Meeting of the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Wednesday, March 13, 2019, 5:30 PM

I. Call to Order

II. Introductions

III. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

IV. Approval of Minutes – February 13, 2019

V. Members’ Interests (2 Minutes Each)

VI. Action Items
A. Committee Appointments (Two Seats)
   1. William A. Sapper
   2. Michelle Sterling
   3. Victoria Klug
B. 2018 State of System Report (Johnny Wong, MPO)

VII. Status Reports
A. Tampa Bay Next I-275 Section 7 PD&E (FDOT Representative)
B. 2045 LRTP Trails Need Assessment (Wade Reynolds, MPO)

VIII. Old Business & New Business
A. Traffic Safety Citizen Board Workshop 5/23

IX. Adjournment

X. Addendum
A. MPO Meeting Minutes & Committee Report
B. Workplace Harassment Prohibited: FL Senate Policy – adopted by MPO 2/5/19 as committee standard of conduct
C. Link to TBNEx special briefing display boards (1/31/19)
D. Strategic Transit Planning – Jarrett Walker
E. Tampa Bay Community Health Needs Assessment

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.
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 13, 2019 MEETING

I. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Forbes called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. in the Plan Hillsborough Room of the County Center Building.

II. INTRODUCTIONS
Members present: Rachel Chase, Jay Collins, Jonathan Forbes, Rafael Hernandez, Tim Horst, Richard Johnson, John Kubicki, Mara Latorre, John Marsh, Faye Miller, Brenden Mosher (for Jason Jackman), Diana Ramirez, Richard Ranck, Jaime Rubscha, Holly Simmons, Jim Shirk, Sally Thompson, Calvin Thornton, and Alain Watson

Others present: Wade Reynolds, Sarah McKinley and Michele Ogilvie - Hillsborough MPO; Sharon Snyder - Planning Commission; Monica Martin – Hillsborough County Public Works

III. PUBLIC COMMENT
Sean Baraoidan spoke regarding Bay-to-Bay Blvd., which is scheduled for repaving. The City engineers designed a road diet to reduce crashes, but as a result of phone calls from citizens, the Mayor vetoed the design. This road is home to many small businesses and schools. There are narrow sidewalks with high speed limits. Mr. Baraoidan is asking the Committee to make recommendations to the Planning Commission to halt the resurfacing to provide more time for public comment and better design. This road is an ideal candidate for bicycle and pedestrian improvements with the All for Transportation tax dollars. Bay-to-Bay connects to Bayshore Blvd. and has CSX tracks running along it. Mr. Baraoidan doesn’t feel Bay-to-Bay should be repaved, as is, with four lanes of high speed roadway and no safe pedestrian or bicycle infrastructure.

Ms. Rubscha informed members of the BOCC meeting on Wednesday, February 20th, at 9:00 a.m. This project will be discussed, putting the redesign back on the table, but delaying it until the new Mayor is in office. She encouraged members to email the County Commissioners in support of better design of Bay-to-Bay. Due to the timing, Mr. Reynolds suggested members contact the Commissioners on their own as any motion will not be approved by the MPO Board in time.

Ms. Ramirez added Hillsborough County Public Works has a new team, Project Development, which reviews project resurfacing needs. The County is aware of what is needed on Bay-to-Bay; however, the road is owned by the County but maintained by the City so most of the public involvement comes from the City. She encouraged Mr. Baraoidan to bring it to the County Commissioners’ attention.

Mr. Baraoidan asked if the Committee can ask the County or City to relook at the safer design vetoed by Mayor Buckhorn, rather than just halting the repaving. Mr. Thornton stated the
decisions are about the numbers. He encouraged Mr. Baraoidan to focus on census. Mr. Baraoidan understood but also feels it should be about intelligent design and professionals that know what they're doing, not the citizens who use the road to get to work making the decisions.

IV. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** Monica Martin provided two revisions to last month’s minutes. Approval of the amended minutes of January 9, 2019. *(Collins - Shirk).* The motion passed unanimously.

V. **MEMBERS' INTERESTS (2 minutes each)**

Ms. Simmons thanked the Committee for their help with the Courtney Campbell Causeway issue she brought up last month. The bushes have been trimmed and visibility has improved.

Mr. Hernandez would like to discuss enforcement of vehicles parked in bike lanes. The City and County aren’t enforcing the laws. Mr. Forbes would like to move forward with finding out what the enforcement procedures are.

Mr. Mosher distributed flyers regarding the Tampa Bay Commuter activities and encouraged members participation.

Mr. Shirk announced that Friday, March 8th is Bike Commute Day. For more information, please send him or Karen Kress an email. Mr. Mosher stated he posted it on Facebook, too.

Ms. Miller would like to discuss the crosswalk lights on Florida Avenue and the Green Artery construction scheduled for late 2019/early 2020.

VI. **ACTION ITEMS**

A. **TIP Amendment – US41 CSX Grade Separation PD&E (Sarah McKinley, MPO)**

Ms. McKinley presented the amendment to the Fiscal Year 2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). The amendment would add $1.45 million in funds for Project Development and Environmental (PD&E) for the grade separation projects at US41 and the CSX tracks near Causeway Blvd. There are approximately 31 trains that use this crossing daily, with an average delay of 8-10 minutes per crossing, for a total of 4-5 hours daily.

This project has had preliminary (design) funding and is currently in PD&E. Currently, right-of-way is funded in FY2020-2022 with construction expected in 2026. Approving this amendment will move design further ahead and provide for future construction funds prior to 2026.

A brief discussion followed regarding how many grade separation crossing locations there are *(one)*.

**Motion:** Recommend approval of the TIP Amendment to the MPO Board *(Thornton - Ranck).* The motion passed unanimously.

VII. **STATUS REPORTS**

A. **Application of Demographic Analysis to Pedestrian Safety (Dr. Pei-Sung Lin, CUTR)**
Dr. Lin, Program Director at CUTR, presented the Application of Demographic Analysis to Pedestrian Safety. He reviewed the project objectives which were to develop a demographic based methodology, identify major factors and produce recommendations for engineering countermeasures and pedestrian safety education/outreach plans. He discussed pedestrian fatality rates and income level, which shows the low income areas have a higher fatality rate, and provided an example of the poverty distribution and 5-year pedestrian crash map in Tampa and Fort Lauderdale.

Dr. Lin reviewed the potential factors for pedestrian crashes, including demographics and social factors, road environment factors, individual characteristics, neighborhood land use attributes and other factors. He discussed the demographics-based methodology steps, candidate variables for analyses and how methodology is applied to two categories. He explained the definition of a low-income area is the poverty rate is greater than 15% or the per-capita income is less than $21,559 and the identification of low-income areas in the case studies. Dr. Lin also explained the analysis for pedestrian crash frequency, the correlation with demographic factors, the effects of demographics on crash frequency, the correlation with road environment factors and the effects of road factors on crash frequency.

Dr. Lin presented a visualization of the neighborhood land use attributes and discussed the correlation with land use attributes, the effects of land use types on crash frequency, the analysis for pedestrian crash injury severity, and the effects of individual characteristics on injury severity. He also presented impaired pedestrian crashes and locations of bars and alcohol retailers and the effects of environmental factors on injury severity.

The study identified the hot zones in low-income areas for improving pedestrian safety and the engineering countermeasures, which are roadway lighting and lighting levels, treatments at non-intersection locations, bus stop improvements, speed reduction treatments and road safety audits (RSA). Dr. Lin also discussed the education and outreach plan.

Discussions ensued regarding if the impaired pedestrian or aggressive driver information was obtained from police reports (from the crash analysis); is the data all census tracked (yes); how changing to LED lighting will help; and were comparative studies done in Hillsborough/Pasco/Pinellas as the ones conducted in other counties (no; we need to request funding in our FDOT district).

Mr. Ranck requested a copy of Dr. Lin’s presentation.

B. Harbour Island Complete Streets (Cal Hardie, City of Tampa)

Mr. Hardie presented the Harbour Island Complete Streets project. The limits of the study were Knights Run Avenue and Beneficial Drive. This project stemmed from a resurfacing project on this collector road. The AADT numbers are quite high, especially for a road that is only about a ½ mile long. The existing speed humps create a challenge. He displayed pictures of the existing pavement conditions, explained the milling equipment and repaving process, including the “paving train”.

Mr. Hardie explained the City has received many requests to provide traffic calming on the island, as well as improve pedestrian and bike safety. Although resurfacing was not scheduled for this year, the multimodal features of the design actually justified the resurfacing. Mr. Hardie explained the traffic calming and complete streets proposed improvements, including raised pedestrian crossings which enhance pedestrian safety, narrowing travel lanes to ten feet, lowering posted
speed limits and installing bicycle lanes. He displayed a photoshopped picture of a raised pedestrian crosswalk, explaining the City is still determining which material to use.

Mr. Hardie discussed the public involvement and general concerns from the public meeting. The city was asked for more speed tables, lower speed limits, physical barriers between vehicular lanes and bicycle/pedestrian facilities and the installation of fencing or a railing to deter pedestrians crossing outside of crosswalks. In response, the City is proposing a raised crosswalk at the location closer to Harbour Place Drive. There is insufficient width on the bridge to provide a concrete barrier and maintain two vehicular lanes in each direction, but the City will add the bridge to a pilot project testing a new type of tubular delineators. The City recognizes the issues of pedestrians crossing to the Garrison Street lot; however, with the rapidly changing nature of the district, the City would like to coordinate more with the CRA and City Planning Officials before adding any railings. The City also feels it is appropriate to lower the speed limit on both Beneficial Drive and Knights Run Avenue to 25 MPH.

The design was completed in January and construction will occur in conjunction with the City's Wastewater Pipeline project.

Mr. Mosher stated the raised pedestrian crossings on 50th Street, between Fletcher and Fowler Avenues, are terrific.

Discussions followed regarding if the City is considering raised intersections (there are several downtown locations currently being considered); what the speed limit is on Knights Run (Mr. Hardie believes it is currently 40 MPH); and what type of delineator posts is the City considering (the posts manufactured by City Posts).

C. FSU Shared Mobility Project (Dara Osher, FSU)

Dara Osher introduced herself and her team: Jarice Barbee, Navael Fontus, Amber Tyrie, Carolyn Back, and Kaleb McClellan. She presented their capstone studio project, Urban Design for Shared Mobility, which the team is working on with Plan Hillsborough and the FDOT Transit office. She provided an overview of the project and explained that shared mobility is any transportation mode that can be shared. She explained the process is to conduct a literature review, plan review, community engagement and policy recommendations. Ms. Osher stated shared mobility is an issue that isn’t unique to the United States, it’s happening worldwide. There are shifts in consumer demands, especially among younger consumers who are looking for flexible, convenient, cost-effective and demand responsive transportation modes.

The team highlighted the key points: Mr. Barbee presented the role of government and economic development, Ms. Back discussed equity, Ms. Tyrie presented health, safety, sustainability and the environment, Mr. Fontus focused on technological innovation, Mr. McClellan discussed design and Ms. Osher reviewed the principles of design.

Ms. Osher reviewed the context areas: Water Street/Amalie Arena, Westfeld Citrus Park Mall, Keystone Park Civic Center and the West River Redevelopment Project. The team distributed preference surveys to gain preliminary input to guide designs and provide what participants would like to see to facilitate shared mobility.

A discussion ensued regarding the need to reduce parking as it is a waste of land (This has been considered. Shared mobility policies will lead to a reduction in the need for parking. The team intends to retrofit the parking lots, particularly to accommodate pick up/drop off.); the possibility
of compartmentalizing the different modes of shared modes of transportation, such as automobile shared, transit shared, etc. to segregate where they will operate in the right of way (it’s a wonderful way to categorize shared mobility); and if the team looked at, under health and safety, the potential impact of socialization for the elderly population and their ability to maintain social contacts (The elderly and Aging in Place is one of the major demographics being studies for that aspect. As people age, they drive less but the number of places they need to go doesn’t decrease. They also studied the need for the elderly to maintain contact.). Mr. Collins explained the reasoning for the four context areas selected and encouraged members to return their surveys to him to forward to the project team, if they need additional time. Mr. Thornton thanked the team for their work on this excellent project and encouraged them to share their findings.

Ms. Osher stated the team will return to Tampa on March 7th and 8th to conduct design charettes.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS & NEW BUSINESS

A. 2019 Dangerous by Design Report

Mr. Reynolds stated Hillsborough County has moved down to #9 on the list, from #6 last year. He encouraged members to review the report and offered to provide a presentation if anyone is interested. Mr. Thornton feels the Committee needs to look further into the numbers as these reports always lump Tampa/St. Petersburg/Clearwater together and that is not always a good representation of the numbers. Mr. Forbes asked that this be added to an agenda as a status report.

B. BPAC Offer to review Trail Modifications

The MPO approved a letter to each jurisdiction offering the Committee’s assistance in reviewing trail modifications. Mr. Collins asked if the review is on capital projects or re-zoning issues. Mr. Reynolds stated the offer was because of the potential re-zoning of the Upper Tampa Bay Trail but is pretty broad.

C. Tri-County BPAC

Due to the light turnout at the last meeting, Mr. Reynolds asked for suggestions (agenda items, location, etc.) to encourage attendance. Ms. Miller suggested having the meeting in the afternoon to avoid rush hour traffic or traveling long distances in the evening. Mr. Forbes suggested presenting the pedestrian Level of Service (LOS) study as it has sparked a lot of interest from all 3 counties.

D. Member resignation

Mr. Reynolds read David Payor letter to the Committee. He is vacating his seat on the Committee due to work travel demands and difficulty leaving his office to get to the meetings on time. He expressed his appreciation and desire to serve again in the future.

E. Gasperilla Bicycle Rodeo

Mr. Reynolds announced the Sheriff’s office sent a nice thank you for the Committee’s participation. A lot of helmets were distributed and a large number of children were guided through the course.
F. Vehicles illegally parked in bike lanes

Mr. Hernandez stated a police officer told him he wasn’t sure what he could do about vehicles illegally parked in bike lanes. Mr. Reynolds will contact the Tampa Police Department and bring information back to the Committee.

G. GreensWay Committee

Ms. Miller missed the last meeting of the GreensWay Committee. Ms. Martin, Hillsborough County Public Works, will forward her the presentation as well as information on the next meeting.

H. Bay-to-Bay Blvd.

Ms. Rubscha had a followup to Mr. Baraidian’s comments earlier. She feels adding more safety measures such as raised pedestrian crosswalks, especially near the schools, is important and feels the Committee should make a public comment in support of these improvements to the MPO Board. Mr. Forbes suggested members email the County Commissioners and reference the Harbour Island Complete Streets project as an example of potential safety improvements. Mr. Reynolds stated Bay-to-Bay is a county road, but it is maintained by the City and they are who decided to just resurface it. Ms. Rubscha stated there are several roads that are scheduled for resurfacing and she is concerned continuous road diets are an issue. She feels citizens are confused about the term “road diet” and they don’t realize these are safety improvements for bicycles and pedestrians. Mr. Reynolds will draft a letter to the MPO Board from the BPAC Chair.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:31 p.m.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
2018 State of the System Report

**Presenter**
Johnny Wong, PhD, MPO Staff

**Summary**

The 2018 update to the State of the System report tracks performance measures required by FHWA and MAP-21 legislation, and performance targets adopted by the MPO Board.

**Recommended Action**
Approve the 2018 State of the System Report.

**Prepared By**
Johnny Wong, PhD, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
Draft 2018 State of the System Report
2018 State of the System
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As of 2018, Hillsborough County is home to just over 1.3 million people. By the year 2045, however, this number is expected to grow by 40%, which will make this county more populous than present day Phoenix, Philadelphia, or San Antonio. The map below offers a glimpse into 2045 by showing where people and jobs will be located. It is the goal of the Hillsborough MPO to ensure that all current and future residents and visitors have safe, convenient, reliable, affordable, comfortable, and well-maintained mobility options.

This report looks at how our transportation system has performed over the past two years and whether we have made progress toward achieving our goals. In other words, this report reviews the state of the system. Understanding how the system is performing is critical for identifying the areas needing improvement. The performance of various aspects of the transportation system help planners determine what kinds of projects can address those needs.

Each section of this 2018 State of the System report describes the performance of a specific element of the transportation system, displays the resources dedicated to funding improvements in that element, lists the kinds of projects able to be funded with those resources, and forecasts how those projects might enhance performance in future years. This data-driven, results-focused approach to planning is called performance-based planning and programming (PBPP) and is how the MPO prioritizes projects across Hillsborough County and the Tampa Bay region.
Hillsborough MPO & Federal Performance Measures

Hillsborough County faces significant challenges in maintaining or improving the condition and performance of the transportation network, and this mirrors a nationwide trend. Nationally, the backlog of needed highway and transit infrastructure projects is approaching $1 trillion and continuing to grow. Average commute times are growing with people spending more and more time on our roads. Meeting the growing demands on our transportation system means we need to invest our limited funding where we can get the most bang for the buck. This can be achieved by targeting projects in areas of greatest deficiency in performance, while minimizing costs of improvement projects.

Transportation planning does not occur in a laboratory separated from the community. The planning profession has a rich history of balancing technical analysis with community engagement to identify community needs. Engaging with citizens and establishing the right performance measures allows the Hillsborough MPO to evaluate how well the transportation system is addressing the community’s needs and how well future transportation projects may improve the community’s quality of life.

Measuring performance is the first step toward addressing the community’s needs. The Imagine 2040 plan took this approach and was adopted in 2014, prior to the passage of federal legislation requiring performance-based planning. The Hillsborough MPO created program categories to measure specific areas of performance and guide investment decisions. In preparation for our 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan update (expected late 2019), the program categories are as follows:

**State of Good Repair & Resiliency** relates to the maintenance of pavement, bridges and transit assets in good working condition, and mitigating floods along transportation infrastructure, which limits our community’s resiliency to hazardous weather events. Performance affects the replacement schedule of assets and is measured by:

- Percent of pavement and bridges in good/poor condition;
- Percent of transit assets not in a state of good repair;
- Economic impact and recovery time resulting from a major storm.

**Vision Zero** focuses on reducing frequent crashes. Performance affects safety and is measured by:

- Total fatal and serious injury crashes; crashes involving vulnerable users; and crash rate per vehicle miles traveled.

**Smart Cities** seeks to reduce traffic delays. Performance has impacts on health and the economic vitality of Hillsborough County and the Tampa Bay region and is measured by:

- Travel time reliability and truck travel time reliability;
- Percent of population affected by high vehicular emissions.

**Real Choices When Not Driving** reflects investments in transportation alternatives, such as transit, multi-use trails, and services for the transportation disadvantaged. Performance affects quality of life and is measured by:

- People and jobs served by the transit and multi-use trails system;
- Access to critical destinations by transit, walking, and biking.

**Major Projects** are a key component in growing our economy. Good transportation infrastructure investments promote economic growth and performance is measured by:

- Jobs served and congestion reduced in key economic spaces.

The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) requires that MPOs track federally-prescribed performance measures (PMs) related to the seven national goals listed below:

- Improve Safety
- Maintain Infrastructure Condition
- Reduce Traffic Congestion
- Improve Freight Movement & Economic Vitality
- Improve System Reliability
- Enhance Environmental Sustainability
- Reduce Project Delivery Delays

Performance targets for safety and transit asset management (TAM) must be set annually to track progress toward achieving the goals. The Hillsborough MPO’s safety-related targets are included in the Vision Zero section of this report (page 9) and the TAM targets appear in the Good Repair & Resiliency section (page 7). Performance targets for pavement & bridge condition and travel time reliability must be set at least once every four years. Pavement & bridge condition targets appear in the Good Repair & Resiliency section (pages 3 and 5) and the reliability targets appear in the Smart Cities section (page 12).
The Federal Highway Administration’s national goals of maintaining infrastructure condition and enhancing environmental sustainability apply to the State of Good Repair & Resiliency program. Maintaining infrastructure and transit assets in a good working condition is critical to a well-performing system, because condition standards ensure the usability and safety of roads, bridges, and transit vehicles. For these reasons, maintaining a state of good repair and improving resiliency is the MPO’s highest ranking priority. Timely maintenance of assets ensures the system performs as intended; whereas deferring maintenance and allowing systems to deteriorate into poor condition can lead to more costly rehabilitation in the long run.

Roadway pavement is our most important asset – without it – car, bus, and bike mobility would be limited or nonexistent. There are more than 12,000 lane miles of road within Hillsborough County, with ownership and maintenance responsibilities divided among the local jurisdictions of the Florida Department of Transportation, Hillsborough County, Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority, City of Tampa, Plant City, and Temple Terrace. Totaling more than 7,000 lane miles, Hillsborough County owns the most pavement, by far. Following the County, City of Tampa owns 2,800, and FDOT owns almost 2,000 lane miles.

In Hillsborough County, slightly more than half of the Vehicle Miles Traveled are on FDOT’s network, which includes the interstates and other high-capacity roads like SR60, Hillsborough Avenue, and US301. The remainder of the vehicle miles traveled occur on county and city-owned roads. The high (and increasing) volumes of traffic on these systems has the potential to rapidly deteriorate the condition of asphalt pavements, which have an optimal lifespan of approximately 15 years.

**Good condition** means that no major investments are needed because the pavement is not excessively rough, cracked, rutting, or faulting. **Poor condition** means that major investments are needed to rehabilitate the surface. As of 2018, Hillsborough is exceeding all of these targets except for percentage of interstate pavement in good condition: our goal is to achieve 60% or better, and we are currently at 50.9%.
This map shows pavement condition across Hillsborough County using the best available Pavement Condition Index data (2012-2019) collected from Hillsborough County, City of Tampa, Temple Terrace and Plant City. The darker green colors correspond to better pavement condition, yellow indicates fair, and darker red colors correspond to worse quality pavement. Condition overall tends toward the higher end of the Standard Pavement Condition Index Rating Scale, with pockets of poorer quality roads existing outside of the urban core.
State of Good Repair & Resiliency – Bridges

With 246 square miles of coastline, Hillsborough County’s bridge infrastructure represents a critical asset. Bridges provide an important linkage within the county and to surrounding counties. They also efficiently connect shippers to markets.

There are 757 bridges in Hillsborough County, and most are owned and operated by FDOT. The table below shows ownership of all bridges in Hillsborough County and the percentage of bridges in either obsolete/deficient or nondeficient condition.

The engineering demands of bridge replacement and/or repair make maintenance exceptionally costly. Fourteen percent of all bridges in Hillsborough County are classified as functionally obsolete or deficient, with the majority owned by Hillsborough County, FDOT, and the City of Tampa. On October 30, 2018, the Hillsborough MPO agreed to support FDOT’s statewide targets for NHS bridge condition:

As of 2018, Hillsborough is exceeding both of these targets with nearly 78% of NHS deck area in good condition and 0% in poor condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge Owner</th>
<th>Total Bridges</th>
<th>Not Deficient</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FDOT</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEA</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnpike</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County Aviation Authority</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busch Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Sports Authority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>757</strong></td>
<td><strong>652</strong></td>
<td><strong>86%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 2016, the total cost to repair or replace bridges in Hillsborough County was estimated to be about **$31 million per year**. The current Capital Improvements Programs of Hillsborough County, the cities of Tampa, Temple Terrace and Plant City, and FDOT allocate a total of $80 million over a five-year period, averaging just over **$16 million per year**. This amounts to only half of what is needed to adequately address desired major repairs and/or replacement on bridges, and bring them to a state of good repair.

Over the next five years:

- Hillsborough County will invest **$44 million** to fund bridge replacements, improvements, and guardrail repairs.
- FDOT will invest more than **$22 million** to repair, rehabilitate and replace bridges and structures, as well as repaint various bridges across the county.
- The City of Tampa will invest nearly **$4 million** for citywide bridge maintenance and to rehabilitate the Brorein and Laurel Street bridges.

A portion of the Courtney Campbell Causeway is currently being reconstructed to create a channel through the bridge. This will improve circulation in Tampa Bay and improve water quality. The project will be completed by summer of 2019.
The Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART) serves the population of Hillsborough County’s transit needs. Due to its large service area, HART’s passenger buses accumulate mileage very quickly. HART buses accumulate, on average, 320,000 miles in the first 7 years of operation. When a bus reaches that mileage, a mid-life overhaul is performed by the agency’s expert mechanics, allowing the vehicle to continue serving passengers for another 300,000 to 400,000 miles. At that point, the bus has met its useful-life benchmark and must be replaced.

The Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority set the following transit asset targets on August 23, 2018:

- Preserving the transit fleet is important to ensure that buses run on time, however, the likelihood of mechanical failures increases as transit vehicles age. On October 30, 2018, the Hillsborough MPO agreed to support the Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority’s transit asset targets. One of the short-term, pre-referendum targets based on existing conditions is to maintain no more than 22% of passenger vehicles in need of repairs.

The Current Capital Improvements Programs (CIPs) of the agencies listed below include many transit asset management projects to be programmed over the next five years. The dollar values below represent investments that were programmed prior to approval of the countywide surtax referendum. Collectively, these jurisdictions have budgeted over $12 million per year - 40% more than what was identified in the 2040 LRTP baseline spending trend. These investments are critical to ensuring that transit service runs smoothly, efficiently, and cost-effectively.

Over the next five years:

- HART will invest an average of $10 million per year to maintain its assets in a state of good repair. This money will go toward replacing vehicles which have met the end of their useful life.
- FDOT will contribute nearly $5 million per year to purchase transit vehicles and equipment, and make improvements to transit stations.
Due to Hillsborough County’s location along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, and Tampa Bay reaching into the heart of the County, the area is vulnerable to storm surges, flooding from hurricanes, and sea-level rise. In 2012, Tropical Storm Debby dropped 20 inches of rain on the Tampa Bay region and parts of Bayshore Boulevard were completely underwater. In 2013, the Weather Channel ranked Tampa as the city “most vulnerable and overdue for a direct hit hurricane.”

While the Tampa Bay region has not been directly impacted by a major hurricane in nearly 100 years, a series of close calls (most recently experienced during Hurricane Irma in 2017) indicate the looming threat of a major hurricane event for the region. Although the threat of destruction from storm surge flooding has not been in the forefront of citizen’s minds during the region’s greatest period of growth, Hillsborough County, along with Pinellas and Pasco Counties in Tampa Bay, have been progressively planning for post-disaster redevelopment and hazard mitigation.

Reducing transportation vulnerabilities and enhancing resiliency to major weather events is important because much of the transportation infrastructure in Hillsborough County is located within zones susceptible to storm surges and sea level rise. The impacts of flooding can be reduced by funding stormwater and roadway improvement projects to increase the resiliency of the transportation system. This could potentially reduce the one-time economic loss from a major storm from $266 million to $119 million.

Current Capital Improvements Programs (CIPs) of the jurisdictions listed below show a determined focus on upgrading stormwater and resiliency projects to be programmed over the next five years. Countywide, more than $232 million will be spent over the next five years, amounting to roughly $46 million per year. These resources will be invested in canal dredging and upgrading and replacing culverts to alleviate flooding along roads. This includes a $72 million project by the City of Tampa to study, model, and construct a regional watershed improvement to address chronic flooding for a large area in South Tampa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Resiliency Spending Programmed for FY2019-2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County</td>
<td>$113,384,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>$101,424,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT</td>
<td>$15,235,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant City</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Terrace</td>
<td>$936,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, The Hillsborough County MPO, Planning Commission, Hillsborough County Public Works-Hazard Mitigation Section, the University of South Florida, and the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council received a grant from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to conduct a pilot project to assess the resiliency of the transportation system in Hillsborough County. Federal, State DOT, and local resiliency planning information will be used to assess the transportation network’s vulnerability to sea-level rise, storm surge, and inland flooding.
Vision Zero addresses traffic safety for drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists. Prioritizing safety projects and programs that can effectively reduce crash rates requires a data-driven approach based on historical crash trends and future benefits forecasting. Hillsborough has frequently ranked among some of the nation’s most dangerous counties for road users. To improve performance in that area, on February 5, 2019, a safety target not to exceed 163 fatalities was adopted for Calendar Year 2019. Aside from fatalities, MAP-21 legislation requires MPOs to track performance for five other safety measures and to set targets for the upcoming calendar year. Federal reporting requirements prescribe that measures and targets be calculated using a 5-yr rolling average ending prior to the year targets are due. For calendar year 2019, safety targets must be calculated using data spanning from 2014-2018, and projections must be made for 2019. The 2019 short-term safety performance targets were based upon data collected within the MPO planning area for previous years related to safety performance measures and benefits forecasting. If the targets are achieved, a 20-51% fatal and serious injury crash reduction by 2040 is possible.

2016 was the single worst year for fatal crashes in the history of Hillsborough County. The year-end fatality total of 226 represents a 15% increase from the previous year. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration reported that nationally, deaths due to distracted and drowsy driving declined, while other reckless behaviors - speeding, intoxication, and not wearing seat belts - increased. Of the 206 fatal crashes in Hillsborough:

- 62 involved an intoxicated person.
- 24 involved driver speeding.
- 136 occurred at night time.
- 109 were initiated by a lane departure.
- At least 32 involved an aggressive driver.
- 26 involved a distracted driver (although the real number of distracted and aggressive drivers is probably much higher).

These statistics highlight the importance of education programs, streetlight investments, and strategies to reduce speed and aggressive driving behaviors. During 2017, Hillsborough County witnessed a slight reduction in the number of automobile-related fatalities. Crashes involving vulnerable users – such as cyclists and pedestrians - also declined following the historically high fatalities suffered in 2015 and 2016. Despite the slight reduction, overall crashes remain unacceptably high.
The graph above shows traffic fatalities broken out by mode over time – the projections for years 2019, 2020, and 2021 are based on a 3.4% annual reduction commensurate with an increase in safety funding equivalent to a 1-cent sales tax.

Achieving a 51% crash reduction by the year 2040 means that Hillsborough County must reduce crashes by 3.4% every year. Following passage of the county charter amendment, a dedicated revenue source for safety projects may make that lofty goal achievable. In the past, Hillsborough County suffered from an extraordinarily high amount of fatal and serious injury crashes, but 2019 could mark a turning point which reverses this trend.
The ultimate goal of Vision Zero is to eliminate traffic fatalities by introducing evidence-based traffic improvements to minimize crash risk to zero.

To support progress toward approved highway safety targets, the Long Range Transportation Plan includes a number of key safety investments. Assessing spending trends through 2014, a total of $498 million was identified in the 2040 LRTP for baseline improvements to highway safety, averaging approximately $25 million per year and resulting in a 10% reduction in crashes. Moving beyond the baseline, the MPO projected that with a funding source equivalent to a 1-cent sales tax, total crashes could be reduced by 20-51%.

The current Capital Improvements Programs (CIPs) of Hillsborough County, the cities of Tampa, Temple Terrace and Plant City, FDOT, and THEA include many safety investments to be programmed over the next five years, 2018-2023. These investments are illustrated below and represent allocations that were programmed prior to approval of the countywide surtax referendum. Over the next five years, the jurisdictions within Hillsborough County have budgeted more than $91 million for safety projects, or an average of $18 million per year. This is about 30% less than the baseline investment level identified in the Imagine 2040 plan, and thus, presents a challenge to reducing crashes 10% by 2040.

Over the next five years:

- Hillsborough County will invest $57 million in safety projects, including pavement markings, signage, turn lane improvements, pedestrian enhancements, sidewalk repairs, and complete streets treatments.
- FDOT will invest more than $22 million in safety projects, like sidewalk construction, corridor improvements, complete streets projects, lighting installations, and landscaping.
- The City of Temple Terrace will invest $756,000 to improve sidewalks, curbs and ramps, improve pavement markings and signage, and construct bicycle infrastructure along select corridors.
The focus of the Hillsborough MPO’s Smart Cities program is developing strategies to alleviate congestion and improve safety at key intersections. Operational improvements along some of the main roads in Hillsborough come in two forms: traditional intersection treatments, like adding turn lanes, crosswalks, and signal modifications; and technology like signal re-timings, dynamic speed limits, ramp meters, active rerouting, active traffic management, and other emergent technologies found in some of the world’s smartest cities.

Non-traditional data sources like Waze allow the Hillsborough MPO to accurately track congestion and travel reliability issues, based on user accounts of traffic conditions experienced in real-time. This map shows user-reported traffic congestion during morning rush hour - approximately 6-9am. Purple indicates that these roads are hotspots for congestion during that time period.
Travel Time Reliability on Interstates

Travel Time Reliability (TTR) is an important metric for assessing the dependability of travel times and extent of non-recurring congestion – such as traffic jams caused by crashes, weather, special events, or construction zones. Reliability in travel times allows travelers to make better decisions about the use of their time and minimizes the aggravation experienced when your normal 30-minute commute home suddenly turns into a 2-hour delay due to game day traffic clogging up the network.

The map below shows portions of the interstate offering reliable travel at least 75% of the time. 70% of the miles on the interstate network meeting reliability standards is the target adopted statewide by FDOT and supported by action of the Hillsborough MPO on October 30, 2018. The MPO also agreed to support the statewide target for truck travel times on the interstate to not exceed a 100% increase on the most severely congested days.

While reliability on the majority of the interstate is meeting the statewide standard, the portions running through the urban core are moderately-to-severely unreliable, meaning that at certain times of day, travel time may increase by 50-100% through these segments. A 20-minute travel time could turn into 30 minutes or more.

As of 2016, travel time reliability on the interstate is not meeting the statewide target. Unreliability through the urban corridor is a challenge due to the excessively high volumes of single occupant vehicles.

Travel Time Reliability on Non-interstate National Highway System

While many of the long-distance trips made both within and across counties are served by the Interstate system, the non-interstate National Highway System (NHS) makes up a much greater proportion of the roads in Hillsborough County. The map below shows that some of the least reliable interstate segments are found Northbound on I-275 from the Howard Frankland Bridge throughout the urban core all the way past the downtown interchange; I-75 near Brandon Blvd; Southbound on I-275 from Bearss Ave to Fowler Ave; I-75 from Fletcher Ave to MLK Jr Blvd; and I-4 both Eastbound and Westbound throughout the urban core.

The statewide target for Travel Time Reliability on the non-interstate NHS is to have 50% of the network providing for reliable travel times. On October 30, 2018, the Hillsborough MPO agreed to support this target. With this target, most of the non-interstate roads are meeting this criterion, and they are shown in green on the maps. Roads shown in yellow are moderately reliable, and those shown in red are unreliable.

As of 2016, travel time reliability on the non-interstate NHS is exceeding the statewide target but may drop below 50% by the end of 2019.
Air Quality

Air pollution is directly related to traffic volume and congestion, and is a public health threat in almost every urbanized area of the United States. National air quality standards are enforced at the state and local levels by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and the Hillsborough County Environmental Protection Commission. The MPO plays a role in meeting our air quality standards by adopting transportation policies that support local pollution control efforts. Adoption of electric vehicles may help reduce the health impacts of certain air emissions. Over the past 4-5 years, the concentration of air pollutants in Hillsborough County has remained stagnant. While alternative fuels are gaining popularity, increases in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and traffic congestion are offsetting emissions savings that could be gained from electric vehicles.

In both 2016 and 2017, Hillsborough County experienced 4 days per year with ozone readings greater than 70 parts per billion, which is the current health-based standard. Ground level ozone, also known as smog, is created when Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) from gasoline combustion react in the atmosphere. Areas of high automobile traffic often witness smog in the air, as the amount of NOx emissions can be high, which can impair breathing among those with asthma, older adults, young children, and people who are active outdoors.

Air quality across all of Hillsborough County continues to meet the health-based standard, yet the County’s adult asthma rate of 9.2% ranks the highest among other large counties in Florida. Health studies show a clear link between asthma rates, traffic volumes, and proximity to major roadways. Concentration of traffic pollutants is highest at the tailpipe and diminishes to background levels at a range of between 150 to 300 meters, depending on traffic volume. This means that those living within 150 meters of roads with

\[ >30,000 \text{ vehicles per day} \]
are exposed to higher levels of air pollution.

>30,000 vehicles per day, approximately 4% of the total US population, have the greatest exposure to traffic-related air pollution. 1% of Hillsborough County’s population lives within 150 meters of a high volume road.

Furthermore, nearly one-fifth of Hillsborough County’s total population lives within 300 meters, and this figure is even higher among vulnerable populations. Approximately one-quarter of those living within a Community of Concern (a community experiencing any combination of low-income, high proportion of racial minorities, zero-vehicle households, limited English proficiency, individuals with disabilities) also live within 300 meters of a high volume road. The health effects of living near high volume roads are exacerbated by the amount of congestion along those corridors.

---


If we were to build all of the costly road widening projects, we would still be facing congested roads. For this reason, the federal government requires a congestion management process that includes objectives relating to goal achievement, with measurable outcomes. Strategies other than road widening are encouraged. In 2014, the Hillsborough MPO identified 640 intersections needing improvements by 2040 and has recently updated its project prioritization criteria to focus more on near-term operational improvements rather than road widening for all of intersections in need of improvement.

Over the next five years:

- Hillsborough County will invest $154 million in operational projects to improve travel time reliability. These projects include expanding the County’s Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) with signals and technology updates to speed data communications. Intersection improvements, such as turn lanes, signal modifications, and access improvements will allow users to move better.
- FDOT will invest $119 million in Smart Cities projects, like intersection improvements, upgrading interchanges, updating legacy (old) traffic signals, and patrolling freeways for clearing incidents.
- The Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority (THEA) will invest $16 million in this program category to study improvements to Meridian Avenue and adjacent facilities to improve access to the Selmon Expressway and Reversible Express Lanes.

The current Capital Improvements Programs (CIPs) of Hillsborough County, FDOT, THEA, and the cities of Tampa and Plant City include many Smart Cities investments in operations and other capacity management projects. These investments will be programmed over the next five years, 2018-2023 and are illustrated in the summary table above.

These allocations were programmed prior to approval of the countywide surtax referendum, meaning that future investments in this program category will be higher than what is represented below. Over the next five years, the jurisdictions within Hillsborough County have budgeted more than $288 million for Smart Cities projects, amounting to an average of $57.6 million per year.
Real Choices When Not Driving

An important aspect of real choices when not driving is to provide independence for those who cannot or do not own a car.

**People and Jobs Served by the Bus System**

Transit will continue to be a focus as people look to other transportation options beyond single occupancy vehicles. In October of 2017, HART implemented a comprehensive system redesign called Mission Max. The redesign was intended to deliver more efficient service by increasing frequencies on routes with higher-demand and enhancing connectivity by reducing trip times. The results of HART’s modifications will be seen in future years.

Over the last five years, however, HART has continued to exceed goals despite seeing ridership numbers fluctuate. After increasing dramatically over a 9-year period from 2006-2015, ridership has decreased slightly since then, possibly due to employment gains and lower gas prices making driving a more attractive option for some.

In 2018, the Hillsborough MPO updated its Inclusivity Plan for ensuring the ability of all residents – regardless of race, color, or national origin – to participate in the planning process. Rather than limiting our focus to these three groups, the MPO expanded them to include limited English proficient households, low-income, those with disabilities, and households without cars. These **Communities of Concern** often have the most limited mobility options and therefore rely on transit, walking, and biking options to get to their destinations. By mapping out the Communities of Concern (COC), we are better able to focus our attention upon these areas to determine how residents of those areas may be impacted by transportation plans. Improving safety, for example, is a key area for our COCs. Residents living in these areas are at a 20% greater risk of being in a severe crash than those who don’t live in a COC. The disparity is striking.
Transit Service Availability

The Hillsborough MPO’s Transit Level of Service (TLOS) is an assessment standard developed from guidelines of FDOT’s Quality/Level of Service Handbook. It is a way of measuring the quality of transit service on specific roadways using variables like rush hour traffic volumes on roads servicing HART buses, road capacity, travel speed, and service frequency. Roadways with transit service are then ranked on a scale from A to F. Countywide, just over 14% of the total population live within ¼ mile of a facility with the quality of Transit LOS ranked as either A or B. Furthermore, only 37% of total employment opportunities across the county are within ¼ mile of good transit facilities.

Unlike for transit, quality of service for multimodal facilities is highly influenced by travel speed, which is not the best way to assess travel quality. Over the past year, Hillsborough MPO has explored innovative methodologies for assessing quality of service.

Walking/Biking Facilities Availability

The MPO established a Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) standard to more accurately assess bike and pedestrian facilities by looking at factors like facility separation, signal timing at crosswalks, and others. This new standard will provide a way for the MPO to highlight corridors and intersections which are performing well, and those which could be enhanced for safety, comfort, and convenience. Bicycle and pedestrian LTS scores range from 1-4 with 1 being the best and 4 being the worst. Approximately 20% of Hillsborough County’s population live near a good or excellent pedestrian facility (PLTS 1 or 2), while more than 50% only have access to facilities ranked 3 or 4. For bicycle facilities, like multi-use trails, less than 10% of the County’s population lives near a good or excellent facility, while almost 60% only have access to facilities ranked 3 or 4. The percentages of population and jobs within ¼ mile of facilities are listed in the graphs below.

To provide real choices for commuters other than just a car, it is important that both their home and job be located near a good facility. The data in the table show that despite 57% of job opportunities being located near bus facilities, transit access for employees is severely limited. Only 30% of the county’s population has access to a facility, regardless of level of service, and about half of that population only has access to a facility with poor service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Many Residents Have Access to ... ?</th>
<th>How Many Workers Have Access to ... ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Facilities</td>
<td>Acceptable Facilities (or better)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation Choices & Health Outcomes

The prevalence of adult obesity stands at 28% in Hillsborough County, amounting to a 2% increase since 2010. Hillsborough County’s obesity rate, cancer incidence rate, and hypertension deaths are all higher than other large counties in Florida, including Broward, Miami-Dade, Orange, and Palm Beach. Type 2 diabetes, a commonly occurring comorbidity of obesity, is also on the rise within Hillsborough County. In 2010, 11.7% of adults had been diagnosed with the disease. By 2016, that number increased to 12.4%. Both physical inactivity and poor access to healthy food are risk factors for obesity and Type 2 diabetes. With only 16% of residents reporting that they eat adequate servings of healthy foods and about 25% reporting physical inactivity, promoting greater physical activity by planning for pedestrians and cyclists is a key to improving health across the community. Facilities that allow people to access health destinations, including hospitals, schools, and grocery stores, contribute to healthy communities.

Access to Hospitals

Of the 17 hospitals in Hillsborough County, 35% are located within ¼ mile of a good bicycle facility; 35% are located within ¼ mile of a good pedestrian facility; and, 18% are located within ¼ mile of a facility with good transit service. Accessibility is defined as having transit service, sidewalks, bike lane, or a trail located within ¼ mile of a person’s home and the destination. This is important because transit and active transportation modes are cost-efficient options for the transportation disadvantaged population, which includes:

- Persons with disabilities – physical or mental impairment that limits life activities.
- Older adults – losing ability to drive on their own.
- Individuals with lower incomes – may not have access to personal car.
- Children at risk – unaware of the traffic movements around them.

For these populations, paratransit services like Hillsborough County’s Sunshine Line and HARTPlus may also provide options to eligible residents who have disabilities or limitations. Depending on the needs of the passenger, the services may taxi them to their destination or drop them to an accessible fixed route bus stop. With the projected increase in transportation the disadvantaged population, the long range transportation plan estimates a $20 to $32 million annual operating cost for paratransit services by 2040.

Access to Grocery Stores

There are 136 grocery stores located around Hillsborough County. 33% are located within ¼ mile of a good bike facility; 36% are located within ¼ mile of a good pedestrian facility; and, 21% are located within ¼ mile of a facility with good transit service.

Schools

There are 280 schools in Hillsborough County. 26% are located within ¼ mile of a good bike facility; 34% are located within ¼ mile of a good pedestrian facility; and, 9% are located within ¼ mile of a facility with good transit service. This is important because walking or biking to school enables children and young adults to add physical activity into their daily routines. The National Center for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) aims to make it safer for students, particularly those living in Communities of Concern, to walk and bike to school.

Percentage of Health Destinations Accessible Using Good Facilities

100%

80%

60%

40%

20%

0%

Hospitals

Grocery Stores

Schools

Bus

Walking

Biking

35%

33%

26%

35%

36%

34%

18%

21%

9%
Investments

To support mobility for those who cannot or do not drive, the LRTP includes a number of key investments: bus service, transportation disadvantaged services, and trail and sidepath network projects. Future spending trends were projected based on existing spending between 2013 and 2017. This was prior to HART’s 2017 update of its Transit Development Plan, 2018’s Mission Max, and the countywide surtax referendum, and a total of $1.73 billion was identified in the 2040 LRTP for baseline improvements to real choices, averaging approximately $32 million per year.

The current Capital Improvements Programs (CIPs) of Hillsborough County, Plant City, and FDOT include many Real Choices investments in multimodal travel and other capacity management projects, averaging nearly $112 million per year. These investments are programmed over the next five years, 2018-2023, and are illustrated in the summary table to the right. These allocations were programmed prior to approval of the countywide surtax referendum, meaning that future investments in this program category will be higher than what is represented below. Over the next five years, the jurisdictions within Hillsborough County have budgeted more than $552 million for Real Choices When Not Driving projects, which is about 70% more than the 5-year total identified in the 2040 LRTP for baseline improvements.

Over the next five years:

- HART will invest $405 million in a new maintenance facility, route operations, new buses, and fare expenses to operate the streetcar.
- Hillsborough County will invest $15 million in ferry operations, paving road shoulders for bikes, the Bypass Canal trail, and a Sun City Center pedestrian mobility plan.
- FDOT will invest $9 million into projects found in HART’s work program, which includes operations, vanpool funds, and an autonomous vehicle pilot project.
Investing in transportation infrastructure is critical to growing an area’s economy. Safe, reliable, and efficient transportation infrastructure must be in place in order for people and goods to move from one place to another. Growth is desirable, yet it also presents challenges. Like many other metropolitan areas, the Tampa Bay region suffers from congestion with 43% of interstates and 24% of other roads currently over capacity. According to one estimate, congestion on National Highway System roads cost drivers more than $2 billion in lost productivity in 2016\textsuperscript{5}. With population projected to increase 40% by 2045, it is clear that this problem will intensify in the future. For the Imagine 2040 Plan, capacity projects were defined as widening or extending major roads or building new fixed-guideway transit systems. Under federal regulations, these types of projects must be itemized in the Plan, rather than being grouped into programmatic categories, such as Vision Zero, State of Good Repair & Resiliency, Smart Cities, or Real Choices. To better focus limited resources on economic vitality and severe congestion, the MPO’s list of capacity needs was screened by level of congestion and by proximity to employment centers. This means that the costliest projects are focused on corridors which serve clusters of at least 5,000 jobs and major roads which are beyond “full.”

Investments
Over the next five years, $1.14 billion will be spent to add capacity to the transportation network, this is an average of $227 million per year. Some of the major projects include:

- Widening segments of US301, SR574, I275, SR60, I-75, Big Bend Rd, 19th Ave NE, and Lithia Pinecrest Rd;
- Extending Citrus Park Drive, Davis Rd, and the Selmon Expressway;
- New or major reconstruction of interchanges, such as US41 at the CSX rail crossing and I-75 at Big Bend Rd.

\textbf{The picture above shows an artistic rendition of the Selmon West extension, which is an elevated facility connecting Gandy Bridge to the Selmon Expressway. It is scheduled for completion in fall of 2020.}

\textsuperscript{5} Estimates were produced using NPMRDS Analytics software,
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Agenda Item
Tampa Bay Next Section 7 (I-275 N from Downtown to Bearss Ave)

Presenter
Florida Department of Transportation Representative

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Recommended Action**
None; for information only

**Prepared By**
Rich Clarendon, AICP

**Attachments**
None
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**Agenda Item**
2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Trail Needs Assessment

**Presenter**
Wade Reynolds, MPO Staff

**Summary**
The 2040 LRTP embodied a major change from previous LRTPs and provides a template for the 2045 update. Similar categories of projects will remain (preserve the system, reduce crashes & vulnerability, minimize traffic for drivers & shippers, real choices when not driving, and major projects), and as before, are not prescriptive but designed to allow local and state implementers to have flexibility in pursuing projects that contribute to improving performance of the system by 2045.

Real Choices When Not Driving includes trail projects as well as transit and Transportation Disadvantaged services. This discussion will focus on the need and funding for trail projects through the 2045 horizon year of the plan.

**Recommended Action**
Discussion of Trail Projects in the 2045 LRTP update

**Prepared By**
Wade Reynolds

**Attachments**
2040 LRTP Trail Needs Assessment
4.0 Trail and Sidepath Network

Considerable progress has been made throughout Hillsborough County in providing sidewalks and on-road bicycling facilities, such as striped lanes and shared-lane arrows. In the last few years, demand has grown for protected bike lanes, which are physically separated from traffic. The separation could be a curb, flexible posts, planters, green boulevard areas, or some other means. National surveys point to 10 percent or less of the population feeling safe and comfortable bicycling on the paved shoulders of roads. Expanding the availability of protected walk/bike facilities could attract a much wider user base.

This analysis focuses on two types of protected walk/bike facilities: paved multi-use trails and paved sidepaths. Trails are completely separated from roads; an example is the Upper Tampa Bay Trail, built on a former rail corridor. A sidepath is also paved but is located in a road right-of-way, along one side; an example is the paved path along the side of Bruce B. Downs Boulevard in New Tampa. Hillsborough County at present has approximately 80 miles of paved trails and sidepaths, which are mostly in parks.

4.1 Data Collection and Review

The MPO’s GIS database of highway and trail segments was used as the basis for this analysis. The database integrates data from multiple sources, including the Hillsborough County and Tampa Greenways Plans, Tampa Walk-Bike Plans, Temple Terrace multimodal plans, recent traffic volume counts by FDOT and the MPO, and community plans prepared by the Planning Commission.

4.2 Performance Measures Methodology

Pedestrian Level of Service (PLOS) and Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS) are defined as quantitative measures that represent the pedestrian’s or bicyclist’s point of view. Trails and sidepaths are both typically considered high PLOS/BLOS facilities. The performance measures used in this analysis were the numbers of residents and workers with access to excellent or good PLOS and BLOS facilities.

For sidepaths, the PLOS and BLOS measures were calculated based on FDOT’s 2013 Quality/Level of Service Handbook. Four variables are considered for the pedestrian LOS along a roadway:

- Presence of a paved walkway;
- Amount of separation and presence of barriers between the walkway and vehicular traffic;
- Traffic volume on the adjacent road; and
- Posted speed limit for vehicles.

Five variables are considered for the bicyclist LOS:

- Average effective width of the outside through lane,
- Motorized vehicle volumes,
- Motorized vehicle speeds,
- Percent of heavy vehicles (trucks), and
- Pavement condition.

In this analysis, if both a sidewalk and sidepath are provided along a highway segment – one on one side, one on the other side, as on US 301 in Riverview – the higher score was used for that segment.

For off-road trails, the above methodology was also used, so as to remain comparable to the scoring of sidepaths; but the roadway traffic volume was set to one vehicle per day, and the posted speed to zero.
miles per hour. In this analysis, trails received a PLOS/BLOS of “A” if they are 12 feet or wider, and grade “B” if less than 12 feet.

The number of residents and employees with access to a high LOS facility was defined as the population living or working within a ¼-mile of a PLOS/BLOS “A” or “B” facility in the year 2040. Future year population and employment by travel analysis zone (TAZ) were prepared by the MPO and can be found in the 2040 Socioeconomic Data Forecasting and Scenario Planning Technical Memorandum.

4.3 Investment Levels Methodology

Opportune locations for new trails and sidepaths are identified in the Hillsborough County and Tampa Greenways plans, community plans adopted by Hillsborough County, and the 2035 LRTP. Typical per-mile costs for trail and sidepath construction were estimated based on recent actual local project costs, and applied to these potential new trail and sidepath corridors, giving each a preliminary cost estimate.

The trail/sidepath investments were prioritized primarily based population density, with an eye to common-sense connectivity. The county’s 700+ zones were sorted into quintiles based on population density, and trails/sidepaths passing within ¼ mile of a higher density zone received a higher score.

The trails/sidepaths were then grouped into three investment levels, as listed and illustrated in Appendix D.
Figure 6. Trail and Sidepath Needs Assessment
**Benefits Analysis Results**

In summary, higher levels of investment increase residential and employee access to trails and sidepaths. The costs and benefits associated with each investment level are described below and in Table 3.

- **Low Investment Level**: maintains the current spending level of $2 million annually ($40 million over 20 years). Under this investment level, 40 more miles of paved trails and sidepaths will be added. Even if high density areas are prioritized, only 16 percent of the population will live near a good or excellent walk/bike facility (PLOS/BLOS “A” or “B”) in 2040. Because jobs tend to be more centrally located, 29 percent of future employees will be near a good or excellent walk/bike facility.

- **Medium Investment Level**: assumes an investment of $7 million annually ($140 million over 20 years) and results in the construction of 136 miles of paved trails and sidepaths. Based on this level of investment, 23 percent of the population will live near a good or excellent walk/bike facility and 35 percent of jobs will be located near a good or excellent walk/bike facility.

- **High Investment Level**: assumes an investment of $12 million annually ($240 million over 20 years) and results in the construction of 232 miles of paved trails and sidepaths. This level of investment expands the trail/sidepath network out into the rural and lower-density suburban areas. Based on this level of investment, 25 percent of the population will live near a good or excellent walk/bike facility. In addition, 37 percent of jobs will be located near a good or excellent walk/bike facility.

**Table 3: Benefits and Costs of Investment Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Level</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capital Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>PLOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide population near trails*</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide jobs near trails</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capital Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>PLOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide population near trails</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide jobs near trails</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capital Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>PLOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide population near trails</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide jobs near trails</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Includes sidepaths and trails; “near” defined as within ¼ mile
MPO Board Meeting of Tuesday, February 5, 2019

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

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

The following members were present:

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

The following members were absent:

Councilman Harry Cohen and Commissioner Ken Hagan.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 8, 2019

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

COMMITTEE REPORTS, ONLINE COMMENTS

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

The committees discussed the following action items:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The following people made remarks on Facebook:

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

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

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

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

ACTION ITEMS

A. 2019 Safety Performance Targets

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Following the discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

B. Southshore Transit Re-Evaluation

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

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

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

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

C. MPO Policy Positions for 2019

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Following discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

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

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

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

B. Heights Mobility Study

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

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

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

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

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

OLD & NEW BUSINESS

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

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

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

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

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

Following discussion, Commissioner Overman withdrew her motion.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on January 9

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ The Southshore Transit Re-Evaluation; given the passage of the transportation referendum, members were keenly interested in knowing when the study’s recommendations would be implemented by HART; they also wanted to know how it relates to the proposed ferry connecting to MacDill.

✓ The 2019 Safety Targets, with questions about the effectiveness of speed reduction strategies and how crashes are recorded.

The CAC also heard reports on:

- The Heights Mobility Study; members were supportive and asked a lot of questions about accommodating transit, pedestrians, autos and parking within the limited right-of-way in the Florida/Tampa/Highlands corridor.
- The referendum outcome and what it could mean for the MPO.
- Highlights from the Association of MPO national conference, focusing on expressway conversion projects in Rochester, NY and Dallas, TX.

Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee on January 28

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ The 2019 Safety Performance Targets. There were questions about funding needed to meet the goals and a lag-time of realizing success should be noted.

✓ The Southshore Transit Re-Evaluation

The TAC also heard reports on:

- 2045 LRTP Revenue Projections
- Automated, Connected, Electric and Shared-Use Vehicles (ACES) in Modeling; the FDOT guidance and potential scenarios were discussed.

Meeting of the Policy Committee on January 29

✓ The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ Multimodal Level-of-Service Evaluation – commenting that the new methodology is a giant leap in the right direction, but there is still room for improvement, such as with bike lane signs and signals.

The committee also discussed and took action on:

✓ MPO Policy Positions for 2019 – the committee discussed the implications of several bills which have been filed, and directed staff to prepare a letter to the legislative delegation; the draft will be discussed at today’s board meeting.
BPAC Motion of December 12 – the committee supported the BPAC’s offer to local governments to review proposals to realign trails.

In addition, the committee provided direction to staff on next steps in regional planning and coordination. Members expressed concern about duplication of efforts and unnecessary bureaucracy. Staff suggested streamlining the regional process with a consolidation of the informal TMA Leadership Group and the legally-created MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee (CCC). The group also discussed that TBARTA’s and the CCC’s areas of responsibility have diverged, and therefore the staff services agreement between the CCC and TBARTA – administered by Hillsborough MPO acting on behalf of the CCC – may need to be rethought.

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on January 9

The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- Multimodal Level of Service Update
- 2019 Safety Targets; with questions regarding how these targets fit into the statewide target of Zero deaths.
- Attendance Review and Declaration of Vacant Seats; two seats, both members at large, were identified as vacant.

The committee also elected officers: Chair – Jonathan Forbes, Vice Chair – Tony Monk, Member at Large – Jim Shirk. The BPAC heard a report on language used by the media when reporting on bicyclist crashes.

Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee (LRC) on January 16

The committee reelected its existing officers, and approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- Appointment of Emily Hinsdale as Advocate for Livable Communities member,
- 2019 Safety Targets

The LRC received status updates on:

- Media Framing of Fatal Bicycle Crashes, and
- Channelside Drive Design Project

Meeting of the Intelligent Transportation Systems Committee on January 10

The current officers were reelected to serve in 2019: Chair – Vik Bhide; Vice Chair – Brian Gentry; Officer at Large – Vinny Corrazza.

The ITS committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- Multimodal Level of Service Evaluation
- 2019 Safety Performance Targets

The ITS committee received updates on

- Signal Cycle Lengths/Signal Re-timings in New Tampa
- Regional Data-Sharing Platform Pilot
The Florida Senate Administrative Policies and Procedures Policy 1.49

Effective January 18, 2018

1.49 Workplace Harassment Prohibited

The Senate is committed to providing a safe, professional environment for conducting the legislative business of the citizens of Florida. The Senate does not tolerate harassment toward any individual based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status. The Senate takes all allegations of harassment seriously and will take appropriate action to eliminate prohibited harassment.

Each Senator and employee has a responsibility to ensure harassment based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status does not occur in the workplace and must avoid conduct, both subtle and overt, that could be seen as prohibited harassment.

To achieve the Senate goal of providing a workplace free from unlawful harassment, the prohibited conduct described in this policy will not be tolerated, and there will be a prompt response to complaints of such harassment consistent with this policy or the Senate Rules, as applicable. The personal identifying information of an alleged victim of sexual harassment will be kept confidential and exempt from public records requirements pursuant to section 119.071(2)(n), Florida Statutes, to the fullest extent allowed by law.

Applicability

This policy is applicable to all Senate employees, Senators, lobbyists, and third parties. All agreements with agents, contractors, and vendors shall also contain provisions prohibiting harassment consistent with this policy.

For the purpose of this policy, the term:

(1) “Employee” means an individual employed by the Senate and includes an intern, Senate Page, volunteer, or other temporary or unpaid staff.

(2) “Lobbyist” means an individual registered to lobby both houses of the Florida Legislature or the Florida Senate pursuant to section 11.045, Florida Statutes.

(3) “Senator” means a current Florida State Senator.

(4) “Third party” means a member of the general public, member of the media, other legislative employee, or visitor to the Senate offices or committees.

Definition of Workplace Harassment

“Workplace harassment” means any:

(1) Harassment based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status, including verbal or physical behavior or conduct that denigrates or shows hostility or aversion toward an individual because of that individual’s race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status;

(2) Harassment based on an individual’s association with an individual because of that individual’s race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status;
(3) Harassment that has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual’s work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment; or

(4) Sexual harassment. While workplace harassment includes sexual harassment, sexual harassment raises issues that are unique in comparison to other types of workplace harassment. Therefore, sexual harassment warrants separate emphasis. “Sexual harassment” means unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:

(a) Submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual’s employment;

(b) Submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual; or

(c) Such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

Examples of Workplace Harassment

The following examples are illustrative of conduct or communications that may constitute workplace harassment:

- Unwanted jokes or slurs with a sexual, racial, religious, ethnic, or similar content.
- Mimicking or imitating the characteristics of an individual based on race, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status.
- Unwelcome remarks about an individual’s sexual anatomy, sexual capabilities, ethnic characteristics, religion, age, physical disabilities, or marital status.
- Unwanted physical contact.
- Hazing based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or marital status.

The following examples are illustrative of conduct or communication, if unwelcome, which may constitute sexual harassment:

Verbal

- Sexual comments or innuendos about one’s clothing, body, appearance, or sexual activity.
- Discussing sexual topics in the workplace, such as sexual practices or preferences or telling sexual jokes or stories.
- Using sexual words or phrases or words or phrases that can or should reasonably be taken as having sexual connotations.
- Implying that certain individuals must attend meetings or provide briefings when it is understood or should be understood the preference is not based on the substantive knowledge or experience of the individual.
- Making unwelcome calls or other communications to discuss matters of a personal nature outside of those required by professional conduct.
• Requesting or demanding sexual favors or suggesting that there is any connection between sexual behavior and any term or condition of employment or the outcome of any issue or matter, whether that connection be positive or negative.

**Nonverbal**
• Displaying sexually explicit pictures, cartoons, messages, or objects in the work area.
• Giving personal gifts of a sexual nature.
• Making sexually suggestive gestures.
• Making unwelcome visits outside the workplace.
• Sending emails, text messages, instant messages, or notes of any kind containing sexual images, cartoons, jokes, words, phrases, or content of a sexual nature.

**Physical**
• Kissing or hugging, unless welcome or clearly not objected to, when made in connection with a greeting or parting, such as a peck on the cheek.
• Patting, pinching, or intentionally brushing against an individual’s body.
• Unwelcome sexual contact of any kind.

Whether conduct or communications constitute workplace harassment depends upon the totality of the circumstances. In that regard, the following should be kept in mind:
(1) A single incident may or may not constitute workplace harassment.
(2) Whether a particular action is workplace harassment will depend on the facts and determinations made on a case-by-case basis.
(3) Conduct or communications that might be welcome to one individual may be unwelcome to another individual. Conduct or communications that might have been welcome between two individuals at one time may become unwelcome at any time.
(4) The examples are not exhaustive. Other conduct or a communication not expressly described in the examples may violate this policy.

**Complaint Contacts**
Any individual who experiences prohibited workplace harassment in the Senate may report the complaint to any of the following individuals:
(1) the Senate President;
(2) the Senate Chief of Staff;
(3) the Secretary of the Senate;
(4) the Senate Sergeant at Arms;
(5) the Human Resources Director of the Office of Legislative Services (Human Resources Director);
(6) an employee’s immediate supervisor;
(7) a designee of opposite gender provided by any of the aforementioned contacts when practical. A list of opposite gender designees, if any, will be provided with annual training materials.

**Complaint Procedure**

Complaints reported to a complaint contact must be promptly communicated to the Human Resources Director for a complete investigation. Once notified, the Human Resources Director will promptly notify the Office of the Senate President, or the Senate President Pro Tempore with a copy to the Secretary of the Senate if the complaint is against the Senate President, of the complaint and attempt to resolve the issue informally. This will include discussing the issues with the individuals involved in the complaint and may include interviewing other personnel, as deemed appropriate. Supervisors, Human Resources staff, or the Senate General Counsel may be requested to assist the Human Resources Director with the facilitation of the informal resolution.

If no informal resolution is possible, or if the complainant or the Human Resources Director determines an informal resolution is not appropriate given the seriousness or severity of the allegation, the complainant will be requested to submit a formal, written complaint to the Human Resources Director. The written complaint must set forth the basis of the complaint, the reasons the complainant believes prohibited workplace harassment has occurred, the specific dates of the alleged harassment, identification of any witnesses to the harassment and any action the complainant believes would resolve the complaint.

Upon receipt of the written complaint, or when deemed appropriate by the Senate President or the Human Resources Director, the Human Resources Director may contact an independent, professional service provider who will conduct a further investigation into the allegations set forth in the complaint.

After appropriate investigation, a written report summarizing the issues raised in the complaint, as well as evidence collected during the investigation, will be prepared by the Human Resources Director or the service provider and submitted to the Office of the Senate President.

A copy of a formal complaint or a description of an informal complaint shall be retained by the Human Resources Director with a summary of how the complaint was resolved.

If the complaint is against the Senate President, the Human Resources Director will notify the Senate President Pro Tempore with a copy to the Secretary of the Senate.

In every case, the Human Resources Director shall provide the complainant with available resources for victims of workplace harassment and follow-up with the complainant, when appropriate, to ensure the complainant was able to access available resources.
Resolution
The Human Resources Director, upon completion of an investigation of a complaint, will provide a summary of any findings, and disciplinary recommendations when a violation by an employee is identified, to the Senate President and the Senate Chief of Staff.

The Senate President and the Senate Chief of Staff, in consultation with the Senate General Counsel, will promptly make a determination and take appropriate disciplinary and corrective action, if any, based on all of the evidence gathered during the investigation.

An employee who is found to have violated this policy is subject to discipline up to and including immediate termination from employment.

The Senate President will take appropriate action if the complaint involves any violations by a Senator or a third party in accordance with the Senate Rules. Appropriate action may include, with the consent and participation of the complainant, the filing of the complaint with the Chair of the Committee on Rules in accordance with the Senate Rules.

If the complaint is against the Senate President, the Senate President Pro Tempore, with the consent and participation of the complainant, will file a written complaint with the Chair of the Committee on Rules in accordance with the Senate Rules.

Confidentiality
Information regarding complaints should be limited to individuals who need to know in order to carry out the procedures in this policy. A complaint and related investigation will be kept as confidential as practicable; however, absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed as reporting to law enforcement, attorneys, the Commission on Ethics, or others responsible for taking action may be required.

Statutes address certain information that is either confidential and exempt or exempt from public records requirements in specific situations and for certain time periods (e.g., sections 119.071(2)(g), 119.071(2)(k)1., and 119.071(2)(n), Florida Statutes).

Reporting Encouraged
The goal of the Senate is to provide a workplace free from harassment of any type. The Senate takes allegations of harassment seriously and will respond to such allegations promptly. Every individual is encouraged to report prohibited harassment so that inappropriate behavior can be addressed quickly and eliminated.

Supervisor Responsibility
Each Senator or employee supervising other employees is responsible for making subordinates aware of the prohibited harassment policy and the means for reporting a complaint.

A copy of this policy will be provided to each new employee and each employee must acknowledge receipt of the policy.
All Senators and employees, especially those supervising others, are responsible for assuring the workplace is free from harassment.

Supervisors and Senators in receipt of a complaint, whether formal or informal, must promptly communicate the complaint to the Human Resources Director.

**Retaliation**

The Senate does not tolerate retaliation against any individual for having complained of workplace harassment or for having assisted or participated in an investigation of alleged workplace harassment. Any individual who believes he or she may have been the subject of retaliation for having complained of workplace harassment or for having assisted or participated in an investigation related to an allegation of workplace harassment should report that information to any of the complaint contacts listed in this policy. Any individual found to have engaged in retaliation will be subject to discipline up to and including immediate termination or other appropriate action.

**False Complaints**

Complaints of workplace harassment found to be intentionally or recklessly dishonest or malicious will not be tolerated and shall be subject to discipline up to and including immediate termination or other appropriate action.

**Training**

**Employees**

Every employee shall receive a copy of this policy at the start of employment and shall return a signed acknowledgment prior to receiving access to Senate facilities or systems acknowledging the employee has read and understands the policy. Employees are encouraged to ask questions of their immediate supervisors if they do not understand the policy. Every employee shall receive a minimum of one (1) hour of training annually through online, classroom, or other appropriate training methods provided by the Senate on the topics of workplace harassment, sexual harassment, and sensitivity. Such training shall include verification through testing that the employee understands the concepts presented in the training and an opportunity for the employee to provide feedback.

Except as provided in this paragraph, volunteers, interns, and other temporary or unpaid staff of the Senate are required to receive the same training and provide the same acknowledgment of this policy as paid employees of the Senate. When requesting a volunteer, intern, or other temporary or unpaid staff, a Senator or the Senate Administration Director may request in writing that such individual receive as an alternative to the training described above, a copy of the Senate Workplace Harassment policy appropriate for the individual along with instructions on reporting any inappropriate behavior. For individuals who are minors, such as pages, the information shall be provided to the parent or guardian of the individual.

**Supervisors and Complaint Contacts**

Supervisors and complaint contacts shall receive additional training beyond the employee training to include instruction on handling workplace and sexual harassment complaints.
Senators
The annual training required of Senators pursuant to Senate Rule 1.40 shall include at least one (1) hour addressing workplace harassment, sexual harassment, undue influence, and sensitivity training. Senators shall acknowledge receipt of the training.

Lobbyists
Prior to lobbying in the Senate, every lobbyist shall receive a copy of this policy at the time of registration and shall sign an acknowledgment prior to completing registration that the lobbyist has read and understands the policy. For the 2018 Legislative Session, and until such time as the registration system is modified, such notification shall be accomplished by providing an electronic copy of this policy to every lobbyist registered on January 8, 2018, and every new lobbyist registering on or after that date, at the contact email address provided with the lobbyist’s registration. The notification shall include current contact information for the complaint contacts listed in this policy available to lobbyists for making a complaint.

Third Parties
The Senate Workplace Harassment policy and a list of complaint contacts shall be available on the Senate website under a separate link for the general public to access.

Recordkeeping
The Human Resources Director is the official recordkeeper for all records related to reports, notifications, complaints, and investigations under this workplace harassment policy.

Annual Review
The Senate commitment to providing a safe, professional environment free of workplace harassment requires continuous improvement and constant engagement at all levels. To achieve the Senate goal, this policy, and the procedures, notifications, and training provided pursuant to it, shall be reviewed at least annually and updated as necessary.
Our local not-for-profit hospitals and the department of health want to hear from you!

These organizations are working together to get the community’s perspective on the most pressing health and wellness needs. The results of this survey will be used to help us to understand your community health concerns so that improvements can be made.

We encourage you to take 15 minutes to fill out the survey below. Your voice is important to ensure these organizations have the best understanding of the needs of our community.

Thank you!