Meeting of the Policy Committee
Wednesday, December 12, 2018, 9:00 AM
18th Floor, Plan Hillsborough Room

I. Call to Order

II. Public Comment – 3 minutes per speaker, please

III. Approval of Minutes – October 23, 2018

IV. Action Items
   A. It's Time Tampa Bay Survey Results & Recommendations (Lisa Silva, MPO Staff)
   B. Speed Management & Safety: A Data-Driven Approach (Paula Flores, GPI)
   C. Health in All Policies Resolution (Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff)

V. Status Reports
   A. FDOT Tentative Work Program (FDOT Representative)
   B. Heights Mobility Plan (FDOT Representative)

VI. Old Business & New Business
   A. MPO Bylaws Amendment
   B. Next Meeting January 29, 2019

VII. Adjournment

VIII. Addendum
   A. MPO Meeting Minutes & Committee Report
   B. Article: Round is Resilient
   C. Email: Mike Lamarca

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

The MPO does not discriminate in any of its programs or services. Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Learn more about our commitment to non-discrimination.
Persons needing interpreter services or accommodations for a disability in order to participate in this meeting, free of charge, are encouraged to contact Johnny Wong, 813-273-3774 x370 or wongj@plancom.org, three business days in advance of the meeting. Also, if you are only able to speak Spanish, please call the Spanish helpline at (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

Si necesita servicios de traducción, el MPO ofrece por gratis. Para registrarse por estos servicios, por favor llame a Johnny Wong directamente al (813) 273-3774, ext. 370 con tres días antes, o wongj@plancom.org de cerro electronico. También, si sólo se puede hablar en español, por favor llame a la línea de ayuda en español al (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, materials attached are for research and educational purposes, and are distributed without profit to MPO Board members, MPO staff, or related committees or subcommittees the MPO supports. The MPO has no affiliation whatsoever with the originator of attached articles nor is the MPO endorsed or sponsored by the originator. Persons wishing to use copyrighted material for purposes of their own that go beyond ‘fair use’ must first obtain permission from the copyright owner.

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.
OCTOBER 23, 2018 - METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE

The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee (MPOPC), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Regular Meeting, scheduled for Tuesday, October 23, 2018, at 9:00 a.m., in the Plan Hillsborough Committee Room, 18th Floor, Frederick B. Karl County Center, Tampa, Florida.

The following members were present:

Pat Kemp, Vice Chairman
Charles Klug for Paul Anderson (alternate)
Guido Maniscalco
Sandia Murman (arrived at 9:20 a.m.)
Robert Frey for Joseph Waggoner

Commissioner, Hillsborough County
Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Tampa Port Authority
Councilman, City of Tampa
(Tampa City Council
Commissioner, Hillsborough County
Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority

The following member was absent:

Harry Cohen, Chairman

Councilman, Tampa City Council

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairman Kemp called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and led in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - SEPTEMBER 25, 2018

The item was deferred to the next meeting.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

1. Bloomingdale Avenue at U.S. Highway 301 Intersection

2. HART Computer-Aided Dispatch/Automatic Vehicle Location Bus Equipment Replacement

Ms. Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO, presented the amendments and requested approval. Councilman Maniscalco so moved, seconded by Mr. Klug, and carried four to zero. (Commissioner Murman had not arrived; Chairman Cohen was absent.)
B. Speed Management and Safety: A Data-Driven Approach

The item was deferred to the next meeting.

C. Board Positions on Federal Performance Measures

Dr. Johnny Wong, MPO, shared a presentation. Councilman Maniscalco asked about the potential impacts of a transportation referendum on the ballot, which Ms. Beth Alden, MPO Executive Director, addressed. Mr. Frey requested a letter from HART indicating agreement with the standards being implemented and questioned the recommended actions. Vice Chairman Kemp appreciated the prioritization of the HART Maintenance Facility feasibility study and inquired about the forecasted future performance numbers. Discussion ensued regarding the Imagine Hillsborough 2040 Plan projections/changes. Vice Chairman Kemp wondered about signalization changes referenced in the report, voiced concerns about the reopening of the Maydell Bridge, and queried staff on how often roads were repaved in the County. Ms. Alden clarified the numbers in the presentation were extrapolations based on the previous long-range plan and would be updated. Vice Chairman Kemp called for a motion for the staff’s recommendation to support the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) statewide performance targets. Commissioner Murman so moved, seconded by Councilman Maniscalco. (Chairman Cohen was absent). Mr. Frey repeated his request for a letter from HART. Commissioner Murman agreed. The motion carried five to zero. (Chairman Cohen was absent).

Vice Chairman Kemp solicited for a motion for the second recommendation, communicate National Highway System bridge maintenance and funding requests in a letter to FDOT. Commissioner Murman so moved, seconded by Councilman Maniscalco, and carried five to zero. (Chairman Cohen was absent). Vice Chairman Kemp sought a motion for the third recommendation, communicate to the Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group that HART Maintenance Facility should be a top regional priority and Transportation Systems Management and Operations projects should also be prioritized at a regional level. Commissioner Murman so moved, seconded by Councilman Maniscalco. Following comments regarding HART representative availability, the motion carried five to zero. (Chairman Cohen was absent).
D. Renewal of Interlocal Agreement with Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority for Organizational and Administrative Services for the MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee

► Mr. Rich Clarendon, MPO, presented the item. ► Commissioner Murman moved approval, seconded by Councilman Maniscalco. Following discussion, the motion carried five to zero. (Chairman Cohen was absent).

V. STATUS REPORT

A. Long Range Transportation Plan Goals Update

► Ms. Michele Ogilvie, MPO, gave the report.

VI. OLD BUSINESS AND NEW BUSINESS

► Ms. Alden announced a public workshop on Monday, October 29, 2018, and the next MPOPC meeting on December 12, 2018. ► Vice Chairman Kemp wanted further examination of the Maydell Bridge restoration project and explained safety concerns regarding development in the area of the Upper Tampa Bay Trail.

VII. ADDENDUM

A. MPO Meeting Summary and Committee Report

B. Walk of Science 2018 - October 20, 2018

C. “Planning Healthy Places” Program with MPO Panelist - October 24, 2018

D. Tampa Bay Next Historic Resources Information Meeting - October 25, 2018

E. Planning Commission Design Awards - October 25, 2018

F. Regional Planning Best Practice Study Workshop 3 - October 29, 2018
VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:02 a.m.

READ AND APPROVED: ___________________________

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
PAT FRANK, CLERK

By: ____________________
    Deputy Clerk
    ag
**Board & Committee Agenda Item**

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

**Presenter**
Lisa K. Silva (MPO Staff)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Transportation Elements – Roads & Highways

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

Transportation Elements - Other

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

During the December MPO Board meeting members asked questions regarding Hillsborough specific results, if the survey addressed safety and I-275 Boulevard.

Recommended Action

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

Prepared By

Lisa K. Silva, AICP, PLA (MPO Staff)

Attachments

2045 Tri-County Transportation Plan Results Summary Report
2045 Survey Comments Appendix
2045 Tri-County Transportation Plan
MetroQuest Survey Results

November 2018

Prepared for

Hillsborough MPO
Metropolitan Planning for Transportation

Prepared by

AECOM
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The preparation of this report has been financed in part through grants from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, under the Metropolitan Planning Program, Section 104(f) of Title 23, U.S. Code. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

The MPOs do not discriminate in any of their programs or services. Public participation is solicited by the MPOs without regard to race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, family or religious status.

Learn more about our commitment to nondiscrimination and diversity by contacting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County MPO</td>
<td>Johnny Wong, Title VI/Nondiscrimination Coordinator (813) 273-3774 ext. 370, or <a href="mailto:wongj@plancom.org">wongj@plancom.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas County MPO</td>
<td>Alicia Parinello, Title VI Program Planner (727) 464-8250 <a href="mailto:aparinello@forwardpinellas.org">aparinello@forwardpinellas.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco County MPO</td>
<td>Tania Gorman, Title VI Planner, (727) 847-8140 <a href="mailto:tgorman@pascocountyfl.net">tgorman@pascocountyfl.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1 – Introduction

It’s TIME Tampa Bay is a collaboration of the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) of Hillsborough, Pasco, and Pinellas Counties. Federal law requires MPOs to evaluate trends, project future growth, and identify fiscally constrained multimodal transportation investments for the next 20 plus years as part of their Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) update. It’s TIME Tampa Bay represents the first tri-county planning initiative the three counties have undertaken as part of the 2045 LRTP planning process. Together, the MPOs are addressing regional mobility needs in an effort to ensure that connections to jobs, universities, healthcare, airports, state parks and the beaches are accessible to everyone. Each MPO will utilize the results of the tri-county public outreach effort to help identify county-specific, and cross-county, projects that support and enhance regional mobility.

Public Outreach

The Hillsborough, Pasco and Pinellas MPOs embrace public outreach as it is a critical step to inform the LRTP development process and helps to ensure the LRTP reflects community values, and overall vision. As such, the MPOs together selected an online survey platform – MetroQuest – as the primary public outreach tool for the It’s TIME Tampa Bay initiative.

The MetroQuest survey provided the public the opportunity to weigh in on:

- transportation and growth priorities,
- three exaggerated future year growth scenarios
- and a variety of potential roadway and transit projects, community development and funding options.

No single scenario will solve the transportation and mobility needs of the tri-county area—it will take a combination of investments to move people and goods around the region, both today and even more so in the future when the three-county area will add over one million in population. The
purpose of this survey was to help the MPOs identify the best ideas, projects, and policies to evaluate further as part of the 2045 LRTP development that will be completed in 2019.

Toward this end, each MPO will continue to conduct transportation planning for their communities and neighborhoods, in coordination with local city and county land-use planning. Some current/recent examples include the Brandon Corridors & Mixed-Use Centers study in Hillsborough, the Master Plan for Gateway/Mid-County in Pinellas, and the Wesley Chapel Roadway Connection study in Pasco. The It’s TIME Tampa Bay survey builds off these local planning and regional planning initiatives in an effort to address these basic questions:

How can the Tampa Bay area, from a mobility and development standpoint, best prepare for a thriving future?

How should we prepare our region for the next generation?

Why it’s TIME!

Already among the top 20 most populated regions in the country, the Tampa Bay area is also one of the fastest growing in the country. Visit any part of the tri-county area and you will experience the growth firsthand: construction in Downtown Tampa, St. Petersburg, Wesley Chapel, and numerous other locations. Residents and visitors to our area feel the impacts of this growth on a daily basis as traffic levels continue to increase and daily commutes become longer. Add an additional one million in population to the tri-county area over the next 20 plus years and it is easy to see that now is the time to act to address our regional mobility and travel needs!
Chapter 2 – Survey Overview

The MetroQuest survey consisted of five screens: Welcome, Priorities, Scenarios, Elements, and Wrap-up. Each screen setup/design, and the corresponding survey results, is discussed in the following chapters.

The Welcome Screen, displayed below, set the context for the project and encouraged people to participate. The visually appealing screen included a brief project background (see text below) and a call to action. The introduction pop-up box was the first information that visitors received when clicking on the survey located to the It’s TIME Tampa Bay website. In an effort to maximize participation, survey participants were eligible to win tickets to a Tampa Bay Buccaneers game, a Tampa Bay Lightning game, or to the performing arts as long as they provided a valid email address on the Wrap-up screen.

Welcome Screen

Transportation, Innovation, Mobility for Everyone!
Transportation, land use, and funding are important challenges in our region. By 2045, our region will have over a million more people living and working here. Hillsborough, Pasco and Pinellas counties would like your input on three growth scenarios. Individual elements of each scenario may be combined into a final regional plan.

It will take a combination of investments to move people around our region, both today and in the future. Please take a few minutes to tell us your views on the region’s future transportation system.
Survey Development/Collection

Development of the MetroQuest survey began in late January 2018. The three MPOs formed a working group comprising staff from the Hillsborough, Pinellas and Pasco MPOs, along with other stakeholders and project consultants. The working group met five times between January and June, with the survey going live at the end of July and ending early October.

The working group reviewed various MetroQuest screens, survey text and images, draft surveys and discussed potential outreach opportunities and marketing strategies. In May 2018, AECOM staff presented an overview of the survey to the Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group (TMA). In May and June, the MPOs conducted testing of the draft survey to check for understanding, ease of use, and to determine the approximate time to complete the survey. Based on feedback, the working group made edits to simplify and shorten the survey. The MPOs approved a final survey in mid-July and MetroQuest completed their final testing the last week of July.

The MetroQuest survey went live on July 31, 2018 and closed October 1, 2018. Over this two-month timeframe, there were 17,762 visitors that clicked on the survey link and 9,666 people answered at least some survey questions. This 54.4% participation rate generally falls in the range for most MetroQuest surveys.

Following a standard review and survey clean-up, the final dataset included 9,575 participants. This set a new record for MetroQuest survey participation in the United States. In total, there were 234,884 data points collected, 10,471 comments provided and over 5,600 participants provided their email address and were eligible to win football, hockey or performing arts tickets. The graph on the right displays strong participation from start to finish due to a strong and steady outreach effort. The survey ended up with 33 straight days with over 100 responses per day (August 13th to September 14th) and the most responses for a single day (500 participants) were recorded on August 28th.
Public Outreach

The MetroQuest survey was available through the It’s TIME Tampa Bay website (itstimetampabay.org) created specifically for the survey. The website was hosted by the Hillsborough MPO and promoted on the Pinellas and Pasco MPOs websites. The MPOs also worked closely with local media outlets to promote the survey and wish to thank the following marketing partners for a successful campaign.

Marketing Partners

The working group also developed and reviewed alternative public outreach tools and activities to spread the word and to generate interest in the planning process. Staff from the three MPOs developed a wide range of outreach activities in an attempt to maximize participation representative of the communities within the tri-county area. The following highlights these activities.

- A matching paper survey, and corresponding PowerPoint slideshow, to provide an alternative method to complete the survey
- A Spanish translation of the paper survey and PowerPoint slideshow
- Facebook (265,000 impressions), Twitter (46,000 impressions) and Instagram (54,000 impressions) campaigns throughout the majority of the survey to encourage residents to visit the It’s TIME Tampa Bay website to complete the survey (34% of the visits to the website came from social media)
- Promotional It’s TIME Tampa Bay video to encourage individuals to take the survey
- It’s TIME Tampa Bay ad in the Tampa Bay Times newspaper
- MPO-staffed booth at Florida’s Largest Home show over Labor Day weekend (resulting in nearly 700 surveys being completed over the holiday weekend)
- Participation of Beth Alden (Hillsborough MPO Executive Director) and Whit Blanton (Forward Pinellas Executive Director) on a radio talk show (The Current with Roxanne Wilder on Q105) to discuss regional transportation and mobility issues, and to promote the survey
- Hillsborough MPO-printed rack cards included with the Property Appraiser’s True in Millage (TRIM) notice, mailed countywide to approximately half million property and business owners
- Pinellas utilized the Nextdoor app to reach communities throughout Pinellas County and also delivered utility mailers to account holders throughout the county.
- Pasco MPO-developed video to highlight the importance of taking the survey to discuss regional travel issues between the three counties
- Numerous Pinellas MPO-posted Facebook advertisements encouraging residents to have their voice heard by completing the survey
• MPO attendance at various small group/community meetings to inform them about the survey, and in some cases to take the survey (Hillsborough MPO attended over 80 meetings)

Chapter 3 – Survey Participation

The two-month survey run resulted in a large dataset that yielded useful information to help inform the LRTP development process. In total, 9,575 surveys were analyzed. Of this total, 6,544 (68%) provided a home zip code that was located within the tri-county area. Home zip codes were assigned to one of the three counties based on United States Postal Service (USPS) classifications. For example, some zip code boundaries cross county lines, in particular along the Hillsborough-Pasco County line, and as such the survey results were assigned to one county based on the USPS classification.

Figure 1 and Table 1 summarize the overall survey results, by county, as compared to the population of the tri-county area. Hillsborough County respondents represented 61% of all survey responses, which is approximately 13 percentage points higher when comparing the share of survey responses to share of tri-county population.

It is also worth noting that over 3,000 surveys were completed that either did not include a home zip code or included a home zip code outside the tri-county area (these surveys could represent individuals who work in the tri-county area, or travel to or through the area on a regular basis, or some respondents simply may not have wanted to provide their zip code information).

Figure 2 displays the distribution of survey responses by home and work zip code.

![Figure 1. Survey Response vs. 3-County Area Population](image)

Table 1. Survey Response Overview
### Figure 2. Survey Response (by Home and Work Zip Code Provided)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population¹</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Participants²</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>1,379,302</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>4,012</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>962,003</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>505,709</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,847,014</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,544</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


² Survey participants who provided their home zip code.
Representative Coverage

It was very important to the MPOs to conduct a survey that—from a demographic and geographic coverage standpoint—reflected the tri-county planning area to the best degree possible. The Wrap-up screen collected general demographic data that was useful in better understanding the survey responses for the priorities, scenarios and elements. Providing demographic data was optional and if someone did not answer these questions their already completed survey responses and comments were still recorded and analyzed as part of the final dataset.

Wrap-up Screen

“What to Do” Pop-up Box

- Home Zip Code
- Work Zip Code
- Employment Status
  - Employed Full-time
  - Employed Part-time
  - Currently Unemployed
  - Retired (full-time FL resident)
  - Retired (part-time FL resident)
  - Student
- Race/Ethnicity
  - White
  - Black, or African American
  - Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin
  - Asian
  - American Indian or Alaskan Native
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
  - Other
- Annual Household Income
  - $39,999 or less
  - $40,000 to $54,999
  - $55,000 to $99,999
  - $100,000 to $199,999
  - $200,000 or more
- Email
  - If a valid email address was provided, the participant was eligible to win tickets to a Tampa Bay Buccaneers game, a Tampa Bay Lightning game, or a performing arts event.

Privacy Statement

The following privacy statement was included on the Wrap-up screen:

Under Florida law, email addresses are public records. If you do not want your email address released in response to a potential public records request, please do not submit your email address. In accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other nondiscrimination laws, public participation is solicited without regard to race color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, or family status. Read more about the MPO’s commitment to non-discrimination and other requirements.
Survey Responses by Demographics

The following sections provide a breakdown of survey responses by employment status, annual household income, and race/ethnicity.

Employment Status

Figure 3 shows that full-time employed residents represented the majority of survey respondents (approximately 70%). A portion of the respondents who did not provide their home zip code could have been students participants. Survey respondents who identified as currently unemployed represent approximately 3% of all respondents. This is consistent with the unemployment rates in the region which range between 3% and 5%. Full-time retired respondents represented about 11% of the survey responses, while less than 1% identified themselves as a part-time retired Florida resident. Given this small response rate, the part-time retired Florida residents were combined with the full-time retired Florida residents for the purpose of further survey analysis.

Annual Household Income

Figure 4 shows that 70% of survey respondents have an annual household income over $55,000, and 40% have an income over $100,000. In general, the survey responses represent a more affluent population as compared to the region’s average, or median income level. For those survey respondents who did not provide a home zip code, 21% indicated that they had an annual household income under $39,999.
Race/Ethnicity

Figure 5 shows that approximately 77% of all survey respondents identified as white. Pinellas County tended to have a slightly higher white response rate at 86%, while Hillsborough County reported in at 72%. Hillsborough County had the highest response rate by minority populations including 11% who identified as Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin, and 7% who identified as African American. While these percentages are lower compared to the County totals, they do reflect an extensive outreach effort to try to maximize the survey participation rate among minority groups.

Emails

Over 5,600 emails were provided and were eligible for the drawing. A drawing to select the winners was held at a meeting of the Hillsborough MPO Board on Tuesday, October 2, 2018.
Chapter 4 – Priorities

The second screen of the It’s TIME Tampa Bay survey (What is Important to You?) included seven priorities. Survey respondents were asked to identify their top five priorities; however, respondents could identify less and still continue on the next screen. The respondents’ priorities were then used on the Scenarios screen to show the impact that each scenario has on each selected priority (additional information provided in Chapter 5). The following images display the Priorities screen, along with the “What to Do” pop-up box.

In total, priorities were ranked 39,645 times by all survey participants, which equates to an average of 4.1 priorities identified per survey respondent. The It’s TIME Tampa Bay priorities and descriptions, as presented in the survey, are listed on the following page. A summary of the top priorities follows the descriptions.

Comment from Hillsborough Resident (commenting on Traffic Jams)

“More than anything else I would like to not have to drive, with a shorter non-car dependent commute.”

Comment from Pinellas Resident (commenting on Alternatives to Driving)

“Give us a city to city (St. Pete to Tampa) solution, where we can park in one city and go to the other.”

Comment from Pasco Resident (commenting on Shorter Commutes)

“Expanding mass transit and other personal vehicle alternatives, especially to poorer and more underserved areas, would be a massive boon to our region and citizenry.”
It’s TIME Tampa Bay Priorities

Traffic Jams
Reduce amount of time spent sitting in traffic on a typical weekday, which affects productivity, family time, air quality, noise, and other factors.

Alternatives to Driving
Expand opportunities for walking, biking, buses and rail, carpooling and water ferries.

Shorter Commutes
Keep the economy moving by shortening commutes so people have access to jobs, and businesses have access to workers.

Open Space
Protect undeveloped lands, including wetlands and wildlife areas.

Public Service Costs
Efficiently manage growth to reduce the costs of building and maintaining new water supply lines, sewers, and local roads.

Equal Opportunity
Improve access to jobs and life-sustaining services for underserved communities.

Storm Vulnerability
Minimize the number of people and jobs located in hurricane evacuation zones.
Top Priorities

Figure 6 summarizes the percentage of times that each priority was identified on screen 2 of the MetroQuest survey. The figure highlights the responses by county, as compared to the overall survey response by all participants. Traffic jams and alternatives to driving were identified as the top tier priorities. Of the 9,575 surveys, 7,184 (75%) respondents identified traffic jams and 7,059 (74%) respondents identified alternatives to driving as a top priority. Second tier priorities included open / green space which was identified 6,123 (64%) times by respondents, and shorter commutes, identified 5,956 times (62%).

![Figure 6. Priority Ratings (by County)](image)

Hillsborough and Pasco County respondents ranked traffic jams as the top priority while a slightly higher number of Pinellas County respondents identified alternatives to driving as their top choice. Pasco County respondents slightly favored shorter commutes as their third priority (over open /green space).

One additional item of note: 57% Pinellas County respondents identified storm vulnerability as a top priority – eight percentage points higher than Hillsborough County respondents and four percentage points higher than Pasco County respondents.

Table 2 on the following page provides a detailed breakdown of the priority ratings.
Table 2. Priority Ratings (Detailed Breakdown)

**Number of Times Identified as a Top 5 Priority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Hillsborough</th>
<th>Pinellas</th>
<th>Pasco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Jams</td>
<td>7,184</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to Driving</td>
<td>7,059</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open / Green Space</td>
<td>6,123</td>
<td>2,593</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter Commutes</td>
<td>5,956</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Vulnerability</td>
<td>4,883</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Costs</td>
<td>4,768</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,645</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,741</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,366</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,369</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Number of Priorities Rated: 4.14 4.17 4.26 4.21

NOTE: Darker to lighter green shading (or no shading) indicates the highest to lowest totals.

**Percentage of Times Identified as a Top 5 Priority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Hillsborough</th>
<th>Pinellas</th>
<th>Pasco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Jams</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to Driving</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open / Green Space</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter Commutes</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Vulnerability</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Costs</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveys by All Participants/County: 9,575 4,012 1,731 801

**Distribution of Responses by Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Hillsborough</th>
<th>Pinellas</th>
<th>Pasco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Jams</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to Driving</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open / Green Space</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter Commutes</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Vulnerability</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Costs</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5 – Scenarios

The Scenarios in screen 3 were created to facilitate discussion of three potentially different growth and transportation futures. The intent was to present exaggerated scenarios that would make participants consider the choices/consequences associated with future growth and development, and to ultimately view how each scenario could potentially impact their priorities, and future transportation and mobility options. In some cases, the project elements identified in the scenarios were inspired by other agencies’ studies, such as:

- Tampa Bay Next
- Regional Transit Feasibility Plan

Other scenario projects may include options that are not currently being explored by the sponsoring agency, but were listed nonetheless because they could provide useful insight into what is important to the public. While each scenario is rated from 1 to 5 stars, participants are not rating individual projects; instead they are rating overall themes associated with each scenario to help inform the LRTP development process. Ultimately, one scenario will not solve the region’s transportation and mobility issues. It will require a wide range of strategies and policies, addressing both growth and infrastructure, to shape the future transportation system.

The Scenarios screen started by asking the general question “How should we grow?” Based on the priorities a respondent selected on screen 2, the impacts of the transportation and growth on that scenario were communicated by arrows. A red arrow pointing left indicated that particular priority would perform worse than today, by the year 2045. A green arrow pointing right indicated that particular priority would perform better than today, by the year 2045. In both situations, the longer the arrow, the greater negative or positive the impact. Furthermore, participants were encouraged to provide comments that could be used to better understand the survey responses. The scenarios are summarized on the following pages.
Scenario A
Imagine a future where we primarily invest in NEW TECHNOLOGIES and a few roadway projects to manage traffic flow.

- Investments in new technologies & driverless cars ease long commutes
- Regional rapid buses on I-275 shoulders bypass traffic
- Select roadway projects help improve local and regional connectivity
- Pinellas redevelops while Hillsborough and Pasco grow in suburbs and rural areas

Scenario A Impact on Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results on priorities:</th>
<th>By 2045, Worse than Today</th>
<th>By 2045, Better than Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Jams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to Driving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter Commutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scenario B

Imagine a future where we primarily invest in EXPRESSWAY LANES forming an outer loop so traffic does not have to go through the congested center of the region.

- New tolled express lanes create a loop linking the three counties:
  - SR 54 (Pasco) to McMullen-Booth Road (Pinellas) to Howard Frankland Bridge to downtown Tampa (Hillsborough)
- North of downtown Tampa, I-275 converted to street-level boulevard
- Growth focused near expressway interchanges with some urban redevelopment

### Scenario B Impact on Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results on priorities</th>
<th>By 2045, Worse than Today</th>
<th>By 2045, Better than Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Jams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to Driving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter Commutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario C
Imagine a future where we primarily invest in BUS AND RAIL SERVICES connecting, revitalizing and in-filling the communities that exist today.

- Significant bus and rail investments encourage redevelopment of housing and businesses in our cities & towns
- Rail service on existing train tracks connects the three counties and rapid bus service found on most major roads
- Rail service connects the region to Orlando
- Water ferry service connects Tampa and St. Petersburg, and MacDill AFB and South Hillsborough

Scenario C Impact on Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results on priorities:</th>
<th>By 2045, Worse than Today</th>
<th>By 2045, Better than Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Jams</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/Green Space</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to Driving</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter Commutes</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Costs</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario Results

The following sections summarize the survey results for the three scenarios. Respondents ranked the scenarios using a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 representing the least appealing score and 5 the most appealing. For the purpose of presenting the results, the graphs combine the 1 and 2 ratings (low approval, or less favorable) and the 4 and 5 ratings (high approval, or more favorable).

Scenario A – New Technologies

Scenario A involved imagining a future that invested mostly in new technologies and a few select roadway projects to manage traffic flow. In total, 7,832 participants (3,702 from Hillsborough, 1,615 from Pinellas, and 727 from Pasco as defined by home zip code) rated this scenario. Figure 7 shows that overall survey respondents in general had a relatively neutral opinion of the new technologies scenario. Of all participants, 40% rated this scenario low with 1 or 2 stars. By comparison, 31% rated this scenario high at 4 or 5 stars. Figure 8 shows the average rating for Scenario A was 2.86. Pasco County respondents had a slightly higher favorable opinion of this scenario with a rating of 2.97.

Comment from Hillsborough Resident
(works outside the tri-county area)

“Want to see less vehicles and roads, not more. Would be further convinced of driverless transport if there was a positive impact on noise, smog, and congestion in highways.”

Comment from Pinellas Resident
(works in Hillsborough County)

“While these solutions are nice on the surface and could certainly be utilized to relieve some of the transportation issues, I don’t think they address the root of the problems. They feel like band aids. I do like the idea of driverless cars, but I think we’re a ways away from people being comfortable with them and money could be better spent elsewhere (at least for now).”

Comment from Pasco Resident
(works in Pasco County)

“More emphasis on convenient, fast, efficient, mass transit, less on a ton of driverless vehicles on already jammed roads.”
Scenario B – Expressway Lanes

Scenario B involved reimagining expressways by adding tolled express lanes and creating an outer loop to facilitate more efficient travel movement through the region. In total, 6,460 participants (3,246 from Hillsborough, 1,352 from Pinellas, and 563 from Pasco as defined by home zip code) rated this scenario. Figure 9 shows that overall the majority of survey respondents had a relatively less than favorable opinion of this scenario. Of all participants, 52% rated this scenario low with 1 or 2 stars. By comparison, only 25% rated this scenario high at 4 or 5 stars.

Figure 10 shows the average rating for Scenario B was 2.53. Pasco County respondents had a slightly higher favorable opinion of this scenario with a rating of 2.77 while Pinellas County respondents rated this scenario lower at 2.35.

Comment from Hillsborough Resident (works outside the tri-county area)

“Expressway lanes have not worked that well in South Florida. Stick with new technologies and alternate forms of transportation (rail, bus, ferry, etc.).”

Comment from Pinellas Resident (works in Pinellas County)

“Express lanes help for major commutes but do nothing for local traffic. You still have to get to the express lanes somehow and this must be accounted for.”

Comment from Pasco Resident (works in Hillsborough County)

“I like the idea of an express lane, but I’m not sure how that minimizes the traffic and shortens the commute.”
Scenario C – Transit Focus (Bus and Rail)

Scenario C focuses on regional and statewide transit, mostly bus and rail, improvements. In total, 6,302 participants (3,210 from Hillsborough, 1,320 from Pinellas, and 547 from Pasco as defined by home zip code) rated this scenario. Figure 11 shows overwhelmingly support by survey respondents for this scenario. Of all participants, 75% rated this scenario high with 4 or 5 stars. Pinellas County respondents rated this scenario slightly higher at 78%. By comparison, only 12% of all respondents rated this scenario low at 1 or 2 stars.

Figure 12 shows the average rating for Scenario B was 4.08. Pasco County respondents had a slightly lower rating at 3.96 while Pinellas County respondents rated this scenario slightly higher at 4.16.

Figure 11. Scenario C Rating (1 to 5 Stars)

Comment from Hillsborough Resident (works in Hillsborough County)

“Multimodal! This is our future. The only thing I would add is an expanded and modernized streetcar system connecting the urban districts within Tampa. I love the inclusion of the water ferry system as well - we are surrounded by water and need to use it!”

Comment from Pinellas Resident (works in Hillsborough County)

“This region needs to invest in transit. I live in Pinellas County and there are very few roadway corridors that can be expanded to accommodate the future levels of traffic. The region also needs to invest in walking and biking.”

Comment from Pasco Resident (works in Pasco County)

“I think this (Scenario C) is great because it gives other options to driving everywhere, which can open up job markets that were previously out of reach based on commute.”
Chapter 6 – Elements

The fourth screen polled respondents about Elements, or components of the three scenarios to facilitate further discussion regarding potential roadway projects, transit projects, community development, and funding options. The Elements screen started with the question, “What Should Be in the Plan?” The intent of the question was to drill down into the ingredients that make up each of the scenarios to help determine what elements should ultimately be included in a hybrid transportation and growth scenario. In total, there were 20 elements – allowing respondents who liked certain aspects of a scenario, but not the entire scenario, to provide more detailed input that could be used to identify key themes.

Elements Screen

“What to Do” Pop-up Box

Rate the individual elements of the scenarios. Your feedback will be used to build a regional plan for future transportation and land use. If you have no opinion on an element, leave it blank. Please review all the elements so we understand your preferences.

Evaluate 5 items or more by rating each 1-5 stars

It’s TIME Tampa Bay Elements

Roadways
- Advanced Technology
- New/Expanded Ramps
- Elevated Toll Roads
- Complete the Loop
- I-275 Boulevard

Community
- Expanded Growth Area
- Preserve Neighborhoods
- More/Better Downtowns
- Efficient Use of Land
- Walk & Bike Focus

Transit
- Expanded Ridesharing
- Express Bus Rapid Transit
- Rail (Local/Regional)
- Water Ferry
- Statewide Rail

Funding
- New Lanes with Tolls
- Taxes/Fees for Roads
- Taxes/Fees for Buses
- Taxes/Fees for Rail
- Special District Fees
Overall Responses

Figure 13 shows all the elements as sorted by average rating (highly supported elements begin on the left side of the graph, and less favored elements on the far right side). The figure includes color-coded symbols to distinguish which of the four elements each response is assigned to (see legend below the graph).

The highest overall support was for rail-related projects—both statewide rail connecting to the Tampa Bay area and for local/regional service, such as Light Rail Transit (LRT). The next four highest rated elements focus on community development and growth. Each of these four elements generally focused on more efficient land use—and expanded walking and biking—that would support an expanded regional transit system. By comparison, the fifth community element was an expanded growth area that received the lowest rating of all 20 elements.

Taxes/fees to fund rail rated the highest among the funding elements, with special district fees being the second highest rated funding element. The remaining funding options were less favorable, with over 40% of survey respondents providing low (1 and 2 star) ratings. Of all five funding elements, taxes/fees for roadways was rated the least favorable.

The majority of roadway elements had support and high (4 and 5 star) ratings. The Complete the Loop element had almost a nearly equal level of low and high support, while the I-275 Boulevard Conversion was rated low, with over 50% of survey respondents rating it 1 or 2 stars. Each element is discussed further in the following sections.
Roadway Elements

Overall, survey participants support New/Expanded Ramps, have a generally positive opinion for Advanced Technology and Elevated Toll Roads, a somewhat neutral opinion on Complete the Loop, and less than positive opinion on the conversion of I-275 to a boulevard. Of the five roadway elements, 55% rated Expanded/New Ramps highly (4 or 5 stars) while 54% rated the I-275 boulevard conversion poorly (1 or 2 stars). Figure 14 summarizes the roadway element ratings.

Table 3 shows expanded/new ramps received the highest roadway element average rating at 3.56. Pasco County respondents rate this slightly higher at 3.79 (0.23 points higher) compared to all participants. Overall, Pasco respondents rated roadway improvements 0.20 to 0.30 points higher compared to the overall average, while having a less favorable opinion of advanced technology and I-275 conversion. Pinellas County respondents had a less favorable rating of the Complete the Loop at 2.79 (0.24 points lower than the overall average 3.03). Pinellas respondents also rated the I-275 conversion 0.14 points lower than the average. Figures 15 to 17 display 1 to 5 ratings by county.
Figure 15. Roadway Elements – Hillsborough County Respondents

Figure 16. Roadway Elements – Pinellas County Respondents

Figure 17. Roadway Elements – Pasco County Respondents
Individual Roadway Elements

New / Expanded Ramps

This element includes targeted roadway investment to improve connections and traffic flow between Interstates/regional expressways and the local roadway network. Generally speaking, these improvements are intended to enhance traffic operations and more effectively move traffic to reduce congestion, reduce travel delay and improve travel safety. Figure 18 displays the 1 to 5 star rating this element received among participants from different counties.

New/Expanded Ramps

Improve expressway ramps and new road connections to make it easier and safer to enter and exit.

The majority of all survey participants favor this type of improvement. In total, among the 6,968 participants who rated this element, approximately 55% rated it highly (four or five stars). Pasco County residents tend to have a more favorable rating of this scenario, coming in approximately 8 percentage points higher compared to all survey participants (63% high rating). By comparison, Pinellas County residents have a slightly less favorable opinion of this element at approximately 3% points lower than the survey average (52% high rating). Figure 19 shows the average rating for this element was 3.56, with Pasco County participants having a higher rating at 3.79.
Elevated Toll Roads

Elevated toll roads would provide greater capacity on area expressways by limiting the number of entry/exit points, helping reduce travel delay and enhance regional travel connections. The elevated toll roads have a secondary benefit as the raised structure has the potential to avoid flooding during hurricanes or other storm events. Figure 20 displays the 1 to 5 star rating for this element among participants from different counties.

The majority of all survey participants slightly favored this type of improvement. Among the 6,880 participants who rated this element, approximately 46% gave it a rating of four or five stars. Pasco County residents have a more favorable rating of elevated toll roads—approximately 8-9 percentage points higher compared to all survey participants (52% four or five star rating). By comparison, Pinellas County residents have a slightly less favorable opinion of this element reporting in at approximately 3 percentage points lower than the survey average (44% four or five star rating). Figure 21 shows the average rating was 3.20, with Pasco County respondents coming in at 3.41.
**Complete the Beltway Loop**

The Complete the Beltway Loop concept would construct a new toll road in Pasco County that would connect I-75 to Pinellas County through Pasco County via the SR 54 and McMullen-Booth Road corridors. This new facility, combined with improvements along I-275 and I-75 would create an outer roadway, or beltway, facility that would move traffic more efficiently away from the Tampa’s urban core area. Figure 22 displays the 1 to 5 star rating for this element among participants from different counties.

![Figure 22. Complete the Loop (Ratings)](image)

The survey participants responded neutrally to this improvement. In total, 6,783 participants rated this element, with approximately 40% rating it high (4 and 5 stars) and 37% rating it low (1 and 2 stars). Pasco County residents tend to have a more favorable rating of this scenario, with 50% rating it 4 and 5 stars. By comparison, Pinellas County residents have a less favorable opinion of this concept, with just 34% rating it 4 and 5 stars and 45% rating it low at 1 and 2 stars. Figure 23 shows the average rating for this element was 3.03, with Pasco County respondents coming in higher at 3.36 and Pinellas County respondents coming lower at 2.79.

![Figure 23. Complete the Loop (Average Rating)](image)
Advanced Technology

Ever changing technology advancements are quickly turning what used to be visionary transportation concepts into viable future mobility solutions. Autonomous vehicles (AV) and connected networks (CN) show promising signs of being able to address increasing traffic gridlock brought on by urban growth. Vehicle automation also extends into shared mobility services and freight transportation, making the potential benefits of a driverless future staggering. Figure 24 displays the 1 to 5 star rating for this element among respondents from different counties.

Figure 24. Advanced Technology (Ratings)

Invest in smart infrastructure to support driverless vehicles and better manage traffic flow.

Generally speaking, survey participants favor investment in advanced technology to better manage traffic flow. In total, 46% of the total 7,793 participants rated this element highly (4 or 5 stars). Pasco County residents have a slightly less favorable opinion of advanced technology at 5 percentage points lower than the survey average. Figure 25 shows the overall average rating for all survey respondents was 3.23, with Pasco County respondents coming in slightly lower at a 3.09 average.

Figure 25. Advanced Technology (Average Rating)
**I-275 Boulevard Conversion**

The I-275 boulevard conversion is a conceptual improvement that would convert an approximately ten-mile segment of I-275 north of downtown Tampa from an interstate facility to an at-grade boulevard. This improvement would be implemented to help reconnect neighborhoods and promote the use of alternative transportation modes. This conceptual project would be coordinated with improvements to the existing interstate and regional roadway network located on the outer fringe to facilitate the movement of people and goods around the area. Figure 26 summarizes survey respondents’ reaction to an I-275 boulevard conversion.

Overall, survey participants rated this the second lowest of all elements. In total, 6,657 participants rated this element, with approximately 54% rating it low (one or two stars), compared to 26% that rated it high (four or five stars). Pinellas and Pasco County residents tended to give this concept a slightly lower rating at 57% to 59%. Figure 27 displays the average rating for the I-275 conversion was 2.49. Hillsborough County respondents were slightly higher at a rating of 2.56.
Transit Elements

Overall, there was widespread support for expanding transit options, which is consistent with the Alternative to Driving receiving a high rating for the Priorities. Survey participants overwhelmingly supported Statewide Rail and Local/Regional Rail Service, generally supported Express BRT Service and Water Ferry and tended to have a less favorable opinion regarding Expanded Ridesharing, where there were more neutral and low ratings than high. Each of the transit elements is discussed in more detail in the following section. Figure 28 summarizes the transit element ratings.

Figure 28. Transit Elements (Ratings 1 to 5 Stars)

Table 4 summarizes the transit element average ratings, which show relatively little variation between counties. The two exceptions are Expanded Ridesharing and Water Ferry were Pasco County respondents were 0.13 to 0.18 points less likely to support these modes. Statewide Rail received the highest average rating (4.35) within the transit category, followed closely by Local/Regional Rail (4.28). Of the five transit elements, the Expanded Ridesharing was the only element to receive an average rating below three (2.93 rating). Figures 29 to 31 display the responses by county.

Table 4. Transit Elements (Average Ratings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide Rail</th>
<th>Rail (Local/Regional)</th>
<th>Express BRT</th>
<th>Water Ferry</th>
<th>Expanded Ridesharing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Participants:</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough:</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+0.02</td>
<td>+0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>+0.02</td>
<td>+0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas:</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+0.06</td>
<td>+0.04</td>
<td>+0.02</td>
<td>+0.07</td>
<td>+0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco:</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>+0.05</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1) Average rating is calculated by summing the 1 to 5 star rating for each element and dividing by number of participants for each category.
2) Green or red text indicates a difference of 0.08 or greater as compared to all survey participants.
Figure 29. Transit Elements – Hillsborough County Respondents

Figure 30. Transit Elements – Pinellas County Respondents

Figure 31. Transit Elements – Pasco County Respondents
Statewide Rail

A statewide rail system would provide a commuter passenger rail service connecting the Tampa Bay region to Orlando and other regions throughout Florida. This concept would provide Tampa Bay residents and out of state visitors an alternative to having to drive the I-4 corridor. Figure 32 summarizes survey respondents’ reaction to a statewide rail connection to Tampa Bay.

As noted above, survey participants responded positively to this type of improvement. In total, among the 6,614 participants who rated this element, approximately 82% rated it four or five stars. All three counties had an equal favorability rating (83%-85%). Figure 33 shows the overall average rating for all survey respondents was 4.35. As the overall average falls below the three county averages, this would indicate that survey respondents who did not provide a home zip coded rated this element slightly lower compared to those who provided their home zip code.
**Rail Service**

This concept would utilize mostly existing rail lines, along with some new rail connections along major travel corridors, to provide regional/local rail transit service. In scenario C, the rail service would connect the three counties and would continue north to connect to Hernando County. Figure 34 summarizes survey respondents’ reaction to implementing a rail service within the Tampa Bay tri-county area.

![Figure 34](image)

**Rail Service**

*Use mostly existing rail lines, and some new rail connections along major roads, to provide regional rail service.*

Nearly 81% of survey participants favor this improvement and rated it high (4 or 5 stars). By comparison, only 9% of all survey participants rated this concept low (1 or 2 stars). In total, 6,666 participants rated this element. All three counties had an equal favorability rating (between 81% and 82%). Figure 35 displays the average rating of 4.28, with Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties only slightly higher.

![Figure 35](image)
**Express Bus & BRT Service**

This concept builds off the exaggerated Scenario C which included additional BRT projects throughout the tri-county area, including a BRT route along Central Avenue in Pinellas County. Figure 36 displays survey respondents' ratings for this element.

**Figure 36. Express Bus and Bus Rapid Transit (Ratings)**

Make express bus service more frequent and run some buses in their own lanes (Bus Rapid Transit).

The survey participants responded positively to this improvement. Fifty-five percent of the total 6,626 participants gave this element a rating of four or five stars. All three counties had a nearly equal favorability rating (54% to 59%), with Pasco County slightly more favorable than Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties. Figure 37 shows the average rating was 3.54, which was fairly consistent across all three counties.

**Figure 37. Express Bus and Bus Rapid Transit (Average Ratings by County)**
Water Ferry

This concept builds off a 2016/2017 trial run of a downtown St. Petersburg to downtown Tampa water ferry service. This service, which returns in November 2018, would be expanded to connect to MacDill Air Force base and South Hillsborough. Figure 37 shows the participant ratings for this element.

The survey participants responded positively to this type of improvement. In total, 6,575 participants rated this element, with approximately 53% rating it four or five stars. Pinellas County responded most favorably (56%, average score 3.56) and Pasco County responded somewhat less favorably (51%, average score 3.36). Figure 38 shows the average rating was 3.49.
Expanded Ridesharing

Over the past decade, ridesharing has emerged as important travel mode in urban environments—drawing both praise and criticism. Depending on the context and local policies, it can enable people to avoid single-occupancy vehicle travel for some trips, such as making first- and last-mile connections to transit; however, it can also add to urban congestion and attract riders away from transit. This element focuses on using ridesharing to provide alternatives that would boost access to transit and decrease the need for car ownership. Figure 40 displays the ratings for this element.

Figure 40. Expanded Ridesharing (Ratings)

Expanded Ridesharing

Encourage more rideshare options (e.g. Uber/Lyft) to travel without having to own a car while improving connections to transit.

The survey participants responded somewhat negatively to this type of improvement. In total, 7,350 participants rated this element, of whom fewer rated it favorably (34%) than negatively (39%). Pasco County responded most negatively to expanded ridesharing (43%) and Pinellas County responded least negatively to this (37%). Figure 40 shows the average rating was 2.93, with Pasco County reporting a slightly lower average at 2.75.

Figure 41. Expanded Ridesharing (Average Ratings by County)
Community Elements

Overall, survey participants rated most community elements very favorably. Preserving Neighborhoods, Walk & Bike Focus, and More/Better Downtowns all received over 72% high approval (4 or 5 stars). The exception is the Expanded Growth Area, which received only 22% high approval. Figure 42 provides a summary of the community elements.

Table 5 provides the average ratings for the five community elements, including the variance of individual counties from the total average. The highest rated were Preserve Neighborhoods, followed closely by Walk & Bike Focus and More/Better Downtowns—all around 4.10. The Expanded Growth Area was the only element to receive an average rating below 3 (2.40 rating), even in the county where it garnered the most support, Pasco County (2.71). Each of the community elements is discussed in more detail in the following section. Figures 43 to 45 display the responses by county.
Figure 43. Community Elements – Hillsborough County Respondents

Figure 44. Community Elements – Pinellas County Respondents

Figure 45. Community Elements – Pasco County Respondents
Preserve Neighborhoods

As our communities grow older and more established, time can take its toll on the buildings, landscape, and infrastructure that make them unique and full of character. This element would dedicate investment to ensuring that neighborhoods that are older and may be in decline receive targeted attention to improve conditions, hopefully serving as a catalyst to encourage further reinvestment by residents and businesses. Figure 46 displays the ratings for this element, overall and by county.

![Figure 46. Preserve Neighborhoods (Ratings)](chart)

Preserve Neighborhoods
Revitalize older neighborhoods in cities and suburbs, and promote reinvestment.

The survey participants responded positively to this type of improvement. In total, 6,571 participants rated this element, and approximately 75% rated it four or five stars. Pasco County responded slightly less positively (73% rating 4 or 5 stars), as might be expected given the County is experiencing primarily new development, and Pinellas County responded most favorably (80% rating 4 or 5 stars). Figure 47 shows the average rating was 4.13, with relatively little difference by county.

![Figure 47. Preserve Neighborhoods (Average Ratings by County)](chart)
Walk & Bike Focus

This element would focus resources on pedestrian and cycling infrastructure to both destination-oriented and recreational trips. Improved connectivity of pedestrian infrastructure (like sidewalks) and bike network can improve first- and last-mile connections to transit and enable more non-motorized trips to work, schools, and shops. In the area of recreational travel, protected or off-street paths provide greater comfort and a more safe and pleasant environment for people of all abilities. Figure 48 shows the ratings for the element across all participants and by county.

![Walk & Bike Focus](image)

Walk & Bike

Sidewalks and bike lanes provide more connections to transit and neighborhoods.

The survey participants responded positively to this type of improvement. In total, 6,491 participants rated this element, with approximately 73% giving it four or five stars. Pasco County responded slightly less positively (67% rating 4 or 5 stars) and Pinellas County responded most favorably (77% rating 4 or 5 stars), consistent with a higher priority focus on identifying alternatives to driving. Figure 49 shows the average rating was 4.11, with Pinellas reporting in at 4.20.

![Figure 48. Walk & Bike Focus (Ratings)](image)

![Figure 49. Walk & Bike Focus (Average Ratings by County)](image)
More/Better Downtowns

This element emphasizes the importance of creating more or better downtowns by directing resources and tailoring land use policies to encourage such commercial districts. These downtowns would typically have a mix of shops, offices, and housing options located in mid- and high-rise buildings near transit stations to revitalize the area with larger day-time and night-time populations. Figure 50 shows the ratings for this element.

The survey participants responded positively to this type of improvement. In total, 6,499 participants rated this element, with 73% giving it four or five stars. Pasco County responded slightly less positively (70% rating 4 or 5 stars) and Pinellas County responded most favorably (74% rating 4 or 5 stars). Figure 51 shows the average rating was 4.07, with relatively little difference between counties.
Efficient Use of Land

Efficient use of land is an element that would enable or encourage higher density of new construction in areas where it is currently prohibited or poorly incentivized. By doing so, expansion into currently undeveloped areas will slow and there will be less need to support long auto commutes or to distribute public services to developments far from existing communities. Figure 52 shows the ratings that this element received in the survey.

Efficient Use of Land
New construction is higher density – such as, more Main Streets and townhomes – allowing more gradual planned expansion into rural lands.

The survey participants responded positively to this type of improvement. In total, 6,456 participants rated this element, with 65% giving it four or five stars. Pinellas County responded slightly less positively (61% rating 4 or 5 stars) and Hillsborough County responded most favorably to this (67% rating 4 or 5 stars). Figure 53 shows the average rating was 3.82, with little difference observed between Counties.
Expanded Growth Area

In contrast to the previous element, Expanded Growth Area would support continued outward expansion, with new development occurring in currently rural areas. This low-density approach to development has been the traditional mode of expansion for much of the second half of the 20th century, corresponding with a boom in road construction and public desire for large-lot single-family homes. Expanded growth also generally increases the cost of providing public services. Figure 54 shows the support that this element received from survey participants.

The survey participants responded negatively to this type of improvement. In total, 7,154 participants rated this element, with approximately 56% giving it 1 or 2 stars. Pinellas County responded most negatively to this (61% rating 1 or 2 stars) and Pasco County responded less negatively to this (46% rating 1 or 2 stars). The average rating was 2.40, as shown in Figure 55.
Funding Elements

Overall, survey participants have a generally positive view of Taxes/Fees for Rail and Special District Fees, and a somewhat negative opinion of Taxes/Fees for Buses, New Lanes with Tolls, and Taxes/Fees for Roads. Of the five funding elements, at least half of respondents gave a high rating (4 or 5 stars) to Taxes/Fees for Rail (59%) and Special District Fees (53%). Among the other elements, only about a third of survey respondents rated them highly; the most negative ratings went to New Lanes with Tolls (45%), followed by Taxes/Fees for Roads (44%) and Taxes/Fees for Buses (42%). Figure 56 summarizes the roadway element ratings for all survey participants, and Figures 57 to 59 provide the ratings summary by county.

Taxes/Fees for Rail received the highest average rating within the funding element category at 3.61; Pasco County rated it slightly lower compared at 3.49, while Pinellas County rated it a little higher (3.70). Overall, Pasco County respondents rated funding elements related to driving/roadways higher and transit and special district funding elements lower than the tri-county average. The funding elements tied for the lowest ratings were New Lanes with Tolls and Taxes/Fees for Roads (2.76). Table 6 summarizes the funding element average ratings based on a 1 to 5 star rating. Each of the elements is discussed in more detail in the following section.

Figure 56. Funding Elements (Ratings 1 to 5 Stars)

Table 6. Funding Elements (Average Ratings)
Figure 57. Funding Elements – Hillsborough County Respondents

Figure 58. Funding Elements – Pinellas County Respondents

Figure 59. Funding Elements – Pasco County Respondents
Taxes/Fees to Fund Rail

The Taxes/Fees to Fund Rail element would seek to raise local taxes and/or fees to build a regional rail system. At this juncture no specific fiscal mechanism is identified (e.g., retail sales tax, property tax increment, development impact fees), so support of this funding element can be interpreted as support for rail infrastructure improvements and willingness to raise new funding to this end (rather than relying on existing funds or revenue streams). Figure 60 shows ratings that this funding element received in the survey.

The majority of survey respondents responded positively to this funding strategy. In total, of the 6,518 participants who rated this element, 59% rated it 4 or 5 stars. Pinellas County responded most positively (62% rating 4 or 5 stars) and Pasco County responded least positively (56% rating 4 or 5 stars). Figure 61 shows the average rating was 3.61, with Pasco County having a slight less favorable view of this element at 3.49.
Special District Fees

The Special District Fees element would implement local fees or taxes to fund community improvements in designated areas. At this juncture no specific fiscal mechanism is identified (e.g., tax increment financing, benefit assessment district, development impact fees), so support of this funding element can be interpreted as support for revitalizing priority communities (perhaps due to a history of disinvestment or catalytic importance) and willingness to raise new funding to this end. Figure 62 shows ratings that this funding element received in the survey.

The survey participants responded positively to this funding strategy. In total, 6,451 participants rated this element, with 53% rating it 4 or 5 stars. Hillsborough County responded most favorably (55% rating 4 or 5 stars) and Pasco County responded slightly less positively (50% rating 4 or 5 stars). Figure 63 shows the average rating was 3.47, with little variation between counties.

Figure 62. Special District Fees (Ratings)

Figure 63. Special District Fees (Average Ratings by County)
**Taxes/Fees to Fund Buses**

The Taxes/Fees to Fund Buses element would seek to raise local taxes and/or fees to improve regional and local bus service. At this juncture no specific fiscal mechanism is identified (e.g., retail sales tax, property tax increment, development impact fees), so support of this funding element can be interpreted as support for bus service improvements and willingness to raise new funding to this end (rather than relying on existing funds or revenue streams). Figure 64 shows the ratings that this funding element received in the survey.

The survey participants responded slightly negatively to this to this funding strategy. In total, 6,471 participants rated this element, with approximately 42% rating it 1 or 2 stars. Pasco County responded most negatively to this (44% rating 1 or 2 stars) and Hillsborough County responded least negatively (41% rating 1 or 2 stars). Figure 65 shows the average rating was 2.84, with little variation between counties.
New Lanes with Tolls

New Lanes with Tolls would build new express lanes with variable tolls to manage traffic flow. While there has been discussion of new lanes with tolls on some area roadways, the overall concept for this funding element can be interpreted as support for expanded roadway capacity funded at least in part by toll revenues. Variable (or dynamically priced) tolls allow for more control over roadway demand, and thus can result in more reliable express lane travel times and higher toll revenues to fund these improvements. Figure 66 shows the ratings that this funding element received in the survey.

Figure 66. New Lanes with Tolls (Ratings)

The survey participants responded negatively to this funding strategy. In total, 7,134 participants rated this element, with approximately 45% rating it 1 or 2 stars. Hillsborough County responded most negatively (46% rating 1 or 2 stars) and Pasco County was evenly divided on this issue (38% 4 or 5 stars and 38% 1 or 2 stars). Figure 67 shows the average rating was 2.76, with Pasco County coming in slightly higher in support of this element at 2.95.

Figure 67. New Lanes with Tolls (Average Ratings by County)
**Taxes/Fees to Fund Roads**

The Taxes/Fees to Fund Roads element would seek to raise local taxes and/or fees to build more roads. At this juncture, no specific fiscal mechanism is identified (e.g., retail sales tax, property tax increment, development impact fees), so support of this funding element can be interpreted as support for more roadway capacity and willingness to raise new funding to this end (rather than relying on existing funds or revenue streams). Figure 68 shows the ratings that this funding element received in the survey.

The largest share of survey respondents responded negatively to this funding strategy. In total, 6,517 participants rated this element, with approximately 44% rating it negatively. Pinellas County responded most negatively to this (43% rating 1 or 2 stars) and Pasco County responded least negatively (40% rating 1 or 2 stars). Figure 69 shows the average rating was 2.76, for all survey participants. Pasco County respondents had a slightly higher approval of this element at 2.86.
Chapter 7 – Conclusion

It’s TIME Tampa Bay involved extensive coordination and outreach between the Hillsborough, Pinellas and Pasco County MPOs. The survey reached over 18,000 visitors and included 9,575 survey participants – a new MetroQuest record for the United States! This large dataset contains a wealth of information that will be used to inform the development of a hybrid scenario that will guide the remaining LRTP development efforts.

Survey Highlights

Beginning with the priorities, it was clear that the primary focus of the survey responses were on addressing traffic congestion, and supporting alternatives to driving. Both of these priorities were identified by 74% to 75% of all survey respondents – the highest of all priorities. A second tier of priorities, protecting open/green space and shorter commutes, were identified by 62% to 63% of survey respondents. The remaining priorities were identified 50% or lower.

The response to exaggerated scenarios questions highlighted a clear desire among survey participants for new mobility options that would provide an alternative to driving. The preference for a statewide rail and regional rail system dominated the survey responses, and appeared also in the high ratings for rail transit and rail funding in the Elements section. Projects or funding mechanisms to expand the roadway network tended to receive comparatively lower levels of support, even when they included advanced technology to improve efficiency.

From a growth and development standpoint, generally speaking, respondents did not want to continue to expand outward, as shown in support for efficient use of land and more/better downtowns, as well as negativity towards an expanded growth area. Investments that focus on improving existing communities such as preserving neighborhoods and a walk & bike focus) also performed well, highlighting a common desire to improve the communities that already exist rather than expanding into open/rural areas on the fringe of Hillsborough and Pasco Counties.

Guidance for 2045 Plan “Hybrid Scenario”

The It’s TIME Tampa Bay exaggerated scenarios were intended to help create a hybrid 2045 scenario, based on the best and most well-supported pieces of the scenarios and elements. The primary purpose of the Scenario planning process was to help:

- Visualize long-term implications of today’s decisions
- Explore “what-ifs” about things we control, and things we don’t
- Build consensus with quantitative feedback to determine what long-range outcomes are the most widely accepted

Figure 70 conceptually shows how the scenarios and elements were pulled together to help identify which components would ultimately become part of a hybrid scenario. This hybrid scenario will help inform future year LRTP multimodal projects and supportive growth policies and funding strategies.
Key themes from this outreach effort—comprising issues related to land use and different transportation modes—are summarized below.

**Land Use**

In the Hybrid Scenario, the MPOs and other transportation agencies will coordinate with local governments to support the creation of comprehensive plans that are compatible with the priorities identified within the Tri-County Transportation Plan. These priorities include:

**Reinvesting in neighborhoods**

In recent years there has been a resurgence of many of our urban core areas as evidenced by redevelopment and denser development in some neighborhoods. This reinvestment means we can make more efficient use of existing infrastructure, encourage newer affordable housing and stimulate more neighborhoods to improve. On-going upgrades to infrastructure and improving services in these areas can help sustain these revitalization efforts which will lead to more connected and inviting communities. Reinvestment can take many forms: improved sidewalks and cycle tracks, green infrastructure implementation for both stormwater and aesthetic benefits, grant funding to finance renovation of buildings in disrepair, installation of comfortable bus shelters, etc.

**Strengthening downtowns and creating more downtown-like places**

Downtowns are key areas for investment, thanks to the efficiencies that come with higher activity levels and shorter distances between people and businesses. Such development patterns are also key for an effective and efficient transit network, which has been identified as one of the key priorities in this outreach effort. Implementing policies conducive to higher density development at key nodes, as well as supporting the construction of mixed-use buildings (including market rate and affordable housing) via incentives, partnerships, or policies, will support this goal.

**Minimizing outward growth**

The complement of strengthening downtowns is reducing the amount of outward growth that occurs. The area is expected to grow significantly—both in population and economic activity—in
coming years, and keeping that growth manageable and sustainable will be a key component of ensuring that our communities are right-sized for our needs. Minimizing outward growth also helps reduce the cost of providing necessary public services that come with outward expansion. This outreach effort clearly demonstrates that of all transportation, growth and funding elements considered that an expanded growth area was the lowest rated, and least desirable, of all possible options.

Transportation

Within the sphere of transportation, identifying specific types of projects and investments—if not individual projects—is an area where each MPO can provide clear guidance, building off of their own analysis and expertise as well as public outreach efforts like this survey. The following highlights transportation priorities that can help guide future planning efforts:

Rail

Based on the results of this survey, rail projects should be considered as part of on-going LRTP efforts. This could include regional rail projects, like expanding the connection of Brightline from Southeast Florida through Orlando to Tampa, or developing a rail network through inter-county coordination and partnership. Streetcar service should also be considered in support of strengthened downtowns or reinvestment in historic communities. No matter the form, it is important to integrate such projects with planned connections to other complimentary transportation resources, such as Bus Rapid Transit or express bus stations.

Funding is always a critical topic for rail projects due to their higher upfront capital costs compared to bus projects. Nevertheless, tax funding for rail improvements gained significant support from responses in this survey. Evaluating potential local funding mechanisms such as tax increment financing, benefit assessment districts, rideshare fees, ad valorem vehicle taxes, sales tax, etc., to support a potential rail or other fixed guideway transit project, should be considered as part of on-going LRTP planning efforts.

Walking and Biking

Walking and biking improvements play an important role as part of an overall comprehensive transportation system. Being able to provide an attractive and low-cost alternative to a solo car trip can reduce congestion at the local level, which can translate to fewer traffic jams, shorter commutes, and increased alternatives to driving—all priorities identified in this study. Most transit trips begin and end with a walk or bike trip, so improved non-motorized connections can boost the potential market for transit agencies to draw their riders from, as well as provide increased opportunities for recreational travel and public health. In addition, better alternatives to driving is a progressive benefit for our communities’ low-income or otherwise disadvantaged residents.

Road

Safety and reliability of the area roadways has been, and will continue to be, one of the top priorities of the MPOs and other transportation agencies. Based on this survey, one of the most widely supported targeted roadway improvements was the construction of new and expanded interchange ramps. Being able to move between the expressways and local roadways smoothly and safely,
without the unpredictability of chokepoints at ramps limited in either capacity or quantity, should be explored in on-going LRTP planning efforts.

The use of elevated toll roads is another roadway concept that received general support and should also be considered in further planning efforts to potentially help reduce travel delay, reduce the need for more right-of-way, enhance regional travel connections, and function as primary evacuation routes during hurricanes or major storm events. The potential congestion management benefits of this type of improvement could also potentially benefit traffic operations in the Downtown Tampa interchange area, as well as along SR 54, with potential connections between these facilities via I-75 and I-4. However, it is worth noting there was clearly a negative feeling towards the concept of “closing the loop” in Pinellas County, which included the use of an elevated toll road in the McMullen/East Lake corridor.

**Technology**

While it did not garner the same level of enthusiasm as the future multimodal scenario, a scenario illustrating a roadway network improved by the implementation of technological advances did elicit the support of many survey respondents. These technology advances can be simple and straightforward, such as smart technology that is used to coordinate traffic signal timings to move traffic more effectively, enhance safety and reduce travel delay. Another example is the use of dynamically priced toll lanes to enhance traffic flow and increase the predictability of travel times in tolled lanes, while keeping some lanes free for less time-sensitive travelers.

Other technology advances might include the implementation of transit signal priority systems, enabling buses operating in congestion to improve their on-time rates and thus become more attractive to potential riders. Or perhaps the use of automated shuttles—a.k.a. microtransit—to ferry people to and from transit stations; such shuttles are already being rolled out in small-scale pilot projects as of 2018—something that was nearly unimaginable just a handful of years ago. The implementation of automated buses is a technological advancement that would dramatically reduce the operating costs of many transit agencies, though its initial roll-out seems more likely in BRT-style routes with dedicated guideways rather than mixed traffic.

Regardless of the project, technology will continue to advance at a rapid pace and future transportation and mobility applications will benefit from these advancements. Based on the responses from this survey, the use of technology should be considered in on-going LRTP planning efforts. At a minimum, it is important to continue the discussion of advanced technology as part of an on-going process to educate the public about the potential transportation and mobility benefits—ultimately with the goal of helping the public become more comfortable with technology over time.
Introduction

The MetroQuest survey provided commentators the opportunity to comment on priorities (screen 2), exaggerated scenarios (screen 3), and the individual planning elements (screen 4). In total, there were 9,944 comments provided. A breakdown of the comments by screen is as follows:

- **Priorities** – 767 comments
- **Scenarios** – 3,114 comments
- **Elements** – 6,063 comments

The following sections summarize the general themes of the comments received.
Priorities

Survey respondents were asked to identify their top five priorities. Traffic Jams and Alternatives to Driving led the tier one comments, identified by approximately 75% of commentators. Preserving Open/Green Space and Shorter Commutes were tier two comments, identified by approximately 62% to 64% of commentators. Storm Vulnerability (approximately 50%), Public Service Costs (approximately 50%), and Equal Opportunity (approximately 40%) rounded out the priorities. The following sections provide a brief overview of the comments associated with each of the priorities.

Traffic Jams

Survey commentators provided 160 comments related to traffic jams. Overall, commentators expressed their concerns regarding the high levels of traffic congestion throughout the tri-county area. The I-4 corridor in general, and the I-4 and I-275 interchange specifically, were identified as locations with excessive traffic jams. There was also an overall recognition among survey commentators that the outward growth occurring in the region is a major contributing factor in the traffic situation getting worse each year. Some commentators suggested the need to stop building/widening roads and to focus on alternative travel modes such as public transportation. Other commentators mentioned the need to look at improvements such as better traffic signal timings to help existing traffic move more efficiently.

Alternatives to Driving

Survey commentators provided 244 comments related to Alternatives to Driving. A number of modes were identified as alternatives to driving. In general, transit improvements were mentioned as a positive alternative to driving. Most notably, rail transit was highly supported and recommended among many commentators. Light rail in Downtown Tampa with connections over Tampa Bay bridges were commonly suggested as an alternative to congested roadways and a good way to connect the tri-county area. Commentators were somewhat critical of bus transit unless routes had designated right of way and could move freely without interference from vehicular congestion. This comment in particular supports the high response to traffic jams—commentators not only want alternatives to driving but they want alternatives that provide faster, more reliable trips. Bicycle and pedestrian connections were also supported as viable transportation options. Bike lanes were mentioned frequently as an alternative to driving with commentators indicating the need to concentrate on bike infrastructure improvements that enhance safety for bicyclists by reducing potential conflicts with vehicular traffic. To a somewhat lesser degree, these comments also apply to providing safe sidewalk connections to enhance walking within neighborhoods.
Shorter Commutes
Survey commentators provided 84 comments related to Shorter Commutes. Many commentators reinforced their dismay at the amount of congestion in the Tampa region and their belief that reducing commute times would be a major benefit for area residents. Some commentators suggested that they would like to have more options to live closer to where they work—ultimately decreasing their commute time. Other survey comments focused on infrastructure-based solutions. Some commentators suggested building a passenger rail system, improving roadway flow by using smarter traffic signals, and implementing car-carrying water ferries across the bay to remove cars from area bridges as possible solutions to help shorten commutes.

Open Space
Survey commentators provided 104 comments related to preserving Open Space. Commentators in particular referenced the importance of protecting wetlands within the tri-county area. Regardless of the type of natural space, protection of the area’s wildlife was another priority among commentators. Survey commentators also mentioned the importance of providing access to residents and visitors that will allow for the enjoyment of natural environments without negatively impacting green space and wildlife. Smart development was frequently identified as a key component to ensure wetlands and wildlife inhabitants are protected. Striking a balance between the natural environments and built environments must be taken into account within land use and development plans.

Public Service Costs
Survey commentators provided 31 comments related to Public Service Costs. Survey commentators expressed their concern regarding increasing public service costs and better management of current funding without raising taxes. Introducing the idea of private investment to fund infrastructure costs was identified as an option to help creatively save taxpayer money. Additional comments referenced the need to upgrade sewers, invest in transportation infrastructure, and promote smart development and planning to limit or reduce the burden on public service infrastructure.

Equal Opportunity
Survey commentators provided 68 comments related to Equal Opportunity. Commentators acknowledged equal opportunity as a critically important component and mentioned a number of groups that must be given equal consideration. Survey commentators highlighted the need to better connect affordable housing and transit to ensure
residents have access to jobs. Low-income, disability, and minority groups were mentioned as individuals and communities that could benefit from transportation initiatives focused on equally distributing funding resources.

**Storm Vulnerability**

Survey commentators provided 76 comments related to Storm Vulnerability. Survey comments on storm vulnerability came in particular from Pinellas County residents. A major concern among commentators was the threat of flooding from storms such as hurricanes or rising sea levels. Avoiding development in vulnerable areas and providing emergency action plans and policies for those located in areas susceptible to flooding were mentioned by many commentators. Improving evacuation routes with alternatives to I-4 also registered with many as an important component to addressing storm vulnerability. According to commentators, the growing population within the tri-county area has made it increasingly difficult to evacuate residents in a timely manner during times of emergency. Strategically placed elevated roadways to avoid flooding and provide for rapid evacuation were also mentioned as a possible infrastructure improvement.
Scenarios

Survey respondents were asked to consider and rate three different potential growth and transportation futures. The intent was to present exaggerated scenarios that would make survey participants consider the choices/consequences associated with future growth and development, and to ultimately view how each scenario could potentially impact their priorities, as well as future transportation and mobility options. The following provides a summary of the comments received for each scenario. The survey commentators are grouped into general categories, or themes.

Scenario A Comments

Imagine a future where we primarily invest in NEW TECHNOLOGIES and a few roadway projects to manage traffic flow.

Rapid Buses

Survey commentators identified buses as an important component of Scenario A. In particular, rapid bus service was felt to be an important improvement, with dedicated lanes helping buses become a more attractive and competitive travel option. Yet, many commentators found fault with the existing bus service and extended this criticism to include a dislike for increasing bus service unless service, frequency of stops and other amenities were improved. Commentators were also somewhat skeptical and uncertain of autonomous vehicles, or any automated rapid transit system. In fact, some stated a strong dislike for this type of service.

Personal / Autonomous Vehicles

Survey commentators also commented on advanced technology as it related to personal vehicles. Overall, commentators appear to be uncertain of how effective autonomous vehicles could be in solving traffic issues in the region. A review of the comments suggests that the majority were largely negative and there were similar criticisms that were mentioned when discussing autonomous transit vehicles. It should be noted that some commentators expressed enthusiasm for autonomous cars, but some still reference this concept as “too Star Trekkie,” “robotic,” and have concerns about the overall safety of private autonomous vehicles.
Dedicated / Express Lanes

Survey commentators also commented on the concept of bus lanes, express lanes, and toll lanes. Opinions regarding bus lanes were generally split between positive and negative comments, but there was concern about dedicating an entire lane to buses. Survey commentators who talked about express lanes in general provided a lukewarm response, but this could be a result of commentators connecting express lanes with having to pay tolls. In general, dedicating a lane to any one purpose was viewed negatively by survey commentators, with some expressing concern that increasing the number of toll roads would negatively impact lower-income individuals.

Rail Transportation

While not specifically listed in the scenario description, the concept of rail transportation was mentioned very broadly. By far, the largest number of commentators commented on light rail as a possible option to enhance travel within the region (these comments expressed interest in rail but did not demonstrate direct support for light rail). Some commentators expressed support for a variety of rail solutions such as a monorail or trolleys. In general, survey commentators indicated a preference for rail over rapid bus service or other local bus improvements.

Comprehensive System

The concept of system elicited the more thoughtful comments, with people commenting on the need to develop a holistic system and wanting to avoid a piecemeal approach to implementing transportation and other infrastructure improvements. Some commentators discussed the concept of a metropolitan area and the need for coordinated regional transportation investments that would benefit everyone. Some referenced the buses and rail systems found in larger metropolitan areas such as New York, while others referenced international systems as good examples of providing a comprehensive multimodal transportation system.

Toll Roads

The concept of tolls, or toll roads, was roundly criticized. A larger majority of commentators did not like the idea of toll roads and indicated they would never use them if they were to be built. Of those supporting toll roads, several suggested the need to include variable pricing.

Transit

The concept of transit also generated many comments. Three themes emerged in the analysis of transit: 1) mass transit, 2) public transit, and 3) rapid transit (previously discussed). Generally, commentators were receptive to mass transit provided it was convenient, fast and efficient, but there were commentators who felt that mass transit was too expensive and not a viable option for the Tampa region. Public transit was mentioned as a possible solution, though one commentator felt it to be a “terribly antiquated” system. Commentators who discussed rapid transit felt a solution could consist of converting old railways or constructing other dedicated lines to serve that purpose. Among those who expressed a dislike for transit it was generally identified as too expensive. Others expressed concern regarding some recent trends that show declining ridership and some stated it would require constant policing.
Scenario B Comments

Imagine a future where we primarily invest in EXPRESSWAY LANES forming an outer loop so traffic does not have to go through the congested center of the region.

I-275 Boulevard Conversion

The boulevard concept (turning Interstate-275 into a Dale Mabry-type boulevard) was strongly criticized. While there was some support for it as an idea of “thinking outside the box,” insofar as it would provide more green space, many others denigrated it as being nonsensical, “pie in the sky,” or otherwise absurd.

Expressway Connection

The expressway concept was viewed with skepticism due to mostly to the lack of physical space to construct it and the aversion many people have for paying tolls. However, some commentators were open to the concept as long as construction would not negatively impact the communities where the expressways would be located.

Tolled Express Lanes

The concept of tolled express lanes concept was clearly categorized into two themes: 1) toll lanes and 2) express lanes. Overall, the comments to toll lanes were almost uniformly hostile. Several commentators noted tolls to be a way of penalizing the poor and creating an unequal transportation system. Express/Expressway lanes had a more mixed comments. Some commentators had positive comments as long as the express lanes incur no cost to drivers and help alleviate traffic congestion. Some comments that were against express lanes due to concerns about encouraging sprawl and being financially unfeasible.

Roads / Traffic

As this scenario focused mostly on roadway investments, survey commentators provided some general comments related to roads/traffic. Some commentators expressed displeasure about the condition of the current roads and the desire to maintain and repair the existing road network. As with comments provided in Scenario A, several commentators viewed traffic as “horrific” and continuing to worsen. As far as solving the problem of traffic, some embraced the idea of mass transit while others encouraged investment in pedestrian and bike infrastructure in support of developing alternatives to driving.
Scenario C Comments

Imagine a future where we primarily invest in BUS AND RAIL SERVICES connecting, revitalizing and in-filling the communities that exist today.

Water Ferry

The ferry concept received mostly positive comments. There were some concerns related to the feasibility and the cost of the project, but most viewed it as a good opportunity to connect the downtowns of Tampa and St. Petersburg. Some commented on this project as an example of finding creative transportation solutions to address regional needs. Some criticized it “transportainment” and not a real solution to the transportation needs.

Rail

A majority of survey commentators support investment in rail and several commentators were enthusiastically behind the implementation of rail service; however, some commentators clarified that their support was contingent on the rail projects being feasible and not costly. Others opined that rail service is “sorely needed” and needs to be “the number one priority.” While some commentators find consensus that rail would only solve part of the problem, most agree it is an option that should be pursued. By comparison, bus service received few comments and seemed to somewhat lack support. Several comments emphasized that the service needed to be accessible, reliable and serve the greatest number of people.

Transit (General Comments)

Some of the comments focused more broadly on transit, and transit usage. Generally speaking, most commentators have a favorable opinion and support for public transportation. Public transit was sometimes touched on cursorily as an “excellent investment” and “great idea,” provided that people use it. One commentator stated that “Floridians just don’t take public transit.” When discussing transit generally, commentators valued transit for its energy efficiency and looked at transit as an investment for future generations. Some commentators indicated that transit seems to be the most logical solution to address traffic issues in the tri-county area, under the assumption that we just can’t continue to build roads to accommodate the growth that is occurring within the region.
Traffic

Some survey commentators took the opportunity to comment generally about traffic within the region. Similar to Scenarios A and B, some commentators emphasized that traffic congestion is a problem that needs to be addressed. While in agreement on the problem, there are multiple options and solutions that people want to consider. It appears that some commentators are willing to pay more for alternatives that could potentially improve mobility within the region, while others indicated they are not willing to pay any additional fees or taxes for transportation investments.

With regard to traffic as a general concept, most commentators want less car traffic and more options and accessibility to alternative modes of transportation. Similar to comments associated with the previous scenarios, some commentators expressed concern regarding how transportation problems disproportionately affect the poor and indicated that public transportation could provide an equitable solution.
Elements

Survey respondents were asked to consider the elements, or components, of the three scenarios to help better understand potential roadway projects, transit projects, community development, and funding options. The Elements were used to drill down into the ingredients that make up each of the scenarios in order to help inform what components should be included in a hybrid transportation and growth scenario. The following sections summarize the comments associated with each Element.

Elements Screen

“What to Do” Pop-up Box

Rate the individual elements of the scenarios. Your feedback will be used to build a regional plan for future transportation and land use. If you have no opinion on an element, leave it blank. Please review all the elements so we understand your preferences.

Evaluate 5 items or more by rating each 1-5 stars

It’s TIME Tampa Bay Elements

**Roadways**
- Advanced Technology
- New/Expanded Ramps
- Elevated Toll Roads
- Complete the Loop
- I-275 Boulevard

**Community**
- Expanded Growth Area
- Preserve Neighborhoods
- More/Better Downtowns
- Efficient Use of Land
- Walk & Bike Focus

**Transit**
- Expanded Ridesharing
- Express Bus Rapid Transit
- Rail (Local/Regional)
- Water Ferry
- Statewide Rail

**Funding**
- New Lanes with Tolls
- Taxes/Fees for Roads
- Taxes/Fees for Buses
- Taxes/Fees for Rail
- Special District Fees
Roadways Element

The roadway elements included advanced technology, new/expanded ramps, elevated toll roads, complete the loop, and I-275 boulevard. This analysis was completed using software that analyzes key words and themes and provides a high level indication of the general survey comments. It was also conducted by a general review of the comments to identify key themes/messages. A total of 1,681 roadway related comments were recorded.

The comments were entered into a word cloud to generate an overview of commentator’s priorities. The word size is proportionate to the number of times each word was identified.

Comment Summary

Advanced Technology

Generally, comments were positive toward the subject of advanced technology focusing primarily on managing traffic flow using smart technology and developing autonomous vehicles. Commentators mentioned concern over advanced technology and felt it was appropriate only when it is proven safe for use in the general public. Commentators generally support enhanced traffic signal technology and other solutions that will help reduce traffic congestion—especially during the morning and evening peak travel hours. Overall, survey commentators are somewhat uncertain regarding what types of technology improvements are available; however, commentators generally acknowledge that technology will be an important part of our future transportation system.
New/Expanded Ramps
New/expanded ramps were met with mostly positive comments. Review of the comments showed that any negativity within a comment was targeted mostly at high levels of traffic congestion throughout the region and not the concept of new and expanded ramps. Generally speaking, survey commentators seem to support targeted roadways improvements including new and expanded ramps as a solution for addressing congestion. However, there were a few commentators that do not want any additional roadway focused improvements and support investment in alternative travel modes.

Elevated Toll Roads
In general, survey commentators recognize the potential congestion relief that elevated toll roads could provide within the region. However, several comments were related to individuals not wanting to pay tolls. Many commentators said toll roads are not the answer to fund transportation improvements and had concerns that those who benefit the most are wealthy individuals. Some commentators were open to the idea of tolls as long as the fees were affordable.

Complete the Loop
There is some general consensus that the complete the loop concept helps provide a critical regional connection; however, there were numerous concerns regarding the cost associated with this project and the loss of open space resulting in mostly negative comments. Specifically, several commentators had concerns that this concept has the potential to encourage urban sprawl. A number of commentators were worried about the concept of the loop negatively impacting neighborhoods, and some questioned how a project could even be constructed in Pinellas County, where land to construct this facility is limited. For those who did support this concept, some felt from an equity standpoint that the roads should not be tolled.

I-275 Boulevard
Of the roadway elements, the I-275 Boulevard concept recorded a higher rate of less favorable comments. Some commentators acknowledged the concept of converting I-275 to a boulevard as forward-thinking, but many interpreted it as non-practical given the cost and concerns regarding surrounding roadways being able to accommodate the shift in traffic.
Transit Element

The transit elements included expanded ridesharing, express bus rapid transit, rail (local/regional), water ferry, and statewide rail. This analysis was completed using software that analyzes key words and themes and provides a high level indication of the general survey comments. It was also conducted by a general review of the comments to identify key themes/messages. A total of 1,619 comments were recorded.

The comments were entered into a word cloud to generate an overview of commentator’s priorities. The word size is proportionate to the number of times each word was identified.


Comment Summary

Expanding Ridesharing
Those who had a negative opinion cited the added congestion due to the increase of rideshare vehicles on the roadways. Some were also concerned about transparency, as ridesharing companies are typically private and may not provide full details regarding their service to the general public. In general, some of these comments reflected commentators who were unfamiliar with how the service worked, or were uncomfortable using ridesharing services. On the other side, several commentators support ridesharing and see it as a way to increase mobility options, especially for those with limited access to other transportation alternatives.

Express Bus Rapid Transit
Despite commentators recognizing express bus rapid transit as an option to potentially decrease travel times, many survey takers did not want this element if it resulted in the reduction of a vehicular
travel lane. Some commentators saw this as an inefficient method to decrease travel times because bus service frequency and ridership are too low to justify a dedicated lane. Several survey takers stated their preference for rail over express bus rapid transit. Others indicated that express bus service was a step in the right direction to expanding transit within the region.

**Rail (Local/Regional)**
Local and regional rail mostly received positive comments as many expressed their support saying that rail would provide a viable alternative to driving and could serve both urban and suburban areas through the Tampa Bay region. Some commentators saw rail as a viable option only if it is funded privately and without public funds. A few commentators mentioned locations in Europe and other U.S. metropolitan areas as examples of what rail service should look like, and to indicate how far behind they felt the Tampa region was regarding passenger rail service.

**Water Ferry**
Water ferries received a split decision as commentators believe ferries can be helpful in shuttling workers between destinations such as Tampa, St. Petersburg, and Bradenton while bypassing automobile congestion on area bridges; however, others don’t believe ferries will have a major impact on traffic relief. Some commentators indicated concerns about connections for ferry passengers at the docks. Specifically, some wondered if there would be access to bikes and other travel modes, especially for those using the ferry service to commute to work.

**Statewide Rail**
Statewide rail was met with predominantly positive comments as commentators frequently called out destinations such as Orlando, Miami, and Jacksonville as viable options to connect to the Tampa region. Some commentators indicated that a statewide rail system was more than just an important travel connection and that it would enhance economic development and support tourism throughout Florida. Despite predominantly positive comments, a few commentators were concerned about the cost and effectiveness associated with constructing and running a statewide rail system. Others questioned the ticket cost and whether a fare would be affordable to most people.
Community Element

The community elements included expanded growth area, preserve neighborhoods, more/better downtowns, efficient use of land, and walk & bike focus. This analysis was completed using software that analyzes key words and themes and provides a high level indication of the general survey comments. It was also conducted by a general review of the comments to identify key themes/messages. A total of 1,382 comments were recorded.

The comments were entered into a word cloud to generate an overview of commentator’s priorities. The word size is proportionate to the number of times each word was identified.

Comment Summary

Expanded Growth Area
Commentators felt strongly that expanded growth areas are a major contributor to many of the transportation-related problems that currently impact the Tampa Bay region. Terms such as urban sprawl and loss of natural spaces were frequently mentioned as detrimental effects connected to expanded growth areas. Some commentators suggested that future growth should occur with higher density to reduce costs and be more efficient in providing infrastructure and other public services. Furthermore, some indicated that with increased density, alternative transportation modes—including transit, walking and biking—become more viable options to reduce roadway congestion.
**Preserve Neighborhoods**
People generally commented positively to preserving neighborhoods within the region. Some commentators mentioned preserving neighborhoods helps promote diversity, which can help enhance the sense of character and culture within an area. Another focal point among commentators is that focusing on revitalization of blighted areas and improving existing assets within neighborhoods can greatly improve communities.

**More/Better Downtowns**
Commentators pointed out how important a multimodal transportation network is to the health of downtown areas. Connecting neighborhoods via transit, walking, and bicycling offers residents alternatives to driving and can help reduce congestion. Many commentators acknowledged improvements in local downtowns across the region and mentioned the importance of expanding revitalization efforts by connecting mixed-use development with multimodal connections. Survey commentators cited affordability as key issue that should be considered, as many residents are priced out of housing developments in downtown areas.

**Efficient Use of Land**
Similar to other community element comments, commentators reiterated the importance of higher density and mixed-use development as the preferred use of land. Survey commentators focused comments on the protection of rural and natural areas by supporting the adoption of land use plans that encourage density and neighborhood diversity. Woven into land use planning should be a focus on multimodal infrastructure such as sidewalks and bike lanes that residents can benefit from.

**Walk & Bike Focus**
The walk & bike focus received favorable results with many commentators supporting action to improve walking and bicycling infrastructure. Many survey takers agreed that walking and bicycling provides a healthy and environmentally friendly alternative for residents. However, any improvement to the pedestrian and/or bikeway network must be made with safety as the top priority, as some cited close calls they’ve had with vehicles as they were bicycling or walking. The term ‘safe’ was mentioned 36 times among all comments within this element group, reinforcing this priority.
Funding Element

The funding elements included new lanes with tolls, taxes/fees for roads, taxes/fees for buses, taxes/fees for rail, and special district fees. This analysis was completed using software that analyzes key words and themes and provides a high level indication of the general survey comments. It was also conducted by a general review of the comments to identify key themes/messages. A total of 1,381 comments were recorded.

The comments were entered into a word cloud to generate an overview of commentator’s priorities. The word size is proportionate to the number of times each word was identified.

Comment Summary

New Lanes with Tolls
Most survey commentators do not favor adding tolls. Some commentators were concerned that the cost to build new lanes is not fully covered by the tolls and others expressed concern that the construction of toll lanes would take away funds that could be used to improve existing roadways. Some suggested that private funding sources should be explored as an alternative to public funding, if added toll lanes are necessary. On the other hand, some commentators find new lanes with tolls acceptable as long as they are affordable and help relieve traffic congestion.

Taxes/Fees for Roads
Some commentators indicated that they would support increased taxes and fees for roads only when improvements are necessary. Others would support this concept if it helped reduce congestion;
however, many survey commentators believe that adding roadway capacity only encourages people to drive and ultimately ends up adding congestion. Some commentators indicated a desire to use road taxes/fees to maintain and improve current roadways, while others suggested that roadway taxes/fees should also be used to invest in alternative transportation options, including carpooling programs.

**Taxes/Fees for Buses**
Survey takers expressed a desire to spend taxes/fees to best maintain and improve the effectiveness of the current bus system. Others felt that funding should focus on growing ridership on the existing system to increase user fees and decrease reliance on subsidies. Some indicated that using taxes/fees to expand express transit in suburban areas was an opportunity to enhance regional bus service.

**Taxes/Fees for Rail**
In comparison of other funding elements, rail taxes/fees received mostly favorable comments. Some commentators felt that funding rail is a good long-term opportunity that would complement other transportation modes in the Tampa region. Many commentators identified private investment as the preferred funding mechanism to minimize taxpayer burden. Those who expressed negative comments about rail taxes/fees noted the high infrastructure and user fee costs associated with building and operating the system.

**Special District Fees**
Special district fees received many negative comments among survey takers. Commentators indicated that special district fees must place fair responsibility on residents and businesses. Among commentators, developers were specifically called out 71 times within comments—primarily citing they need to pay their fair share toward infrastructure. Survey takers also commented that, when enacted, special district fees need to be transparent and clearly explained to residents. Overall, the high negative rating appears to be more associated with development concerns as opposed to a negative feeling toward this concept.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Speed Management & Safety: A Data-Driven Approach

**Presenter**
Paula Flores, GPI

**Summary**
With the concerning numbers of people hurt and killed on the roadways in Hillsborough County, several approaches will be needed to see a reduction in these numbers. Through Vision Zero, there is an acknowledgement that speed plays a significant role in avoiding a crash altogether or at least surviving one.

Reliable data helps point to the most dangerous roadways, causes of crashes, and the most effective technologies and treatments. The data can also be used to determine the appropriate speed, effective roadway design, that along with automated technology and enforcement, set the stage for seeing a significant reduction in injuries and death.

**Recommended Action**
That the MPO sponsor a study of speed management and safety, focusing on severe crash corridors in Hillsborough County.

**Prepared By**
Gena Torres

**Attachments**
Presentation slides.
SPEED MANAGEMENT & SAFETY

Presented by
Paula Flores, FITE
Michael Salatti, P.E., PTOE
of Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.

for
Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
SPEED LIMITS
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?
DEVELOPING AN ACTION PLAN
Florida - most dangerous state for pedestrians and bicyclists in recent history

Nations Top 10 metro areas with highest pedestrian fatalities
- Cape Coral
- Palm Bay
- Orlando
- Jacksonville
- Daytona Beach
- Lakeland
- Tampa/St. Petersburg
- Sarasota/Bradenton
On average, one person is dying on Hillsborough streets every day!
Traffic Deaths per 100,000 Residents

- US: 10.1
- Florida: 12.5
- Hillsborough: 12.7

**WHAT DOES THE DATA TELL US?**

For every 1 fatal crash...
8 incapacitating injury crashes occur.

Image Source: Tampa Bay Online
FATAL CRASHES
- 75% occur on roads with posted speeds +40 mph
- 75% of fatal & serious injury crashes occur on one-third of our roads
- 33% of fatal crashes involve aggressive driving
- Pedestrian crashes - one-third result in death or incapacitation

WHAT DOES THE DATA TELL US?

1/3 OF ROADS ACCOUNT FOR 3/4 OF SEVERE CRASHES

TOP 20 CORRIDORS
- 63 miles of roadway
- Comprise 4% of our roads
- 19% severe crashes in five years
- 36% of crashes - Aggressive driving
- 15% of crashes - Ped/Bike crashes
“...incremental progress is no longer acceptable given the increasingly rapid advances in technology and the wealth of knowledge about how to prevent crashes...

with the right policies, technologies, and strategy, we could prevent all roadway deaths”

USDOT, National Safety Council
SPEED TAKES THE BACK SEAT

- PEDESTRIAN FATALITY & SERIOUS INJURY RISK
  
  18%  
  50%  
  77%  

- 20 MPH  
  30 MPH  
  40 MPH +

Source: FHWA Achieving Multimodal Networks

SPEED TAKES THE BACK SEAT

- 20 MPH  
  30 MPH  
  40 MPH +

CONE OF VISION

Source: FHWA Achieving Multimodal Networks
SPEED MATTERS MOST

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

SPEED LIMITS

WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

DEVELOPING AN ACTION PLAN
Speed limit review
• Classify roads by function and activity
• Road rules, legislative, and regulatory settings
• Speed enforcement methods and penalties

Speed limits inform motorists of appropriate safe driving speeds under favorable conditions.

Setting speed limits that are safe, consistent, and reasonable is the first step in speed management in order to protect all road users.
TYPES OF SPEED LIMITS

US METHOD OF SETTING SPEED LIMITS

Base speed predicated on:

- 85th percentile speed
  - Based on collective judgement of majority of drivers
  - Posted limits usually set about 5mph lower
  - Method not supported by evidence

- USLIMITS2
  - Considers road, traffic, crash data, access, density, ped/bike activity
  - Median or 50th percentile speed used to set speed limits

- Safe Systems Approach

What is the 85th percentile speed?

Speed at which 85 percent of free-flowing traffic is traveling at or below.
2017 National Traffic Safety Board Study

...leads to unintended consequences of higher operating speeds

and

...an undesirable cycle of speed escalation and reduced safety!

**85th PERCENTILE SPEED SETTING**

**SEATTLE**
- 40% in crashes
- 30% in injury crashes

**NYC**
- 14% in crashes
- 49% in pedestrian crashes
- 42% in bicyclist crashes

**Mexico City**
- 18% in crashes

**SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION RESULTS**
TARGET SPEED

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

SPEED LIMITS

WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

DEVELOPING AN ACTION PLAN
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

Speed management is not just about reducing speed, but to a considerable extent about planning and designing the road and network in a way that an appropriate speed is obtained.

GOAL
• Improve public health and safety by reducing speeding-related fatalities and injuries.

DESIRED OUTCOMES
• Reduction in speeding-related fatalities and injuries
• Improved safety experience for all road users - motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists.
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

SPEED MANAGEMENT ATTRIBUTES:
- Data-driven - crash, roadway, user, landuse data
- Applying road design, traffic operations, & safety measures
- Setting “appropriate/rational/desirable/safe” speed limits
- Institutionalize good practices
- Supportive enforcement efforts
- Effective outreach & public engagement
- Cooperation by traffic safety stakeholders

Design - Speed Management Countermeasures
- Road Diet
- Speed Humps / Tables
- Roundabouts
- Raised / Refuge islands
- On-Street Parking
- Street Trees
- Narrow Lane widths
- Horizontal/Vertical Curvature
- Short Blocks/ Midblock Crossings
- Pavement markings and Signs

Source: USDOT, SPEED MANAGEMENT PROGRAM PLAN, MAY 2014
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

Intelligent Transportation Systems to Manage Speed

- Driver feedback signs
- Install signals to maintain an orderly progression
- Time signals for target speed
- Rest in Red signals
- Excessive speeds trigger red signal indication
SUPPORTIVE ENFORCEMENT TECHNIQUES

- Automated Speed Enforcement
- Automated Red Light Cameras
- Targeted enforcement on high crash corridors
- Higher fines on high crash corridors
- Radar and Laser Speed Monitoring
- Aerial enforcement

WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

- Reduction in fatal crashes
- Reduction in crash severity
- Reduction in societal costs
  - Emergency services
  - Lost time at work
  - Medical costs
  - Property damage costs
  - Insurance costs
- Eases congestion related to crash delays
- Encourages non-motorized transportation
- Resulting in safer and healthier communities
WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
SPEED LIMITS
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?
DEVELOPING AN ACTION PLAN

SPEED MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN

- Partners and Stakeholders
- Existing Speed Management Practices
- Industry Best Practices
- Establish Speed Management Practices
- Measuring Success
- Pilot Project
Partners & Stakeholders

- Hillsborough County MPO
- Hillsborough County
- City of Tampa
- Law Enforcement
- FDOT
- FHWA
- Department of Health
- Advocacy Organizations
- Other

Existing Speed Management Practices

- Industry Best Practices
  - Statewide Best Practices
  - National Best Practices
Establish Enhanced Speed Management Practices

- In Conjunction with the Steering Committee
- Select Existing Speed Management Practices to Retain
- Select Statewide and National Best Practices to Adopt
- Generate Enhance Speed Management Practices

Establish Goals:
- Reduce Crash Fatalities
- Reduce Crash Severity
- Reduce Pedestrians/Bicyclist Crashes
- Reduce Average Operating Speed

Performance Measures:
- Establish Key Performance Indices
- Establish Data Requirements
- Establish Dashboards on Status
PILOT PROJECT

- Select corridors
- Different types of roadways/function/context
- Different jurisdictions (City & County)
- Evaluate corridor needs - Baseline
- Identify and Install treatments & strategies
- Evaluate effects
- Identify lessons learned
- Finalize the action plan

WHAT ARE WE ASKING FOR?

- Commitment to preventing fatalities & serious injuries!
- Develop a Hillsborough County Speed Management Action Plan
THANK YOU!

Presented by
Paula Flores, FITE
Michael Salatti, P.E., PTOE
of Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.
Summary

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

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

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

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

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

**Recommended Action**

That the MPO adopt the Health in All Policies Resolution.

**Prepared By**

Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff

**Attachment**

Health in All Policies Resolution and Report
April 11, 2018

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

RE: Transportation and Health

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. The MPO will consider and report the health impacts based on the Transportation and Health Indicators Matrix (attached)
## Transportation and Health Indicators Matrix

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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

2. After sharing potential capital/operating concerns and wanting to see municipal/County/PC feedback, Commissioner White moved to send that to the County administration, the administration of the three municipalities, and the PC, to look at the land use and transportation linkage for potential impacts of costs, growth, and any other implications, and have that resolution come back accompanied by a report on that review for the MPO’s consideration at that time, seconded by Commissioner Kemp, and carried eleven to zero. (MPO BOARD- 5/1/18)

CONTEXT

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

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

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

DEFINITIONS:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Transit supportive infrastructure improvements can be achieved with the implementation of Complete Streets policies. Complete Streets is a set of policies and planning practices intended to ensure that roadways accommodate all users and uses including walking, cycling, transit and
automobile travel. Complete Streets are designed with its community context- in a rural setting a Complete Street will look much different than a Complete Street in an urban setting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In 2017, the Hillsborough County MPO created a Health Atlas web-based mapping tool to provide a baseline context of health and health-related indicators within Hillsborough County as well as to visualize the interconnectedness of health, transportation, economic development, and the environment.
The catalyst for the Health Atlas is the MPO’s involvement in the Healthiest Cities & Counties Challenge. The Challenge is a partnership between the Aetna Foundation, the American Public Health Association and the National Association of Counties. The partnership has “challenged” 50 cities and counties to create a positive health impact through a small seed money grant. Hillsborough County’s Challenge project is called Garden Steps; the purpose being to establish community gardens in food deserts within Tampa, as a case study, evaluating transportation conditions surrounding sites.

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

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

**THE HEALTH IN ALL POLICIES MATRIX:**

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

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

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

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

3. Manage Congestion for Drivers & Shippers, including intersection, signalization, freeway incident management and ITS projects, evaluated by their impact on:
   - Travel time reliability on heavily congested arterials
   - Peak period V/C ratio

4. Real Choices When Not Driving, including alternatives such as transit, multi-use trails and services for the transportation disadvantaged, evaluated by:
   - Density of jobs and population in 2040 within ¼ mile of proposed transit service
   - Density of jobs and population in 2040 within ¼ mile of proposed trail/sidepath

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

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

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

The CHIP includes the six major health concerns for the county, which are:

- Access to Care
- Behavioral Health
- Chronic Diseases
- Health Equity
- Long Healthy Life
- Infant Death.

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

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

### Transportation and Health Indicators Matrix

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

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

**HEALTH AUDIT:**

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

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

**Key Findings:**

**TIP:** Nearly $439 million will be spent in the next five years to support healthy behaviors. Over the next five years, dollars will continue to be spent to improve walking, biking. Local and state governments are implementing projects to improve safety, increase access and mobility, maintain air quality standards and promote economic development. This is 11% of the $1.55 billion we are spending on transportation infrastructure. These funds will increase walking, biking, and transit opportunities.

**Analysis of Existing Priorities Funded for Construction** shows that jurisdictions are submitting projects that increase opportunities to walk, bike, or use transit. 41 of the 54 projects advanced from the LRTP in 2018/2019 supported one or more health indicators. HART continues to plan for an expanded, reliable and frequent public transit system. In the current TIP, we spend $685,556,302 on transit, which is 16.99% of total funding. To determine money spent on the transit components in the TIP, projects with a transit component were selected, including those for capital purchases, maintenance, operations, equipment, pilot projects, vanpools, and administration. This amount was then divided by the total money allocated in the TIP for all funding.

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

This study provides the MPO with potential methods and measures for identifying COCs and more systematically monitoring the long-term impacts of the regional plan and projects, using indicators related to affordability, accessibility and safety. Results of the study were presented to various MPO committees and the MPO Board to help inform future planning efforts.
The Hillsborough MPO is now using this equity analysis to screen TIP projects for impacts and benefits to COCs. In particular, the MPO is identifying areas with low access to food and other services, such as healthcare, and using additional tools, such as health impact assessments, to prioritize projects to help COCs facing these challenges. The 2045 update to the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan and Title VI plan will include details from, and expansion of, this equity analysis. Other projects include a recently concluded Transportation Disadvantaged Summit, which brought together providers and recipients to discuss transportation disadvantaged needs.

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

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

- Indicator 2 – Total crashes reduced
- Indicator 4 – Number of miles of sidewalk present
- Indicator 5 – Pedestrian Intersection Improvements
- Indicator 6 – Pedestrian friendly intersections for COCs
indicator 11 – Ratio of Sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area

Indicator 13 – Miles of sidewalk present within ¼ miles of populations with high rates of chronic health conditions

Indicator 14 – Sidewalk coverage within ¼ mile of transit stops

Indicator 15 – Sidewalk coverage for block groups within ¼ mile of restorative and social activities

Indicator 18 – Sidewalk coverage within designated food deserts

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Does the project help improve recovery time for critical transportation links after a Category 3 storm?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Does the project help to reduce severe crashes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Does the project increase the number of street lights installed in high crash corridors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Does the project increase the number of miles of sidewalk present in high pedestrian crash areas/complete network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Does the project include pedestrian intersection improvements (example-high visibility crosswalks, ADA compliant sidewalks, median pedestrian refuge and bulb-outs) 1/4 mile from transit stops?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Does the project include pedestrian friendly intersections within Communities of Concern?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Does the project reduce the population or households adjacent (500 feet) to congested or high-volume roads (30,000 ADT or a volume to capacity ratio of 1.0 or greater)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Does the project increase the span and/or frequency of transit service?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Does the project increase highway centerline miles within 1/2 miles of major healthcare (hospitals), recreation (regional parks, entertainment venues), education (universities and colleges)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Does the project improve transit and/or sidewalk coverage to areas of Essential Destinations (map attached)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Does the project increase the ratio of sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to roadway miles in the Urban Service Area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Does the project increase transit and/or sidewalk coverage to behavioral health and chronic disease services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Does the project increase the number of miles of sidewalk and trails present within 1/4 mile of populations identified with high rates of behavioral health and chronic disease conditions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Does the project increase sidewalk coverage (both sides of street) within 1/4 mile of transit stops?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the project increase sidewalk coverage (both side of street) for block groups within 1/4 mile of restorative and social activities, e.g. parks, recreation, and community centers?

Does the project increase transit service route miles within 1/4 miles of high proportion of elderly population (over 500 per square mile)?

Does the project increase the percentage of Environmental Justice population living within 1/4 mile of a trail/side path?

Does the project increase transit and/or sidewalk coverage within designated USDA Food Deserts?

Does the project increase the percentage of the Community of Concern population living within 1/4 mile of transit service (map attached)?

TOTAL NUMBER OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES ADDRESSED

SUMMARY CONCLUSION:

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

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

Agenda Item
FDOT Tentative Work Program

Presenter
FDOT Representative

Summary
In preparation for the development of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), the MPO has the opportunity to comment on the Tentative Work Program which is the projects and phases programmed for funding during the next 5-years.

Staff from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) will present the Work Program highlights. The presentation will also highlight the MPO priority projects that have been funded.

Some project highlights include:

- I-75 at Big Bend Interchange improvements
- Vision Zero Corridor Studies for Hillsborough County
- Ola Ave and Central Ave Bikeways
- El Prado Complete Street Improvements
- Urban Corridor Improvement along Nebraska, Florida, Highland, Tampa
- SR 60 Intersection Improvements
- Apollo Beach Road Extension

Recommended Action
Provide comments and recommend approval to the MPO Board.

Prepared By
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

Attachments
Attachment coming from FDOT
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Heights Mobility Study

**Presenter**
Stephen Benson, FDOT District 7

**Summary**
The Heights Mobility Study is an effort to improve safety and mobility in the Greater Seminole Heights/Tampa Heights area, especially, along the Florida Avenue and Tampa Street/Highland Avenue corridor between downtown Tampa and the Hillsborough River. Additionally, the Study Team will work with the community to develop a long-term vision for transportation improvements in the area.

The study objectives, schedule and ways to get involved will be discussed.

**Recommended Action**
None. For information only.

**Prepared By**
Gena Torres, MPO staff

**Attachments**
Visit [Heights Mobility Study website](#) for more information.
CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

The MPO Vice Chairman, Councilman Harry Cohen, called the meeting to order with one member short of a quorum at 9:06 a.m. Commissioner Stacy White led the pledge of allegiance and gave the invocation.

The following members attended:


The following members were absent:

Trent Green, Commissioner Ken Hagan, Mayor Mel Jurado, Mayor Rick Lott, David Mechanik, Commissioner Les Miller, and Cindy Stuart.

Vice Chair Cohen read into the record a memo from Chairman, Commissioner Les Miller, stating that he was unable to attend due to a medical procedure.

*Some non-action agenda items were taken out of order until the quorum was established.*

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Jim Davison requested the following:

1. The value capture analysis report that backs up the response provided to the Citizens Advisory Committee that not enough funds would be raised with this strategy to be considered in any Long Range Transportation Plan.
2. Under what authority the MPO appropriated the entire amount of money remaining in the CIT tax for Plant City, Temple Terrace, and the City of Tampa of which 61% of it was given to the bus category (the transit category).
3. How the tax referendum is going to affect the MPO’s scenario planning, since representatives of All For Transportation and County Administration have stated that this plan will not end congestion and congestion will continue to increase.

Sharon Calvert commented on the five-page charter amendment, All for Transportation, and Ms. Alden’s presentation at the August 23rd Tampa City Council meeting. She feels that Ms. Alden presented wrong and misleading information. Ms. Calvert distributed an article titled “Sales Tax Initiative Would Mostly Fund Maintenance, Not New Mass Transit Options.” She expressed concerns regarding a $16 billion tax hike only funding basic services. She stated that the MPO Board should rein in the bureaucracy if they want to remain credible.

Tom Nocera representing St. Pete Tampa Aerial Transit, LLC and Beach Tran Clearwater, LLC requested the opportunity to go into detail on the plan for a regional solution for traffic congestion that is not tax payer
funded. He would need ten minutes to make the presentation. He presented the information at a Pasco MPO Board meeting and received a resolution for support. On November 6, he is presenting at the Sarasota/Manatee MPO Board. He suggested members view videos on skytram.com and on tampabaytransit.com. He hopes to hear back from the MPO Board regarding an available time to make a presentation.

Chris Vela expressed concerns about the Tampa Bay Next project and requested that his concerns be shared with future MPO Board members.

Following the public comment period, Commissioner White requested MPO staff work with Mr. Davison on the questions that he asked. He also requested Cameron Clark, MPO Attorney, assure that Mr. Davison receives records if his questions turn into a public records request.

**STATUS REPORT**

**A. Brightline Proposal for Rail to Orlando, Miami**

Mr. Bob O’Malley, Brightline’s Vice President of Government Affairs, presented information on the Brightline Proposal for connecting Orlando to Tampa with high-speed rail. Mr. O’Malley offered to make presentations to any group. He invited members to tour Brightline stations and for those who support Brightline to encourage the Florida Department of Transportation to move forward. Members can contact Mr. O’Malley if they have questions or suggestions.

Following the presentation, Councilman Maniscalco inquired about the ticket cost, route and the estimated travel time from Tampa to West Palm Beach.

Commissioner Murman invited Mr. O’Malley to present at a Board of County Commissioners meeting. She will have her staff contact Mr. O’Malley regarding scheduling and for a possible letter of support.

Ms. Janet Scherberger spoke on behalf of Tampa International Airport in support of the concept of having some type of connection between Orlando and Tampa.

Councilman Cohen stated if Mr. O’Malley is not already scheduled to make a presentation to Tampa City Council, he would like to request a presentation as well.

_A quorum was established at 9:32 a.m. upon Commissioner Kemp’s arrival._

Commissioner Kemp arrived at the end of the presentation and thanked Mr. O’Malley. She is excited about the Brightline possibility.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 2, 2018**

A motion was made by Commissioner Murman to approve the minutes of October 2, 2018. The motion was seconded by Commissioner White and carried unanimously.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS, ONLINE COMMENTS**

Ms. Gena Torres, MPO Staff, presented the committee reports. Committees approved and forwarded to the MPO Board the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment for the Bloomingdale Ave/US 301 Intersection and for the HART CAD/AVL bus equipment replacement. In addition, they approved the Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for the USF Campus for acceptance as a concept. The Citizens Advisory Committee voted 10 to 2, and the nay votes were due to concerns about impacting bicycling and cost effectiveness versus Bull-Runner bus service.
The Policy Committee passed motions for the renewal of the interlocal agreement with TBARTA for organizational and administrative services for the MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee on the consent agenda. They also took a position on the federal performance measures, supporting the staff recommendation, with a request that HART send a letter or a representative to the board meeting.

The Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee approved a motion supporting the reconstruction of the Maydell Avenue Bridge as previously supported by the committee.

The Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board approved the annual report for the countywide coordinated system.

The TBARTA MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee Staff Directors discussed making minor adjustments to the regional priority lists; the 2019 Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit; the public workshop for the Regional Planning Best Practices Study; and confirmed support for renewal of the TBARTA Staff Services Agreement. The committee will meet on Friday, December 14, over lunch, near the I-75/University Pkwy interchange. The meeting is being arranged and hosted by the Sarasota/Manatee MPO.

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

Commissioner Kemp inquired about the presentation that took place at the BPAC meeting regarding the reconstruction of the Maydell Avenue Bridge. At two County Commission budget meetings, they received significant pushback from several community members not to have the bridge rebuilt. She supports pedestrian access across the bridge and feels that it needs to be explored more. Staff will find out about the BPAC presentation and advise Commissioner Kemp.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A. Committee Appointment
B. Renewal of Interlocal Agreement with TBARTA for Organizational & Administrative Services for MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee

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

**ROLL-CALL VOTES: TIP Amendments Approved by Committees**

Commissioner Murman made a motion for approval of the TIP Amendment for the Bloomingdale Avenue and US 301 Intersection. Councilman Maniscalco seconded the motion. Upon a roll call vote, the motion carried nine to zero.

Commissioner Murman made a motion for approval of the TIP Amendment for the HART CAD/AVL Bus Equipment Replacement. Councilman Viera seconded the motion. Upon a roll call vote, the motion carried nine to zero.

**ACTION ITEMS**

A. MPO Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for USF Campus

Mrs. Allison Yeh, MPO Staff, introduced the item, which is part of the MPO’s investigation into the potential of new automated-vehicle technologies, as required by a recent Florida law on MPO long-range plans. Mr. Brian Pessaro, Senior Research Associate with CUTR, presented the findings of a study to bring
autonomous shuttles to the USF Campus, which is a good location for a trial because of its controlled environment, low speeds, and parking constraints. Service concepts that would complement the Bull Runner and the new IP circulator, and respond to student preferences, include a night-time shuttle and/or a shuttle to a remote parking lot. USF will consider its next steps.

Following the presentation, Councilman Viera stated that modest ideas like this will yield big results in the future. USF is an area with a tremendous amount of growth potential. He wanted to know if the liability issue was covered under sovereign immunity? Mr. Pessaro was unable to provide an answer to Councilman Viera’s question; however, Commissioner Murman stated if the autonomous shuttle were operated by USF, it is covered.

Commissioner Kemp suggested consideration for the transportation needs of USF staff in addition to students. She also expressed concerns about safety in walkable communities with the operation of the autonomous shuttles. Mr. Pessaro stated these low-speed shuttles are capable of operating in mixed environments.

A motion was made by Commissioner Murman to approve the USF Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study report. The motion was seconded by Councilman Viera and carried unanimously.

B. Board Positions on Federal Performance Measures

Dr. Johnny Wong, MPO Staff, provided an update on the action item that was deferred at the October 2, 2018 meeting. At that meeting, following extensive discussion, board members still had numerous concerns. Staff emailed members and provided an opportunity for them to express concerns and ask additional questions. The comments and questions that members emailed were covered in Dr. Wong’s presentation. The Federal deadline to set the performance targets is November 14, 2018. Staff emailed board members and received responses back from members. Staff also had conversations with the Office of Policy and Planning to clarify concerns expressed by members.

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) oversees collecting all data and reporting to the Federal Highway Administration. FDOT is the lead agency for the performance measures and targets. They set statewide targets for all national highway system roads. FDOT has been measuring mobility performance for over thirty years and does not anticipate that the new performance measures will change funding allocations. FDOT staff suggests that MPOs support the state targets.

The following are the suggested board actions:

- Support FDOT’s statewide performance targets for the NHS and accept transit asset outcomes emerging from the 2018 HART TAM Plan.
- Communicate, in a letter to FDOT:
  - Request NHS bridges continue to be maintained in good state of report.
  - Request funding for bottleneck near-term fixes to improve travel time reliability – ex. ICM, ATMS, ramp changes, and other TSM&O projects on the priority list.
- Communicate to the TMA Leadership Group:
  - HART Maintenance Facility should be a top regional priority.
  - TSM&O projects should also be prioritized at the regional level.

Following the presentation, Commissioner Kemp commented on travel time reliability. She expressed interest in having a future presentation on traffic signal timing to improve traffic flow, and reiterated her previous request for information on the effect on induced travel demand. Dr. Wong stated that he had been unable to find published papers that deal with induced demand resulting from operational improvements as opposed to induced demand resulting from capacity projects.
Mr. Waggoner brought up the impacts on performance reliability measures when improvements to the National Highway System that are in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) are delayed. Did the MPO look at what happens if the LRTP National Highway System program is not carried out? Ms. Alden showed congestion forecasts from the LRTP. She stated that the travel time reliability forecast, which Dr. Wong showed to illustrate the benefits of advanced traffic management systems (ATMS), assumes that many interstate express lane projects will be implemented by 2040. The MPO evaluated scenarios with and without the express lane projects, and found that the express lane scenario had the smallest increase in traffic congestion, even with outward growth and new office parks around interchanges. Mr. Waggoner wanted to know if the travel time reliability forecast will be updated, using the Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP2) tool? Ms. Alden stated, if the board agrees, staff would like to complete a similar analysis and utilize the SHRP2 tool again for the update of the LRTP in the coming year. Mr. Waggoner agreed, if the tool can show how other moderate improvements can provide benefit, but the MPO must make sure that capacity is key to our transportation system remaining functional.

Commissioner Murman stated that the action item was discussed quite a bit at the Policy Committee. Road reliability and vulnerability is important to the region. As a Commissioner, she receives daily calls regarding the poor quality of roads.

A motion was made by Commissioner Murman to support FDOT’s statewide performance targets for the National Highway System and accept transit asset outcomes emerging from the 2018 HART Transit Asset Management Plan. In addition, support the Policy Committee’s recommendations for communication to FDOT and the TMA Leadership Group. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kemp.

Prior to the vote, Mr. Waggoner commented again on travel time reliability, and suggested an amendment to the motion for general support of carrying out the National Highway System improvements in the LRTP. Commissioner Murman and Commissioner Kemp accepted the suggestion of the amendment to the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

STATUS REPORT

B. Florida MPO Advisory Council Update

Mr. Carl Mikyska, Executive Director of Florida MPO Advisory Council, provided an overview of the MPOAC, transportation funding in Florida, MPOAC Legislative Priorities, and the MPOAC’s weekend institute for elected officials. The dates for the 2019 weekend institute for elected officials are: Orlando (March 29 – 31) and Tampa (May 31 – June 2).

Commissioner Kemp recommended members attend the weekend institute for elected officials if they have not attended. She wanted to know where the MPOAC legislative priorities come from. Mr. Mikyska stated they are determined by 27 members, one from each MPO Board in the state, who vote and adopt the priorities annually.

Mr. Waggoner commented on the SIS recommendation, maintaining capacity, and distracted driver information that was discussed in the presentation. He recommended considering distracting transportation not just distracted driving.

Councilman Cohen acknowledged that Karen Michalski wanted to provide comments during the public comment period regarding combining MPO’s, but she had to leave prior to being called. She stated that she would email her comments. (To date her comments have not been received)
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Ms. Alden stated that yesterday’s workshop on the Regional Planning Best Practices study was very informative. The consulting team has put together three different sets of options for consideration, for strengthening the regional planning process. The information is also available on the TBARTA website. A copy of the information was provided to members in the board folders. She is scheduling a regional workshop tentatively for January 15th for an opportunity to have a discussion with the consulting team.

Later today, staff is meeting with the AETNA Foundation and the American Public Health Association because the Hillsborough MPO is one of the national finalists for a grant to potentially expand the Garden Steps Project.

The next board meeting will be held Tuesday, December 4th on the 26th floor of the County Center. The annual election of officers will take place.

The next Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group will take place on November 2nd and will be held at the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority. The process of a rotating chairperson will begin, and Commissioner Murman has agreed to be first chairperson.

OLD & NEW BUSINESS

There was no old or new business.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:51 a.m.
Committee Reports

Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on November 14

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendment for HART’s FTA Section 5337 & 5339 Funding;
- The It's Time Tampa Bay Survey Results & Recommendations: the CAC voted to approve, but recommended that the I-275 Boulevard conversion concept currently has low public support due to a lack of understanding by the public, and therefore still warrants further study (motion passed 12-3);
- MPO Comments on the FDOT Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) 2045 Cost Feasible Plan;
- The Health in All Policies Resolution;
- The 2019 Committees & MPO Board Meeting Schedule.

The CAC also received a report on the Southshore Transit Reevaluation.

Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on November 19

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- TIP Amendment for HART FTA Section 5337 & 5339 Funding
- It's Time Tampa Bay Survey Results & Recommendations. Committee members asked how the results would be used in developing the 2045 LRTP.
- MPO Comments on the SIS 2045 Cost Feasible Plan
- Health in All Policies Resolution. Questions were asked about how the indicators would be used in the LRTP project prioritization process.
- 2019 Committees & MPO Board Meeting Schedule

The TAC also received reports on:

- The Heights Mobility Plan
- MPO Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on November 14

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- It’s Time Tampa Bay Survey Results and Recommendations
- 2019 Committee and MPO Schedule
The BPAC also received reports on:
  o Heights Mobility Plan
  o Gasparilla Children’s Bike Rodeo
  o Noise Wall Best Practices

The committee also continued to move forward with developing a list of questions for candidates in upcoming local elections that would reflect the concerns of the committee.

Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee (LRC) on November 28
Verbal report to be given at meeting.

The School Transportation Working Group did not meet during November.
Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area (TMA) Leadership Group
Representing the MPOs in Pasco, Pinellas, & Hillsborough Counties

Summary for 11.2.18 meeting

Based on the importance and reach of the conversations that happen at the TMA Leadership Group, we are looking to keep our stakeholders aware of the outcomes of these meetings. The following is a summary of the most recent meeting highlights; you can find the full agenda online. A video of the proceedings is also available on YouTube.

The TMA Leadership Group spent much of the meeting discussing possible restructuring options after deciding to move away from a facilitated consensus model in September.

- As discussed at the previous meeting, the group began its rotating chair structure, with Hillsborough County Commissioner Sandra Murman serving as the first chair.
- Forward Pinellas Executive Director Whit Blanton presented the group with three options for a voting structure:
  - Option A, non-weighted voting with one vote per MPO, each MPO having three representatives
  - Option B, weighted voting by population, with Hillsborough having five representatives, Pinellas having three representatives, and Pasco having two representatives; a tie-breaker option would allow each MPO get one vote in case of a tie
  - Option C, a hybrid option where any vote would have to be agreed upon by weighted membership and by a non-weighted vote of the three MPOs
  - Other additional options included possibly allowing non-elected members of an MPO to serve as representatives to the TMA leadership group, and including other MPOs and independent transportation agencies as advisers who could give formal recommendations before votes
- Commissioner Murman said she preferred option B, but said she disliked the tie-breaker as pitting one MPO against another, and asked that Robert's Rules of Order be followed in regard to ties instead (with a tie meaning the motion fails or is taken up again later)
  - Pinellas County Commissioner Dave Eggers agreed and added that he felt each MPO should have a quorum of its own membership in order for a vote to be taken
  - Hillsborough and Pasco representatives (Pasco did not have an elected representative at the meeting) agreed that only elected officials should be allowed to serve
  - Members agreed additionally that the most important items brought before the group would be action items requiring a vote, and that these items would be noted on the agenda for the benefit of the public and the representatives attending the meeting
    - The option of having non-voting advisers offer recommendations was also popular
- Hillsborough and Pinellas representatives in attendance at the meeting agreed widely on the Option B structure with aforementioned changes, but said they would wait for Pasco representatives to weigh in
Absent Pasco Commissioners Jack Mariano and Kathryn Starkey communicated through staff that they would not support a weighted voting structure

Hillsborough and Pinellas representatives noted that with the current structure, several meetings were absent any representative from Pasco County, but agreed to table the structure decision to the next meeting

In addition to re-addressing the voting structure, staff agreed to come back to the next meeting with bylaws and clarify some roles and responsibilities, including possible overlap with the TBARTA MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee

Members also tasked staff with thinking about a possible slogan for the group

Consultant Jim Meyer from AECOM presented results from the It's TIME Tampa Bay MetroQuest regional survey conducted in August and September, conducted to help develop the regional element of the Long Range Transportation Plan

The survey set a US MetroQuest Record with 9,575 participants

In terms of demographics, MetroQuest participants deviated from a representative sample that more identified as white, higher income, and living in Hillsborough than the mean

With almost 70 percent of respondents providing some zip code data, 61.3% of respondents lived in Hillsborough, 26.5% lived in Pinellas, and 12.2% lived in Pasco

When respondents were asked to list their priorities, a few rose to the top among all counties

All counties prioritized 1) traffic jams and 2) alternatives to driving as top priorities, with second tier priorities of 3) open/green space and 4) shorter commutes

A few small deviations were visible per county

- Pinellas ranked alternatives to driving over traffic jams, and also ranked storm vulnerability as a high priority
- Pasco ranked shorter commutes over open/green space

Survey respondents were asked to rank (from 1-5, 5 being the best) three scenarios for transportation, growth and development: Scenario A: New Technologies; Scenario B: Tolled Express Lanes; and Scenario C: Transit Focus

- Of those, Scenario B had the lowest average rating (2.53)
- Scenario A had a middling average rating (2.86)
- Scenario C had the highest rating (4.08), with 75.8% of all participants rating the scenario 4 or 5 stars

Participants were also asked to rank elements within each scenario, to drill down into the makeup of each scenario and help determine which elements should be included in the final hybrid plan

- Elements included roadway, transit, community and funding options
- The three highest ranked options were Statewide Rail, Rail (Local/Regional), and Preserve Neighborhoods

- Of funding options, taxes/fees for rail and special district fees were the most popular, each with a majority positive (4 or 5) rating
- Expanded Growth Area, an I-275 Boulevard concept, and Taxes/Fees for Roads were the three lowest ranking elements

Meyer went over a few takeaways from the survey that could help guide the 2045 plan’s hybrid scenario

- Encourage reinvestment in neighborhoods, stronger downtown and minimal outward growth in local government comprehensive plans
- Consider options for incorporating rail
○ Continue to explore elevated express lane projects, using tolls for congestion management rather than revenue
○ Several takeaways on the transportation elements, including expanded interchange ramps, importance of bike/ped, negative reaction to the I-275 boulevard, and needing to be convinced on the realism and safety of technology advances
● Group members praised the high response rate of the survey
○ Some reactions included:
  ■ Emphasis on people’s desire to protect their neighborhoods
  ■ Emphasis on what they felt was confirmation of the conventional wisdom that millennials do not want to live somewhere they feel car-bound
  ■ Emphasis on a further need for a plan that connects transit elements rather than having them included but not showing the connectivity between them

Hillsborough and Pinellas staff went over the Strategic Intermodal System Cost Feasible Plan for 2045
● The SIS Cost Feasible Plan is the list of projects that FDOT submits as highest priority for economy and mobility statewide
○ The MPOs are in the process of sending comments to FDOT on the SIS, with major comments including:
  ■ Pinellas County:
    ● Asking FDOT to modify plans for US19 interchanges at Alderman and Tarpon or remove the specific interchange projects from the SIS plan
    ● Advance construction of the connection between the Gateway Express and Roosevelt Boulevard
    ● Advance Construction of Gandy Bridge replacement
  ■ Hillsborough:
    ● Advance interchanges at SR60/Memorial, I-75 at Gibsonton Drive, and I-75 at Big Bend Road
    ● Provide justification of current inclusion of SR60 from Dover Road to Polk County (other higher priorities)
    ● Pendola Point Road to South of Causeway Boulevard is constrained in the Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan
    ● Clarify scopes for interchanges on I-275 (MLK to Fletcher, Bearss) and I-4 (Mango Road to Park Road)
  ■ Pasco:
    ● I-75 improvements (phasing/timing issues)
    ● Add CSX Line in Pasco County to the SIS
● FDOT District 7 Secretary David Gwynn asked that county commissions and MPO boards send letters supporting the Westshore /I-275 Interchange as the number one regional priority, saying that he felt the possibility of getting that funding would be high if there was agreement among all three counties (a representative of the Westshore Alliance also gave public comment at the beginning of the meeting asking that the SR60 interchange be moved up in the plan)
○ Forward Pinellas has already done so, Pinellas County Commissioner Janet Long said she would ask the County Commission to do so as well, and Commissioner Murman noted she would support the Hillsborough MPO and County Commission doing the same
• Much of the discussion on the SIS plan focused on FDOT’s request that officials avoid the legislative earmark process to try to move projects up in the process
  ○ If earmark projects get put into the state budget but are vetoed by the governor, that money is not only removed from the budget, but FDOT cannot put the project into a work program for a full year
  ○ Earmarks come out of the Department’s budget, meaning another project on the priority list may get deferred or under-funded to compensate.
• Forward Pinellas is requesting that SIS funding should be available for transit in the right of way for SIS roads
  ○ This would include capital and operating, including in managed lanes; currently the SIS requirement is that funds may only be used for transit in fixed guideway
  ○ Hillsborough County Commissioner Pat Kemp did express concern that the SIS was overfunded at the expense of non-SIS arterial roadways and projects, and said she was unsure she could support removing the fixed guideway requirement, specifically citing her opposition to the Regional Transit Feasibility Plan proposed bus project on I-275
• Group members also said they would like to hear more expert input about managed express toll lanes, on both sides of the congestion management and equity issues

The TMA Leadership Group meets next on February 8 at the Hillsborough Government Center.
Natural Disaster Recovery and Resiliency
Paul Bertels knew he faced the biggest challenge of his career. Hurricane Charlie had already destroyed parts of Punta Gorda and was headed directly for Clearwater Beach, a barrier island on the west coast of Florida. As the City of Clearwater Traffic Operations Manager, he, somehow, had to pull off a mandatory evacuation of the beach. Hurricane Charlie was the most intense storm to hit Florida since Hurricane Andrew wreaked havoc on South Florida in 1992 and the strongest storm to hit the west coast of Florida in a century.

Bertels knew he could contraflow the westbound lanes of the 4-lane divided highway, Memorial Causeway, that connects Clearwater Beach to the mainland. That would give him enough causeway capacity to safely evacuate the beach population. But the intersection connecting the causeway to the beach roadway network was the Clearwater Beach Entryway Roundabout, a trailblazing project that four years earlier had become the first high-profile modern roundabout in the United States. With a normal daily traffic of about 33,000 vehicles, the beach roundabout operation is tested every Spring Break weekend, when the traffic volume almost doubles to nearly 60,000. The roundabout aces that test every year by controlling Spring Break traffic arriving from the mainland with the first roundabout metering signal in the United States, but how could the roundabout handle mandatory evacuation traffic departing the Beach?

The problem Paul Bertels had to solve was how to double the capacity of the roundabout for the evacuation. Because the roundabout is located mid-island, normally traffic from both North and South Clearwater Beach departs the island by flowing counterclockwise through the south half of the roundabout and directly into the two eastbound lanes of the causeway and on to the mainland. No one had ever attempted to evacuate an island through half a
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As the City of Clearwater Traffic Operations Manager, Paul Bertels, somehow, had to pull off a mandatory evacuation of the beach.
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roundabout. Working closely with the police beach commander Mike Williams, Bertels devised a plan to contraflow the north half of the roundabout, so that all North Beach traffic contrafl owed clockwise through the north half of the roundabout and directly into the two contrafl owed westbound lanes of Memorial Causeway. Remarkably, very few resources were needed to contraflow the roundabout: just one parked police vehicle to block circulating traffic from entering the contrafl owing section and two patrol officers on foot to direct North Beach traffic entering the roundabout to contraflow clockwise, instead of flowing normally counterclockwise.

Networks aren’t networks without functioning nodes, and that includes the roadway transportation network. But severe storms, hurricanes and power outages can severely curtail the operation of street intersections and make them dangerous to cross, adding to woes during and after disasters.

Modern roundabouts are the most resilient intersections ever invented. In normal operation, they provide excellent operational efficiency and outstanding safety compared to conventional intersections. Modern roundabouts operate exactly the same both in normal times and after disasters because they require no sensors, signals, controllers or electricity to operate the same as they always do. Even if the roundabout YIELD signs have been blown away by high winds, the geometry of modern roundabouts causes all drivers to slow down to 25 MPH or less—highly desirable behavior during times of stress.

For roundabouts, there is no lengthy and very costly post-disaster recovery period of dangerous, minimally functioning intersections while repair crews scramble to repair downed power lines, restore power, and replace missing signal heads and damaged controllers. There is no hindrance to emergency vehicles, no severe crashes, and no need to divert critically-needed police forces to manually direct intersection traffic.

Many small and medium-sized signalized intersections are good candidates for conversion to modern roundabouts for safety and operational benefits alone; taking them off the signal network relieves the annual signal budget during normal times and can pay big dividends in time of disaster. Instead of rebuilding signalized intersections post-disaster at considerable expense, some could instead be converted to modern roundabouts.

An early study by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety found that modern roundabouts reduce fatalities by more than 90% --thereby closing in on the goal of Vision Zero for intersections. Based on 17 years of crash data, a 2018 study by Pennsylvania DOT found modern roundabouts have reduced both fatalities and severe injuries by 100% to zero. Minor injuries were reduced 95%, and possible/unknown injuries by 92%. Total crashes went down 47%. The Florida DOT pegs the comprehensive cost to society of a fatal crash at $10,660,000 and severe injury crashes at $599,040.

A 2017 Minnesota DOT study found
modern roundabouts have reduced the fatality crash rate by 86% and the severe injuries rate by 83%. The crash rate for all roundabouts is ½ the crash rate of high-volume/low-speed signalized intersections and 1/3 the crash rate of high-volume/high-speed signalized intersections. The typical 15-25 MPH roundabout speeds and two-thirds fewer pedestrian/vehicle conflict points are a substantial safety benefit for pedestrians, youngsters, oldsters, bicyclists, skaters and transit riders, as well.

Converting signalized intersections to modern roundabouts typically improves peak hour operations a very welcome 30%, and roundabouts flow even better for the roughly 80% of traffic that is off-peak. Late-night vehicles typically encounter no delay at all. The elimination of idling vehicle-hours queued up at red lights typically results in a 30% reduction in the associated fuel consumption, toxic pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions—the last a major contributor to increasing storm severity due to the greater energy input of warming ocean water into storm formation.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Florence, Traffic Management Officer Eric Lippert was directing traffic at an inoperative signalized intersection in Wilmington, NC, when he realized the intersection could better handle the low post-storm traffic volume by itself and without him—if it were converted to a temporary roundabout by means of few traffic cones. His “tactical urbanism” idea worked surprisingly well in rudimentary implementation, so several other Wilmington intersections were also promptly and easily converted to temporary “cone” roundabouts. Wilmington City Traffic Engineer Don Bennett, PE, refined the design and observed that, “Unequivocally, a single lane roundabout works better than four, 5-lane approaches with STOP control. There are capacity issues, but it works much better and everyone complies.” During critical times, each intersection was tying up 12-16 officers for 24-hour operations; the “coneabouts” got that down to just three officers plus a patrol car parked in the center. The officers reset downed cones and the vehicle’s flashing blue light alerts motorists in advance.

Modern roundabouts offer engineers a way to dramatically reduce intersection fatalities and severe injuries while saving society billions of dollars annually. To date,

*continued on next page*
the United States has built approximately 5,000 modern roundabouts, but to achieve roundabout parity by population with countries such as France or Australia, the U.S. would need to construct some 145,000 roundabouts. The City of Carmel, Indiana, has led the way by eliminating almost all roundabouts—more than one for every 1,000 residents. The equivalent for Tallahassee would be a minimum of 190 roundabouts.
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