Meeting of the MPO Board

Monday, March 11, 2019, 9:00 a.m.
Hillsborough County Center, 601 E. Kennedy Blvd., 26th Floor

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

I. Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance & Invocation

II. Approval of Minutes – February 5, 2019

III. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, 30 minutes total; as needed, additional time may be provided later in the agenda.

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

V. Consent Agenda
   A. Committee Appointments

VI. Special Presentation: Healthiest Cities & Counties Challenge Grant Award (Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff)

VII. Action Items
   A. TIP Amendment for US 41-CSX Rail Crossing PD&E Study (Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff) – Roll-call vote required

VIII. Status Reports
   A. School Transportation Working Group Recognition, Annual Report & Transition Steps (Lisa Silva, MPO Staff)
   B. Tampa Bay Next Quarterly Update (FDOT Representative)
   C. 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Revenue Estimates (Robert Peskin, AECOM, MPO Consultant)

IX. Executive Director’s Report
   A. Legislative update
   B. Regional coordination update
   C. County charter amendment update
   D. Next Board meeting: Tuesday, April 2, 9am, 26th Floor, and TMA Leadership Group meeting: April 5, 9:30am, PSTA Headquarters – 3201 Sherer Dr.

X. Old & New Business
   A. Process for Executive Director Annual Evaluation (Cameron Clark, MPO Attorney)
   B. Other Old or New Business
XI. Adjournment

XII. Addendum

A. Upcoming Events
   - Public Hearing, I-275 from I-4 to Bearss PD&E Study, March 26, 5:30pm, Seminole Heights United Methodist, 6111 Central Ave
   - National Sustainability Summit, April 16-19, Tampa

B. Correspondence
   - Forward Pinellas Letter to Senator Rouson re: Pinellas Policy Positions
   - To Tampa Heights Junior Civic Association re: 2019 Youth Summer Program
   - From FDOT District 7, Fatal Crash Report, Jan. 14 - 27
   - From FDOT District 7, Fatal Crash Report, Jan. 28 - Feb. 10

C. Miscellaneous
   - Florida MPO Advisory Council legislative update for week ending 2/22/2019
   - Renewing the National Commitment to the Interstate Highway System: Highlights

D. Articles Relating to MPO Work
   - Legal drama still clouds future of Hillsborough’s transportation tax
   - Report: Tampa drivers lost 87 hours - plus $1,200 each - because of traffic last year
   - State transportation officials set sights on new West Shore interchange
   - Despite lawsuit, Commission moves forward with transportation tax
   - Most roads in Hillsborough County deemed dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists, study finds
   - Hillsborough transit agency taps Sean Shaw and an HCC Dean for oversight committee

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 electrónico. 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.
MPO Board Meeting of Tuesday, February 5, 2019

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

The MPO Chairman, Commissioner Les Miller, called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m., led the pledge of allegiance and gave the invocation. The regular monthly meeting was held at the County Center in the 26th Floor Conference Room.

The following members were present:

Trent Green, Mayor Mel Jurado, Commissioner Pat Kemp, Charles Klug for Paul Anderson, Joe Lopano, Mayor Rick Lott, Councilman Guido Maniscalco, David Mechanik, Commissioner Les Miller, Commissioner Kimberly Overman, Commissioner Mariella Smith, Cindy Stuart, Councilman Luis Viera, and Joe Waggoner.

The following members were absent:

Councilman Harry Cohen and Commissioner Ken Hagan.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 8, 2019

A motion was made by Mr. Joe Lopano to approve the minutes of January 8, 2019. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kemp and carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

COMMITTEE REPORTS, ONLINE COMMENTS

Ms. Gena Torres, Executive Planner, provided a summary of committee reports, email and Facebook comments received from citizens.

The committees discussed the following action items:

1. *The 2019 Performance Safety Targets* were approved by committees. Questions were raised about speed reduction strategies, the funding needed to meet the goals, and how targets fit into the statewide target of zero deaths.

2. *The Southshore Transit Re-Evaluation,* given the passage of the transportation referendum, members were interested in knowing when the study’s recommendations would be implemented by HART.

3. Policy Committee acted on *legislative positions for 2019* and discussed the implications of several bills. The committee directed staff to prepare a letter to the Hillsborough County Legislative Delegation Chair, Senator Rouson that was included in the agenda packet for Board discussion.
The committees approved and forwarded for MPO Board approval the following:

1. Multimodal Level-of-Service Evaluation;
2. Letter requested by BPAC to be sent to local governments offering to review proposals for trail realignments.

The Policy Committee directed staff on next steps in regional planning and coordination. Concerns were expressed about duplication of efforts and unnecessary bureaucracy. Staff suggested streamlining the regional process with a consolidation of the TMA Leadership Group and the MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee.

The BPAC held elections for 2019 and elected Jonathan Forbes as Chair, Tony Monk as Vice Chair, and Jim Shirk as Officer at Large. The Intelligent Transportation Systems Committee held elections, as well, and re-elected Vik Bhide as Chair, Brian Gentry as Vice Chair, and Vinny Corrazza as Office at Large.

The committees received reports on the Heights Mobility Study, what the referendum outcome could mean for the MPO, expressway conversion projects in Rochester and in Dallas, 2045 LRTP Revenue Projections, and media framing of fatal bicycle crashes.

The following email remarks were provided to board members with their meeting material:

- City of Tampa employee wrote in appreciation of the MPO’s community gardens initiative.
- Dale Tindall emailed supporting the extension of the Suncoast Parkway to Jacksonville
- Nicole Perry was disappointed in learning that the historic home she was negotiating to purchase and preserve from FDOT in Tampa Heights would be impacted by 2 of the 4 interchange options.
- Walter Slupecki was concerned with the governor’s plan for expansive toll roads being costly and wasteful and asked that the Tampa Bay Next project be removed from the TIP.
- Concerned about economic impact, Natasha Goodley with the East Tampa Community Revitalization Partnership wrote Sec. Gwynn in opposition to the closure of the Floribraska exit.
- Wanda Vinson emailed about safety concerns around MacFarland Park Elementary.
- Angela Beers and Kaitlyn Ranze both emailed about the traffic congestion on US41 from Symmes to East Bay and supports funding recommendations out of the Southshore Transit Reevaluation.
- Chris Vela emailed about the timing of FDOTs deliverables.
- Tony Monk, BPAC Chair, was concerned with terminology of the safety targets and suggested rephrasing the “target” to “expected outcomes” since a target denotes a desired number.
- Sharon Calvert asked for the meeting invitation, attendees, notes, minutes for the All 4 Transportation Brainstorming Session held December 18, 2018.
- David DiMarco, officer with TPD, thanked Wade Reynolds and BPAC members for their enthusiastic participation in the Gasparilla Children’s Bike Rodeo.

The following people made remarks on Facebook:

- In viewing the display boards of the downtown interchange alternatives, Rick Fernandez posted that TBX is not gone.
- Chris Vela commented regarding the letter to the legislature that any inclusion of support for tolled lanes should be removed.

There were no questions following the committee reports and online comments.
CONSENT AGENDA

A. Committee Appointments
B. Multimodal Level-of-Service Evaluation
C. MPO Bylaws Amendment
D. Letter Requested by BPAC on Review of Trail Realignments

A motion was made by Commissioner Kemp to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Smith and carried unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS

A. 2019 Safety Performance Targets

Johnny Wong, MPO Staff, presented the performance targets. Under the MAP-21 legislation, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requires state DOTs and MPOs to adopt performance targets for five safety measures. Federal reporting requires that the measures and targets are calculated using a prescribed five-year rolling average ending prior to the year that the targets are set. August of 2017, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) set a statewide target of zero traffic deaths. Whereas achieving zero traffic deaths is the long-term aspirational goal of the Hillsborough MPO, the FHWA has encouraged MPOs to select realistic targets based on data analysis. Using a methodology developed for the Imagine 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan to predict performance based on different investment levels for safety projects, targets have been calculated for calendar year 2019.

By February 27, the MPO must establish safety targets for calendar year 2019. The deadline of February 27, 2019 is significant because any changes, amendments, or updates to the Transportation Improvement Program or Long Range Transportation Plan will require staff to include the stated performance measures and targets. It is anticipated that by the end of 2020, FDOT will review the targets and determine whether or not progress has been made, and FHA will do the same with FDOT’s statewide targets.

If the surtax revenue is added to the existing safety funding, that would be enough to fund roughly seven safety projects, similar to the recent Fletcher Ave project, annually.

A long-range target was not required by FHWA. Achieving a 51% crash reduction over time represents the upper limit of the forecast range, and hence, is the MPO’s aggressive estimate. To meet that goal by 2040, crashes would have to be reduced by 3.4% each year.

Based on the adopted goal of reducing crashes 51% by 2040, recommended 2019 Safety Targets call for an average annual reduction of at least 3.4%:

- For fatalities in 2019, not to exceed 163
- For the five-year fatality average, not to exceed 188
- For the five-year serious injuries average, not to exceed 1,354
- For the five-year nonmotorized fatalities and serious injuries, not to exceed 229
- For the five-year fatalities per 100M vehicle miles traveled, not to exceed 1.33
- For the five-year serious injuries per 100M vehicle miles traveled, not to exceed 9.55

(Cindy Stuart arrived at 9:20 a.m.)
(Councilman Guido Maniscalco arrived at 9:26 a.m.)

Following the presentation, Commissioner Miller wanted to know if research was done on where most of the fatalities took place and commented on 2016 being the record year for fatalities and also the year that work was completed on Fletcher Avenue. Dr. Wong did not have the information available and stated that Gena Torres is working on an upcoming study looking at safety issues county-wide comprehensively, and
the geographic location of some of the crashes should be included. Safety issues for the State of the System Report will be presented at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Lopano inquired about the Level 2.5 funding scenario referenced in the presentation and wanted to know if the Board approves the recommended action, how much money will be allocated from the one cent sales tax to achieve the goals? Dr. Wong was unable to provide a figure and stated the portion of the sales tax money that goes towards safety is part of the 54% set aside for road improvements. 27% of that 54% is allocated specifically for safety projects. There may also be some safety benefits from projects that fall into the sidewalk and bike facility improvements category.

Mr. Lopano wanted to know if the Independent Oversight Committee (IOC) will approve projects that are within the specified scope. Commissioner Miller stated that appointees from Hillsborough County, City of Tampa, City of Temple Terrace, Plant City, and HART will make up the committee. Mr. Lopano inquired about the process of the IOC approving projects. Commissioner Miller stated that the boards and the city councils will make recommendations to the IOC, and the IOC will make decisions based on the guidelines of the law.

Commissioner Overman wanted to know if there were determining factors that caused the spike in fatalities between 2014 and 2016. Dr. Wong stated that combined factors are probably responsible for the rise. He also stated that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration produced a report stating that incidents of distracted driving increased significantly during that period. Commissioner Overman wanted to know if land use code is being taken into consideration for safety recommendations. Beth Alden responded and stated the types of crashes are different on different corridors, and the issue of limited access in and out of developments puts a lot of pressure on specific intersections. MPO staff will work with local governments on how to make the high crash intersections safer.

Mr. David Mechanik followed up on Mr. Lopano’s comments and stated that the referendum already has a category that the local governments are obligated to spend and call safety improvements. He wanted to know if it was being suggested to spend more than the allocation to achieve the goals. Dr. Wong stated that the allocation of the general revenue portion of the surtax comes almost directly out of the funding categories that were identified in the 2040 LRTP. So, the funding allocation that was used to project the crash figures, that exact same amount of money that was identified was what is made available through the language of the surtax amendment. Mr. Mechanik also wanted to know does the MPO Board action have any effect on the choice of projects that the local government might choose. He does not want the MPO Board to impede a discretionary process that will continue as a result of the referendum. Dr. Wong stated that the jurisdictions will assemble their own work programs outlining how they intend to spend the surtax revenue that will be allocated to them. As long as it meets the criteria spelled out in the Surtax Amendment, the Independent Oversight Committee is free to select safety projects.

Mr. Waggoner wanted to know what dollar amount was used to come up with the 51% safety increase forecast. The safety category is 27% of 54% of the surtax proceeds, and Ms. Alden stated that was approximately $45 million a year. The estimates are a few years old and the LRTP will be updated this year.

Commissioner Kemp stated that the MPO does not dictate to jurisdictions what they should do, but can provide recommendations.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Kemp to approve the 2019 Safety Performance Targets. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Overman.**

Commissioner Kemp wanted to know if there were penalties for not meeting the standards and wanted to know how school safety plays into identifying the areas for improvements. Mrs. Stuart stated that the school district does not transport students within two miles of their school. The State was asked again this
year through the Legislature to look at the hazardous walking condition legislation. Funding is always the biggest challenge in the school district.

Commissioner Smith inquired about the 3.4% annual fatality reduction. Dr. Wong stated that we are overachieving in reducing crashes, but some years we may not do as well. A lot depends on external factors that are difficult to estimate. Commissioner Smith also wanted to know how much it would take to get to the goal of Vision Zero in 20 years. Dr. Wong was unable to provide cost estimates for the inquiry, but stated as we get closer to achieving a target of zero, the cost of making a marginal improvement will probably go up considerably. He also stated that this would require an analysis by a Safety Economist.

Mr. Mechanik requested clarification of the consequences of failure to meet the goals, since it was stated that there were none. Ms. Alden stated if the State is making progress towards the targets that are set, then there are no penalties. The penalty that Federal Highway could apply if it found a state was not making progress, would be less flexibility in the use of federal funds.

Commissioner Overman stated that the Hillsborough BOCC adopted Health in All Policies, which also supports Vision Zero; therefore, it would be a violation by not following those types of protocols. The school system’s circumstance that has caused children to be at risk should be a priority. She wanted to know when the safety goals are set, will there be room among the stakeholders to adjust addressing the risk that school children are in. Dr. Wong stated that baseline spending was calculated by identifying safety projects that are in the current five-year capital improvements program, and it is up to the local jurisdictions to either increase or decrease the funding. Commissioner Overman suggested that state or local jurisdictions address stronger legislation on distracted driving penalties in which pedestrian and cyclists’ injuries cause death or permanent life-changing injuries.

Councilman Maniscalco stated that he was glad that the conversation has changed from being car-centric to people-centric because seventy-nine deaths per year is an epidemic, and we need to embrace Vision Zero. It is the duty of elected officials to do whatever they can at the local and state level to make people a priority.

Following the discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

B. Southshore Transit Re-Evaluation

Ms. Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, presented information on the Southshore Transit Re-evaluation. In 2014, the Hillsborough MPO conducted and adopted the SouthShore Transit Study that looked at improving transit in the SouthShore region. The MPO was recently asked by HART to revisit the study and assure the recommendations from that study still meet the needs of the community and create a new implementation phase with updated costs.

Following the presentation, Commissioner Smith inquired about the timing of the various phases and the Bloomingdale area. Ms. McKinley could not provide details on a timeline due to the referendum; however, staff is working closely with HART to see if some of the services can be restored sooner than later. The Bloomingdale area will be reevaluated as a Brandon Phase Two in the upcoming year.

A motion was made by Commissioner Kemp to approve the SouthShore Transit Study Re-evaluation. The motion was seconded by Mayor Rick Lott.

Commissioner Overman was excited to see that bus service levels are being examined and restored in Southshore. She wanted to know if an analysis was done on the major source of the employees that are getting to MacDill Airforce Base, as part of this service design. Ms. McKinley stated that there is a route deviation recommendation in the study.
Following discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

C. MPO Policy Positions for 2019

Beth Alden provided an overview of legislative updates from the Florida MPO Advisory Council. The Policy Committee reviewed some of the topics for the session and asked staff to draft a letter to Senator Rouson, the Hillsborough County Chairman of the Legislative Delegation, supporting the following positions for the 2019 legislative session: restating the position that the board took two months ago requesting full funding for the I-275/SR 60 interchange project; bullets addressing safety and school hazardous walking conditions; and opposition of the legislation that restricts citizen participation in key decision by eliminating seats on the MPO Board or restricting the use of voter-approved Charter County Transportation Surtax proceeds to a narrow set of eligible expenditures. Staff will communicate the positions to all of the Legislative Delegation and potentially to representatives from other areas as well.

The concerns about the bill that was filed by Representative Avila from Miami-Dade were because it changes the list of expenditures from the charter county and regional surtax that was approved by our voters last November. It would delete the list of eligible expenditures and replace it with a shorter list which includes only capital, like construction and vehicle acquisition for bus and rail projects. It would not include operations; therefore, fuel could not be bought to expand bus services and drivers could not be paid.

Chairman Miller wanted to know if anyone talked to Representative Avila about the bill. Ms. Alden stated that staff had not talked to him but have been in conversation with the Hillsborough Legislative Delegation members. Chairman Miller suggested that the three impacted MPOs (Hillsborough, Miami-Dade, and Duval) and their Chairs schedule a face to face discussion with the Representative.

There was brief discussion on the surcharge restriction element and retroactivity.

A motion was made by Commissioner Kemp to transmit the letter to Senator Rouson. The motion was seconded by David Mechanik.

Mr. Mechanik recommended including someone from HART, or the HART Lobbyist in the team that will be travelling to Tallahassee. Chairman Miller suggested that Ms. Alden meet with Mr. Jim Taylor, Hillsborough County’s Lobbyist.

Commissioner Overman suggested scheduling an appointment during the Hillsborough Day on March 13th in Tallahassee. Commissioners Miller and Kemp will be in Tallahassee that day as well. Mayor Rick Lott stated that Plant City has a Lobbyist that would be willing to join the group as well. Mayor Mel Jurado added the Temple Terrace Lobbyist, and Mrs. Cindy Stuart added the School Board Lobbyist.

Commissioner Smith asked for clarification on the SEIS Study, timing and funding for the Westshore Interchange. Ms. Alden stated that there are a lot of questions about the design of the project and the questions are being investigated. There will be a public process for the design and engineering phase of the project. It is being procured as a design build project, so the design and construction will be under one master contract.

Secretary David Gwynn responded to Commissioner Smith’s question regarding funding for the design phase for the Westshore Interchange. Funding was available at one time; however, it was taken away when the reset was done. The SEIS would have to be approved prior to being able to move into the next phase, and there is still some right of way to acquire.

Following discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

STATUS REPORTS
A. FDOT District 7 Freight Plan, Sub-Area Study & Local Freight Improvements

Brian Hunter, with FDOT District 7, provided an update on local freight improvements in District 7. Information on current freight industry practices and new local plans for Hillsborough County can be found at www.tampabayfreight.com and www.freightmovesflorida.com

Following the presentation, Commissioner Overman wanted to know the percentage of freight that moves via truck versus rail. Mr. Hunter stated 100% since everything at one point or another is on a truck. Mr. Charles Klug agreed and stated that Port Tampa Bay is trying to put more cargo on rail and work with CSX. Mr. Lopano agreed with 100% from TIA’s point of view.

B. Heights Mobility Study

Mr. Stephen Benson, FDOT Representative, provided an update on the study. The purpose of the study was to identify improvements throughout the Florida Avenue and Tampa Street/Highland Avenue corridor that provide safe and efficient mobility. The study began October 2017 with a lot of community outreach and community vision. Implementation of short-term and mid-term improvements will take place through 2024.

(Mr. Mechanik left at 10:25 a.m.)
(Mr. Waggoner left at 10:42 a.m.)
(Mr. Lopano left at 10:44 a.m.)

Following the presentation, Commissioner Overman encouraged FDOT to accelerate a crosswalk and light beacons between Florida and Wilder, as well as a crosswalk and lighting at Idlewild near the Milhouse Project and near Knollwood.

Commissioner Kemp would like to see something done with the poles in the middle of the sidewalks and suggested using mobility fees for underground electrical.

Councilman Maniscalco echoed comments from Commissioners Kemp and Overman and thanked FDOT for being responsive.

Commissioner Overman would also like to see lower speed limits or speed limit indicator signs along Florida Avenue.

Chairman Miller thanked Mr. Benson for his report since the study is in a District that he represents.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Ms. Alden informed the group of a discussion about the MPO Merger Study that took place at the Policy Committee meeting. The committee discussed looking at how to streamline planning and unify the regional coordination process. The topic will be brought to the TMA Leadership Group at the Friday, February 8th meeting and then will go back to all of the MPOs for consideration.

The workshop held on January 31st regarding community impacts of FDOT’s Plans for I-275 & I-4 Interchanges was a success. It was the first of three about Tampa Bay Next and what happens specifically with the Downtown Interchange. Following completion of all three workshops, the Board will potentially send a letter of comment to FDOT. Comments from the public about what should be included in the letter will be obtained at the public hearing this summer.

Last month, Ms. Alden had an opportunity to speak at the National Conference of the Transportation Research Board on the Health in All Policies approach, and thanked the board for their leadership on health.
The next MPO Board meeting will be held on Monday, March 11.

Commissioner Smith commented on a no-build option and would like to see an opportunity for the public and stakeholders to provide comments and have a conversation at the next public meeting on FDOT’s plans for the Downtown Interchange. Ms. Alden stated that the letter of comment that she referenced from the Board will be part of the June public hearing agenda, and the public will have an opportunity to address the Board regarding options for the Downtown Interchange.

OLD & NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Overman recommended that the various stakeholders for the Sales Tax Referendum get together and compare projects with professionals to put together and provide to the MPO their decisions that they are taking to their boards for approval in order to produce a list for the IOC to review with the possible funding in September.

A motion was made by Commissioner Overman to schedule a presentation at a future MPO Meeting by staff of the five agencies receiving the surtax funding for the purpose of addressing what will be approved with the interlocal agreement and any projects that they would feel comfortable bringing forward. The motion was seconded by Councilman Maniscalco.

(Mayor Jurado left at 10:58 a.m.)

Mayor Lott stated that Plant City already has their list ready and the County has seen it.

Commissioner Kemp felt that the motion would create more redundant bureaucracy.

Following discussion, Commissioner Overman withdrew her motion.

ADJOURNMENT

A quorum was maintained for the duration of the meeting. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:04 a.m.
Committee Reports

Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on February 13

The CAC met on February 13th and recommended for MPO approval:

✓ An amendment to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to fund a Project Development & Environmental (PD&E) study for the US 41/CSX grade separation project proposed by FDOT.

The CAC was also briefed on:

o The Tampa Bay Next Section 7 PD&E study recommendation to add two general purpose lanes to I-275 north of downtown Tampa to Bearss Ave. Members asked how this project would affect the Boulevard conversion proposal for I-275, the southbound to eastbound fly-over, how to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety around the interchanges, and the express bus lanes proposed by TBARTA.

o The Shared Mobility Design and Policy Studio project being conducted by the FSU Dept. of Urban and Regional Planning and the Planning Commission. Members were impressed by the level of knowledge presented by the urban planning graduate students and had lots of questions about what shared ride mobility like Uber and Lyft will mean for traditional transit, how users can navigate through the system, drop off and pick up zones around venues such as Amalie Arena, and how citizens can get involved.

Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee on February 25

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ An amendment to the TIP to fund a Project Development & Environmental (PD&E) study for the US 41/CSX grade separation. Members acknowledged this as one of the highest priority congested intersections and are interested in hearing more about the design alternatives as the project moves forward.

The TAC also heard reports on:

o 2045 LRTP update and ways for the TAC to weigh-in. The members were interested in moving the date of their May or June regularly-scheduled meetings to coincide with a joint workshop with the Planning Commission to further explore ways to coordinate and influence the 2045 LRTP update.
Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on February 13

The committee **approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:**

- An amendment to the TIP to fund a Project Development & Environmental (PD&E) study for the US 41/CSX grade separation.

The BPAC also heard reports on:

- The Application of Demographic Analysis to Pedestrian Safety by Dr. Pei-Sung Lin of CUTR. The presentation focused on the demographics of pedestrian victims of traffic crashes, and how those are correlated to race, age, and income as well as proximity to destinations such as bars, schools or stores.

- The City of Tampa’s Harbour Island Complete Streets project, which will reduce speed limits and add safety features for pedestrians and cyclists.

- A Shared Mobility Project underway by FSU Master’s of Urban and Regional Planning students focusing on transit, ridesharing, and other types of shared mobility.

The BPAC also discussed the 2019 Dangerous by Design report, which placed the Tampa Bay area at number 9 nationally for pedestrian and cycling danger. The committee also heard public comment in favor of a road diet on Bay to Bay Blvd. in Tampa.

Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee (LRC) on February 20

The committee **approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:**

- Whit Remer as alternate Advocate for Livable Communities;
- TIP Amendment to fund a PD&E study for the US41 CSX Grade Separation.

The LRC also heard reports on:

- The City of Tampa’s Harbour Island Complete Streets.

Meeting of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board (TDCB) on February 22

The committee **approved:**

- The abbreviated results of the annual evaluation of the Community Transportation Coordinator. Clients reported 99 percent satisfaction for the Sunshine Lines’ service.

- The Legislative Message for the 2019 Transportation Disadvantaged Legislature Day scheduled for March 20th in Tallahassee.
The TDCB also heard reports on:

- The Advantage Ride pilot project sponsored by the Florida Legislature and Commission for Transportation Disadvantaged. The pilot provides free trips for persons with disabilities in Hillsborough, Pinellas, and Manatee. There are no limitations on the trip type or destination.

- The Tampa Bay Next Workforce Development program piloted by the Florida Department of Transportation. The purpose of the program is to:
  1. To build productive, sustainable relationships with regional and local stakeholders and community members;
  2. To provide direct economic benefits to communities where FDOT is constructing infrastructure projects, specifically targeting low-income, and high-unemployment areas; and
  3. To help address the construction labor shortage by recruiting and building a pipeline of workers for infrastructure projects in the Tampa Bay region and increasing the likelihood of FDOT projects staying on time and within budget.
The vast majority of the meeting discussion was devoted to approaches to regional coordination and the future structure of the TMA Leadership Group

- Hillsborough MPO Executive Director Beth Alden presented a number of options for how regional coordination could proceed in future
  - The staff recommendation was to continue the current TMA meeting schedule this year, and in 2020 use the TBARTA MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee (CCC) as a base group for regional coordination and restart quarterly CCC meetings
    - The CCC has a voting structure and existing processes for dispute resolution, joint approval of plans, sharing of financial resources among MPOs to create regional documents, and public participation, as well as an existing interlocal agreement
    - In addition, it includes Hernando/Citrus MPO, Polk County TPO, and Sarasota/Manatee MPO as members
  - Staff recommended that after the Tri-County LRTP approval in late 2019, the TMA could move to annual meetings, with supplemental joint board meetings among at least two MPO boards as needed
    - In 2020, the regional plan could also be expanded to the larger CCC area
- The consensus among the group was that members found value in continued regular meetings as a core three-county region, with the TMA potentially structured as a named subcommittee of the CCC to eliminate redundancies and unnecessary bureaucracy
  - Using the CCC structure could streamline the number of interlocal agreements needed, manage the overall number of regional groups, and allow the TMA to use existing CCC processes
    - It would eliminate the need for new interlocal agreements
    - A formal interlocal agreement for regional planning coordination is federally required not only among the TMA MPOs but also between the Pasco and Hernando/Citrus MPOs and between Hillsborough MPO and both Polk TPO and (soon) Sarasota/Manatee MPO
    - The existing CCC Interlocal Agreement satisfies the federal requirements
    - To streamline the number of regional meetings, the TMA could in 2020 meet on the same days as the CCC, immediately before or after the CCC, adding focus to the core area of this mini-super-region
There was discussion of the CCC’s relationship with TBARTA, which has evolved over time
- The CCC predates TBARTA, but CCC members agreed to merge with TBARTA when the two groups’ missions and geographic areas were nearly identical
- In 2017, the legislature revised TBARTA’s mission and area to be narrower than the CCC’s
- There were differing opinions about whether TBARTA or the MPOs – through the CCC – should lead regional multimodal planning

There was significant discussion of the need to speak with one voice as a tri-county region to successfully pursue funding for the federally recognized urbanized area of Hillsborough/Pasco/Pinellas
- There was also some discussion of how to balance local needs vs. regional needs, and of whether regional coordination was necessary to advance the needs of local communities
- The Central Avenue BRT was cited as a local project that is on a path to success in its quest for federal funding because it was supported by the region as a whole

There was also recurring discussion of the merits of the Regional Transit Feasibility catalyst project, which has not thus far received consensus of support among the group, but that was ultimately tabled to a future meeting after concerns were raised about Tampa core neighborhoods
- The project will be studied further by TBARTA in an upcoming PD&E study, and can be considered by the TMA as a potential priority when it has been better defined

Hillsborough MPO Executive Planner Allison Yeh presented on the Regional Vulnerability Assessment
- The pilot program is a joint project between Hillsborough MPO, Forward Pinellas, Pasco County MPO, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council and FDOT District 7.
  - It is funded by a Federal Highway Administration Resilience and Durability to Extreme Weather Grant, one of 11 awarded throughout the country
- The program addresses FAST Act requirements for long-range planning, including improving the resilience and reliability of the transportation system
  - The program’s findings will be incorporated into the 2045 LRTP, with a final report being issued later this year
  - 29% of the region’s lane miles are affected by a Category 3 storm and sea level rise
- Each county picked two representative corridors to analyze for vulnerability because a region-wide analysis is daunting
  - Hillsborough: Big Bend Rd from US-41 to I-76; Gandy Blvd from 4th St to Dale Mabry Hwy
  - Pasco: US 19 from SR 54 to SR 52; SR 54 from US 19 to Suncoast Pkwy
  - Pinellas: Gulf Blvd. from Bath Club Cir. to 125 Ave. & Tom Stuart Cswy Bridge; Roosevelt Blvd/SR 686 from Ulmerton Rd/SR 688 to Gandy Blvd.
  - 11 factors went into the selection of those critical projects, including evacuation route, projected traffic volume, proximity to activity centers, projected population density, and more
- The project is currently in the adaptation strategies phase, which examines how the region can adapt its physical assets, natural landscapes, and water management to mitigate sea level rise and land loss
  - Next steps include econometric modeling, another round of stakeholder engagement, and incorporating the findings into the LRTP
- Members thanked Yeh for her presentation and emphasized the importance of the project
The group heard staff recommendations for the annual priority project list

● Previous priorities have been inconsistently defined in the past, and often were not specific projects that could be advanced
● Staff recommended five top regional priorities to advance immediately:
  ○ SR60/I-275 interchange in Hillsborough County
  ○ I-75 at Overpass Road in Pasco County
  ○ I-75 at Gibsonton in Hillsborough County
  ○ I-275 operational improvements from north of downtown Tampa to the I-275/I-75 apex
  ○ Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit in Pinellas County
● The priority list will be brought back to the group in April for final approval

The group received a brief update on the Regional Long Range Transportation Plan development

● Next steps for the plan development include regional modeling for travel demand and project selection, cost/revenue estimates, cost feasibility for projects, and local outreach by each MPO this summer

For future agenda items, group members requested a presentation on the mechanics of how transportation/transit funding occurs at the state level, and that the group revisit a voting structure as members had not come to a...
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Committee Appointments

Presenter
None – Consent Agenda

Summary
The Livable Roadways Committee (LRC) shall be responsible for integrating Livable Roadways principles into the design and use of public rights-of-way and the major road network throughout Hillsborough County. The LRC seeks to accomplish this responsibility by: making recommendations to create a transportation system that balances design and aesthetics with issues of roadway safety and function; ensuring that public policy and decisions result in a transportation system that supports all modes of transportation, with a special emphasis on pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and transit infrastructure and service. The following individuals have been nominated by their organizations:

- Whit Remer, Advocate for Livable Communities, alternate

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

- Evangeline Linkous

The following individual has been nominated by Plant City:

- Steven Hollenkamp

The following individual has been nominated by Commissioner Smith:

- Vivienne Handy

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) shall be responsible for considering safe access to schools in the review of transportation project priorities, long-range transportation plans and transportation improvement programs and shall advise the MPO on such matters. In
addition, the TAC shall be responsible for assisting in the development of transportation planning work programs; coordinating transportation planning and programming; review of all transportation studies, reports, plans and/or programs, and making recommendations to the MPO that are pertinent to the subject documents based upon the technical sufficiency, accuracy, and completeness of and the needs as determined by the studies, plans and/or programs. The following individuals have been nominated to represent the Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority:

- Anna Quinones (alternate)

The Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) shall be responsible for making recommendations to the MPO, Hillsborough County, City of Tampa, City of Plant City, City of Temple Terrace, the Hillsborough County Environmental Protection Commission, the Florida Department of Transportation, the Southwest Florida Water Management District, and others, on matters concerning the planning, implementation and maintenance of a comprehensive bikeway and pedestrian system. In addition, the BPAC shall be responsible for studying and making recommendations concerning the safety, security, and regulations pertaining to bicyclists and pedestrians. The following individual has been nominated by the BPAC to fill one of several Citizen-at-Large seats. The following individual has been nominated to represent Hillsborough County Public Works Department:

- Marcello Tavernari

**Recommended Action**

That the MPO confirm the above appointments

**Prepared By**

Wanda West

**Attachments**

None
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Special Presentation: Healthiest Cities and Counties Challenge Grant Award

Presenter
Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff

Summary
On February 12, 2019, Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Garden Steps project was selected as first runner-up in the Healthiest Cities & Counties Challenge (the Challenge). As a runner up, the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization received $50,000 to continue their work to improve health equity in the city of Tampa.

The Challenge was launched in partnership with the American Public Health Association (APHA) and the National Association of Counties (NACo), empowering 50 small-to-mid-sized cities and counties nationwide to make measurable, scalable improvements to public health issues in their local communities. Since its inception, the Challenge awarded a total of $1.5 million in grants and prizes to the 50 participating programs to support their efforts to tackle the most pressing health issues facing their communities.

Our Garden Steps Initiative seeks to create community gardens with easy pedestrian and bicycle access in identified food deserts in the city of Tampa. The goal is to improve health equity and population health by increasing easy access to fresh fruits and vegetables.

Over the course of the Challenge, Garden Steps accomplished the following toward this goal:

- To encourage the sustainability and formation of Community Garden, the Garden Steps team sponsored the first annual Grow Community Gardens – Tampa Bay Conference with 120 attendees participating.
- Garden Steps installed two pop-up gardens with the strong capacity of community volunteers.
- Working with the City of Tampa Transportation Department, a pedestrian wayfinding pilot project to a community garden was completed and installed.
- Addressing population health, Garden Steps has hosted two vegetable cooking & tasting sessions for seniors who are learning to manage diabetes. A new partnership with Senior Connections offered an opportunity to assist in the support of better outcomes in the health and wellness of older adults.
- Garden Steps has collected data on food deserts, chronic health conditions, transportation facilities and related indicators; creating the Hillsborough County Health Atlas, a public tool which currently features over 65 health indicators.
The Garden Steps Health Initiative proposed a model approach to improving health equity through presentations at events such as the Community Indicators Consortium 2017 Impact Summit, the 2018 National Conference on Equitable Development and the 2018 Florida Public Transit Association/Commission for Transportation Disadvantaged Annual Training Workshop.

A Health in All Policies resolution demonstrating the relationship between the MPO’s regional, short and long-term transportation plans with the Department of Health’s priorities in addressing health equity has been created.

Partnering with our transit partner, HART, Garden Steps created an education poster on the value of community gardening that is on display at all transfer stations and at stops along HART’s bus transitway.

Garden Steps has established a web page sharing information on how to begin a garden at: http://www.planhillsborough.org/gardens/.

Garden Steps attended 15 neighborhood and community group meetings to consult and collaborate, and used annual community events such as the Neighborhoods Conference and Clean Air Fair, to encourage and educate on the benefits of community gardens.

The first cohort of Challenge participants were chosen out of hundreds of city governments, local municipalities, health departments, educational institutions and other entities that applied to enter the competition. Improvements were measured around at least one of five domains: healthy behaviors, community safety, built environment, social/economic factors and environmental exposures. The Challenge winners and runners up were selected with assistance from an Advisory Council of public health leaders including elected officials, professors and physicians. RAND Corporation was tapped to evaluate the improvements in social determinants of health achieved and identify the most promising practices with potential for replication.

“We recognize that to solve our most pressing public health issues, we have to start at the local level – acknowledging the solutions to our problems are as diverse as the communities facing them,” said Dr. Garth Graham, president of the Aetna Foundation, an independent philanthropic arm of CVS Health, which is working to deliver on the company’s purpose of helping people on their path to better health.

The awarding of the Challenge prizes, funded by the Aetna Foundation, is part of a $100 million commitment by CVS Health and its affiliates, making community health and wellness central to the company’s charge for a better world. For more information on this announcement, visit www.healthiestcities.org and join the conversation at #HealthiestCitiesChallenge.

Recommended Action
None

Prepared By
Michele Ogilvie, MPO staff

Attachments
None
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
TIP Amendment – US 41/CSX Grade Separation Project Development & Environment Study (440746-1)

Presenter
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

Summary
The following item is an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The amendment would add $1.45 million in funds for Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study for the grade separation project at US 41 and the CSX tracks near Causeway Blvd. This project has had Preliminary Engineering (design) funding, and is currently in PD&E. Right-of-way is funded in FY 2020-2022, with construction expected in 2026.

This project is listed in the current Imagine 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) as a major capacity project for economic growth and is a priority of the MPO. According to the Freight Investment Program Technical Memorandum for the LRTP, this crossing has 31 trains per day, with an average delay of 8–10 minutes per crossing. This project is considered a major investment to relieve congestion for highway and freight traffic, is located within the fastest growing portion of Hillsborough County, and is of regional significance.

Recommended Action
Recommend approval of the TIP Amendment for US 41 CSX Grade Separation

Prepared By
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

Attachments
TIP Comparative Report
FDOT
5 Year TIP
Hillsborough County, District 7

HIGHWAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status: Adopted</th>
<th>Adopted Date: 06/12/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Number:</td>
<td>440749 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>US 41/SR 45/S 50TH ST @ CSX GRADE SEPARATION SOUTH OF CAUSEWAY BLVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Project:</td>
<td>4407491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Description:</td>
<td>FROM AUSTIN ST TO N OF 21ST AVE S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Length:</td>
<td>2.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Work:</td>
<td>NEW BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION</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><strong>CONSTRUCTION - MANAGED BY FDOT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACNP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,940,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,940,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P D &amp; E - MANAGED BY FDOT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>$1,393,632</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,393,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIH</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>$1,432,632</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,432,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING - MANAGED BY FDOT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>$154,601</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$154,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIH</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>$106,368</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,593,294</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,699,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>$27,496</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>$288,465</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$6,593,294</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,882,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIGHT OF WAY - MANAGED BY FDOT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIF</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIH</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMR</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$32,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
<td>$33,501,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$62,001,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 440749 1 Totals:</td>
<td>$1,721,097</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$16,593,294</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
<td>$33,501,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$131,256,726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LRTP: Minimize congestion, p. 163
*SIS*
**Item Number:** 440749 1  
**Description:** US 41/SR 45/S 50TH ST @ CSX GRADE SEPARATION SOUTH OF CAUSEWAY BLVD

**Related Project:** 4407491  
**Extra Description:** FROM AUSTIN ST TO N OF 21ST AVE S

**Type of Work:** NEW BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION

<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>CONSTRUCTION - MANAGED BY FDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACNP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,940,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,940,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P D &amp; E - MANAGED BY FDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIH</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>$1,393,632</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,393,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added ACFP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$1,432,632</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,732,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING - MANAGED BY FDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>$154,601</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$154,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIH</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>$106,368</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,593,294</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,699,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>$27,496</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$288,465</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$6,593,294</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,882,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAILROAD &amp; UTILITIES - MANAGED BY FDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added ACFP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY - MANAGED BY FDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIH</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMR</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$32,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
<td>$33,501,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$62,001,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 440749 1 Totals:** $1,721,097 | $1,451,000 | $16,593,294 | $18,500,000 | $33,501,000 | $0     | $60,940,335 | $132,706,726
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
School Transportation Working Group Recognition, Annual Report & Transition Steps

**Presenter**
Lisa K. Silva, MPO Staff

**Summary**
The MPO School Transportation Working Group (STWG) was established by the MPO chair in early 2016 to provide needed coordination at many levels that did not previously exist. Having created new working relationships among staff at multiple agencies, the STWG is no longer needed. Its work has now been taken up by regular meetings organized by the School District and by FDOT’s Community Traffic Safety Team. Staff will share the STWG’s succession proposal, celebrate its successes, and provide highlights of the upcoming Safe Routes to School (SRTS) National Conference November 12-14, 2019, co-hosted by Hillsborough MPO and planned to be held jointly with the 2nd Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit.

**Recommended Action**
None

**Prepared By**
Lisa K. Silva, AICP, PLA

**Attachments**
1. STWG Succession Proposal
2. STWG Successes
3. SRTS Conference and GCSSS Summit Flyer
4. [MPO School Safety Study](#)
School Transportation Working Group Succession Proposal after December 2018

The Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), which provides transportation coordination and long-range planning, will be completing its role serving as host for the School Transportation Working Group. On February 2, 2016, the MPO Chair created the School Transportation Committee. With the great number of topics and geographic locations needing attention, monthly meetings for the first year were recommended. The inaugural meeting was on April 27, 2016. After each year, the schedule was reevaluated. Since there was momentum and more work to do, the MPO has extended the group’s tenure twice. The last scheduled STWG meeting was December 5, 2018.

Coordination has occurred on many levels. Interagency partnerships have been busy problem-solving on a host of topics, from traffic circulation to walk/bike safety to school-pools and transit. The MPO funded, completed and then adopted the School Safety Study on July 31, 2018.

After reviewing adjacent jurisdictions and exploring existing safety groups and a meeting with Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Secretary Gwynn and staff. MPO Staff suggested and the STWG approved the following proposal to continue the work the STWG set in motion.

The School Board Transportation Committee:

The School Board understands that not all its work can be accomplished at regularly scheduled meetings of the entire Board, and that in order to dedicate the necessary time, expertise and focus on individual issues it may be necessary to utilize workshops and committees of the Board.

The board created the following shall be standing committees of the Board. Each committee consists of three Board Members and complies with all Sunshine Law requirements. The Board reserves the right to establish other committees as deemed necessary:

- Facilities
- Teaching & Learning
- Finance
- Transportation
- Legislative
- Communications
- Human Resources

Committees meet regularly at the Raymond O. Shelton School Administration Center (ROSSAC) and only recommend items to be considered by the full Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Committee</th>
<th>Senior Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Stuart</td>
<td>Chris Farkas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School District School Circulation Committee:

Contact: Jamie Warrington, Transportation Safety Manager, under Chris Farkas supervision.

At inauguration the committee is meeting frequently (bi-weekly) to address the backlog of site issues and address changes needed due to bell times revisions.

The School Circulation Committee is comprised of multi-disciplinary internal school district representatives from safety, transportation, growth management, sites, and security. The Circulation Committee addresses traffic, bike, and pedestrian circulation issues impacting schools and the surrounding communities by coordinating solutions with school administration and other local governmental entities. The committee is and invites attendance of adjacent jurisdictional/agency staff as needed. Example, Blake HS consulted with FDOT, Hunter Green City of Tampa and Farnell with Hillsborough County. In the fall of 2018 staff developed and began hosting an online request form and shared the information via Principals’ Weekly Newsletter.

The Circulation Committee is complemented by the bi-monthly Hillsborough County/School District Coordination Meeting in which many departments of Hillsborough County coordinate growth management, planning and land use, real estate, architecture/construction, right-of-way and co-location (park and library) topics. The Coordination meetings are managed by Lorraine Duffy Suarez, Growth Mgmt. and Planning Director.

Florida Department of Transportation District 7 Community Traffic Safety Team (CTST):

Community Traffic Safety Teams (CTSTs) are locally based, data-driven groups of highway safety advocates that are committed to a common goal of improving traffic safety in their communities.

CTSTs are multi-jurisdictional, with members from city, county, state, and occasionally federal agencies, as well as private industry representatives and local citizens. CTST boundaries are determined by the organizations comprising the team and can be a city, a portion of a county, an entire county, multiple counties, or any other logical arrangement. The Hillsborough CTST is boundary in the county.

Integrating the efforts of the 4 "E" disciplines that work in highway safety, (Engineering, Enforcement, Education/Public Information, and Emergency Services) is also encouraged. By working together with interested citizens and other traffic safety advocates within their communities, the CTSTs help to solve local traffic safety problems and promote public awareness
of traffic safety best practices through campaigns that educate drivers, motorcyclists, pedestrians, and bicyclists about the rules of the road.

Each FDOT District has a full-time CTST Coordinator who works closely with the CTSTs in their geographic area. In addition, the State Safety Office has a Traffic Safety Program Manager who serves as a Central Office resource to the District Coordinators. The District 7 CTST Coordinator is Ginger Regalado.

Ms. Stuart began meeting regularly with FDOT’s Hillsborough CTST in June 2018. In October, Ms. Stuart met with Sec. Gwynn and CTST staff regarding integration with CTST. FDOT is supportive of the idea to include STWG coordination, and even suggested a subcommittee to meet before or after CTST to address detailed initiatives. CTST will add the School District to their regular agenda for continued discussion of school related traffic concerns/changes. Jamie Warrington will be the school district’s designated contact.
At the December 2018 STWG meeting, working group members were asked to submit any successes during their participation on the STWG. The following comments were received:

Jim Beekman, General Manager, Transportation, Hillsborough County Public Schools: Overall, what I feel is the most significant accomplishment is the inter-agency collaboration. Silos have been reduced significantly. In the beginning, agencies were territorial but now we all realize that we are working towards the same goal – safety of our citizens/kids. Thank you!

William Porth, Traffic Safety Coordinator, City of Tampa: A great working relationship which should live on through the CTST. The MPO School Safety study is a great help to prioritize our work in the City of Tampa. Thanks for all the work by the MPO to keep the wheels turning on the STWG.

Emily Hinsdale, Sidewalk Stompers: STWG members visited our little walk to school program at our local elementary school last year. Thanks to the support and guidance of STWG members, our program is now a 501(c)3, working with 5 schools, and growing. Thank you for the encouragement for a citizen-led, non-governmental program to get more students walking safely to school.

Deborah Sickman, St. Joseph’s Children’s Wellness and Safety Center: The STWG afforded Safe Kids Greater Tampa, led by St. Joseph’s Children’s Hospital, the opportunity to beta-test a global Star Ratings 4 School app utilizing the iRap (International Road Assessment Program). In a vision of a world where all children travel safely to and from school, being one of 200 schools on 5 continents to test the SR4S app shows STWG’s proactive and leading role in addressing safety concerns for the students and families of Hillsborough County.

Amber Dickerson, Manager, Planning and Siting, Hillsborough County Public Schools: The School Circulation Committee was birthed out of STWG and has been a total success. The School Traffic Safety Study has proven to be an awesome resource for the District’s Circulation Committee. Many issues presented by school administration had been identified within the safety study. Ease of collaboration between agencies to solve daily issues has been greatly appreciated and provides resolutions to parent concerns.

Krista Nalls, St. Joseph’s Children’s Wellness and Safety Center: Through the School Transportation Working Group, our center, was able to form relationships with Hillsborough County Public School personnel and Transportation Services. We formed an MOU with them and began a partnership to bring on-bike pedestrian and bicycle safety training to the students in Hillsborough County. Beginning with the 2017-18 school year, our goal was to educate all elementary students in the 150 plus elementary schools and all 6th grade students in the 50 plus middles schools, in the next three years. With the help of FDOT, through the Safe Routes to School grant, five trailers and 143 bicycles were purchased. HCPA transportation services deliver and pick up the trailers to the scheduled schools. St. Joseph’s Children’s Wellness and Safety Center staff join the school’s PE teacher to educate the students.

Brita Wilkins Lincoln, Advocacy Chair, Hillsborough County Council PTA/PTSA: For Parent Teacher Association/Parent Student Teacher Association STWG has been a venue where parents can voice their concerns about busing. We also have appreciated being in a
group with so many organizations to collaborate with and benefit from. Thank you especially to Lisa for all your work!

Robert Cox, Magnet Programs Supervisor: There is always info that can be used from this group to inform: emails, meetings, conversations and events. Sometimes being present to address questions on a project or schools has made this valuable to be a part of. Encouraging schools to be a part of competitions or projects has been incredible. It has been great inviting MPO to our school events and has led to giving the community information on transportation across the district.
2nd Annual Summit, held jointly with the Safe Routes to School National Conference

Safe Routes to School National Conference
November 12 – 14, 2019

Safe Streets Summit
Nov. 14, 2 – 8PM
Summit (only) registration: $60

Hilton Tampa Downtown
211 N. Tampa St.
Tampa, FL 33602

For more information:
saferoutesconference.org
planhillsborough.org/gulf-coast-safe-streets-summit/
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Summary
In 2014, FDOT initiated a Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study for 7.7 miles of Interstate 275 (I-275) in Hillsborough County from north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (SR 574) (MLK Boulevard) to Bearss Avenue (SR 678/CR 582). Within this corridor, FDOT is focusing on options for making improvements to I-275 N as part of the Tampa Bay Next program.

I-275 is a major north-south, Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) highway, designated as a critical evacuation route within the State of Florida. It provides an important link to the regional and statewide transportation network through connections to Interstate 4 (I-4) and Interstate 75 (I-75). The SIS is the state’s network of high priority facilities. Improvements to I-275, from north of MLK Boulevard to north of Bearss Avenue are critical to maintaining and improving access and capacity in the SIS, as well as enhancing mobility within the Tampa Bay region.

The purpose of the project is to improve the corridor’s capacity during peak periods, and to improve overall safety and operating conditions of the facility. Capacity improvements are needed to address existing daily bottlenecks and accommodate projected population and employment growth and decrease the crash rates along this segment of I-275, which are higher than the statewide average for this type of facility.

The Recommended Build Alternative consists of adding one 12-foot wide general purpose lane in each direction, providing a hardened inside shoulder and providing noise walls along the corridor. Operational and safety improvements will also be implemented at the Hillsborough Avenue and Bearss Avenue interchanges. All roadway improvements would occur within the existing FDOT right-of-way and would not require right-of-way acquisition. Minimal right-of-way may be required at the Bearss Avenue interchange only for stormwater facilities. There are no other improvements proposed for this segment of I-275 as part of this study.

FDOT is no longer considering adding express lanes on this section of I-275 north of the I-4 interchange. Also, the No-Build Alternative will remain a viable alternative throughout the PD&E Study process. It assumes that no improvements except routine maintenance would be made to I-275 within the project limits.

This is part of Tampa Bay Next and thus there will be several opportunities for the public to provide review and comment on this and related projects:
• FDOT will hold a public hearing on this PD&E for I-275 Section 7 on at 5:30 on March 26, 2019 at the Seminole Heights United Methodist Church

• FDOT will provide an update on Tampa Bay Next to the committees and MPO in April and May, focusing on the SEIS.

• Because the MPO’s Imagine 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan envisioned two toll express lanes on this section of I-275, an amendment will be necessary to make it consistent with the proposed general purpose lanes. The amendment is scheduled for action by the committees in May and an MPO public hearing in June.
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**Summary**

In preparation of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), a report on revenue projections has been generated. Title 23 of the United States Code (U.S.C.) Section 134 requires that a Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) shall contain a financial plan that estimates funds that can be available to support implementation of the plan. The financial plan shall indicate resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the plan, and recommends any additional financing strategies for needed projects and programs. The purpose of the financial plan is to demonstrate fiscal constraint and ensures that the LRTP reflects realistic assumptions about future revenues.

The purpose of this technical memorandum is to provide the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) with a forecast of reasonably available funding from traditional revenue sources to support transportation investments through 2045. The memorandum outlines federal, state, and local sources of revenue for funding transportation improvements, describes the methodology and assumptions developed to forecast future revenues, and summarizes anticipated amounts from each revenue source. The memorandum also discusses potential new and additional revenue sources from untapped local funding options that could be used for transportation.
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1 2045 LRTP Funding Executive Summary

The 2045 LRTP includes revenue projections from existing federal, state, and county sources as well as potential revenue sources. This technical memorandum describes the revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available for use in developing the 2045 Cost Feasible Plan. Additional details are available in subsections of this report.

Table 1 presents a summary of the 2045 LRTP revenue projections for existing revenue sources and Table 2 presents the summary of revenues for potential new sources.

Table 1. Summary of Existing Sources, FY 2020-2045

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Categories</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 - 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026 - 2030</th>
<th>FY 2031 - 2035</th>
<th>FY 2036 - 2045</th>
<th>FY 2026-2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal and State – Capacity</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$1,038</td>
<td>$2,031</td>
<td>$3,870</td>
<td>$3,679</td>
<td>$9,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State – O&amp;M Safety, Resurfacing, and O&amp;M</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$358</td>
<td>$423</td>
<td>$456</td>
<td>$944</td>
<td>$1,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State – O&amp;M Other Operational Activities</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>$207</td>
<td>$244</td>
<td>$263</td>
<td>$545</td>
<td>$1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro/Regional</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>$254</td>
<td>$506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State – Fuel Tax to Local Transportation Programs</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$103</td>
<td>$107</td>
<td>$226</td>
<td>$435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State – Fuel Tax to Local Administration of Local Transportation Programs</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit (Federal and State)</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$217</td>
<td>$276</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$1,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit (Local and Other)</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$348</td>
<td>$397</td>
<td>$483</td>
<td>$1,338</td>
<td>$2,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Local Transportation Programs</td>
<td>$485</td>
<td>$2,748</td>
<td>$2,969</td>
<td>$3,411</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
<td>$15,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administration of Local Transportation Programs</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$39</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$916</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,192</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,627</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,095</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,566</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,287</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Assumes CIT and Ninth-Cent Fuel Tax are renewed.
Table 2. Summary of Potential Sources, FY 2020-2045
Millions of YOE Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021-2025</th>
<th>FY 2026-2030</th>
<th>FY 2031-2035</th>
<th>FY 2036-2045</th>
<th>FY 2026-2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolls</td>
<td>$169</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$1,188</td>
<td>$1,644</td>
<td>$4,769</td>
<td>$7,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd LOFT (5-cents)</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$151</td>
<td>$152</td>
<td>$154</td>
<td>$316</td>
<td>$623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Valorem (1 mill)</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td>$780</td>
<td>$1,022</td>
<td>$3,094</td>
<td>$4,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART Ad Valorem (3 mills)</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>$1,248</td>
<td>$1,408</td>
<td>$1,810</td>
<td>$5,477</td>
<td>$8,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Network Company (TNC) Fee</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$157</td>
<td>$195</td>
<td>$247</td>
<td>$677</td>
<td>$1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking Fee</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$107</td>
<td>$351</td>
<td>$534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled Fee</td>
<td>$161</td>
<td>$871</td>
<td>$1,007</td>
<td>$1,180</td>
<td>$2,878</td>
<td>$5,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Registration Fee</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver License Fee</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 2045 LRTP Funding Introduction

Title 23 of the United States Code (U.S.C.) Section 134 requires that a Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) shall contain a financial plan that estimates funds that can be available to support implementation of the plan. The financial plan shall indicate resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the plan, and recommends any additional financing strategies for needed projects and programs. The purpose of the financial plan is to demonstrate fiscal constraint and ensures that the LRTP reflects realistic assumptions about future revenues.

The purpose of this technical memorandum is to provide the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) with a forecast of reasonably available funding from traditional revenue sources to support transportation investments through 2045. The memorandum outlines Federal, state, and local sources of revenue for funding transportation improvements, describes the methodology and assumptions developed to forecast future revenues, and summarizes anticipated amounts from each revenue source. The memorandum also discusses potential new and additional revenue sources from untapped local funding options that could be used for transportation.
3 Federal Funding Sources

3.1 Federal Highway User Fees

Federal funding for transportation in Hillsborough County is derived from highway excise taxes on motor fuel and truck-related taxes on truck tires, sales of trucks and trailers, and heavy vehicle use. Excise taxes on gasoline and other motor fuels account for more than 85 percent of all receipts to the Federal Highway Trust Fund (HTF). Tax revenues are deposited into either the Highway Account or the Mass Transit Account of the Federal HTF and then distributed to the states. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) then distribute funds from the Highway and the Mass Transit Account, respectively, to each state through a system of formula grants and discretionary allocations. The most recent transportation bill, Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST), extended the imposition of highway-user taxes through September 30, 2022, with generally no change to the tax rates as imposed under MAP-21.

3.2 Current State of the Federal Highway Trust Fund

According to estimates from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), since 2001 outlays have consistently exceeded the revenues to the trust fund. To address the shortfall, Congress has authorized transfers from the general fund to the HTF to prevent the HTF from being depleted. Under the Fast Act (2015), $52 billion was transferred to the highway account and $18 billion to the transit account, allowing the accounts to pay their obligations through the end of 2020. For its baseline spending projections, CBO assumes that future obligations will be paid in full. Under those circumstances, and without other legislative action, federal funding for the two accounts would be reduced starting in fiscal year 2021 to match the revenues projected to be credited to the fund.

4 State Funding Sources

In Florida, there are five revenue sources that go into the State Transportation Trust Fund (STTF): fuel tax, motor vehicle fees, document stamps, rental car surcharges, and aviation fuel tax. According to the transportation revenue data released by FDOT, revenues from fuel tax, the largest source, contributed to 58 percent of the state transportation funding in FY 2016.

---

2 Transportation Funding Sources Presentation, https://fdotwww.blob.core.windows.net/sitefinity/docs/default-source/content/comptroller/pdf/gao/revmanagement/transportationfundingsources.pdf?sfvrsn=2c308622_0, Spring 2017.
4.1 State Fuel Taxes

Highway fuel taxes constitute the oldest continuous source of dedicated transportation revenues in the State. Initially, it was levied in 1921 at the rate of 1 cent per gallon of motor fuel. Since then, the state fuel tax has been adjusted and restructured in the form that it is levied. The fuel taxes collected at the state level include the following:\(^3\)

- **State Fuel Sales Tax** – Currently, Florida imposes a sales tax to the sales of all motor (gasoline) and diesel fuels. The state fuel sales tax is based on floor tax of 6.9 cents per gallon indexed to the consumer price index (CPI, all items), with the base year set as FY 1989 (12-month period). Currently, the rate is 13.7 cents per gallon after adjusting for inflation.

---

\(^3\) Florida’s Transportation Tax Sources, A Primer, FDOT Office of Comptroller – General Accounting Office, January 2017, https://fdotwww.blob.core.windows.net/sitefinity/docs/default-source/content/comptroller/pdf/gao/revmanagement/tax-primer.pdf?sfvrsn=f1eadaf7_0
• **State Comprehensive Enhanced Transportation System (SCETS) Tax** – The SCETS is an excise tax on all highway fuels. To the extent possible, the SCETS proceeds must be spent in the transportation district and County from which they are collected. Similar to the fuel sales tax, the SCETS tax is indexed to the CPI (all items), but with the base year set as FY 1990 (12-month period). The 2018 SCETS tax rate for Hillsborough County is 7.6 cents per gallon.

• **State-Collected Motor Fuel Taxes Distributed to Local Governments** – The State of Florida collects a fuel excise tax of 4 cents per gallon to be distributed to local governments based on formulas that consider, among other factors, population.
  - The **Constitutional Fuel Tax** is set at 2 cents per gallon. The first call on the proceeds of Constitutional Fuel Tax is to meet the debt service requirements, if any, on local bond issues backed by the tax proceeds. The balance, called the 20 percent surplus and the 80 percent surplus, is credited to the counties’ transportation trust funds. The allocation formula is based on a geographic area component, a population component, and a collection component; in addition, a distribution factor is applied to each county. Hillsborough County will receive an estimated $12.5 million in FY 2019.
  - The **County Fuel Tax** is set at 1 cent per gallon, and it is distributed by the same formula as the Constitutional Fuel Tax (based on a geographic area component, a population component, a collection component, and a distribution factor). Counties may use the revenues from this tax for transportation-related expenses. Hillsborough County will receive an estimated $5.5 million in FY 2019.
  - Lastly, the **Municipal Fuel Tax** is also set at 1 cent per gallon. Revenues from this tax are transferred into the Revenue Sharing Trust Fund for Municipalities. These revenues may be used for transportation-related expenditures within incorporated areas and are distributed to municipalities by statutory criteria. In FY 2019, Plant City and the cities of Tampa and Temple Terrace are slated to receive approximately $0.4 million, $3.7 million, and $0.3 million, respectively, from the Municipal Fuel Tax.

• **Alternative Fuel Fees** – Use of alternative fuels represents a small part of the State’s total fuel consumption and historically amounted to less than $1 million annually. In order to encourage the use of alternative fuels, the 2013 Florida Legislature passed legislation to exempt these fuels from taxation beginning January 1, 2014, and ending January 1, 2019. At that point, there will be a per unit tax that is lower than the rates for gasoline and diesel but revenue-neutral to the previous in-state annual decal fee.

• **Fuel Use Tax** – This tax is designed to ensure that heavy vehicles which engage in interstate operations incur taxes based on fuel consumed, rather than purchased, in the State. This tax applies with few exceptions, to each privately owned vehicle with at least three axles or a gross weight of more than 26,000 pounds that engages in interstate operations, whether or not titled in this State. The tax is comprised of an annual decal fee of $4 plus a use tax based on the number of gallons of fuel consumed multiplied by the
prevailing statewide fuel tax rate. If a vehicle consumes more fuel than was purchased during a reporting period, additional taxes are due; otherwise a refund is issued.

4.2 State Motor Vehicle Fees

Funding transportation from vehicle-related revenues started early in Florida’s transportation history. Almost from their inception, motor vehicle license fees were designated as a highway user charge levied to partially defray the costs of constructing and maintaining the roads which benefited those who paid the fees.

There are four types of motor vehicle fees:4

- **Initial Registration Fee** – Known originally as the “New Wheels on the Road” Fee, it is designed primarily to affect only those vehicle owners whose actions result in net additions to the State’s registered vehicle stock. The Initial Registration Fee is $225.

- **Motor Vehicle License Surcharge** – Currently the State imposes a $1.20 surcharge on the annual registration fee of every vehicle except mobile homes. Of each transaction, $1 is deposited to the STTF and the remaining 20 cents is deposited to Highway Safety and Operating Trust Fund.

- **Motor Vehicle Title Fee** – The current Motor Vehicle Title Fee is $70. Prior to 2012, 70 percent of the proceeds ($49) were deposited to the General Revenue Fund and 30 percent ($21) to the STTF. Title fee revenues from for-hire vehicles are deposited into the General Revenue Fund. The 2012 Legislature directed that the first $200 million collected from $47 of the $49 General Revenue Fund portion of the $70 title fee be deposited into the STTF, beginning FY 2012-2013.

- **Rental Car Surcharge** – The existing rental car surcharge rate is $2 per day for the first 30 days. FDOT receives 80 percent of the surcharge after deducting costs of administration and an 8 percent General Revenue Service charge. The tax distributed to the STTF is unique in that its proceeds must be spent in the transportation district from which the surcharges were collected. In addition, car-sharing services pay only $1 if the rental is less than 24 hours, and surcharges are distributed the same as other rentals.

4.3 State Aviation Fuel Tax

Florida imposes an aviation fuel tax of 6.9 cents per gallon excise tax on aviation fuels. Unlike the state fuel tax, the aviation tax remains fixed at its current level, until changed by legislative action. Ninety-two percent of the proceeds are deposited into the STTF, while the remaining eight percent are deposited into the General Revenue Fund. The aviation fuel tax

will drop to 4.27 cents per gallon in FY 2019-2020 after the repeal of aviation refunds that were available to certain airlines meeting employment targets in the state.

4.4 State Documentary Stamp Tax

Documentary Stamp Tax is levied on documents, including, but not limited to: deeds, stocks and bonds, notes and written obligations to pay money, mortgages, liens, and other evidences of indebtedness. The 2005 Legislature passed a growth management bill to address needed infrastructure in Florida. The growth management package provided $541.75 million annually from documentary stamp revenue to fund transportation needs. The 2008 Legislature changed the distribution of documentary stamp tax collections so that the STTF receives 38.2 percent of collections after other distributions are made, not to exceed $541.75 million per year. This formula significantly decreased the funding for transportation projects. Additionally, the 2011 Legislature directed the following amounts to be transferred to the State Economic Enhancement and Development (SEED) Trust Fund from the STTF portion of documentary stamp tax revenues: $50 million in FY 2012-2013, $65 million in FY 2013-2014, and $75 million every fiscal year thereafter. In 2014, voters approved for 20 years that 33 percent of the revenues from the Documentary Stamp Fund would go to the Land Acquisition Trust Fund for water and land conservation, resulting in the revenues available to the STFF declining from 38.2 percent to 24.18442 percent. The December 2018 Revenue Estimating Conference estimated $317.8 million in distributions of documentary stamp revenue to the STTF for FY 2018-2019.

5 Summary of Federal and State Funding

In 2018, FDOT developed a long-range revenue forecast, which was based on recent Federal legislation (e.g., FAST ACT), changes in factors affecting state revenue sources (e.g., population growth rates, motor fuel consumption and tax rates), and current policies. The forecast estimates revenues from Federal, state, and turnpike sources that “flow” through the FDOT Work Program for fiscal years 2019-2045. The 2045 Revenue Forecast Handbook documenting how the 2045 revenue forecast was developed, as well as guidance for using this forecast information was published in July 2018. Florida’s MPOs are encouraged to use these estimates and guidance in the updates of their long-range plans.

Some important parameters of the long-range revenue forecasts include:
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• All amounts in the 2045 forecast are expressed in “year of expenditure” (YOE) dollars. Annual inflation in the 2045 Revenue Forecast Handbook is 2.6 percent annually, consistent with the Florida Revenue Estimating Conference.

• Estimates through 2045 were based on current federal and state laws, funding sources, FDOT policies, and assumptions over factors affecting state revenue sources such as population growth and motor fuel consumption.

• The basis for the forecast is FDOT’s Program and Resource Plan (PRP).

• The forecast is based on state and Federal funds that “pass” through the Department’s Work Program. The forecast does not include estimates for local government, local/regional authority, private sector, or other funding sources except as noted. No estimates for new revenue sources or increases in existing sources were included unless required by law.

• FDOT has developed metropolitan estimates from the 2045 Revenue Forecast for certain capacity programs for each MPO. These metropolitan estimates are included in a separate document prepared for each MPO. Metropolitan estimates reflect the share of each state capacity program planned for the area. The estimates can be used to fund planned capacity improvements to major elements of the transportation system (e.g., highways, transit). The metropolitan estimates are summarized into three 5-year periods and a final 10-year period.

FDOT’s estimates for Hillsborough County MPO are included in the 2045 Revenue Forecast Hillsborough MPO. In addition, revenue data from existing transit services in the County (HART, streetcar, and Sunshine line) were gathered to provide forecast of Federal and other state funds not provided by FDOT or included in the District 7 estimates. For the purpose of the Hillsborough MPO 2045 LRTP, these estimates were summarized into: Federal and state highway funding; metropolitan and regional programs; federal and state transit funding; and state-collected fuel taxes distributed to local governments.

5.1 Federal and State – Highway Funding

Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Highways Construction and Right-of-Way (ROW). This funding program is used to fund construction, improvements, and associated ROW acquisitions on SIS highways (i.e., Interstate, the Turnpike, other toll roads, and other facilities designed to serve interstate and regional commerce, including SIS Connectors). FDOT takes the lead in identifying planned projects and programs funded by this program. The SIS First Five Year Plan (FY 2018/2019-FY 2022/2023), Second Five Year Plan (FY 2023/2024-FY 2027/2028), and the Long-Range Cost-Feasible Plan (FY 2029-2045) are posted on FDOT websites. SIS projects within Hillsborough County can be identified from these plans and their costs can be used as available program funds. Project costs are given annually for FY 2019-2028, and projects from the Long-Range Cost-Feasible Plan were allocated to years based on the midpoint of the range of the construction period. Between FY 2026-2045, the total SIS

---
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Highways Construction and ROW funds available to Hillsborough County are approximately $7.4 billion. Additional funding for PE is not available for SIS.

**Other Arterials (also known as Other Roads) Construction and ROW.** This funding program is used to fund construction, improvements, and associated ROW on State Highway System roadways not designated as part of the SIS. This program also includes funding for the Economic Development Program, the County Incentive Grant Program, the Small County Road Assistance Program, and the Small County Outreach Program. Between FY 2026-2045, the total program funding available to Hillsborough County is about $1.8 billion according to the 2045 Revenue Forecast Hillsborough MPO. In addition, MPOs can assume that an additional 22 percent of estimated Other Arterials Construction and ROW funds is available from the statewide “Product Support” program to support preliminary engineering (PE) activities. This additional funding is not available for SIS. Therefore, between FY 2026-2045, PE funding available to Hillsborough County is estimated to be $395 million. This amount was added to the total Other Arterials Construction and ROW estimates.

**District-Wide State Highway System (SHS) Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Funds.** This funding program is used to provide financial assistance to activities to support and maintain transportation infrastructure once it is constructed and in place. Only district-wide estimates were provided by FDOT. Funding was estimated based on the proportion of Hillsborough population to total population within FDOT District 7. Between FY 2026-2045, the total program funding available to District 7 amounts to $6.8 billion, based on estimates from the 2045 Revenue Forecast Hillsborough MPO, with $2.9 billion allocated to Hillsborough MPO. Based on projected spending levels, it was assumed that 63 percent ($1.8 billion) will be applied to safety, resurfacing, and operations and maintenance; the remaining 37 percent ($1.1 billion) will be used for other FDOT District 7 operational activities including bridge, product support, and administration.

Figure 2 illustrates FDOT’s funding estimates of approximately $12.4 billion from Federal/state programs for the SIS, Other Arterials (including PE funds), and SHS O&M over the 2026-2045 period.

---

**Figure 2. Federal and State Highway Funding, FY 2026-2045**

Sources: FDOT 2045 Revenue Forecast Hillsborough MPO (November 2018); FDOT SIS Plans.
5.2 Metropolitan and Regional Programs

Funding from Metropolitan and Regional programs available to Hillsborough County is estimated at $506 million over 20 years (2026-2045). Figure 3 illustrates funding from these programs as estimated from FDOT’s *2045 Revenue Forecast Hillsborough MPO*.

**Figure 3. Metropolitan and Regional Programs, FY 2026-2045**

Source: Analysis of FDOT Revenue Estimates for Hillsborough MPO.

**TMA Funds.** These funds are distributed to Transportation Management Areas, as defined by the FAST Act. They are the same as “SU” funds in the five-year Work Program. The estimates are based on current population estimates. Between FY 2026-2045, the total program funding available to Hillsborough County amounts to $396 million according to the *2045 Revenue Forecast Hillsborough MPO*. These funds are not included in the estimates for Other Arterials Construction and ROW above.

**Transportation Alternatives (TA) Funds.** As defined by the FAST Act, TA funds are used to assist MPOs in developing their plans. The TA program includes TALU (more than 200,000 population), TALL (more than 5,000 and less than 200,000 population), and TALT (any area) programs. Estimates of these TA program funds that FDOT provided for District 7 are district-
The TALU and TALT funds available to Hillsborough County were estimated using the following methodology:

- **TALU** – Available TALU funding was estimated based on the proportion of the Hillsborough population within urbanized areas to the total population within the Tampa-St. Pete Urbanized Area from the 2010 Census. The resulting program funding amounts to $15.3 million between FY 2026-2045. These funds are not included in the estimates for Other Arterials Construction and ROW.

- **TALT** – Available funding for projects in Hillsborough from the TALT program was estimated based on the proportion of the Hillsborough population to the total population within District 7 from the 2010 Census. The resulting program funding amounts to $30.8 million between FY 2026-2045. These funds are not included in the estimates for Other Arterials Construction and ROW.

**Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) Funds.** After allocations to the Small County Outreach Program and the New Starts Transit Program, 25 percent of the remaining Documentary Stamps Tax funds are allocated annually for TRIP for regional transportation projects in “regional transportation areas.” The first $60 million of funds allocated to TRIP are allocated annually to the Florida Rail Enterprise. Only district-wide estimates were provided to District 7 by FDOT. TRIP is a highly competitive program, and funds that may be available to Hillsborough County were estimated based on the proportion of the Hillsborough population to the total population within District 7. The resulting total program funding amounts to $63.8 million between FY 2026-2045. TRIP will fund up to 50 percent of eligible project costs. Projects anticipating funding from TRIP should be noted as “illustrative” in the LRTP, because a small portion of eligible projects actually receive funding.

### 5.3 Transit – Federal and State Programs

Transit funding is estimated at $1.2 billion over 20 years (as illustrated in Figure 4) from Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and other Federal funds, and state operating and capital grants (excluding FTA Major Capital Investment Funding and State New Starts programs).
Sources: Analysis of FDOT, HART, and Hillsborough County data. Excludes potential Federal and State New Starts funding.

**FDOT Transit.** This funding program is used to provide technical and operating/capital assistance to transit, paratransit, and ridesharing systems. For the Hillsborough MPO, it includes funding allocations to the Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART), streetcar, Sunshine Line, and other transit/intermodal funding. Between FY 2026-2045, the total program funding available to Hillsborough County amounts to $782.9 million according to the 2045 Revenue Forecast Hillsborough MPO. Funding allocations to existing transit agencies and services were distributed as follows:

- Funding through 2028 based on state grants provided by the Hillsborough Transit Authority in the FY 2019-2028 Transportation Development Plan (TDP)\(^\text{11}\) is approximately $6 million per year. After 2028, a growth factor equivalent to the funding growth assumptions from the FDOT estimates was applied.

---

• The Streetcar Business Plan\textsuperscript{12} assumes $200,000 in state operating assistance. For the purpose of the 2045 LRTP, it was assumed that the State will provide $200,000 per year through 2025. Growth factors after 2025 were applied in line with growth in transit funding estimates from FDOT.

• Hillsborough County received about $2.3 million in 2017 in state funding from the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged for the Sunshine Line. For the 2045 LRTP, it was assumed that future funding will increase in-line with the average 10-year inflation rate (1.7 percent).

\textbf{FTA Formula Funds.} This program provides grants to Urbanized Areas (UZA) for public transportation capital, planning, job access and reverse commute projects, as well as operating expenses (in certain circumstances). FTA formula funds for the 2045 LRTP were estimated based on a review of HART and streetcar budgets and Transit Development Plans, and additional service projected under the FY 2019 Unfunded Needs Plan:\textsuperscript{13}

• \textbf{HART} – $12.8 million in 2019 increasing to $15.3 million in 5307 funds for 2028 as found in the HART TDP, and increasing to $23.2 million annually thereafter based on the additional vehicle miles in the Unfunded Needs Plan and applying the appropriate incremental funding for FTA Section 5307, 5337, and 5339 programs. This is in addition to the transit funds through the FDOT work program.

• \textbf{Tampa Streetcar} – The Streetcar Business Plan assumes a FTA funding allocation of $100,000 annually, which was extended through 2045. This funding is in addition to the transit funds through the FDOT work program.

\textbf{Funding for Major Transit Capital Investments.} Additional funding for major transit investments can be made available through Federal and state discretionary programs, namely FTA’s Capital Investment Grants Program (Section 5309) and FDOT’s State competitive New Starts Transit Program. Projects anticipating Florida New Starts funding should be noted as “illustrative” in the LRTP, because a small portion of eligible projects actually receive funding.

Projects applying for FTA funding go through a multiyear, multistep process to be eligible and are evaluated based on project justification and local financial commitment criteria. The FTA Section 5309 funding program is chronically oversubscribed and thus extremely competitive. Although eligible New Starts/Small Starts/Core Capacity projects could request the statutory maximum Federal share of 80 percent, the historical average Federal share for projects is roughly 50 percent. No funding estimates were developed from these funding programs.

\textbf{Other Federal and State (Sunshine Line).} The Sunshine Line is the paratransit service managed by Hillsborough County. In addition to FDOT transit funding allocations, this service

\textsuperscript{12} TECO Revised Business Plan, September 2012

is funded with other Federal and state funds. Data from recent Hillsborough County Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plans were used to develop a baseline and forecast of anticipated revenues:

- **Other Federal Funding** – No growth, remaining at 2017 funding level ($416,000); and
- **Other State Funding** – No growth, remaining at 2017 funding level ($514,000).

### 5.4 State-Collected Fuel Taxes Distributed to Local Governments

Revenues from the Constitutional, County and Municipal fuel taxes (see Figure 5) were estimated at $511.9 million over the FY 2026-2045 period, of which 15 percent ($76.8 million) is set aside for the administration of local transportation programs. The forecast of reasonably available revenues was developed applying the following assumptions:

- Base year (FY 2019) estimates for the Constitutional and County fuel taxes were obtained from the *2018 Local Government Financial Information Handbook* (September 2018).

  The *2018 Local Government Financial Information Handbook* (September 2018) also provides estimates of the Municipal Sharing Program revenues for the base year by municipality (Plant City, Tampa, and Temple Terrace). The Municipal Revenue Sharing program is comprised of state sales tax and municipal fuel tax, and beginning January 1, 2024, a portion of the excise tax levied on natural gas fuel.

- Annual growth will be in line with fuel consumption growth (through FY 2028) estimated from the FDOT Revenue Estimating Conference (August 2018). Table 3 summarizes the growth rates. The average growth rate was applied beyond FY 2028.

- Fifteen (15) percent is set aside for the administration of local transportation programs.
### Table 3. Motor Fuel Consumption Annual Growth Rates through FY 2028

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gasoline</th>
<th>Gas + Diesel</th>
<th>Diesel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FDOT Revenue Estimating Conference. Note: Gas + Diesel is average of Gasoline and Diesel; note that the forecast rates from the state Revenue Estimating Conference consider technological advancements in fuel efficiency and the implementation of the Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards.

5.5 Summary of Federal and State Funding Programs

Table 4 summarizes the detailed projection of the previously discussed funding sources. Between FY 2026 and FY 2045, the total state and Federal funding available to Hillsborough County is estimated to be $14.7 billion\(^{15}\).

\(^{15}\) Excluding potential FTA and State New Starts funding for transit fixed guideway projects.
Table 4. Estimates of Federal and State Programs
Millions of YOE Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Source</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021-2025</th>
<th>FY 2026-2030</th>
<th>FY 2031-2035</th>
<th>FY 2036-2045</th>
<th>FY 2026-2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Programs – Highway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS Highways – Construction and ROW</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$654</td>
<td>$1,535</td>
<td>$3,324</td>
<td>$2,531</td>
<td>$7,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arterials – Construction and ROW</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>$407</td>
<td>$448</td>
<td>$941</td>
<td>$1,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Roads – PE</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$207</td>
<td>$395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit (State)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit – HART Allocation</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit – Streetcar</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$3.14</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit – Sunshine Line</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit – Other State Transit and Intermodal</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$96</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$245</td>
<td>$484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State Transit (Sunshine)</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan and Regional Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$198</td>
<td>$396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA – PE (included in line above)</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALU&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALU – PE (included in line above)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALT&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALT – PE (included in line above)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIP&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$16</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIP – PE (included in line above)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Capacity Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway System O&amp;M Safety, Resurfacing, and O&amp;M</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$358</td>
<td>$423</td>
<td>$456</td>
<td>$944</td>
<td>$1,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway System O&amp;M – Other Operational Activities</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>$207</td>
<td>$263</td>
<td>$545</td>
<td>$1,052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit (Federal)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Formula (HART)</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$116</td>
<td>$232</td>
<td>$440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Formula (Streetcar)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal (Sunshine)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Major Capital Programs&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Starts Transit (State Program)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fuel Taxes to Local Governments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td>$126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal – Plant City</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal – Tampa</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal – Temple Terrace</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Federal and State</strong></td>
<td>$359</td>
<td>$2,057</td>
<td>$3,219</td>
<td>$5,158</td>
<td>$6,338</td>
<td>$14,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Local and Local-Option Funding Sources

Beyond the traditional Federal and state fuel taxes, several local and local-option revenue sources are available for funding transportation improvement projects in Hillsborough County. These alternative revenue sources include local option fuel taxes and development-related fees, such as mobility fees. In addition, transit services in the region, such as HART and the Tampa Streetcar, are funded through property taxes, fare revenues, and other dedicated revenue sources. This section summarizes these local and local-option revenue sources.

6.1 Local Option Fuel Taxes

County governments in Florida are authorized to levy up to 12 cents per gallon of fuel through three local option fuel taxes (LOFT) for transportation needs: the Ninth-Cent Fuel Tax (1 cent per gallon of gasoline and diesel), the First LOFT (up to 6 cents per gallon of gasoline and diesel), and the Second LOFT (up to 5 cents per gallon of gasoline). Hillsborough County has adopted the Ninth-Cent and the First LOFT at the maximum 6 cents per gallon.

Revenues from both local option fuel taxes are forecast at $1.1 billion over 20 years (2026-2045), based on the following assumptions:

- Base year (FY 2019) estimates for both the Ninth-Cent and First LOFT were obtained from the 2018 Local Government Financial Information Handbook (September 2018).
- Revenue forecasts were developed assuming that annual growth will be in line with fuel consumption growth estimated from the FDOT Revenue Estimating Conference (December 2018).\footnote{Forecast rates consider technological advancements in fuel efficiency and the implementation of the Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards. Source: State Revenue Estimating Conference documentation found at: http://edr.state.fl.us/Content/conferences/transportation/Transsummary.pdf}
  - The growth rates of gasoline consumption range from 0 to 1.0 percent between 2019 and 2028, at an average of 0.3 percent annually.
  - The growth rates of diesel fuel consumption are assumed between 1.3 percent and 1.1 percent from 2019 to 2028, at an average of 1.3 percent annually.
- The growth rates of motor fuel consumption (i.e., the average of gasoline and diesel) are forecast between 0.7 percent and 0.5 percent from 2019 to 2028, for an average of 0.8 percent annually.

- The average growth rates were applied after 2028.

- It is assumed that these local fuel taxes will be renewed and collections will continue beyond the current sunset dates.
  - The Ninth-Cent Fuel Tax is set to expire in 2021.
  - The First LOFT is set to expire in 2042.

- Fifteen (15) percent is set aside for the administration of local transportation programs.

### 6.1.1 The Ninth-Cent

The Ninth-Cent Fuel Tax was initially authorized in 1972 by the Florida Legislature. The tax is limited to 1 cent per gallon on highway fuels. Originally, the tax could be proposed by a county’s governing body, but it had to be approved by the electorate in a countywide referendum. The 1993 Florida Legislature allowed a county’s government body to impose the tax by a majority plus one vote of its membership, without holding a referendum.

Counties are not required to share revenue from the Ninth-Cent Fuel Tax with municipalities; however, the proceeds of the tax may be shared with cities in whatever proportion is mutually agreed upon, and used for county or municipal transportation purposes. The tax has no time limit imposed on it by state statutes. As of January 1, 1994, the Ninth-Cent Tax on diesel fuel is no longer optional. The 1990 Legislature decided to realize all optional taxes on diesel fuel so that interstate truckers, who pay fuel taxes based on miles driven in the state, would be subject to standard tax rates.

According to the 2018 Local Government Financial Information Handbook, the Ninth-Cent Fuel Tax will generate $7.6 million in FY 2019. Assuming renewal after 2021, over 20 years the Ninth-Cent Fuel Tax is forecast to generate $172.6 million, of which $25.9 million (15 percent) is set aside for the administration of local transportation programs. If the Ninth-Cent Fuel Tax sunsets in December 2021, revenues would total $17.3 million over FY 2020-2022. Table 5 shows the revenues for the Ninth-Cent Fuel Tax under both scenarios.
### Table 5. Estimated Revenues from the Ninth-Cent Fuel Tax, FY 2020-2045
*Millions of YOE Dollars*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Years</th>
<th>Assuming Renewal past 2021</th>
<th>Assuming Sunsets in 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2025</td>
<td>$39</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026-2030</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031-2035</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036-2045</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2026-2045</strong></td>
<td><strong>$173</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

### 6.1.2 The First LOFT

The 1983 Florida Legislature provided local governments with two major new sources of revenue called the Local Option Gas Taxes (LOGT) that were renamed the Local Option Fuel Taxes (LOFT) in 1996. Up to 11 cents per gallon may be levied to help fund a variety of transportation projects. These include the First LOFT (6 cents) and the Second LOFT (5 cents). Hillsborough County currently levies the full First LOFT only.

The First LOFT is authorized for a maximum duration of 30 years, at which time it must be voted on for extension. Implementation of 1 to 6 cents per gallon tax requires only a simple majority vote of the County commissioners. The proceeds of the tax must be shared with municipalities, either by a mutually agreed-upon distribution scheme or, if agreement cannot be reached, by using a formula contained in the Florida Statute.

Local governments may pledge revenues from any portion of the Local Option Fuel Tax to repay state bonds issued on their behalf. In addition, a local government must use Local Option Fuel Tax revenues for transportation expenditures on the state or local highway systems or transit-oriented capital purchases, or operations. Transportation expenditures include ROW activities, roadway maintenance, and the construction of roads.

The proceeds of the First LOFT are shared with Plant City, Tampa, and Temple Terrace. Overall, the First LOFT will generate approximately $42.7 million in FY 2019, of which about $13.5 million will be distributed to the municipalities and the remainder goes to the unincorporated Hillsborough County, based on estimates provided in the 2018 Local Government Financial Information Handbook. Over 20 years, the First LOFT is forecast to generate $974.1 million, of which $146.1 million (15 percent) is set aside for the administration of local transportation programs.
6.2 Local Option Sales Tax

Local governments are also authorized by the State to levy some sales taxes to address their transportation needs, including the Charter County and Regional Transportation System Surtax and the Local Government Infrastructure Surtax. The maximum potential local sales tax rate in Hillsborough County is 3 percent; as of November 2018, the local sales tax rate is set at 2.5 percent, leaving the County with a local sales tax potential of 0.5 percent that remains untapped. The existing local option sales taxes are the Local Government Infrastructure Surtax (called the Community Investment Tax, at 0.5 percent), the Indigent Care/Trauma Center surtax (at 0.5 percent), the Charter County and Regional Transportation System surtax (at 1.0 percent), and the School Capital Outlay surtax (at 0.5 percent).

6.2.1 Charter County and Regional Transportation System Surtax

In the fall of 2018, Hillsborough County voters agreed to impose the Charter County and Regional Transportation System Surtax, known locally as the Transportation Surtax and implemented only within Hillsborough County, at the maximum rate of 1 percent. Generally, the tax proceeds are for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of fixed guideway rapid transit systems, bus systems, on-demand transportation services, and roads and bridges.

For the purpose of the 2045 LRTP, the revenue forecast was developed assuming the 1 percent countywide sales tax starts in 2019 and will be collected for 30 years.

The base year (FY 2019) estimate for the Charter County and Regional Transportation System surtax was provided by the County. After 2019, the 23-year compounded average growth rate (3.58 percent, for the 1990-2013 period) was applied to be consistent with the 2040 LRTP. At 1 percent, the countywide sales tax is forecast to generate $10 billion over 20 years. Table 6 displays the estimated revenues from the new surtax.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Years</th>
<th>Charter County and Regional Transportation System Surtax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2025</td>
<td>$1,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026-2030</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031-2035</td>
<td>$2,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036-2045</td>
<td>$5,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2026-2045</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,089</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.
6.2.2 Local Government Infrastructure Surtax (Community Investment Tax)

The Local Government Infrastructure Tax (known as the Community Investment Tax (CIT), in Hillsborough County) can be levied at a rate of 0.5 percent or 1 percent. Counties cannot levy a combined rate exceeding 1 percent of the Local Government Infrastructure Surtax, Small County, Indigent Care and Trauma Center, and County Public Hospital surtaxes. Therefore, Hillsborough County is at the statutory maximum with the combined CIT and Indigent Care/Trauma Center taxes, each levied at 0.5 percent. Revenues from the CIT are used to acquire, construct, and improve general government, public education, and public safety infrastructure to promote the health, safety, and welfare of Hillsborough County residents. The CIT was adopted by referendum, and an extension must be approved by voters. The current CIT will sunset in 2026.

By agreement, several other governmental entities in Hillsborough County share the proceeds of this tax. The Hillsborough County School Board receives 25 percent of gross revenue, and a portion of the revenues go to pay annual debt service on a $318 million bond issue that financed the Raymond James Stadium. The remaining CIT proceeds are shared by the County and its three municipalities.

For the purpose of the forecast, gross sales tax revenues were adjusted for the School Board allocation (25 percent) and for debt service payments on the stadium, before levies are distributed to unincorporated Hillsborough County and the cities of Tampa, Plant City, and Temple Terrace. Based on discussion with the County, it is assumed that the CIT expires in 2026.

The CIT base year (FY 2019) estimate is based on data from the County. Revenues are shown for Hillsborough County and for the three cities alone. The County has bonded its share of revenues through 2026. Table 7 shows the estimated CIT revenues to the County and three cities based on two scenarios: CIT sunsets in 2026, and assuming CIT is renewed after 2026.
Table 7. Estimated Net Revenues from CIT, Countywide, FY 2020-2045
Millions of YOE Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Years</th>
<th>Assuming CIT Sunsets in 2026</th>
<th>Assuming CIT is Renewed after 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIT Net Proceeds Hillsborough County</td>
<td>CIT Net Proceeds Three Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$98</td>
<td>$26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2025</td>
<td>$551</td>
<td>$144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026-2030</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031-2035</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036-2045</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2026-2045</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Potential Net Revenues are after School Board allocation and debt service payments. Totals may not add up due to rounding. CIT renewal post-2026 is a possibility.

6.3 Mobility Fees (Previously Transportation Impact Fees)

Impact Fees were charges assessed for the impact that new development makes on Hillsborough County roads, parks, schools, and fire systems. Impact fee ordinances required new developments to pay a fair share for costs of improving existing infrastructure; in the case of transportation, impact fees are used for improving existing roads or constructing new roads made necessary by developments. A transportation impact fee schedule is typically based on trip generation, the cost of additional lane construction, trip length, percent of new trips added to the system, and existing lane capacity. The fee was assessed on the type of development and square footage.

Mobility fees were established in Chapter 40 Article III of the Hillsborough County Code of Ordinances and Laws Part A General Ordinances in 2016 as a replacement for transportation/ROW impact fees. Similar to impact fees, mobility fees are a one-time fee levied on new developments to cover the costs of transportation infrastructure consumed by the new development. As a charge on new development, the mobility fee has characteristics of an impact fee with some modifications:

- Sensitive to vehicle or person miles traveled encouraging shorter trips and reduction of total travel thereby promoting compact and mixed-use development.

- Funds multimodal transportation improvements for roadways, transit, bikeway, and pedestrian walkways. This includes capital projects, system efficiency and congestion management improvements/strategies and transit capital and operating costs.
• Provides a charge for recouping a new development’s share of transit operating costs for a short-term period.

• Distributed among all the governmental entities responsible for maintaining impacted transportation facilities.

A mobility fee in Hillsborough County replaced impact fees and proportionate fair share, which is how the County defrays infrastructure costs associated with additional road capacity that is necessary to serve new development. Because mobility fees are relatively new, the estimation is based on historical impact fees. Mobility fees may be spent on roads, bicycle, and pedestrian projects in the district where they are collected and must be spent within 10 years.

6.3.1 Hillsborough County Mobility Fees

Historical data of county transportation impact fee levies over the last decade were found in the Hillsborough County Annual Local Government Financial Reports for FY 2015-2018. The residential and commercial impact fees are assumed to grow with population and employment, respectively. Over 20 years, Hillsborough County mobility fee revenues are estimated to total $207.6 million.

6.3.2 Tampa, Plant City, and Temple Terrace

For city-specific transportation impact/mobility fees, data were collected from the respective city sources.

• **Tampa**: Transportation impact fees for FY 2016-2019 came from the City of Tampa Operating Budgets and ranged from $1.9 million to $2 million annually. For the revenue forecast, it is assumed that mobility fees will remain constant (i.e., no growth) at the average level of impact fees over the past 5-years of $2.1 million throughout the planning horizon, which would generate an estimated $41.1 million over 20 years.

• **Temple Terrace**: The City of Temple Terrace established a transportation mobility fee in 2009. The Annual Budget for FY 2019 includes street improvement fund impact fees declining from $1 million in FY 2016 to $0 by 2019. For the purpose of revenue forecasting, it was assumed that Temple Terrace mobility fee revenues will be the average of FY 2016-2019, at $48,000 annually, totaling $960,000 over 20 years.

• **Plant City**: For the revenue forecast, it was assumed that Plant City revenues would be the average of the FY 2016 and 2017 transportation impact fees, as found in Plant City Annual Financial Reports, at $289,000 annually with no growth. Over 20 years the revenues would total $5.8 million.

6.4 Transit Funding

The estimates of future revenues to support transit capital and operating needs in the region include dedicated funding for HART, the streetcar, and the Sunshine Line (paratransit).
6.4.1 HART

HART has generally relied on revenues generated through passenger fares, ad valorem taxes, advertising, and other miscellaneous revenues to pay for operations. Over the 20-year period, total revenues from these sources were estimated at $2.2 billion.

The base forecast for these revenue sources was obtained from the most recent Transit Development Plan (TDP, September 2018) and HART’s FY 2019 Adopted Budget. The following assumptions were used to estimate potential revenues.

- **Passenger Fares.** Passenger fare revenues are forecast at $18.4 million in FY 2019. The 20-year revenue forecast is estimated at $589.1 million assuming an expansion of services.
  - Passenger fare revenue forecast through FY 2028 was obtained from the TDP and include existing and new service revenues and pass revenues.
  - A 2 percent annual growth was applied to forecast revenues post-2028.

- **Ad Valorem Taxes.** HART receives the levies from a 0.5 mill (i.e., $0.50 per $1,000 of value) that are dedicated to transit. The 20-year ad valorem revenue forecast is estimated at $1.6 billion.
  - Ad valorem forecast through FY 2028 were obtained from HART’s TDP and the FY 2019 Adopted Budget.
  - After FY 2029, a 6.58 percent annual growth was applied, based on the compounded average annual growth rate on property values from 2018-2024 from the Office of Economic & Demographic Research’s Revenue Estimating Conference (December 2018).\(^\text{17}\)
  - Plant City is considering joining HART and adding the ad valorem tax.

- **Advertising.** Revenues collected through advertising were estimated at $21.9 million over 20 years.
  - Applied forecast from HART’s TDP through 2028.
  - After FY 2028, it was assumed that revenue will grow annually by 2 percent.

HART also receives funding from other miscellaneous sources (e.g., interest income). For the purpose of the 2045 LRTP, revenues were assumed to remain at the FY 2019 estimate levels.

---

\(^\text{17}\) Ad Valorem Forecast Comparison Sheet, December 11, 2018, http://edr.state.fl.us/Content/conferences/advalorem/ComparisonForecast.pdf
6.4.2 Streetcar

Funding for the streetcar includes passenger fares, special assessment district revenues, and Tampa Port Authority contributions, estimated at $65.0 million over 20 years.

The 20-year Business Plan for the Streetcar (through 2033) anticipates the need for additional funding to meet revenue shortfalls starting in 2020. The City of Tampa must cover any funding shortfall, unless other funding is identified.

- **Passenger fares.** Fare revenues in FY 2017 totaled over $550,000 as found in the HART FY 2017 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. For the purpose of the 2045 LRTP, an annual growth rate of 1.5 percent was applied through 2045.

- **Special Assessment District.** The streetcar operating expenses are funded with revenue from a special assessment district that includes downtown Tampa, the central business district (CBD), the Channel District, Ybor City, and Channelside. Properties within the current district are taxed a one-third mill ($0.33 per $1,000 of value).
  - The TECO Board of Director’s meeting from September 2018 estimated FY 2018 revenues of $772,600.
  - The revenue forecast applied an annual growth rate of 6.58 percent, consistent with the average projected ad valorem growth rate from 2018-2024 from the Office of Economic & Demographic Research’s Revenue Estimating Conference (December 2018).

- **Tampa Port Authority.** No contributions from the Tampa Port Authority are included in the revenue forecast.

6.4.3 Sunshine Line

The Sunshine Line provides door-to-door transportation and bus passes for elderly, low-income, and disabled persons who do not have or cannot afford their own transportation. Funding includes passenger fares, and other state (non-FDOT) and local funding. Total revenues over 20 years are estimated at $90.2 million.

- **Local Funding** – Hillsborough County provided about $3.0 million in 2013. For the 2045 LRTP, it was assumed that future funding will increase in-line with the historical average 10-year inflation\(^\text{18}\) rate (1.7 percent).

- **Farebox Revenues** – HART’s assumption of 2 percent annual growth was applied, consistent with the 2040 LRTP.

---

6.5 County Revenues for Transportation

In September 2016, the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) passed Board Policy Section Number 03.05.09.00 that sets aside a portion of County revenues for transportation. As a policy decision, the Board demonstrated their commitment to funding transportation and that transportation is one of the County’s highest priorities. A set amount of revenues is budgeted annually for ten years, starting with $35 million in FY 2017 and increasing to $90 million in FY 2026. Funds could come from a number of sources including ad valorem, local government half-cent sales tax, grants, new financing, additional recurring commitments, eligible reserves, and others. Mobility fees are not an eligible funding source and neither would be any new fuel taxes. Funds are prioritized for capital maintenance of existing infrastructure over new construction. Projects are proposed by the Hillsborough Transit Authority and other government agencies for selection by the BOCC. Revenues in FY 2017 were $35 million, increasing to $90 million by FY 2026 for a total of $600 million over the ten years. It is assumed that the funding source expires after FY 2026.

6.6 Summary of Local Revenue Sources

Table 8 shows the rates at which some of these taxes and fees are currently set. Table 9 summarizes the funding sources currently dedicated to Hillsborough County for carrying out transportation improvements, including the unbonded surtax revenues through 2026. Overall, all local sources are forecast to generate about $13.6 billion for transportation needs over 20 years, as shown in Table 9.

Table 8. Rates for Existing Local Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Option Fuel Taxes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ninth-Cent Fuel Tax</td>
<td>1 cent per gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First LOFT</td>
<td>6 cents per gallon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Optional Local Funding</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Fees</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART Fares</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART Ad Valorem</td>
<td>0.5 mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar Fares</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Line</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter County and Regional Transportation System Surtax</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Infrastructure Surtax</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Community Investment Tax (C.I.T.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Revenues for Transportation</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Source</td>
<td>FY 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fuel Taxes Levied Locally</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ninth-Cent&quot; Countywide (sunsets 2021)</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ninth Cent&quot; Countywide (renewed post-2021)</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First LOFT (6 cents), Unincorporated County</td>
<td>$29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First LOFT (6 cents), Plant City</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First LOFT (6 cents), Tampa</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First LOFT (6 cents), Temple Terrace</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Set Aside Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Revenues for Transportation (ends in 2026)</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Option Sales Taxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter County and Regional Transportation System Surtax (1 percent)</td>
<td>$287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Infrastructure Surtax (C.I.T.) Hillsborough County (sunsets 2026)</td>
<td>$98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.I.T (renewed post-2026)</td>
<td>$98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility Fees (Previously Impact Fees)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant City</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Terrace</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HART</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART Passenger Fares</td>
<td>$19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART Ad Valorem</td>
<td>$39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART Advertising</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Source</td>
<td>FY 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART Other</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streetcar</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar Passenger Fares</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar Special Assessment</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunshine Line</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Passenger Fares</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Local</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LOCAL (CIT and Ninth Cent Sunset)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LOCAL (CIT and Ninth Cent Renewed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
a Includes 15 percent "set-aside" for the administration of local transportation programs.

Figure 6.  Local Funding, FY 2026-2045
7 Potential New Funding Sources

This section examines the potential revenues of the taxes or fees that are not in place in Hillsborough County, but that could be implemented to support transportation investments. Opportunities to levy additional revenues for transportation improvements exist with the implementation of the Second LOFT, Ad Valorem taxes dedicated to transportation, transportation network company (TNC) fees, parking fees, a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) tax, and fees on vehicle registration and driver licenses. The following resources were used to develop the forecasts of potential local funding sources:

- 2018 Local Government Financial Information Handbook (September 2018)
- FDOT Tampa Bay Express Planning Level Traffic and Revenue (T&R) Study, February 2017
- 2040 Tampa Bay Regional Transportation Analysis v8.0 Measures of Effectiveness Report
- Tampa Downtown Partnership parking database
- State of Florida Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles Department Revenue Report FY 2018
- Data provided by Hillsborough County Tax Collector Offices

7.1 Second LOFT

The 1993 Florida Legislature extended the scope of the Local Option Fuel Tax to include an additional fuel tax of up to 5 cents per gallon of gasoline. Diesel fuel is not subject to this tax. Implementation of the second tax of 1 to 5 cents per gallon requires a majority plus one vote of the County Commissioners. The proceeds of the tax must still be shared with municipalities, either by mutually agreed-upon distribution scheme, or by using the state formula. Pursuant to Section 336 of the Florida Statutes, local governments may only use revenues from the tax for transportation expenditures needed to meet the requirements of the capital improvements element of an adopted comprehensive plan.

Revenues from implementing the full 5 cents per gallon of the Second LOFT are forecast at $622.6 million over 20 years (2026-2045). The forecast methodology was similar to the one used for the Ninth-Cent and the First LOFT.

---

19 Tampa Downtown Partnership, Parking in Downtown Tampa, https://www.tampasdowntown.com/getting-around/parking/
21 Communication with Hillsborough County Tax Collector Offices, November 12, 2018 provided Class E licenses for the County
• Base year (FY 2019) estimates for the Second LOFT were obtained from the 2018 Local Government Financial Information Handbook (September 2018).

• Revenue forecasts were developed assuming that annual growth will be in line with fuel consumption growth estimated from the FDOT Revenue Estimating Conference (August 2018).
  - The growth rates of gasoline consumption are assumed between 1.0 percent and 0.0 percent from 2020 to 2028, at an average of 0.3 percent annually.
  - The average growth rate was applied after 2028.

Table 10 displays the forecast for the Second LOFT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Years</th>
<th>1 Cent per Gallon</th>
<th>2 Cents per Gallon</th>
<th>3 Cents per Gallon</th>
<th>4 Cents per Gallon</th>
<th>5 Cents per Gallon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2025</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$91</td>
<td>$121</td>
<td>$151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026-2030</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td>$91</td>
<td>$122</td>
<td>$152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031-2035</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036-2045</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td>$316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2026-2045</strong></td>
<td><strong>$125</strong></td>
<td><strong>$249</strong></td>
<td><strong>$374</strong></td>
<td><strong>$498</strong></td>
<td><strong>$623</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

### 7.2 Ad Valorem Taxes

According to Florida Statutes, local governments may levy ad valorem taxes based on the assessed value of property. Ad valorem taxes are subject to the following rate limitations:

• Ten mills for County purposes;

• Ten mills for municipal purposes;

• Ten mills for school purposes;

• A millage fixed by law for a County furnishing municipal services; and

• A millage authorized by law and approved by voters for special districts.

Levies from ad valorem taxes provide funding for programs that have countywide benefit, such as services to the elderly and children, emergency management and emergency dispatch.
functions, jail operations and law enforcement, fire services, among others. To fund operations of the city-county library system, Hillsborough County levies a Special Library District Ad Valorem Tax, which applies only to property in the City of Tampa and in unincorporated areas of the County. Ad valorem taxes are also collected to meet annual debt service requirements for the payment of voter approved general obligation bonds. In addition, entities such as the cities of Tampa, Temple Terrace, and Plant City, the Hillsborough County School Board, HART, the Southwest Florida Water Management District, the Tampa Port Authority, and the Children’s Board are all authorized by the State to levy their own ad valorem taxes.

As noted in the section of existing local taxes dedicated to transportation, HART receives dedicated revenues from a 0.5-mill ad valorem tax and the streetcar is funded with a 0.33-mill special assessment.

For the purpose of estimating the revenue potential from a countywide ad valorem tax, a tax rate of 1 mill was applied to the countywide taxable value estimates. The County estimates 2019 ad valorem revenues of $95 million. Growth after 2019 was based on the State Revenue Estimating Conference’s growth rates for 2020-2024, and after 2024, a 5.5 percent annual growth was applied based on input from the County. An additional 1 mill in ad valorem is forecast to generate approximately $4.9 billion between 2026 and 2045.

In addition, HART has the authority to increase its ad valorem tax from the existing 0.5 mills up to 3 mills. An amendment to the HART charter may be required, as well as Board and County approval. In doing so, revenues would amount to $9.5 billion over 20 years, compared to the existing $1.6 billion.

### 7.3 Tolls

Per the 2018 Florida Statues, toll revenues are dedicated to maintenance, repair, and operating the turnpike system, to pay principal of and interest on bonds issued to finance or refinance the system, and to create reserves for all such purposes. As such, Hillsborough County is not an eligible recipient of toll revenues. However, the County may continue to collect tolls on a revenue-reducing project, aside from high occupancy toll or express lanes, after bonds have been paid off, and may even increase tolls. The tolls should be used for operations, maintenance, and improvements of the toll project. If the project is on the State Highway System (SHS) or county road system, the remaining revenues can be used for construction, maintenance, or improvement of any road on the SHS or county road system within the county in which the project is located. This provision may provide some flexibility for Hillsborough County if it were to operate a toll project not under the jurisdiction of the transportation or expressway authority that had discharged any bond indebtedness.

---

22 2018 Florida Statutes 338.231
23 2018 Florida Statutes 338.165
FDOT-tolled facilities in Hillsborough County through the Turnpike Authority include the I-4 Connector and the Veteran’s Expressway (Toll 589). Future plans are underway to toll I-4, sections of I-275 south of downtown, and I-75 within the County as well, with the toll lanes assumed to be operated by FDOT. The Tampa Hillsborough Expressway Authority (THEA) owns and operates the Selmon Expressway (tolled), Brandon Parkway, Meridian Avenue, and Selmon Greenway facilities in the county. Revenues from the Selmon Expressway stay in the County for use by the facility.

The State’s forecast of toll revenues for the Veterans Expressway and I-4 Connector total $99.8 million by 2028, each showing over 4.5 percent annual growth in revenues. Based on the FDOT Tampa Bay Express Planning Level Traffic and Revenue (T&R) Study, February 2017, revenues from tolling I-4 and I-275 in the County total $15.5 million in 2030 based on the most conservative projection of Scenario 4 and adjusted for an opening year of 2030. I-75 is also expected to be tolled in Hillsborough County with an estimated opening in 2030; based on the I-4 revenues from the T&R study and adjusted for VMT from the managed lanes on I-4 and I-75, revenues are projected to total $9293 million for I-275, I-4, and I-75 for 2026-2045.

THEA estimates toll revenues for the Selmon Expressway at $128.9 million in 2027 and annual growth of 4.4 percent, resulting in projected revenues of $3.8 billion for 2026-2045. Revenues from the I-4 Connector and Veteran’s Expressway, as estimated by Florida’s Turnpike, total $20.5 million and $79.4 million respectively, growing by 4.5 percent and 4.7 percent annually resulting in $2.8 billion over 2026-2045.

In total, the facilities’ tolls could provide $7.6 billion over the 20 years for operations, maintenance, bonding, and system expansion. These funds are assumed to be collected and used by the state and Turnpike Authorities, with no revenues passed on to Hillsborough County.

7.4 Off-Street Parking Fee

Several other metropolitan areas have implemented fees on off-street parking and a fee could be implemented on a per-space, per-transaction basis, or as a sales tax. As a per-space per day tax, it would act as a version of property tax. As a starting point of departure, the City of Tampa suggested using all of the parking spaces included in their downtown inventory, totaling over 29,000 in 2018 for non-residential parking in public and private lots and garages. Assuming that parking grows in proportion to employment and that all spaces are occupied once per weekday, a $1 fee in 2019 would yield $8.3 million in revenues. Assuming that


26 Tampa Downtown Partnership, Parking in Downtown Tampa, https://www.tampasdowntown.com/getting-around/parking/
parking rates and fees would increase with inflation over 20 years, revenues would total $533.7 million. Expanding the fee to non-residential, off-street parking countywide would add to this total.

In order to implement such a fee, the Tampa City Council would need to pass a resolution to amend the existing fees on parking. The City Council has the authority to set fees by resolution without the need to amend state statutes as found in Chapter 15 of the Tampa Code of Ordinances.

7.5 Transportation Network Company (TNC) Fee

A transportation network company (TNC) is defined as an entity that operates using a digital network to connect riders and drivers for a prearranged ride, such as Lyft, Uber, and Sidecar. Currently, all fees charged by TNCs are retained by the TNC, but there is potential for an additional fee to be levied for rides within the County. The Tampa International Airport implements a TNC fee on trips originating at the airport; fees are currently $4 per trip and all revenues are retained by the airport. To implement the fee at a county level, legislation would need to be amended as currently the 2017 Florida Statutes dictate that “a county... may not... subject a TNC, a TNC driver, or a TNC vehicle to any rate, entry, operation, or other requirement of the County.”

Based on county trips as found in the travel demand model, and assuming an estimated 1.5 percent of trips are provided by a TNC, a $1 fee per trip would yield $26.5 million in 2019. Assuming the fee would increase with inflation, a TNC fee would total $1.1 billion over 20 years.

7.6 Vehicle Registration Fee

The County could explore increasing the annual vehicle registration fee. Currently, none of the vehicle registration fees stay in the County except for the service fees. Rates for automobiles and light trucks range from $14.50 to $32.50 annually, while heavy trucks range from $60.75 to $1,322. The number of vehicles by type was estimated from the Florida Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles Department Revenue Report. To implement the additional fee would require updates to the Florida Statutes. However, there are a number of existing registration fees and

28 2018 Florida Statutes 627.748
29 Gutman, David, McClatchy, WA: How popular are Uber and Lyft in Seattle? Ridership numbers kept secret until recently give us a clue, November 5, 2018
service charges where a fee could be added to the statutes, but would need to be dedicated to the County.

Projecting increases to autos and light trucks based on population growth, and heavy trucks based on employment growth, an illustrative additional fee of $1 per vehicle registration in the County would yield $1.2 million in 2019, and total $52.9 million over 2026-2045.

7.7 Driver License Fee

Similar to the vehicle registration fee, an increase in the fees charged for obtaining or renewing a Class E license could be dedicated to transportation uses in Hillsborough County. Currently, all of the license fees collected in the County are passed to the state; only service fees stay in the County. Florida driver's licenses cost $48 and are valid for 8 years, or 6 years for those 80 and older. In order to implement the new fee, an update to the Florida Statutes would be required; however, there are a number of existing license fees and service charges where a fee could be added to the statutes and would need to be dedicated to the County.

Based on the Florida Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles Department Revenue Report and summarized Class E licenses provided by the Hillsborough County Tax Collector Offices, an estimated 220,000 licenses were issued in 2017. These include Class E original licenses, renewals, and replacements. Assuming issued licenses grow proportional to population, an illustrative $1 fee would yield $266,000 in 2019 and $12.2 million over 20 year.

7.8 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Fee

A fee based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would be a new fee levied on the number of miles traveled annually. There are different ways to implement such a fee; for example, it could be levied based on miles traveled within the County, requiring a GPS-based system, or on vehicles registered in the County no matter where the miles are driven based on odometer readings. A state-level pilot study on how to track and tax VMT is ongoing in Oregon and several other states are considering such a tax.

Challenges to implementation include privacy concerns and undefined tracking and collection mechanisms in Florida. Because the state does not require annual vehicle inspections, it would be more challenging to track annual mileage and collect fees. While global positioning systems (GPS) are likely the most efficient and accurate means of tracking mileage distance and locations, their usage introduces privacy concerns and therefore the funding mechanism is politically unpopular. An amendment to the state statutes would be needed to implement a VMT fee, and would also necessitate amendments to the statutes on motor and other fuel taxes (Chapter 206).

The VMT fee or tax has been suggested as a potential way to make up for the shortfall of the eroding gas tax revenues. Based on the projected vehicle miles traveled as found in the travel demand model, an illustrative fee of $0.01 per mile would yield $156.9 million in 2019. Though the 2040 travel demand model predicts Hillsborough County VMT will decrease from 2018 levels, revenues for 2026-2045 could total nearly $5.1 billion.
7.9 Summary of Potential New Funding Sources

Table 11 and Figure 7 show the revenue potential of new funding sources that could be implemented in Hillsborough County for infrastructure investments, including transportation. The revenue potential ranges from $12.2 million for driver license fees up to $8.7 billion from a 3 mill ad valorem tax for HART.

Table 11. Potential New Local Funding, FY 2020-2045

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021-2025</th>
<th>FY 2026-2030</th>
<th>FY 2031-2035</th>
<th>FY 2036-2045</th>
<th>FY 2026-2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolls</td>
<td>$169</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$1,188</td>
<td>$1,644</td>
<td>$4,769</td>
<td>$7,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd LOFT (5-cents)</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$151</td>
<td>$152</td>
<td>$154</td>
<td>$316</td>
<td>$623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Valorem (1 mill)</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td>$780</td>
<td>$1,022</td>
<td>$3,094</td>
<td>$4,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART Ad Valorem (3 mills)</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>$1,248</td>
<td>$1,408</td>
<td>$1,810</td>
<td>$5,477</td>
<td>$8,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Network Company (TNC) Fee</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$157</td>
<td>$195</td>
<td>$247</td>
<td>$677</td>
<td>$1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking Fee</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$107</td>
<td>$351</td>
<td>$534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled Fee</td>
<td>$161</td>
<td>$871</td>
<td>$1,007</td>
<td>$1,180</td>
<td>$2,878</td>
<td>$5,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Registration Fee</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver License Fee</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 summarizes total transportation-related revenues anticipated to be available through the period 2026-2045. According to these estimates, approximately $32.3 billion is expected to be available for transportation needs between FY 2026 and FY 2045. Figure 8 shows all available funding for transportation from Federal, state and local funding sources, and potential revenues from local sources.
### Table 12. Summary of Total Revenues, FY 2020-2045

**Millions of YOE Dollars**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Categories</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021-2025</th>
<th>FY 2026-2030</th>
<th>FY 2031-2035</th>
<th>FY 2036-2045</th>
<th>FY 2026-2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal and State – Capacity</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$1,038</td>
<td>$2,031</td>
<td>$3,870</td>
<td>$3,679</td>
<td>$9,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SIS</em></td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$654</td>
<td>$1,535</td>
<td>$3,324</td>
<td>$2,531</td>
<td>$7,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arterials</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$384</td>
<td>$496</td>
<td>$546</td>
<td>$1,148</td>
<td>$2,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State – O&amp;M</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$358</td>
<td>$423</td>
<td>$456</td>
<td>$944</td>
<td>$1,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, Resurfacing, and O&amp;M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State – O&amp;M</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>$207</td>
<td>$244</td>
<td>$263</td>
<td>$545</td>
<td>$1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operational Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro/Regional</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>$254</td>
<td>$506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State – Fuel Tax to Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transportation Programs</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$103</td>
<td>$107</td>
<td>$226</td>
<td>$435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State – Fuel Tax to Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Local</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit (Federal and State)</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$217</td>
<td>$276</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$1,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit (Local and Other)</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$348</td>
<td>$397</td>
<td>$483</td>
<td>$1,338</td>
<td>$2,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transportation Programs</td>
<td>$485</td>
<td>$2,748</td>
<td>$2,969</td>
<td>$3,411</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
<td>$15,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Local</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$39</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$916</td>
<td>$5,192</td>
<td>$6,627</td>
<td>$9,095</td>
<td>$16,566</td>
<td>$32,287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Assumes CIT and Ninth-Cent Fuel Tax are renewed.
Figure 8. Summary of Total Available and Potential Revenues, FY 2026-2045

Legend: Blue: Federal and State Highway
Yellow: Local
Red: Transit
Green: Potential Funding
Contact Information
We encourage your participation in this I-275/State Road 93 Project Development and Environmental Study. If you wish to discuss any issues related to this project, please contact Ashley Henzel, P.E., Senior Project Manager, at 813-975-6433 or Kris Carson, Public Information Officer, at 800-226-7220 or by email to kristen.carson@dot.state.fl.us. Written comments may be sent to:

Kirk Bogen, P.E.
Environmental Management Engineer
Florida Department of Transportation, District Seven
11201 N. McKinley Drive, MS 7-500
Tampa, FL 33612-6466

En Español
Si usted tiene preguntas o comentarios o si simplemente desea mas información sobre este proyecto, favor de ponerse en contacto con el señor Lillian Escalera, E.I., al teléfono (813) 975-6445 o correo electrónico lillian.escalera@dot.state.fl.us.

Non-Discrimination
Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who need special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation service (free of charge) please contact Alex Henry, Public Involvement Coordinator, 813-975-6405 or alex.henry@dot.state.fl.us at least seven (7) days in advance of the hearing.

Public hearing notice:

Project: I-275 from SR 93 to north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (SR 574) and north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (SR 574) to north of Bearss Avenue (SR 678/CR 582)

FDOT District: District Seven

Hillsborough County

FDOT Project Development & Environmental (PD&E) Studies

Study Schedule

The Study schedule for north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard to north of Bearss Avenue (WPI 431821-1) is shown below.

Phase | Anticipated Completion
--- | ---
Project Kickoff | Spring 2014
Complete Analysis | Spring 2019
Stakeholder Meetings | Spring 2019
Public Hearing | Spring 2019
Finalize PD&E Documents | Summer 2019
PD&E Approval | Summer 2019

Non-Discrimination
Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who need special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation service (free of charge) please contact Alex Henry, Public Involvement Coordinator, 813-975-6405 or alex.henry@dot.state.fl.us at least seven (7) days in advance of the hearing.

For more information about the project or to leave a comment go to active.fdotflstudies.com/i275/milktobearss

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by FDOT pursuant to Title 23 of the United States Code, Section 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 14, 2016 and executed by Federal Highway Administration and FDOT.

FDOT Florida Department of Transportation, District Seven

I-275 PD&E Studies from north of I-4 to north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (SR 574) and from north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (SR 574) to north of Bearss Avenue (SR 678/CR 582)

11201 N. McKinley Drive, MS 7-500
Tampa, FL 33612-6466
I-275 Project Overview

A Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study is a comprehensive evaluation of social, cultural, economic, and environmental effects associated with proposed transportation improvements. The objective of this PD&E Study is to assist the FDOT in deciding the type, location, and conceptual design of the necessary improvements. The PD&E Study satisfies all applicable requirements, including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), for this project to qualify for federal-aid funding of subsequent development phases (right of way acquisition, design, and construction).

Study Purpose

Right of Way Acquisition Procedure

When a transportation project proposes acquiring private property, you may have questions and concerns. To better inform you about the right of way acquisition process and your rights, the FDOT created real estate acquisition and relocation informational brochures. These brochures and other educational materials will be available during the public hearing. Copies of these brochures are available on our website: www.dot.state.fl.us/rightofway/Documents.

Right of Way Varies (128' - 470') Right of Way Varies (121' - 201')

Alternatives Considered

No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative assumes that no improvements would be made to I-275 within the project limits except routine maintenance. The disadvantages of the No-Build Alternative include no costs for design and construction, no effects to existing land use and natural resources, and no disruption to the public during construction. However, the disadvantages of the No-Build Alternative are not consistent with local plans. However, this alternative remains a viable alternative throughout the PD&E Study process.

Preferred Build Alternative

The Preferred Build Alternative would add one 12-foot general purpose lane in each direction on I-275 for a total of four 12-foot general purpose lanes in each direction. Improvements would also include a 15-foot inside shoulder to accommodate transit, a 12-foot outside shoulder, and a 2-foot concrete barrier separating each direction of travel. The mainline I-275 improvements would be constructed within the existing right of way. Approximately 3.4 acres of right of way will be required for stormwater management facilities near the Bearss Avenue interchange. Right of way may be needed for stormwater management facilities for other projects within the limits of WPI 443770-1. A "Right of Way Acquisition Procedure" below for more information.

Project Overview

The limits of this PD&E Study (WPI No. 431821-1) are from north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard to north of Bearss Avenue in Hillsborough County. The proposed project involves widening I-275 to add one general purpose lane in each direction, provide transit accommodations on the inside shoulder, and complete operational improvements at the Hillsborough Avenue and Bearss Avenue interchanges. The project is shown in teal in the map above.

FDOT District Seven committed to remove express lanes from this portion of I-275 and study them on a separate corridor that is more regionally focused.

Evaluation Matrix

The environmental and socio-cultural impacts of the Preferred Build Alternative and the No-Build Alternative are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

| Table 1: Alternatives Evaluation Matrix |
|---|---|
| Evaluation Criteria | No-Build Alternative | Build Alternative |
| Potential Relocations | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Businesses and Residents | 0 | 0 |
| Potential Right of Way Impacts | 0 | 0 |
| Additional Right of Way for Roadway (acres) | 0 | 0.64 |
| Additional Right of Way for Ponds (acres) | 0 | 1.00 |
| Potential Environmental Effects | 0 | 8 |
| Agricultural Sites | 0 | 0 |
| Historic Sites | 0 | 0 |
| Section 4(f) Sites | 0 | 0 |
| Noise Sensitive Sites | 0 | 448 |
| Wetlands (acres) | 0 | 749 |
| Floodplains (acres-feet) | 0 | 0.64 |
| Surface Waters (acres) | 0 | 0.06 |
| Threatened & Endangered Species | None | Minimal |
| Contamination and Hazardous Material Sites | 0 | 15 |
| Estimated Costs (in millions) | 0 | 817.6 |
| Right of Way Acquisition | $0 | $2.3 M |
| Wetland & Surface Water Mitigation* | $0 | $0.2 M |
| Construction & Engineering Inspection (8%) | $0 | $23.5 M |
| Design-Build | $0 | $239.6 M |
| Preliminary Estimate of Total Costs | $0 | $317.4 M |
| Right of way for stormwater management facilities near Bearss Avenue Interchange | $0 | $2.3 M |
| Site ranked as Medium and High | 0 | 0 |

* Wetland mitigation cost is $177,551 per acre; 2018/19 fiscal year cost from the Environmental Mitigation Payment Processing Handbook (May 2017).
Save the Date
National Sustainability Summit
Tampa, Florida
April 16-19, 2019

For more information email: sustainability@pinellascounty.org

USDA  United States  Department of Agriculture
National Institute of Food and Agriculture  IFAS Extension
UNIVERSITY of FLORIDA  NNSLE
February 18, 2019

Senator Darryl Rouson  
535 Central Avenue  
Suite 302  
St. Petersburg, FL 33701

RE: Forward Pinellas Policy Positions

Dear Senator Rouson:

As the countywide land use and transportation planning agency for Pinellas County, Forward Pinellas is acutely aware of the strong relationship that development and mobility decisions have on economic growth, affordability and quality of life. The Forward Pinellas Board adopted the attached policy positions at its meeting on February 13, 2019 with respect to the current state legislative session.

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

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dave Eggers  
Chair

Attachment

cc: Pinellas Delegation Members  
Forward Pinellas Board  
Brian Lowack, Pinellas County Intergovernmental Liaison  
Brad Miller, Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority CEO  
Carl Mikyska, MPOAC Executive Director  
[Highlighted: Beth Alden, Hillsborough MPO Executive Director]  
John Villeneuve, Pasco MPO Manager
Policy Positions - 2019
Adopted February 13, 2019

Support Urban Agriculture. Local governments are discouraged from allowing urban agriculture because the Florida Right to Farm Act (Section 823.14, Florida Statutes) exempts commercial farms from most local land development regulation. This protects rural farms from encroaching suburban development, a necessary and beneficial purpose. However, the statute is broadly written and so applies to commercial farms in urban areas, which bring value to communities from a health, economic development and affordability standpoint, and where reasonable regulation is required to protect adjacent development. Forward Pinellas supports proposed bill language amending the Florida Right to Farm Act to define urban agriculture and appropriately exempt it from restrictions on local land development regulation.

Protect Trust Funds. Trust funds such as the State Housing Trust Fund, the State Transportation Trust Fund and Local Government Housing Trust Fund are established with a clear purpose. These trust funds should be protected and not subject to transfers to the Budget Stabilization Fund and the General Revenue Fund. Forward Pinellas specifically supports Senate Bill 70, protecting funding intended for affordable housing from being transferred to other sources.

Support Transportation Funding.
- Taxes on fuel are a primary source of transportation funding for local governments. Increasing fuel efficiency, more electric vehicles in the fleet, and rising roadway maintenance and operating costs are placing pressure on local governments to search for additional funding. Local fuel taxes are not indexed to the Consumer Price Index to account for inflation, as state fuel taxes are, and therefore, revenues are declining at a faster rate. Forward Pinellas supports the Legislature permitting the indexing of local fuel taxes for inflation to better keep pace with transportation needs like it has done for state fuel tax revenues.

- The Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) receives the vast majority of state transportation funding. As our highway network continues to mature in urban areas like Pinellas County, and reaches a point where expansion is not a feasible or affordable option, Forward Pinellas supports increased flexibility for SIS funds for premium or express transit operating on the SIS roadway, but not necessarily on its own fixed guideway. This is consistent with the legislative position of the Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council.

Stop Distracted Driving. Texting while driving and related distractions pose a threat to the safety of motorists and non-motorized users. Forward Pinellas is committed to a Vision Zero initiative to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries on our roadways. In 2017, there were 106 serious injury and 8 fatal crashes in Pinellas County due to distracted driving (Forward Pinellas 2018 Countywide Trends and Conditions
Report). SB 76 and HB 107 authorize law enforcement officers to stop motor vehicles and issue citations to persons who are using a wireless communications device while driving. *Forward Pinellas supports legislation that prohibits distracted driving by addressing the use of wireless communications devices with clear definitions and clarification on what it means to be stationary and operating.*

**Maintain MPO Authority for Apportionment Structure.** State-mandated changes to metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), such as HB 385 this year and HB 575 last year, are a recurring concern to Forward Pinellas and other MPOs statewide. Attempts like HB 385, which is aimed at one county, could easily be revised to apply to other MPOs. *Forward Pinellas opposes one-size-fits all changes that would usurp local authority to determine the most appropriate structure of MPOs consistent with federal law and consultation with the Governor.*

**Encourage Transportation Mobility.** *Forward Pinellas supports micromobility options, such as electric bicycles and scooters as described in HB 453 and SB 542, and encourages first and last mile transportation options to reduce driving. These new micromobility options should be subject to appropriate and reasonable local regulations to address liability and ensure safety and compatibility with local conditions and procedures.*

**Support Home Rule.** Florida is a diverse state characterized by unique communities. Pinellas County is an example of that with its many downtowns, beach communities and neighborhoods. Home rule allows local governments to align the values of a community to its ordinances and other governing elements. *Forward Pinellas supports home rule and opposes bills that erode the ability of local governments to reflect the wishes and desires of their communities. A few examples:*  

- Many of Florida’s local governments, including those in Pinellas County, are still struggling with the effects of previous legislation, such as those amending Section 509.032(7)(b) that limit the ability of local governments to address vacation rentals. The preemption of local laws, ordinances or regulations to regulate the duration or frequency of vacation rentals limits the ability of local governments to respond to the negative impacts that may occur with vacation rentals.
- HB 385 restricts the ability of local governments to use the charter county and regional transportation system surtax on system operations, an ongoing expense.
- SB 588 and H6 603 would preempt regulation of single-use plastic straws to the state.
- SB 336 would require that a referendum to adopt or amend a local discretionary sales surtax be held at a general election, replacing the current ability of governing bodies to set a time at its discretion.
February 27, 2019

Ms. Lena Young Green
Tampa Heights Junior Civic Association
2005 N. Lamar Avenue
Tampa, FL 33602

Dear Ms. Young Green,

This letter serves as the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO's) agreement to assist the Tampa Heights Junior Civic Association in its 2019 Youth Summer Program. Our organization is honored and here to serve the community.

The MPO recently adopted a Health in All Policies Resolution, which prioritizes health considerations in transportation, looking at access to healthy foods, land use, housing, public safety and education. In addition, the MPO adopted a Vision Zero Action Plan with the goal to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries on our roads.

We will provide in-class learning on the topic of Vision Zero, bicycle safety, and bicycle repair. In addition, we would like to hold a bike safety rodeo, and provide helmets and bike lights to participants.

We support your efforts and look forward to collaborating to improve the safety and health of our community.

Please feel free to contact me or Gena Torres at the number below if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Beth Alden
Executive Director
Attached is the latest report. We had 11 fatalities, and 8 were vulnerable road users. Seven pedestrians were killed and one bicyclist. Please continue to look for ways to help improve pedestrian safety, which continues to be a big problem for our region. We are working on a lot of projects to improve lighting, crosswalk locations and other items but good ideas are always welcome and appreciated.

Thank you for keeping safety at the forefront of your work.

David W. Gwynn, P.E.
District Seven Secretary
Florida Department of Transportation
11201 N. McKinley Drive
Tampa, FL 33612
813-975-6039
Safety in Seven

District Seven’s Bi-Weekly Crash Report Update - A Summary of Traffic Fatalities that has occurred on public highways in the Tampa Bay Region. For more information, please note names of victims highlighted in blue are hyperlinked to news stories as published by the media and text highlighted in green are hyperlinked to obituaries as available. “Safety Doesn’t Happen by Accident.” Suggestions and/or ideas to enhance safety are welcomed here or by contacting Matthew Nance at 813-975-6747 or Matthew.Nance@dot.state.fl.us. Please note the word “here” is hyperlinked to District Seven’s Innovation Share Point Site.

January 15, 2019

Ryan Allen Kaytor, 31, Valrico: Ryan was walking across the westbound lanes of Hillsborough Avenue east of Orient Road when he was struck by a pickup truck. During the investigation, a second driver entered the scene and was subsequently arrested for DUI. Ryan died at the scene. Ryan is survived by his parents, brother, family and friends.

January 17, 2019

Arturo Martinez-Ramirez, 57, Plant City: Arturo was found deceased near Charlie Taylor Road and US 92. When officers arrived, it was determined to be a hit and run crash. Law enforcement officers believe they have impounded the vehicle involved in the crash, however, they are currently still looking for the hit and run driver. Arturo is survived by his longtime girlfriend, family and friends.

January 18, 2019

Linda Haynes, 55, Spring Hill: Linda was walking south across Spring Hill Drive near Linden Drive when a westbound vehicle struck her. Linda was transported to Bayfront Health Spring Hill hospital where she later died from her injuries. Linda is survived by two daughters, two brothers, twelve grandchildren, family and friends.

January 19, 2019

Tyrie “Ty” Nathan Thomas, 30, Inverness: Tyrie was riding his motorcycle westbound on SR 44 west of South Tighe Drive. A second vehicle was stopped on the north shoulder and attempted to make a U-turn. This resulted in the motorcycle striking the second vehicle, overturning, and catching fire. Tyrie was not wearing a helmet and died at the scene. Tyrie is survived by his family and friends.
January 20, 2019

Gary Edward Gogolowski, 73, Brooksville: Gary was driving north on US 301, when his truck broke down. He made a call asking for help and his wife called the Hernando County Sheriff’s Office requesting they look for him. At some point, Gary crossed US 301 and was struck by a southbound vehicle, who then fled the scene. Soon after, Zephyrhills police responded to a disturbance where the driver was located and taken into custody under the Baker Act. The driver confessed to the hit and run and was found to be under the influence of drugs and alcohol. After the confession, authorities located the scene of the crash where Gary was found deceased. Gary served in the U.S. Marines and received three Purple Hearts. Gary is survived by his wife, sons, daughter, grandchildren, family, and friends.

January 23, 2019

Melissa Rae Sandberg, 51, New Port Richey: Melissa was crossing Congress Street just north of Kentucky Avenue when a vehicle struck her. She was transported to Morton Plant North Bay Hospital where she later died from her injuries. Melissa is survived by her family and friends.

January 25, 2019

Roger P. Galvin, 61, Southwick, Great Britain: Roger was walking across Gulf Boulevard in front of a Double Tree when a southbound vehicle struck him. He was transported to Bayfront Health St. Petersburg where he died from his injuries. Roger is survived by his family and friends.

January 27, 2019

Ruel Depante Ramos, 37, New Port Richey: Ruel was the passenger in a vehicle traveling north on East Lake Road near Pasado Drive when, for unknown reasons, the driver veered off the roadway. The driver then overcorrected, traveled across the roadway and into the median. Ruel was transported to Regional Medical Center Bayonet Point where he later died from his injuries. Ruel is survived by his family and friends.

John Wesley Wise, 77, Crystal River: John was the passenger in a vehicle traveling south on US 19 in the left turn lane approaching Turkey Oak Drive, while a second vehicle was traveling northbound. John’s vehicle then attempted to make a left turn and entered the path of the second vehicle. John died at the scene of the crash and is survived by his family and friends.
Heather Scozzaro, 40, St. Petersburg: Heather was the passenger in a taxi traveling south on 49th Street when the driver rear ended a stopped vehicle at 38th Avenue North. Neither Heather nor the driver were wearing a seatbelt at the time. Both were transported to Bayfront Health St. Petersburg where Heather later died from her injuries. Authorities say that alcohol played a role in the crash. Heather is survived by her children, mother, siblings, family, and friends.

Tiffany Pomroy, 29, Spring Hill: Tiffany was walking across US 19 when she was struck by a vehicle driving north approaching Berkeley Manor Boulevard. Tiffany was transported to Reginal Medical Center Bayonet Point where she later died from her injuries. Tiffany is survived by the father of her sons, daughters, siblings, family, and friends.
Attached is the latest bi-weekly fatal crash report. We had eight people die on District 7 roadways including three pedestrians and two bicyclists. This is less than half the average two week number of fatalities. It certainly would be nice if this became more of the norm for a while as we continue to move towards our vision of zero fatalities.

Since there are less people this report, if you haven’t read through the individual write ups in a while consider doing so this week. We always need to remind ourselves that each person that dies was important to their family and leave loved ones behind. They are much more than a statistic in a bi-weekly report. Preventing these fatalities is what we should always have in our thoughts when we do planning, design, maintenance, or construction, and always look for ways to incorporate safety into your everyday work.

Thank you for all you do to promote safety in District 7.

David W. Gwynn, P.E.
District Seven Secretary
Florida Department of Transportation
11201 N. McKinley Drive
Tampa, FL 33612
813-975-6039
District Seven’s Bi-Weekly Crash Report Update - A Summary of Traffic Fatalities that has occurred on public highways in the Tampa Bay Region. For more information, please note names of victims highlighted in blue are hyperlinked to news stories as published by the media and text highlighted in green are hyperlinked to obituaries as available. “Safety Doesn’t Happen by Accident.” Suggestions and/or ideas to enhance safety are welcomed here or by contacting Matthew Nance at 813-975-6747 or Matthew.Nance@dot.state.fl.us. Please note the word “here” is hyperlinked to District Seven’s Innovation Share Point Site.

February 4, 2019

Robert Kirby Parker, 67, Clearwater: Robert was walking with his wife on a sidewalk adjacent to Feather Sound Drive when a vehicle failed to negotiate a curve. The vehicle departed the roadway and struck the two pedestrians. Robert died at the scene. He was constantly working to improve the lives of his family and community. Robert is survived by his wife, daughter and friends.

February 5, 2019

Sheri Rena Aaron, 43, Brooksville: Sheri was a passenger in a vehicle traveling on CR 476 near Daly Road, when for unknown reasons, the driver lost control of the vehicle. After overcorrecting, the vehicle overturned and collided with several trees. None of the occupants of the vehicle were wearing seatbelts. Sheri died at the scene. Sheri is survived by her family and friends.

February 6, 2019

Eberto Benito-Pablo, 32, Mulberry: Eberto was driving eastbound on SR 60 just east of SR 39 when he crashed into the back of a tractor-trailer that was stopped at a railroad crossing. Eberto was taken to South Florida Baptist Hospital in Plant City where he later died from his injuries. Eberto is survived by family and friends.

February 7, 2019

William A. Bologneta, 85, Wesley Chapel: William was driving east on Eagleton Boulevard when he proceeded to make a left turn onto Bruce B. Downs into the path of a southbound vehicle. William was transported to St. Joseph’s Hospital where he died from his injuries. William is survived by family and friends.

Johnny F. Renshaw, 71, Dover: Johnny was riding his bicycle with a friend when they crossed SR 60 near Marge Owens Road, east of the Hillsborough County Fairgrounds. After stopping in the median, Johnny proceeded into the eastbound lane when he was struck by a truck. Johnny died at the scene. Johnny is survived by family and friends.
February 8, 2019

Mary McGhee, 58, St. Petersburg: Mary was walking Friday evening attempting to cross 4th Street N. near Lincoln Circle when an oncoming vehicle struck Mary. She was transported to Bayfront Health, where she was later died from her injuries. Mary is survived by family and friends.

February 9, 2019

Samatha Bilbrey, 28, Pinellas Park: Samatha was riding a bike west on 54th Ave. in Pinellas Park when she crossed 49th N. St. in the crosswalk, but against a red signal. Unfortunately, she entered the path of a moving vehicle and the two collided. Samatha was pronounced dead at the scene. Samatha is survived by family and friends.

February 10, 2019

Jay Howard Kimmel, 59, Hudson: Jay was walking down SR 52 and decided to cross near Choctaw Trail in the early hours of Sunday morning. Jay was subsequently hit by three oncoming vehicles and died at the scene. Jay is survived by his loving family.
This past week advanced a couple of bills we are tracking in your MPOAC Legislative Newsletter. A couple to note, the Distracted Driving Bill passed out of its first committee in the Senate. The House version has not yet been scheduled for its first committee hearing and that is a little concerning. There is plenty of session to go, but we do need the House version to begin moving. Florida is one of four states that does not have a primary ban on texting while driving. The bill on street racing, SB 116 named Motor Vehicle Racing passed its first committee as well this week. Since Florida is committed to traffic safety the drag racing bill is something that will hopefully help make our roadways a safer place.

As the session is unfolding, some non-transportation issues are beginning to take on importance, headlines and the time of our legislators. This can be good at times and not so good in other regards. We have bills and issues we want advanced and these other non-transportation issues distract our members of the legislature from advancing our priorities. On the other hand, if legislators are looking for something to introduce we could find ourselves on the wrong end of a proposed bill. It is a double-edged sword.

While the legislature is not meeting next, they will begin their official session on March 5th. During this next week and during session, issues and questions that may occupy the minds of our legislators would be: should medical marijuana include a smokeable version, how to implement and define completion of a sentence which allows voting rights for ex-felons and how to deal with a couple of insurance issues including assignment of benefits reform. We will see where these topics go and how much attention they gather. In the meantime, please watch the bills which we have listed here in the newsletter. There are a couple of bills (OK, more than just a couple) which affect local units of government. I know these are of interest to the reading audience of this newsletter and if something really shocking comes up I will share the news with you here. Our partner organizations such as Florida League of Cities and Florida Association of Counties are tracking these “other” bills and we meet regularly to compare notes.

The Senate and the House are not meeting next week

A few more bills have been filed and certainly many more will be filed over the coming months. New bills are shown in RED in the last section of the newsletter. Your MPOAC Legislative Update will keep you apprised of newly filed bills and amendments.

Grab a cup of coffee and enjoy this edition of the MPOAC Legislative Update.
**Important Dates for the 2019 Legislative Session**

- January 25, 2019 - deadline for submitting requests for drafts of general bills and joint resolutions, including requests for companion bills
- March 1, 2019 - Deadline for approving final drafts of general bills and joint resolutions, including companion bills
- March 5, 2019 - Regular Session convenes, deadline for filing bills for introduction
- April 20, 2019 - All bills are immediately certified, motion to reconsider made and considered the same day
- April 23, 2019 - Last day for regularly scheduled committee meetings
- May 3, 2019 - Last day of Regular Session

**Committee Meeting schedule prior to the official Legislative Session beginning on March 5th**

- January 2019 - Week of the 7th
- January 2019 - Week of the 22nd
- February 2019 - Week of the 4th
- February 2019 - Week of the 11th
- February 2019 - Week of the 18th

**Legislation of interest to the membership**

This is a summary of transportation related bills filed and published on the legislature’s website as of February 22, 2019. More bills will be filed during the 2019 session and as they are made available the newly filed transportation bills will be added to this list. The bills are listed in numerical order for your convenience. As the session and bills progress, this ordering of bills will make it easier to follow the status of any particular bill you are tracking. All updates to this section of the newsletter and bills shown below will be in RED so you can quickly distinguish between updates and old news.

**SB 68: Transportation Disadvantaged – (Book)** - Requiring community transportation coordinators, in cooperation with the coordinating board, to plan for and use any available and cost-effective regional fare payment systems that enhance cross-county mobility for specified purposes for the transportation disadvantaged; requiring each coordinating board to evaluate multicounty or regional transportation opportunities to include any available regional fare payment systems that enhance cross-county mobility for specified purposes for the transportation disadvantaged, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.

**HB 71: Traffic Offenses – (McClain; Co-Introducers: Stevenson; Stone)** – Identical to SB 158 by Baxley. Provides criminal penalties for person who commits moving violation that causes serious bodily injury to or death of vulnerable road user; requires person to pay specified fine, serve minimum period of house arrest, & attend driver improvement course; requires court to revoke person's driver license for minimum specified period; defines "vulnerable road user". Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Criminal Justice Subcommittee; State Affairs Committee.
SB 72: Alligator Alley Toll Road – (Passidomo; Co-Introducers: Hooper) – Identical to HB 6011 by Rommel. Requiring specified fees to be used indefinitely, instead of temporarily, to reimburse a local governmental entity for the direct actual costs of operating a specified fire station, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations. On Committee Agenda – Infrastructure and Security, 02/19/2019, 4:30PM, Room 110 Senate Building. Favorable by Infrastructure and Security; 8 Yeas, Zero Nays. Now in Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism and Economic Development.

HB 75: Expanded Uses of Unmanned Aircraft – (Yarborough; Co-Introducers: Grieco; Killebrew) – Similar to SB 132 by Rouson. Permits use of drones by law enforcement agencies & other specified entities for specified purposes. Referred to Criminal Justice Subcommittee; State Affairs Committee; Judiciary Committee. On Committee agenda-- Criminal Justice Subcommittee, 02/06/19, 9:00 am, Sumner Hall. Favorable by Criminal Justice Subcommittee, 14 Yeas, 1 Nay. On Committee agenda-- State Affairs Committee, 02/19/19, 3:00 pm, Morris Hall. Committee Substitute by State Affairs Committee, passed 22 Yeas, Zero Nays.

SB 76: Use of Wireless Communications Devices While Driving – (Simpson; Co-Introducers: Passidomo; Hooper; Mayfield; Book; Rouson; Berman) – Similar to HB 107 (Toledo, Slosberg) and H 45 (Slosberg). Creating the "Florida Ban on Wireless Communications Devices While Driving Law", prohibiting a person from operating a motor vehicle while listening or talking on a wireless communications device for the purpose of voice interpersonal communication; deleting a provision requiring that enforcement of this section be accomplished only as a secondary action, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Innovation, Industry, and Technology; Judiciary; Rules. On Committee agenda-- Infrastructure and Security, 02/19/19, 4:30 pm, 110 Senate Building. Committee Substitute by Infrastructure and Security; passed with 8 Yeas, Zero Nays. Now in Innovation, Industry, and Technology Committee.

SB 78: Public Financing of Construction Projects – (Rodriguez) – Identical to HB 169 by Fernandez. Prohibiting state-financed constructors from commencing construction of certain structures in coastal areas without first conducting a sea level impact projection study and having such study published and approved by the Department of Environmental Protection; requiring the department to develop by rule standards for such studies; providing for enforcement; requiring the department to publish such studies on its website, subject to certain conditions, etc. Referred to Environment and Natural Resources; Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Environment, and General Government; Appropriations.

HB 107: Use of Wireless Communications Devices While Driving – (Toledo; Slosberg; Co-Introducers: Beltran; Casello; Cortes; Duran; Eskamani; Gottlieb; Grieco; Hattersley; Killebrew; Massullo; McClure; Overdorf; Polo; Smith, C.; Stark; Stevenson; Thompson; Webb) – Similar to SB 76 (Simpson). Revises short title & legislative intent; prohibits person from operating motor vehicle while using wireless communications device for purpose of nonvoice or voice interpersonal communication; redefines term "wireless communications device" to include voice communications; requires deposit of fines into Emergency Medical Services Trust Fund; removes provision requiring that enforcement be accomplished only as secondary action. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Appropriations Committee; State Affairs Committee.
SB 116: Motor Vehicle Racing – (Stewart) – Identical to HB 611 (Mercado). Increasing the criminal penalty for a third or subsequent violation related to motor vehicle racing within a specified period after the date of a prior violation that resulted in a conviction, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Criminal Justice; Judiciary; Rules. On Committee agenda--Infrastructure and Security, 02/19/19, 4:30 pm, 110 Senate Building. Favorable by Infrastructure and Security; 8 Yeas, Zero Nays. Now in Criminal Justice.

SB 132: Drones – (Rouson) – Similar to HB 75 (Yarborough). Defining the terms “dangerous or deadly weapon” and “large-scale event”; authorizing the use of a drone by a law enforcement agency to prepare for or monitor safety and security at a large-scale event; prohibiting a law enforcement agency using a drone in an authorized manner from equipping it with specified attachments or using it to fire projectiles, etc. Referred to Criminal Justice; Infrastructure and Security; Rules. On Committee agenda – Criminal Justice, 02/11/19, 2:30PM Room 37 Senate Bldg. Committee Substitute by Criminal Justice; 5 Yeas, 0 Nays. Now in Infrastructure and Security.

SB 144: Impact Fees – (Gruters) – Similar to HB 207 (Donalds). Revising the minimum requirements for impact fees adopted by a local government; exempting water and sewer connection fees from the Florida Impact Fee Act, etc. Referred to Community Affairs; Finance and Tax; Appropriations. On Committee agenda-- Community Affairs, 02/05/19, 2:00 pm, 301 Senate Building --Temporarily Postponed.

SB 158: Traffic Offenses – (Baxley) – Identical to HB 71 by McClain. Citing this act as the "Vulnerable Road User Act"; providing criminal penalties for a person who commits a moving violation that causes serious bodily injury to, or causes the death of, a vulnerable road user; requiring that the person pay a specified fine, serve a minimum period of house arrest, and attend a driver improvement course; requiring that the court revoke the person’s driver license for a minimum specified period, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations Subcommittee on Criminal and Civil Justice; Appropriations.

HB 169: Public Financing of Construction Projects – (Fernandez) – Identical to SB 78 by Rodriguez. Prohibiting state-financed constructors from commencing construction of certain structures in coastal areas without first conducting a sea level impact projection study and having such study published and approved by the Department of Environmental Protection; requiring the department to develop by rule standards for such studies; providing for enforcement; requiring the department to publish such studies on its website, subject to certain conditions, etc. Referred to Agriculture and Natural Resources Subcommittee; Appropriations Committee; State Affairs Committee.

HB 207: Impact Fees – (Donalds) – Similar to SB 144 (Gruter). Revises minimum requirements for adoption of impact fees by specified local governments; authorizes prevailing party to recover attorney fees under certain circumstances; exempts water & sewer connection fees from Florida Impact Fee Act. Referred to Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee; Commerce Committee; State Affairs Committee. On Committee agenda-- Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee, 02/20/19, 4:00 pm, 12 HOB. Committee Substitute by Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee; 14 Yeas, Zero Nays.

SB 306: Traffic Infraction Detectors – (Brandes) – Similar to HB 6003 by Sabatini. Repealing provisions relating to the installation and use of traffic infraction detectors to enforce specified provisions when a driver fails to stop at a traffic signal, provisions that authorize the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, a county, or a municipality to use such detectors, and the distribution of penalties collected for specified violations; amending provisions
relating to distribution of proceeds, enforcement by traffic infraction enforcement officers using such detectors, procedures for disposition of citations, preemption of additional fees or surcharges, compliance, amount of penalties, registration and renewal of license plates, and points assessed for certain violations, to conform provisions to changes made by the act, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations. Withdrawn.

**HB 309: Railroad-Highway Grade Crossings – (Duggan)** – Similar to SB 608 by Bean. Prohibits railroad train from blocking public highway, street, or road at railroad-highway grade crossing for more than specified time period; provides exceptions; provides civil penalties; exempts certain persons from liability for violations. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Civil Justice Subcommittee; State Affairs Committee.

**HB 311: Autonomous Vehicles – (Fisher) – Co-Introducers: Rodriguez; Mayfield** – Similar to SB 932 by Brandes. Exempts autonomous vehicles & operators from certain prohibitions; provides that human operator is not required to operate fully autonomous vehicle; authorizes fully autonomous vehicle to operate regardless of presence of human operator; provides that automated driving system is deemed operator of autonomous vehicle operating with system engaged; authorizes Florida Turnpike Enterprise to fund & operate test facilities; provides requirements for operation of on-demand autonomous vehicle networks; revises registration requirements for autonomous vehicles. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee; State Affairs Committee.

**HB 341: Motor Vehicles and Railroad Trains – (LaMarca)** – Identical to SB 1002 by Hutson. Requires that, in event of crash involving railroad train, collection of certain information be at discretion of law enforcement officer having jurisdiction to investigate crash; specifies that certain persons are not considered passengers for purpose of making crash reports. Not yet assigned to committees.

**SB 350: Impact Fees – (Hutson)** – Prohibiting local governments from charging impact fees for certain developments, etc. Referred to Community Affairs; Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations.

**HB 385: Transportation – (Avila)** – Requires certain authority members to comply with financial disclosure requirements; limits levy of & revises authorized uses of certain surtaxes; revives Pilot Rebuilt motor vehicle inspection program; revises provisions relating to DOT design plan approval, transportation project programs, toll collection & use, & M.P.O. membership; repeals pts. I & V of ch. 348, F.S., related to Florida Expressway Authority Act & Osceola County Expressway Authority Law. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Ways and Means Committee; State Affairs Committee. On Committee agenda--Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee, 02/13/19, 1:30 pm, Reed Hall. Committee Substitute by Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; 15 Yeas, 0 Nays. Now in Ways and Means Committee.

**HB 453: Micromobility Devices and Motorized Scooters – (Toledo)** – Similar to SB 542 (Brandes). Authorizes county or municipality to regulate operation of micromobility devices & for-hire motorized scooters; authorizes county or municipality to require licensure; requires proof of certain insurance coverage; provides that regulation of micromobility devices & for-hire motorized scooters is controlled by state & federal law; provides that operator has all rights & duties applicable to rider of bicycle; exempts micromobility device or motorized scooter from certain requirements; provides that person is not required to have valid driver license to operate
micromobility device or motorized scooter; authorizes parking on sidewalk; removes requirements for sale of motorized scooters; exempts micromobility devices & motorized scooters from certain emblem requirements. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee; State Affairs Committee.

HB 476: Child Restraint Requirements – (Perry) – Identical to HB 567 (Slosberg). Increasing the age of children for whom operators of motor vehicles must provide protection by using a crash-tested, federally approved child restraint device; increasing the age of children for whom a separate carrier, an integrated child seat, or a child booster seat may be used, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Children, Families, and Elder Affairs; Rules.

SB 542: Micromobility Devices and Motorized Scooters – (Brandes) – Similar to HB 453 (Toledo). Defining the term “micromobility device”; revising the definition of the term “motorized scooter”; authorizing a county or municipality to regulate the operation of micromobility devices and for-hire motorized scooters, subject to certain restrictions; authorizing a county or municipality to require that a person offering micromobility devices or for-hire motorized scooters be licensed; exempting a micromobility device or motorized scooter from certain registration, insurance, and licensing requirements, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.

SB 544: Airports – (Brandes) – Requiring the Department of Transportation to provide financial and technical assistance to sponsors that operate public-use airports by making department personnel and department-owned facilities and equipment available on a cost-reimbursement basis to such sponsors for special needs of limited duration; requiring federal funding of individual local public-use airport projects to be wholly between the airport sponsors and the appropriate federal agencies; authorizing the department to receive federal grants for both local and statewide public-use airport projects when no sponsor is available, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.

SB 567: Child Restraint Requirements – (Slosberg) – Identical to SB 467 (Perry). Increasing the age of children for whom operators of motor vehicles must provide protection by using a crash-tested, federally approved child restraint device; increasing the age of children for whom a separate carrier, an integrated child seat, or a child booster seat may be used, etc. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Children, Families and Seniors Subcommittee; State Affairs Committee.

HB 605: Tax Increment Revenues – (Casello) – Authorizes counties and municipalities to use increment revenues under specified conditions. Referred to Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee; Ways and Means Committee; State Affairs Committee.

SB 608: Railroad-Highway Grade Crossings – (Bean) – Similar to HB 309 by Duggan. Prohibits railroad train from blocking public highway, street, or road at railroad-highway grade crossing for more than specified time period; provides exceptions; provides civil penalties; exempts certain persons from liability for violations. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Judiciary; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.
HB 611: Motor Vehicle Racing – (Mercado) – Identical to SB 116 (Stewart). Motor Vehicle Racing; Increases criminal penalty for third or subsequent violation related to motor vehicle racing within specified period after date of prior violation that resulted in conviction. Referred to Criminal Justice Subcommittee; Justice Appropriations Subcommittee; Judiciary Committee.

SB 612: Driving Under the Influence – (Baxley) – Similar to HB 929 by Antone; Plakon. Requiring that the monthly leasing fee for an ignition interlock device be discounted by specified percentages under certain circumstances when a person claims inability to pay; authorizing a court, upon agreement by a state attorney, to withhold adjudication of guilt for certain criminal violations relating to driving under the influence, under certain circumstances, etc. Not yet assigned to committees. Referred to Criminal Justice; Appropriations Subcommittee on Criminal and Civil Justice

SB 622: Traffic Infraction Detectors – (Brandes; Co-Introducer: Diaz) – Similar to HB 6003 (Sabatini). Repealing provisions relating to the installation and use of traffic infraction detectors to enforce specified provisions when a driver fails to stop at a traffic signal, provisions that authorize the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, a county, or a municipality to use such detectors, and the distribution of penalties collected for specified violations; repealing provisions relating to the authorization to use traffic infraction detectors, etc. Not yet assigned to committees. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations

SB 660: Transportation – (Brandes) – Requiring the Department of Transportation to consist of a central office that establishes policies and procedures and districts that carry out projects as authorized or required under the policies and procedures of the central office; prohibiting the driver of any vehicle from following another vehicle more closely than is reasonable and prudent given certain circumstances; revising the number of times that certain persons may elect to attend a basic driver improvement course; providing requirements, beginning on a specified date, for license plates, cab cards, and validation stickers for vehicles registered in accordance with the International Registration Plan; directing the department to implement protocols for issuing an optional electronic credential and to procure a related technology system, etc. Not yet assigned to committees. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations

HB 681: Florida Transportation Commission – (Zika; Co-Introducer: Roach) – Removes requirement that Secretary of Transportation be nominated by FTC & that secretary provide assistance to FTC; removes provisions relating to creation, membership, duties, meetings, executive director & staff, & budget of FTC; removes requirement that FTC review certain transportation policy initiatives; repeals provisions relating to transportation performance & productivity standards; revises membership & member approval of Center for Urban Transportation Research advisory board; revises provisions relating to review & evaluation of DOT's tentative work program; requires DOT to determine certain average administrative costs for expressway authorities; removes FTC rulemaking authority. Not yet assigned to committees. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee; State Affairs Committee

HB 693: Communications Services – (Fischer) – Reduces communications services tax rate on sales of communications services; revises authority for municipalities, and counties to impose permit fees on providers of communications services that use or occupy municipal or county roads or rights-of-way; deletes procedures, requirements, & limitations with respect to such fees. Not yet assigned to committees. Referred to Energy and Utilities Subcommittee; Ways and Means Committee; Commerce
HB 725: Commercial Motor Vehicles – (Payne) – Repeals assistive truck platooning technology pilot project; revises provisions relating to platoon vehicle operation, commercial motor vehicle safety regulations & penalties, apportionable vehicle requirements, certain license plate fees, vehicles registered under International Registration Plan, & theft of certain commercial cargo; authorizes DHSMV to partner with tax collector to conduct Fleet Vehicle Temporary Tag pilot program. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee; State Affairs Committee.

SB 728: Growth Management – (Lee) – Authorizing sufficiently contiguous lands located within the county or municipality which a petitioner anticipates adding to the boundaries of a new community development district to also be identified in a petition to establish the new district under certain circumstances; providing requirements for the petition; providing notification requirements for the petition, etc. Referred to Community Affairs; Infrastructure and Security; Rules

SB 898: Transportation – (Diaz) – Revising the authorized uses of proceeds from charter county and regional transportation system surtaxes; revising the preservation goals of the Department of Transportation to include ensuring that all work on the State Highway System meets department standards; requiring the department to approve design plans for all transportation projects relating to department-owned rights-of-way under certain circumstances; prohibiting the department from using toll revenues from high-occupancy toll lanes or express lanes to offset certain funding, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.

HB 905: Department of Transportation – (Andrade) – Identical to SB 1044 by Albritton. Revises provisions related to DOT, including requirements for appointment of Secretary of Transportation, computation of mileage, pavement standards, construction contracts, use of toll revenue, allocation of transportation capacity funds, facility improvements, & project development & environmental studies. Filed, not yet assigned to committees.

HB 929: Driving Under the Influence – (Antone; Plakon) – Similar to SB 612 by Baxley. Requires ignition interlock provider to discount monthly leasing fee for ignition interlock device by certain percentage for certain persons; exempts such person from paying costs of installation of device; authorizes court to withhold adjudication of guilt for certain DUI offenses; requires court to order adjudication of guilt if certain requirements are not met; authorizes person to petition court for withhold of adjudication 5 years after his or her conviction. Filed, not yet assigned to committees.

SB 932: Autonomous Vehicles – (Brandes) – Similar to HB 311 by Fischer. Exempting a fully autonomous vehicle being operated with the automated driving system engaged from a prohibition on the active display of television or video; exempting a motor vehicle operator who is operating an autonomous vehicle from a prohibition on the use of wireless communications devices; providing that a licensed human operator is not required to operate a fully autonomous vehicle; authorizing a fully autonomous vehicle to operate in this state regardless of whether a human operator is physically present in the vehicle, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.

SB 952: Electronic Navigation Systems – (Taddeo) – Prohibiting electronic navigation systems, for certain purposes, from directing the operator of a vehicle to drive through adjacent residential areas when a school zone speed limit is in effect if the primary purpose of such
direction is to avoid the school zone, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Innovation, Industry, and Technology; Rules.

**SB 1002: Motor Vehicles and Railroad Trains—(Hutson)** — Identical to HB 341 by LaMarca. Revising the definition of the term “railroad train”; requiring that, in the event of a crash involving a railroad train, the collection of certain information be at the discretion of the law enforcement officer having jurisdiction to investigate the crash; specifying that certain persons are not considered passengers for the purpose of making crash reports, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Criminal Justice; Rules.

**SB 1044: Department of Transportation —(Albritton)** — Identical to HB 905 by Andrade. Providing that the Department of Transportation consists of a central office that establishes policies and procedures and districts that carry out certain projects; requiring certain preservation goals to include ensuring that a specified percentage of the pavement in each of the department’s districts meet department standards by a specified year; prohibiting local governments from adopting standards or specifications that are contrary to the department standards or specifications for permissible use of aggregates and materials that have been certified for use, etc. Referred to Infrastructure and Security; Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development; Appropriations.

**HB 6001: Alligator Alley Toll Road —(Rommel)** — Identical bill to SB 72 by Passidomo. Requires specified fees to be used indefinitely to reimburse local governmental entity for direct actual costs of operating specified fire station. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Transportation and Tourism Appropriations Subcommittee; State Affairs Committee.

**HB 6003: Traffic Infraction Detectors —(Sabatini – Co-Introducers: Grieco; Hill; Jacobs; Sirois)** — Similar bill to SB 306 (Brandes). Repeals provisions relating to Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Program & authorization to use traffic infraction detectors; repeals provisions relating to distribution of penalties, transitional implementation, & placement & installation; conforms cross-references & provisions to changes made by act. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Appropriations Committee; State Affairs Committee. Favorable by Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, 12 Yeas, 1 Nay. Now in Appropriations Committee.

**HB 6017: Small-scale Comprehensive Plan Amendments —(Duggan)** — Removes acreage limitations that apply to small-scale comprehensive plan amendments. Referred to Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee; Commerce Committee; State Affairs Committee. On Committee agenda-- Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee, 02/13/19, 8:30 am, 12 HOB. Favorable by Local, Federal and Veterans Affairs Subcommittee; 14 Yeas, 0 Nays. Now in Commerce Committee.

**HB 7007: OGSR/Toll Facilities —(General Bill by Oversight, Transparency and Public Management Subcommittee; Andrade)** — Removes scheduled repeal of exemption from public records requirements for personal identifying information provided for purpose of paying, prepaying, or collecting tolls & associated administrative charges for use of toll facilities. Referred to Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; State Affairs Committee. On Committee agenda-- Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee, 02/13/19, 1:30 pm, Reed Hall. Favorable by Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee; 15 Yeas, 0 Nays. Now in State Affairs Committee.
Renewing the National Commitment to the Interstate Highway System: A Foundation for the Future

The Interstate Highway System has conferred broad and deep benefits and has been pivotal in shaping and supporting demographic, spatial, economic, and social development in the United States for more than 50 years. The Interstate Highway System provides the main corridors for passenger and freight movement within rural and urban areas. Interstate highways must be preserved, rehabilitated, and modernized to adapt to the country’s changing demographic, economic, climatic, and technological landscape.

The Interstate Highway System’s future, despite its crucial role in the economy and society, is threatened by a persistent and growing backlog of physical and operational deficiencies and by a number of large and looming challenges. Many Interstate highway segments are more than 50 years old, subject to much heavier traffic than anticipated, and operating well beyond their design life without having undergone major upgrades or reconstruction. These aging and heavily used segments are poorly equipped to accommodate even modest projections of future traffic growth, much less the magnitude of growth experienced over the past 50 years.

Congress asked the Transportation Research Board (TRB), a program unit of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, to form a special committee to conduct a study to inform pending and future federal investment and policy decisions concerning the Interstates. Congress asked the committee to make recommendations on the “features, standards, capacity needs, application of technologies, and intergovernmental roles to upgrade the Interstate System” and to advise on any changes in law and resources required to further the recommended actions. The report of the study committee suggests a path forward to meet the growing and shifting demands of the 21st century in the report: Renewing the National Commitment to the Interstate Highway System: A Foundation for the Future.

LOOMING CHALLENGES

The prospect of an aging and worn Interstate System that operates unreliably is concerning in the face of a vehicle fleet that continues to transform as the 21st century progresses and the vulnerabilities due to climate change place new demands on the country’s transportation infrastructure. Unless a commitment is made to remedy the system’s deficiencies and prepare for the challenges that lie ahead, the system risks becoming increasingly congested; far more costly to operate, maintain, and repair; and vulnerable to the effects of a changing climate and extreme weather. Looming challenges that will necessitate this commitment include the following.

AGING ASSETS IN NEED OF REBUILDING

Many of the Interstate pavements built in the 1950s and 1960s were designed for 20-year service lives but have now gone more than 50 years without reconstruction of their foundations, despite much higher traffic loadings than projected. While these foundations are being rebuilt, sufficient resources will be needed to preserve, restore, and rehabilitate the system’s thousands of aging bridges and other assets.
ESCALATING URBAN TRAFFIC LEVELS

Large portions of the Interstate Highway System, especially in metropolitan areas, are chronically congested and have difficulty accommodating the demands of both local and longer distance travelers. As most of the country’s population and economic growth is forecast to occur in large metropolitan areas, the potential grows for worsening congestion unless capacity is added and more actively managed.

DEMANDS FOR MORE SYSTEM COVERAGE

Although thousands of miles of high-quality highways other than Interstates connect the country’s population centers, lack of access to the Interstate Highway System may be viewed by some smaller communities and emerging cities as detrimental to their growth and development, particularly given that the Interstate System includes the country’s main trucking corridors and links to other modes.

EXPECTATIONS FOR CONTINUAL SAFETY GAINS

The Interstates are the nation’s safest highways, but they still account for more than 5,000 traffic deaths annually. As new highway and vehicle technologies are introduced, reconstruction work increases, and physical and operational measures are taken to accommodate growing traffic demand, an emphasis on ensuring safety performance will be critical.

TRANSFORMATIONS TO THE VEHICLE FLEET

New vehicle technologies have the potential to alter the operations and safety performance of the highway system, including the Interstates. The system will need to be made adaptable to changing vehicle capabilities while avoiding premature investments in assets and the introduction of standards that would hinder useful development pathways.

CHANGING CLIMATE CONDITIONS

When much of the Interstate Highway System was being built during the 1960s and 1970s, little was known about the threat of climate change. Transportation agencies across the country will need to make changes to how they plan, design, construct, operate, and maintain the Interstates to make them more resilient and less vulnerable to adverse effects of climate change.

ERODING REVENUES FOR SYSTEM FUNDING

Increasing vehicle fuel economy and electric vehicles threaten a funding base that relies heavily on revenues from fuel taxes that have lagged spending needs. New funding mechanisms that are equitable and efficient and do not divert resources from other highways and transportation modes will be needed to pay for system reinvestments.

AN INVESTMENT IMPERATIVE

Only limited planning and budgetary preparations have been made to fix the deterioration to the Interstate System that has already occurred, and much less for addressing the challenges that lie ahead. Recent combined state and federal capital spending on the Interstates has been about $20–$25 billion per year. The estimates in this study suggest this level of spending is too low and that $45–$70 billion annually over the next 20 years will be needed to undertake the long-deferred rebuilding of pavements and bridges and to accommodate and manage growing user demand. This estimated investment is incomplete because it omits the spending that will be required to meet other challenges such as boosting the system’s resilience and expanding its geographic coverage. While these investment needs could not be estimated even roughly for this study, they are certain to require billions, and perhaps tens of billions, in additional annual spending.

...what makes today’s investment choices so critical is that much of the Interstate System is already past due for major reconstruction and modernization...

Committee for a Study of the Future Interstate Highway System
A BLUEPRINT FOR ACTION

The original Interstate Highway Construction Program was underpinned by a long-term, collaborative commitment among the states and the federal government. A comparable partnership is needed to renew and modernize the system and ensure that it is resilient and responsive to the changing demands of users.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

Congress should legislate a
Interstate Highway System
Renewal and Modernization
Program (RAMP). This program
should focus on reconstructing
deteriorated pavements, including
their foundations, and bridge infra-
structure; adding physical capacity and operations
and demand management capabilities (e.g., tolling)
where needed; and increasing the system’s resilience.

The RAMP should be modeled after the original
Interstate Highway System Construction Program by
reinforcing the traditional program partnership in
which the federal government provides leadership in
establishing the national vision for the overall system,
the bulk of the needed funding, and overall stan-
dards, while states prioritize and execute projects in
their continued role as owners, builders, operators,
and maintainers of the system. The federal share of
project in spending should be comparable to the 90
percent share of the original Interstate Highway Sys-
tem Construction Program.

Congress should, as a near-term step, (1)
increase the federal fuel tax to a level com-
mensurate with the federal share of the
required RAMP investment, and (2) adjust
the tax as needed to account for inflation and
changes in vehicle fuel economy.

To provide states and metropolitan areas with more
options for raising revenue for their share of RAMP
investments and for managing the traffic demand on
and operations of Interstate segments that offer lim-
ited opportunity for physical expansion, Congress
should lift the ban on tolling of existing gen-
eral-purpose Interstate highways. As a condition
for imposing those tolls, states should be required to
assess their impact on current users and offer alterna-
tive mobility options for those users significantly and
disproportionately harmed by the tolls.

A “rightsizing” component of RAMP should address
current and emerging demands to extend the Inter-
state System’s length and scope of coverage and
to remediate economic, social, and environmental
disruptions caused by highway segments that com-
unities find overly intrusive and are not deemed
vital to network traffic. Congress should direct the
U.S. Department of Transportation and the
Federal Highway Administration to develop
criteria for such system rightsizing using a
consultative process that involves states, local
jurisdictions, highway users, and the general
public.

To ensure that the federal government’s long-term
commitment to RAMP is not threatened by declining
fuel tax revenues as the vehicle fleet and its energy
sources evolve, Congress should prepare for the
need to employ new federal and state funding
mechanisms, such as the imposition of tolls
or per-mile charges on users of the Interstate
Highway System.
A TRIED AND TRUE APPROACH

Implementation of the above recommendations, together with several other complementary recommendations called for in the report, would represent a fundamental shift away from a federal policy that has lost focus on the Interstate Highway System and the commitment to funding it adequately. These actions would restore the system’s premier status within the nation’s highway program in a manner that is aggressive and ambitious, although by no means novel. Taking these actions would (1) rekindle a tried-and-true federal–state partnership; (2) reinforce the system’s long-standing reliance on user fees to provide a fair, adequate, and reliable source of funding; and (3) reassert the forward-looking vision that was instrumental to the genesis of this crucial national asset more than a half-century ago. At that time, the nation’s leaders endorsed a modern highway system that would confer large and lasting societal and economic benefits, a vision whose realization required a strong and continuing national commitment. Today, the nation is experiencing, and can anticipate, new expectations for system performance, condition, and use. Meeting those expectations will require the same forward-looking outlook and commitment that informed the system’s creation—a rededication to that original vision that reshapes and re-equip the system to serve generations to come.
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