Joint Meeting of the Citizens & Technical Advisory Committees
Monday, December 17, 2018 at 1:15 p.m.

Please join us for a holiday lunch starting at noon!

I. Call to Order & Introductions

II. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

III. Members’ Interests

IV. Approval of Minutes – November 14 CAC and October 22 & November 19 TAC

V. Action Items
   A. Election of Officers (MPO Staff)
   B. FDOT Tentative Work Program & MPO Comments (FDOT Representative)
   C. Speed Management & Safety: A Data-Driven Approach (Paula Flores, GPI)
   D. Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation (Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff)

VI. Status Reports
   A. Tampa Bay Next Update (FDOT Representative)
   B. Resilient Tampa Bay: Transportation (Allison Yeh, MPO Staff)

VII. Old Business & New Business
   A. Next meeting: January 9th CAC, January 28th TAC
   B. TBARTA CAC Report (Rick Richmond)
   C. AMPO Conference Highlights (Beth Alden)
   D. 2019 MPO Official Meeting Calendar & October 2019 CAC Meeting

VIII. Adjournment
IX. Addendum

A. MPO Meeting Summary & Committee Reports
B. FDOT Tentative Five-Year Work Program Online Public Hearing and Open House
C. Article:
   i. Round is Resilient
D. Email:
   i. 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 help line 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 correo electrónico. También, si sólo se puede hablar en español, por favor llame a la línea de ayuda en español al (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

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

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.
I. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bill Roberts at 9:02 a.m. and was held in the Plan Hillsborough Room on the 18th floor of the County Center Building. Member introductions were made.

**Members present:** Ricardo Fernandez, Ray Alzamora, David Bailey, David Butcher, Bill Roberts, Ed Mierzejewski, Lynn Vadelund, Diane Stull, Dayna Lazarus, Cliff Reiss, Kimberly Overman, Robert Davila, Terrance Trott, Rick Richmond, Barbara Kennedy Gibson.

**Others present:** Rich Clarendon, Wade Reynolds, Wanda West, Michele Ogilvie, Lisa Silva, Sarah McKinley – MPO Staff; Pedro Parra – Planning Commission Staff; Cyndy Zambella, Linda Walker – HART, Josh Baumgartner – Tampa Chamber, Roger Roscoe – FDOT.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

III. MEMBERS’ INTERESTS

Mr. Terrance Trott requested contact information for citizens to report road related issues. He had a friend contact him regarding several traffic incidents in front of a local business, and he wanted to assist in reporting the matter for possible road improvements. Mr. Clarendon will provide members with a contact list for reporting road concerns.

Mr. David Bailey asked if the CAC was involved, prior to his appointment, with the decision-making process for ferry service from Southshore to MacDill. Chair Roberts stated that the committee had a presentation on the ferry and asked Mr. Clarendon to elaborate. The MPO completed feasibility studies a few years ago and provided the information to Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART) and the County to move forward. There was a federal allocation of a grant secured by Congresswoman Castor that helped develop the project and it went to the County. After further analysis, the costs seemed more than the County wanted to absorb.

Ms. Dayna Lazarus inquired about the justification on not moving forward with the project, commented on the benefits and drawbacks of the project and wanted to know if the CAC could receive a presentation on the County’s public private partnership agreement. She wanted to know if it would have saved the County money to move forward with the public private partnership. Chair Roberts shared information regarding the project that he read in the newspaper about the environmental problems and the cost of building a parking facility and combined cost of docking continued to escalate. The project was discontinued but could be revived. Mr. Bailey wanted to know if there is anything that the committee could do to help with partnerships and possible options.

Ms. Kimberly Overman stated that there was a staff report to the BOCC that was not properly noticed, which became an action item, and the BOCC cancelled the contract that the County had with the service provider. She said the study was scheduled to be completed in January 2019 and the board made a
premature decision. She suggested filing an inquiry of concern regarding the proper protocol that should have been made regarding the decision. She believes the report was halted when the contract was terminated.

Mr. Ed Mierzejewski mentioned an article from the ITE Journal about the Brightline Project, titled *South Florida's Brightline: The Public Costs of Private Rail* and a recent presentation by two professors from Florida Atlantic University. He pointed out that the capital costs are being covered by $1.75 billion in private activity bonds, and the repayment stream are revenues generated by rail passengers. He suggested being fully aware of the risks associated with Brightline.

Mr. Ricardo Fernandez recommended Jeff Speck’s new book, *Walkable City Rules*.

Mr. Bill Roberts congratulated Kimberly Overman for being elected to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC).

Ms. Overman attended the meeting to officially resign from the CAC and invited members to attend the BOCC Investiture Ceremony on Tuesday, November 20 at 9 a.m. at the County Center.

Mr. Roberts wanted to know if the committee was interested in a presentation at the January meeting on the allocation of funds for the one percent sales tax referendum and the administrator. Members agreed, and Ms. Lazarus requested that the presentation include information on the Independent Oversight Committee. Ms. Lazarus wanted the article that Mr. Mierzejewski referenced distributed to the committee. Mr. Mierzejewski stated that he provided Ms. Alden the link for the presentation by the FAU Professors. Mr. Clarendon will assure the information is sent to the CAC.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: Approval of the CAC minutes for October 10, 2018 *(Richmond-Fernandez)*. The motion passed unanimously.

V. ACTION ITEMS

A. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments: HART Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307, 5309/5337 & 5339 Funding

Ms. Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, presented information on three amendments to the FY 2019-2023 TIP. The amendments will allow HART to apply for and receive programmed FTA funding. The funding programs allow for capital assistance, fixed guideway state of good repair, and bus and bus facility related expenses. This also amends the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) so that HART will have the appropriate reference needed for FTA applications.

Following the presentation, Ms. Overman wanted to know what fixed route was referenced. Ms. McKinley stated that it is the Street Car State of Good Repair and it supports maintenance.

Mr. Roberts wanted to know if the funds were being increased for bus acquisition or is it just one purpose of the allocation. Ms. McKinley stated that these are funding grants and the money is not programmed, but it allows HART to apply for additional funds.

Motion: Recommend approval of HART FTA funding to the MPO Board. *(Mierzejewski-Alzamora)*. The motion passed unanimously.
B. It’s Time Tampa Bay Survey Results & Recommendations

Ms. Lisa Silva, MPO Staff, presented information on the results and recommendations from the MetroQuest online survey tool that was utilized to evaluate a tri-county planning initiative for Hillsborough, Pasco, and Pinellas Counties. The results of the survey will help the MPOs identify the best ideas, projects, and policies to assist with the development of the 2045 LRTP.

During the presentation, members commented on the express lanes on the beltway, the deconstruction of I-275, elevated express lanes, the roadway elements converting to the boulevard, and growth areas.

Ms. Overman wanted to know if the presentation information was available in the packet. Ms. Silva stated that the link was available in the electronic agenda, and the information is available on the Plan Hillsborough website at http://www.planhillsborough.org/2045-lrtp/.

Following the presentation, Ms. Lazarus inquired about the scenarios and if the elements favored changed from the 2040 bustling metropolis hybrid and wanted to know if there is a report forthcoming on the how opinions have changed. Ms. Silva stated that the information will be addressed once the hybrid scenario is moved forward.

Mr. Clarendon stated that a formal comparison has not been completed, but there are similarities from what was stated five years ago when responses were received only for Hillsborough County.

Mr. Fernandez felt that it was difficult to present the I-275 deconstruction and boulevard concept in a survey format that was fair to the idea, since a lot of people are unaware of the concept. He would like to see the outcome further explored.

Mr. Clarendon agreed that the concept is hard to communicate in a short survey, but stated during outreach for It’s Time Tampa Bay staff explained the concept visually and verbally and answered questions regarding the concept.

Mr. Mierzejewski would like to make sure as transit modes are being considered to attract choice riders that people who depend on local bus service are not neglected. When he worked with CUTR, he had an opportunity to review various MPO plans for the State of Florida, and he complimented the Hillsborough MPO for setting the standard over the last twenty years for public involvement.

Ms. Barbara Kennedy Gibson inquired about survey results for the percentage of people who are unemployed and make under $40,000 who answered the survey and the percentage of South County people. She was uncomfortable with supporting something in Pasco County without supporting South County.

Mr. Clarendon pointed out that the other MPOs were involved and included information on their individual counties. Ms. Silva stated that the presentation was prepared for the tri-county region; however, the information will be broken down to include Hillsborough alone in the LRTP.

Mr. Alzamora wanted to know if survey responses included information regarding expanding railways. Ms. Silva stated that the numbers were off the chart as it related to rail and transit for all three counties.

Ms. Vadelund expressed concerns on the low ratings for alternate transit in South County. Ms. Silva stated that the strategies will be unique and different for South County because of its difference in infrastructure.
Mr. Roberts wanted to know if there were any comments referencing the South County Circulator. Ms. Silva stated that those types of details were not received, and she informed the group of the upcoming SouthShore Transit Study Reevaluation final public input meeting being held at the South Shore Regional Service Center on November 15th at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Reiss commented on the initial presentation disclaimer stating that the information is not statistically valid, but self-directed. He wanted to know if the demographics for responses were close to the demographics of the counties. Ms. Silva stated that they were. He also wanted to know if Hillsborough will have a disproportionate effect due to growth in the coming years. Ms. Silva stated that the information will be fleshed out in the hybrid, and the Planning Commission will receive the same presentation and help guide the growth scenarios.

With the focus on growth, Mr. Bailey asked why there is not a focus on South County as it relates to ferry, rail, and other transportation options. He wanted to know if the information could be added specifically as it relates to South County, since it has the highest growth rate in Hillsborough County. Ms. Silva stated that needs of future residents are being taken into consideration.

Mr. Davila commented on expanded growth ranging so low across the tri county area and wanted to know if it will change the way density is viewed. Ms. Silva stated consideration for areas outside of service areas will be measured when more density is ready to be allowed.

Ms. Overman stated that land use zoning is going to have to be addressed.

Mr. Fernandez requested a parenthetical on the bullet that stated public support was not present for the I-275 boulevard conversion, to read “‘More study warranted. Survey has limited utility in evaluating the scenario.”

Committee members suggested several changes to the bullet.

**Motion:** Modify the bullet point to say “the I-275 boulevard conversion currently has low public support; more study is warranted”. *(Fernandez-Gibson).*

The motion passed 12 – 3 with LeVine, Bailey and Vadelund voting nay. The change will be made to the presentation.

**Final Motion:** Recommend approval of the Guidance for 2045 Plan “Hybrid Scenario” from the It’s Time Tampa Bay Outreach to the MPO Board, as amended. *(Bailey – Fernandez)*

The amended motion passed unanimously.

**C. MPO Comments on Strategic Intermodal System 2045 Cost Feasible Plan**

Ms. Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, presented information on the Plan from a regional point of view. During the presentation, there were inquiries about the widening of Pendola Point Road, south of Causeway Boulevard, and the starting date for the top three prioritized projects. Ms. McKinley stated that the funding would be available after 2029 for the interchanges, but staff has been working closely with FDOT to advance I-75 at Gibsonton Drive and I-75 at Big Bend Road. The SIS Cost Feasible Plan is updated annually as funds become available and sometimes projects get advanced.

Mr. Mierzejewski suggested that Brightline should be included in the Plan. Mr. Clarendon stated that Brightline, as a private venture, is not seeking SIS funding.
Motion: Recommend acceptance of comments to be included as part of the SIS 2045 CFP to the MPO Board. (Bailey-Vadelund). The motion passed unanimously.

D. Health in All Policies (HiAP) Resolution

Mrs. Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff, provided information on a resolution supporting continued work with the Florida Department of Health promoting health, equity, and sustainability.

Following the presentation, there was discussion on compliance, working with Public Works on CIP projects, and the suitability of including HiAP consideration in studies being done in Hillsborough County. Mrs. Ogilvie will add the inclusion to future studies in the resolution. Mr. Trott suggested the inclusion of crash reduction information as well. The drafted resolution states that the MPO will consider the health outcomes/impact in the project prioritization process based on the Transportation and Health Indicators matrix. The matrix and the resolution were included in the electronic agenda.

Ms. Lazarus wanted to know if there was a tool to evaluate, or a rating scale for the various indicators of the matrix. Mrs. Ogilvie stated that tools are in place to make the analytical decisions.

Motion: Recommend adoption of the Health in All Policies Resolution to the MPO Board. (Bailey-Alzamora). The motion passed unanimously.

E. 2019 Committee & MPO Schedule

Mr. Rich Clarendon, MPO Staff, provided an overview of the 2019 CAC meeting schedule. The CAC meetings will continue to take place at 9:00 a.m.

Motion: Recommend approval of the 2019 MPO and Committee Meeting Calendar to the MPO Board. (Fernandez-Vadelund).

Ms. Lazarus did not agree with the July recess and it was pointed out that October 9th is Yom Kippur. Mr. Clarendon stated that staff can look at moving the meeting to another Wednesday. Discussion regarding this will be calendared two months prior to the meeting if necessary.

The motion passed unanimously.

VI. STATUS REPORTS

A. SouthShore Transit Study Reevaluation

Ms. Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, provided information on the draft report that HART was asked to revisit to update costs and create an implementation plan. The CAC will have an opportunity to comment on the final draft in January.

Following the presentation, there was brief discussion regarding the need for HART routes southeast of US 301, park and ride, and ferry service.

VII. OLD BUSINESS & NEW BUSINESS

A. TBARTA CAC Report

Mr. Rick Richmond provided information from his first TBARTA meeting as the representative for Hillsborough MPO’s CAC. TBARTA has hired Mr. David Green as their new executive director. Mr.
Green is the former CEO of the Greater Richmond Transit Company. There was discussion on the Regional Transit Feasibility Plan and the MPO Regional Coordination. The group also received a presentation on Hyperloop technology.

Ms. Overman inquired about the regionalization meetings taking place in Pinellas County and expressed concerns about the level of participation from Hillsborough.

**B. Follow-up: Regional Transportation Leadership Study**

Mr. Clarendon provided a handout that was distributed at the October 29th Regional Planning Best Practices Workshop on three different scenarios of the MPOs working together. There will be a public workshop in January to discuss the information in more detail.

There was brief discussion.

**C. Next Meeting**

Mr. Clarendon informed the group of a special briefing that will be held on the community impacts associated with future interchanges in Tampa’s Downtown and Westshore on Tuesday, November 27th.

The next meeting will be a combined meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee and is scheduled for December 17th at 12 p.m.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion: For adjournment (Stull-Vadelund).** The motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.m.
The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Regular Meeting, scheduled for Monday, October 22, 2018, at 1:30 p.m., in the Plan Hillsborough Committee Room, 18th Floor, Frederick B. Karl County Center, Tampa, Florida.

The following members were present:

Jeffrey Sims, Chairman
Environmental Protection Commission

Melanie Calloway
City of Tampa (Tampa)

Vincenzo Corazza
City of Temple Terrace (Temple Terrace)

Amber Dickerson
Hillsborough County School District

Gina Evans
Hillsborough County Aviation Authority

Christina Kopp for Robert Frey
Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority

Anthony Garcia
Planning Commission (PC)

Stephen Griffin
PC

Mark Hudson for Julie Ham
City of Plant City (Plant City)

Danni Jorgenson
Tampa

Christina Buchanan for Linda Walker
HART

Charles White
Hillsborough County

Christopher Bridges for Michael Williams
Hillsborough County

The following members were absent:

Michael Case
Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority

Rachel Chase
Florida Department of Health – Hillsborough County

Michael English
Tampa Historic Streetcar Incorporated

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Sims called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – AUGUST 20, 2018, AND SEPTEMBER 17, 2018

Chairman Sims sought a motion to approve. Mr. Griffin moved to approve the August and September 2018 minutes as submitted to the committee, seconded
by Mr. Hudson, and carried thirteen to zero. (Members Case, Chase, and English were absent.)

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

   i. Project 441896-1: HART Computer-Aided Dispatch/Automatic Vehicle Location Bus Equipment Replacement

   ii. Project 437639-1: Bloomingdale Avenue at U.S. Highway 301 Intersection

Ms. Sarah McKinley, MPO, gave a presentation on the amendments. Mr. Griffin inquired on equipment replacement, potential consequences to the bus fleet, and effects to the west side of Bloomingdale Avenue. Mr. Corazza pondered whether bicycle lanes/signage options had been considered. Chairman Sims asked about the time frame implementation. Mr. Griffin requested staff follow up on expanding the Interstate 75 overpass to a four-lane road. After contemplating the five-year project planning/implementation gap, Chairman Sims sought a motion to approve the TIP amendments. Mr. White so moved, seconded by Mr. Griffin, and carried thirteen to zero. (Members Case, Chase, and English were absent.)

B. MPO Autonomous Transit Feasibility Study for University of South Florida (USF) Campus

Mr. Brian Pessaro, Center for Urban Transportation Research, USF, supplied a presentation. Mr. Griffin questioned if cost estimates included traffic signal improvements/assisted driver funding, and the number of students on campus. Ms. Kopp sought information on intersection upgrade costs and confirmation those funds would not be collected. Mr. Corazza asked if the study was being conducted elsewhere and suggested including a control center. Ms. Allison Yeh, MPO, added remarks. Chairman Sims opined on the vehicle differences. Mr. Pessaro estimated the charging periods for the car. Chairman Sims called for a motion to accept the report. Mr. Griffin moved to accept the report as presented, seconded by Ms. Calloway, and carried thirteen to zero. (Members Case, Chase, and English were absent.)
V. STATUS REPORTS

A. Brightline Incorporated (Brightline) Proposal for Rail to Orlando, Miami

Mr. Robert O’Malley, Brightline, gave a presentation. Mr. Griffin asked about offsetting train costs and whether the selected station locations were considered from previous efforts. Ms. Calloway pondered if a person had to ride the train to park in the garage. Chairman Sims inquired about the general ride time/train speed. Mr. Corazza suggested the university area for a stop location. Dialogue ensued on possible stop locations, ridership, existing technology/systems, using existing tracks, connection studies, bicycles going on board, and funding.

B. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard Operational Improvements from 40th Street to Interstate 4

Mr. Craig Fox, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), displayed images and spoke on the item. Regarding two-way left-turn lane placement options, Mr. Corazza proposed not using the cut-through. Noting the high volume of left turns westbound added to traffic, Mr. Griffin suggested a separate left-turn lane for improvements.

C. District 7 Freight Plan, Subarea Study, and Local Freight Improvements

Mr. Brian Hunter, FDOT, gave a presentation. Ms. Torres observed the plan would streamline train/trucking considerations. Mr. Griffin wanted to know the project time frame.

D. Long Range Transportation Plan Goals Update

Ms. Michele Ogilvie, MPO, supplied a presentation. Mr. Corazza discussed sacrificing safety versus mobility and elevating nonmotorized user’s safety. Chairman Sims referenced rising sea levels/storm surges and argued the system’s vulnerabilities/identifying flood resistant structures should be included as project goals.

E. SouthShore Transit Study Reevaluation

Ms. McKinley gave a presentation.

VI. OLD BUSINESS AND NEW BUSINESS - None.
MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2018

VII. ADDENDUM

A. MPO Meeting Summary and Committee Report

B. 36th Annual Planning and Design Awards, October 25, 2018

C. Regional Planning Best Practice Study Workshop 3

D. Tampa Bay Next Tampa Interstate Study Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Historic Resources Information Meeting, October 25, 2018

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

► There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:19 p.m.

READ AND APPROVED: ______________________________

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

PAT FRANK, CLERK

By: _______________________

Deputy Clerk

jh
The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Regular Meeting, scheduled for Monday, November 19, 2018, at 1:30 p.m., in the Plan Hillsborough Committee Room, 18th Floor, Frederick B. Karl County Center, Tampa, Florida.

The following members were present:

Jeffrey Sims, Chairman
Melanie Calloway
Michael Case
Vincenzo Corazza
Michael English
Gina Evans
Robert Frey
Anthony Garcia (arrived 1:46 p.m.)
Stephen Griffin
Mark Hudson for Julie Ham
Danni Jorgenson
Linda Walker
Charles White
Christopher Bridges for Michael Williams

Environmental Protection Commission
City of Tampa (Tampa)
Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority
City of Temple Terrace
Tampa Historic Streetcar Incorporated
Hillsborough County Aviation Authority
Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority
Planning Commission (PC)
PC
City of Plant City
Tampa
HART
Hillsborough County
Hillsborough County

The following members were absent:

Rachel Chase
Amber Dickerson

Florida Department of Health - Hillsborough County
Hillsborough County School District

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Sims called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.
III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – OCTOBER 22, 2018

Due to a distribution error, Chairman Sims stated the item would be deferred to the December MPO TAC regular meeting.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. It’s Time Tampa Bay Survey Results and Recommendations

Ms. Lisa Silva, MPO, gave a presentation. Chairman Sims inquired if the results were anticipated. Mr. Frey asked how the survey affected the development of the long-range transportation plan and verified the statistical analyses. MPO TAC members wondered when the transportation plan would be brought back and Mr. Frey requested development milestone presentations.

Mr. Griffin moved to approve the guidance from MetroQuest as presented to the TAC, seconded by Mr. Hudson, and carried fourteen to zero. (Members Chase and Dickerson were absent.) Ms. Gena Torres, MPO, confirmed updates and milestone presentations would be placed on future agendas.

B. 2019 Committees and MPO Board Meeting Schedule

Ms. Torres presented the item. After Mr. Frey announced a scheduling conflict, Mr. Griffin moved to approve the calendar as submitted, seconded by Mr. Frey, and carried fourteen to zero. (Members Chase and Dickerson were absent.)

C. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment – HART Federal Transit Administration Section 5537 and 5539 Funding

Ms. Sarah McKinley, MPO, shared a presentation. Mr. Frey sought confirmation that HART approved of the amendments. Chairman Sims requested clarification on the “HART Fixed Guideway.” Following discussion, Mr. Case moved to approve the TIP amendments, seconded by Mr. Griffin, and carried fourteen to zero. (Members Chase and Dickerson were absent.)

D. MPO Comments on Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) 2045 Cost Feasible Plan

Ms. McKinley explained the item. Chairman Sims inquired about prioritizing the Gandy Bridge replacement. Mr. Frey asked what information from the “It’s Time Tampa Bay” survey was being implemented in the plan. Mr. Stephen Benson, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), explained
the FDOT’s priorities included the Westshore interchange and Interstate 275. Following remarks, Mr. Frey moved the MPO TAC approve the SIS recommendations with FDOT’s comments added as an emphasis that the MPO TAC support those top two priorities for the region, seconded by Mr. Griffin, and carried fourteen to zero. (Members Chase and Dickerson were absent.)

E. Health in All Policies Resolution

Ms. Michele Ogilvie, MPO, gave a presentation. Mr. Frey asked what impact the resolution would have on project prioritization. Discussion ensued on quantifying the benefits of improvement projects. Chairman Sims called for a motion to approve. Mr. English made the motion, seconded by Ms. Calloway, and carried twelve to zero. (Members Evans and Hudson were out of the room; Members Chase and Dickerson were absent.)

V. STATUS REPORTS

A. Heights Mobility Plan

Mr. Benson presented the item. Ms. Torres commented on peak hour traffic and short-term improvements. In response to Mr. Corazza, Mr. Benson addressed a similar study on 56th Street. Mr. Frey and Chairman Sims made appreciative remarks.

B. Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation

Ms. McKinley shared a presentation. Ms. Torres noted methodology improvements. Chairman Sims asked if the Level of Traffic Stress measurement was implemented by other MPOs.

VI. OLD BUSINESS AND NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Sims noted the December 17, 2018, meeting was a joint meeting with the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee.

VII. ADDENDUM

A. MPO Meeting Summary and Committee Report
B. Correspondence
   1. FDOT’s Response on West Busch Boulevard Corridor Study
C. Upcoming Events

1. Tampa Bay Next Community Working Group - Westshore, November 15, 2018

2. Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Public Workshops, December 10, 2018, and December 13, 2018

3. Cleveland Elementary Mural Painting, December 15, 2018

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

READ AND APPROVED: ____________________________ CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
PAT FRANK, CLERK

By: ____________________________

Deputy Clerk
Agenda Item
Election of Officers for CAC and TAC

Presenter
Committee Staff

Summary

The MPO By-Laws require that officers are to be elected each year. There are no term limits for officers, therefore they can be re-elected and serve indefinitely. The By-Laws state:

Officers of Standing Committees: The committee shall hold an organizational meeting each year for the purpose of electing a committee chair … a committee vice-chair, and, at the discretion of the committee chair, an officer-at-large. Officers shall be elected by a majority vote of a quorum of the members.

The current CAC officers are:

- Chairman        Bill Roberts
- Vice Chair      Rick Fernandez
- Officer-at-large Nicole Rice

The current TAC officers are:

- Chairman        Jeff Sims
- Vice Chair      Mike Williams
- Officer-at-large Amber Dickerson

Members can nominate themselves or any other member. No second is needed, and each nomination is voted on individually until one member receives a majority of votes for an officer’s position.

Recommended Action
Hold Election of Officers for CAC and TAC

Prepared By
Rich Clarendon, AICP

Attachments
None
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
FDOT Tentative Work Program Highlights FY 2020 - 2024
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.

GPI
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

NationsTop 10 metro areas with highest pedestrian fatalities
- Cape Coral
- Palm Bay
- Orlando
- Jacksonville
- Daytona Beach
- Lakeland
- Tampa/St. Petersburg
- Sarasota/Bradenton

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT?

Racing blamed in deadly Bayshore crash

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT?
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

MANAGING SPEED

• Speeding kills more than 10,000/year
• On par with drunk driving
• Doesn’t carry the same social consequences
• 30% of all fatal crashes nationwide
• Societal cost = $40 Billion annually
• National problem, effective solutions must be applied locally
SPEED TAKES THE BACK SEAT

Source: FHWA Achieving Multimodal Networks

![Pedestrian Fatality & Serious Injury Risk](image1)
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SPEED TAKES THE BACK SEAT

Source: FHWA Achieving Multimodal Networks
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SPEED MATTERS MOST

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
SPEED LIMITS
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?
DEVELOPING AN ACTION PLAN
SPEED LIMITS

- 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

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**

#### Speed Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1-Natural</td>
<td>Lands preserved in a natural or wilderness condition, including lands unstable for settlement due to natural conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2-Rural</td>
<td>Sparsely settled lands, may include agricultural land, prairies, woodland, and wetlands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2T-Rural Town</td>
<td>Small concentrations of developed areas immediately surrounded by undeveloped and natural areas, includes many historic towns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3R-Suburban</td>
<td>Mostly residential areas within large blocks and a disconnected or sparse roadway network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3C-Suburban</td>
<td>Mostly non-residential uses with large building footprints and large parking lots within large blocks and a disconnected or sparse roadway network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4-Urban General</td>
<td>Mix of uses at within small blocks with a well connected roadway network. May extend long distances. The roadway network usually connects to residential neighborhoods immediately along the corridor or beyond the area fronting the roadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5-Urban Center</td>
<td>Mix of uses at within small blocks with a well connected roadway network. Typically concentrated around a few blocks and identified as part of a civic or economic center of a community, town, or city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6-Urban Core</td>
<td>Areas with the highest densities and building heights, and within 1000 feet of the urban core. Many are regional centers and destinations. Buildings have mixed uses, are built up to the roadway, and are within a well-connected roadway network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

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

BENEFITS OF 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
PART II

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

EDUCATION • ENGINEERING • ENFORCEMENT • EQUITY • EVALUATION
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

MEASURING SUCCESS

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.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Multimodal Level of Service Update

**Presenter**
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

**Summary**
In 2017 the MPO created a White Paper looking into methodologies and best practices in calculating Level of Service (LOS) for bicycle, pedestrian and transit. From the recommendations in that report the MPO has been working with a consultant to update the methodologies used for calculating bicycle and pedestrian LOS. The effort has focused on establishing a Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) standard and apply this to the transportation network. The goal was to have a new minimum standard, and through the database maintained by the MPO, highlight corridors and intersections that could be enhanced for safety.

The MPO currently uses Florida Department of Transportation guidance that was established over 20 years ago. With new minimum design standards, it became time to revisit the methodology. The updated standards will better reflect the new innovations in bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

The task has culminated in the creation of a technical report, the Bicycle Facility Selection Toolkit, and pedestrian crossing guidance.

**Recommended Action**
Recommend approval of the MMLOS Update to the MPO Board

**Prepared By**
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
 Evaluating Bicycle and Pedestrian Quality of Service DRAFT Report
Bicycle and Pedestrian Toolkit DRAFT
Pedestrian Crossing Guidance Guide DRAFT
Agenda Item
Tampa Bay Next Quarterly Update

Presenter
FDOT Representative

Summary
Tampa Bay Next is a program to modernize Tampa Bay’s transportation infrastructure and prepare for the future. FDOT will provide an update on recent activities.

Recommended Action
None; for information only

Prepared By
Wanda West

Attachments
None
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Resilient Tampa Bay: Transportation Pilot Project

**Presenter**
Allison Yeh, AICP, LEED GA - MPO Staff

**Summary**

The Tampa Bay region is one of the most vulnerable areas in the country, experiencing frequent storm events and persistent flooding. The Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), in collaboration with the Pinellas MPO, Pasco MPO, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, and the Florida Department of Transportation District 7, was awarded a Federal Highway Administration Resilience and Durability to Extreme Weather grant.

Each MPO is currently conducting their 2045 Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update. New federal requirements state that Long Range future LRTP updates must work on “improving the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reducing or mitigating the stormwater impacts of surface transportation …” This pilot project will assist in meeting the new federal mandate as well as inform the LRTP updates for three MPOs and the regional LRTP.

The project officially kicked off on in August 2018. The project team has completed the data collection phase and is currently in the evaluation and initial stakeholder engagement process.

Staff will provide a status update for the project. Additional Information can be found at [http://www.planhillsborough.org/resilient-tampa-bay-transportation/](http://www.planhillsborough.org/resilient-tampa-bay-transportation/)

**Recommended Action**
None, for information only

**Prepared By**
Allison Yeh, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
None
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:

- Heights Mobility Plan
- Gasparilla Children’s Bike Rodeo
- 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.
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 to 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.
JOIN US FOR THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, DISTRICT SEVEN’S

TENTATIVE FIVE-YEAR WORK PROGRAM

ONLINE PUBLIC HEARING

FISCAL YEAR 2020 TO FISCAL YEAR 2024

VISIT D7WPPH.COM BEGINNING DECEMBER 17, 2018
PUBLIC COMMENTS DUE BY DECEMBER 31, 2018

OR

ATTEND THE OPEN HOUSE ON DECEMBER 20, FROM 9:00AM TO 6:00PM
AT THE FDOT DISTRICT 7 OFFICE, LOCATED AT
11201 N MCKINLEY DR, TAMPA, FL 33612
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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

continued on next page
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 contraflowed clockwise through the north half of the roundabout and directly into the two contraflowed 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 contraflowing section and two patrol officers on foot to direct North Beach traffic entering the roundabout to contraflow clockwise, instead of flowing normally counter-clockwise.

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,
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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Good morning.

I am an avid cyclist, living in southern Hillsborough County, who logs around 5,000 miles a year on a bike. Some of those are commute miles, some of those are to go to events in Tampa, some are exercise, and some are just fun miles. Unfortunately, the bike infrastructure in this area is in horrible condition. New roads are built poorly, requiring more maintenance, and old roads don’t get the maintenance they need to keep the bike lanes and shoulders clear. This becomes blatantly apparent when leaving District 7, and heading south into District 1 and District 6. My rides often take me into Manatee County, where the bike lanes are kept clear. This last week, I took my annual trip to Homestead, and rode numerous D6 maintained roads. From SR9336, SR997 (Krome), and US1 down to Islamorada. The bike facilities in that area are clear. Minimal debris. No overgrowth. It was eye-opening. Even last year, two months after Irma, the roads were in better than expected condition. So I drove the scenic route home this time to look around, and stayed on as many state maintained surface roads as I could, from almost the Dade/Monroe line north.

Taking SR997 north out of Homestead/Florida City, and then driving north on US27, all the way up to SR66 to get into Zolfo, cutting up US1 and over to US41 and back up to Apollo Beach. I do not believe it to be an exaggeration to say I could see more road debris, garbage, poor construction, improper striping, and overgrown bike lanes in the 15-20 mile stretch of US41 from the Manatee County line north to Causeway Blvd, than I saw in the 240 miles of state roads I traversed from south Dade County up to the southern terminus of District 7. If you have a day to waste, drive it and see for yourself.

I have said this to just about everyone whose ear was close enough to hear. How can we continue to build new roads, when we can’t maintain what we have? Even the other month, at the FDOT/Pasco County meeting, you only had to drive from I-75 down to Rasmussen College on SR54 where the meeting was held to see exactly what I am talking about. Poorly striped, debris filled, overgrown bike lanes. Typical FDOT D7.

In my unscientific drive across the state, this problem is very specific to District 7. What challenge does District 7 face that Districts 1 and 6 do not have? What is the difference? What are the other FDOT districts doing that D7 is not? Why does it seem that District 7 is reactive to problems, whereas Districts 1 and 6 are proactive, and can maintain their roads at a higher standard?

Just looking at striping obliteration, there is probably more of that in Hillsborough County than the rest of the state. That may be an exaggeration, but the only obliteration I could see in the 200 miles I rode in Dade and Monroe, was on a county road, Card Sound, and was so light, if you didn’t know what you were looking for, you wouldn’t have known it happened. In Hillsborough County, we can’t seem to stripe anything properly the first time, and always have to mill/blast striping to do it twice.
I know there is a Bike/Ped Safety team in D7, but is looking at google maps all that it takes to give an FDOT Seal of Approval? It would seem to me that requiring this team to actually ride bikes and walk, without yellow safety vests and sheriffs details, like most users do, on the infrastructure is a much better hands on approach to improving the bicycle and pedestrian facilities, than sitting in an office looking at GIS maps. They can fishbone, pareto, or 5 why this to death on a whiteboard, but without going out in the field and looking at, and experiencing, the real problems, Gemba, how are they going to be able to complete the PDCA cycle to improve?

And I am more than willing to play tour guide to any takers willing to ride a bicycle down US41, SR674, US301, and down south into Manatee to see the striking differences. So far, no takers, in the four or five years I have offered. Very telling.

I am to the point of clearing, cleaning, and maintaining the local bike lanes I ride myself, as all this talk I have been doing over the years has given little ROI. Just give me the approval, and a PO. If you need more boots on the ground, all it would take is a white F150 with some flashing ambers, a few power tools, and a paycheck, and I am more than willing to get my hands dirty.

Thank you,

Mike Lamarca
813-380-4890