacity of the system.

Commissioner Kemp also wanted to know if the project includes the ability to read when a road is open and traffic light signaling. Mr. Bugel stated it addresses road maintenance and detectors that may not work properly. When the system is implemented, it will be able to address the source of issues. Sensors and detection devices will be added to the infrastructure so they will have the capability of knowing where volume is.

Mr. Klug wanted to know if there was any way that Port Tampa Bay could coordinate with FDOT on the current project for integrated activity for their trucks. Mr. Chin stated that Port Tampa Bay is a partner on the project.

Mr. Wagoner thanked FDOT for contributing to their connected and automated vehicle pilot project.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Ms. Alden thanked Mr. Eric Hill with MetroPlan Orlando for attending the meeting. MetroPlan has reached out to other MPOs to collaborate on a mega-regional program to expand Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) practice, with a focus on supporting the I-4 Corridor effort and linking the three districts along the I-4 Corridor.

The next board meeting will be held Tuesday, October 30th on the 26th floor of the County Center.

The next Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group (TMA) will take place on November 2nd and will be held at the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority. The TMA has decided to have a rotating chairperson beginning at the November meeting. The group will discuss options for creating a voting structure at the tri-county level.

Outreach was wrapped up on the tri-county survey for It’s Time Tampa Bay. A national record was broken for a MetroQuest-platform survey, with more than 9,600 survey responses. Ms. Alden thanked staff in the audience who conducted outreach at 84 different community meetings and events over the last month. There were over 8,700 attendees at the events.

Ms. Alden also thanked the Tampa Bay Times for donating online impressions and matching the MPO’s by donating $2,000 in print ads. In addition, Florida’s Largest Home Show provided complimentary exhibit space during Labor Day weekend. The Beasley Media Group provided two talk show broadcasts, 30-second public service announcements, distributed rack cards at station events, and donated the Lightning tickets that were raffled off. They also featured the department on their website in several social media campaigns. Ms. Alden also thanked the Property Appraiser’s Office for allowing the insert into their mailers at cost.

She thanked MPO Board members and their local staff for their support during the outreach effort.
The responses to the surveys will be summarized, and the information will be provided to the MPO’s advisory committees in November. Ms. Alden will schedule discussions with board members and then the information will be on the agenda for the December Board meeting with recommendations on how to synthesize public preferences into the LRTP update.

Following meeting adjournment, the drawing took place for winners of the donated Lighting tickets.

OLD & NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Kemp invited members to attend a community conversation event that she is hosting on Monday, October 8th from 6:00 to 7:30 p.m. at the Saunders Library, located at 1505 North Nebraska Avenue in Tampa. Dr. Beverly Ward and Professor Taryn Sabia are scheduled to present.

ADJOURNMENT

A quorum was maintained for the duration of the meeting. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:51 a.m.
Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on October 10

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ TIP Amendments for the Bloomingdale Ave/US 301 intersection and for the HART CAD/AVL bus equipment replacement, by a unanimous vote

✓ The Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for the USF Campus for acceptance as a concept, by a vote of 10 to 2. The nay votes were due to concerns about impacting bicycling, cost-effectiveness versus Bull-Runner bus service and how to pay for such an autonomous transit service.

The CAC also received reports on:

- The North Alexander Street Corridor Land Use and Marketing Study
- The Brightline Proposal for Rail to Orlando and Miami
- Long Range Transportation Plan Goals
- After an inquiry from the CAC, the Florida Turnpike Enterprise sent a letter stating that they expect to implement dynamic toll pricing following the completion of improvements at the I-275/SR 60/Veterans interchange, which is anticipated by the summer of 2019.

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

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ TIP Amendments for the Bloomingdale Ave/US 301 intersection and for the HART CAD/AVL bus equipment replacement – The committee wanted to ensure bicycle facilities and signage would be included in the Bloomingdale/US301 project and was concerned if there would be a delay in replacing aging buses.

✓ Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for USF Campus – Interest was sparked as to whether the cost estimate included signal upgrades, and if students living just beyond campus boundaries would be served.

The TAC also received reports on:

- Brightline Proposal for Rail – The committee was interested in the increasing ridership numbers, speeds attained, if the technology was compatible with existing tracks, and the development opportunities.
- MLK Boulevard Operational Improvements (40th Street to I-4) – The committee agreed with the FDOT design ideas to complete sidewalks, add bike lanes, extend turn lanes and reconfigure two intersections. There was interest in having
refuge islands, since medians were not recommended along the two-way left turn section.

- District 7 Freight Plan, Sub Area Study & Local Freight Improvements – Questions arose on how to improve intersection turning radii for trucks without compromising pedestrian safety.
- Long Range Transportation Plan goals update
- SouthShore Transit Study Reevaluation

Meeting of the Policy Committee on October 23
The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- TIP Amendments for the Bloomingdale Ave/US 301 intersection and for the HART CAD/AVL bus equipment replacement
- Renewal of the interlocal agreement with TBARTA for organizational and administrative services for the MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee
- Board positions on federal performance measures, with the request that HART send a letter or representative to the board meeting

The Policy Committee also received reports on:
- Long Range Transportation Plan goals update

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on October 10
The committee approved a motion supporting the reconstruction of the Maydell Ave. Bridge as previously supported by the committee.

The BPAC received reports on:
- Long Range Transportation Plan goals update – Committee members expressed interest in understanding how air quality and pollution are addressed.
- Eco Districts
- Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation
- Vision Zero Quarterly Report and Nebraska Ave

The committee discussed several ways that they might be able to better advocate for the interests of pedestrians and cyclists. Committee members suggested that submitting questions to the MPO Board about priorities might be an effective path.

Public comment on the Green Artery Trail was submitted by Brad Hissing of Riverside Heights who questioned the route through that neighborhood.

Meeting of the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Committee on October 11
The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- TIP Amendments for the Bloomingdale Ave/US 301 intersection and for the HART CAD/AVL bus equipment replacement
- MPO Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for USF Campus

The committee also received reports on:
- Connected Traveler Initiative
Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee (LRC) on October 17
The committee **approved and forwarded to the MPO Board**:

- Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for USF Campus – Interest was sparked as to whether the cost estimate included signal upgrades, and if students living just beyond campus boundaries would be served.

The LRC also received reports on:
- District 7 Freight Plan, Sub Area Study & Local Freight Improvements
- Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation

Meeting of School Transportation Working Group (STWG) on October 24
The working group agreed to recess this month.

Meeting of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board on October 26
A verbal report will be provided at the board meeting.

Meeting of the TBARTA MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee (CCC) Staff Directors on October 19

The **MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee will meet on Friday, December 14**, over lunch, at a facility near the I-75/University Pkwy interchange, arranged and hosted by the Sarasota/Manatee MPO. Box lunches will be available for a small charge, and RSVP information will be provided.

The CCC is scheduled to make minor adjustments to the regional priority lists for Multi-Use Trails, the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP), and major regional projects for discretionary funding.

The staff directors also briefly discussed arrangements for the 2019 Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit, the October 2019 public workshop for the Regional Planning Best Practices Study and confirmed support for renewal of the TBARTA Staff Services Agreement which is on today’s agenda.
October 17, 2018

Ms. Beth Alden, AICP
MPO Executive Director
Plan Hillsborough
601 E Kennedy Blvd, 18th Floor
Tampa FL 33602

Re: West Busch Boulevard Corridor Study (WBCS) (FPN 435908-1-22-01)

Dear Ms. Alden,

I’m in receipt of your letter of September 5, 2018 on the referenced corridor study. Thank you for the feedback as well as the assistance of your staff during this project.

Please allow me to address each of the issues raised in your letter:

Design Alternatives

The WBBCS includes numerous design alternatives. The purpose of the study is to provide a comprehensive set of feasible options. As a planning exercise, the study will include alternatives that are feasible.

Please note that none of the design alternatives are identified as “recommended”, “preferred” or “suggested”. This signifies that no design decisions have been made; and therefore, the cross-sections and their components are open to revision.

Level of Service (LOS)

Current economic and demographic projections indicate increased travel demand in the study area. We anticipate greater peak period congestion as a result. Vehicular LOS is primarily experienced as delay at traffic signals. That is why the study focused on improvements at signalized intersections. Technical advances may yet provide additional LOS progress.

The study does include Multimodal LOS analyses performed according to FDOT Q/LOS guidelines. I refer you to the Corridor Alternatives and Strategies Report, Appendix G.
Speeds and Context Classification

We fully recognize the connection between vehicle speed, fatalities and injury severity. Safety for all roadway users is the top priority for FDOT.

The WBBCS includes design options based upon a 35-mph posted speed limit. Corridor speed reduction is a subject of active internal discussion. Given the corridor's safety history, we are looking at implementation strategies.

The Context Classification designations are based upon FDOT Complete Streets policy criteria. Both the "Suburban Residential" (C3R) and "Urban General" (C4) designations permit a 35-mph speed zone. If the goal is speed reduction, reconsideration of the designations is unnecessary.

Land Use and Stormwater

As you suggested, we will coordinate with city and county staff concerning land use and stormwater issues throughout the project.

Beth, thank you again for your input and assistance. We'll continue working with the MPO to create a safer corridor.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard Moss, P.E.
Director of Development
Florida Department of Transportation
Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons with disabilities who require accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Alex Henry, by phone at (813) 975-6405, or via email at alex.henry@dot.state.fl.us at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting. If you are hearing or speech impaired, please contact us by using the Florida Relay Service, 1-800-955-8771 (TDD) or 1-800-955-8770 (Voice).

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) pursuant to 23 U.S.C. §327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 14, 2016 and executed by the Federal Highway Administration and FDOT.

Comuníquese Con Nosotros: Nos importa mucho la opinión del público sobre el proyecto. Si usted tiene preguntas o comentarios, o si simplemente desea más información, por favor comuníquese con nuestra representante, Sandra González, P.E., 813-975-6996. Departamento de Transportación de Florida, 11201 N. McKinley Dr., Tampa, FL 33612. sandra.gonzalez@dot.state.fl.us.

For more information: TampaBayNext.com | TampaBayNext@dot.state.fl.us | 813-975-NEXT (6398)
Like us on /TampaBayNext | Follow us on @TampaBayNext
Join us as we paint the winning student's mural design on the street in front of the school!

**Sat. December 15th**
**10 AM - NOON**
**723 E. Hamilton Ave.**

Refreshments and snacks will be provided.

For further information please contact torresg@plancom.org