Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee
Wednesday, June 12, 2019, 9:00 AM

REVISED AGENDA

NOTE: This meeting will be recorded by video

I. Call to Order & Introductions
II. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

III. Members’ Interests

IV. Approval of Minutes – May 6 and May 15, 2019

V. Action Items
A. Appoint At-Large Hispanic Representative
   (Rich Clarendon, MPO Staff) 9:30
B. It’s Time Hillsborough Survey for 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan
   (Lisa Silva, MPO Staff) 9:40
C. Temple Terrace Electric Vehicle Study
   (Wade Reynolds, MPO Staff) 10:15

VI. Old Business & New Business
A. Debriefing on Transportation Improvement Program Public Hearing
B. Off-Site Tours & Informal Evening Meetings (Rich Clarendon, MPO Staff)
C. TBARTA CAC Report (Rick Richmond)
D. TBARTA Transmittal of MPO Research Results
E. Content Analysis of Comments Received for 6/12/18 TIP Public Hearing
F. Next meeting: June 12th

VII. Adjournment

VIII. Addendum
A. MPO Meeting Minutes & Standing Committee Reports
B. Florida MPO Advisory Council 2019 Freight Priorities
C. Sidewalk Labs Street Design Principles & Articles of Interest

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

The MPO does not discriminate in any of its programs or services. Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Learn more about our commitment to non-discrimination.

Persons needing interpreter services or accommodations for a disability in order to participate in this meeting, free of charge, are encouraged to contact Johnny Wong,
813-273-3774 x370 or wongj@plancom.org, three business days in advance of the meeting. Also, if you are only able to speak Spanish, please call the Spanish helpline at (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

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

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

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.
CAC Chairman Roberts called the workshop to order shortly after 7 PM in the Multi-Function Room on the first floor of the County Center building. He asked those present to introduce themselves.

The following members were in attendance: Bill Roberts, Vance Arnett, Van Linkous, Amy Espinosa, Rick Fernandez, Nicole Rice, Dennis LeVine, Rick Richmond, Sky White and Cliff Reiss.

Also attending were: Commissioner Les Miller, MPO Chairman, Rich Clarendon, MPO staff, Stephen Benson, FDOT, and Chris Vela, citizen.

Commissioner Miller thanked the CAC members for their service and emphasized how it contributed to better MPO decision-making. He noted that the County's growing transportation needs could finally be addressed with funding from the new sales tax. He stressed the importance of members’ expressing different perspectives and to remember to debate issues among themselves, staff and citizens respectfully, and to try to resolve differences civilly. Commissioner Miller also said that the MPO looks forward to receiving reports delivered verbally by the CAC Chairman and providing feedback from the MPO board to the CAC. He finished by saying that this was an exciting time to be involved in transportation planning.

Responding to questions from CAC members, Commissioner Miller said:

- The MPO board gets written reports from the CAC every month, up until now delivered by MPO staff, and takes those reports seriously.
- He encourages and expects full participation by all members; members clarified that the CAC had not had trouble achieving a quorum and that this workshop was an extra meeting with no formal agenda.
- The region’s MPOs are working together better today than in the past, perhaps because of the threat of combining the MPOs; the Legislature wants to see cooperation and coordination between MPOs.
- The MPO board is willing to consider non-traditional ideas and potential solutions proposed by citizen planners; in the end, the board may agree or disagree, but will absorb ideas and strive to give them fair hearing.
- Changing the MPO’s voting structure to allow more citizen input requires changing state and federal laws that govern the MPO’s make-up.
- If the legal issues are resolved, the BOCC and HART are prepared to move quickly to implement needed projects; delays in the past were largely due to a lack of consensus on funding; speaking as one Commissioner, he would advocate HART putting more buses on the road and restoring services cut under Mission Max, preferably electric buses.
Despite a lack of progress in pursuing multimodal projects, the MPO is looking down the road at what can be done, the BOCC and HART have changed and are taking steps to use funding from the successful sales tax referendum to implement improvements.

He’s willing to come back periodically to meet with the CAC in the future.

Members discussed recent decisions by the MPO that reflected input from the CAC such as Tampa Bay Express, review of TIP priorities, studying the boulevard concept, input from civic activists, and how the CAC listens to presenters but asks tough questions when necessary.

Discussion continued regarding the desire to hear more CAC presentations from HART related to transit and the bus system. Members want to understand the “big picture” and the vision for the future; they want to know why specific projects are being proposed, for example, why an expansion of the Interstate is needed, and how that fits into the future vision.

Most CAC members understand how long it takes for projects to get done, and some fear that they will be out-of-date by the time they’re built. The view was expressed that more agile planning, adaptable to changing conditions is needed.

Members expressed frustration at the lack of past leadership and vision for future multimodal connections, especially compared to other metro areas. For example, how will trails such the Riverwalk will eventually connect with other greenways, or how the streetcar system will connect with the CSX lines? There was also frustration about the layers of decision-makers.

Members also noted that the CAC has become more diverse, and one of their former members now sits on the BOCC, which should help conveying the urgency to act for a better transportation.

Commissioner Miller left the workshop shortly after 8 PM.

Chairman Roberts suggested that in the time remaining, CAC members focus on what can be done to improve their meetings. He noted that meeting durations have often exceeded their timeframes.

Suggestions included:

- Putting status reports that do not require action into a “reading packet” that members can scan for information and request a briefing but not take up time on an agenda unless requested.
- Staff tell the CAC what opportunities they must weigh in on MPO decisions, frame action items more clearly, and advise the CAC when it’s appropriate to request studies.
- Make sure the CAC, especially newer members, understand the “big picture” before voting on topics.
- Provide the CAC with more opportunities to understand and give choose alternatives or options when projects or plans are presented.
- Go out in the field and look at project sites to get a fuller understanding of the surrounding environment and context.
- Invite a more diverse range of presenters with new perspectives to CAC meetings.
- Make clear what is “actionable” on items that come before the CAC and ask presenters what the CAC can influence.
Chairman Roberts recognized Chris Vela, a member of the public, and asked if he wanted to share his perspective. Mr. Vela suggested that the CAC hold more workshops, in and to have conversations with communities to get a better understanding of what’s going on. He also referred to the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which is part of the BPAC agenda. He said he’s remains concerned with Tampa Bay Next, the ongoing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the downtown interchange and how the TIP now refers to capacity and not the SEIS. He urged the CAC to question line 29 in table 2 of the TIP and ask the MPO to take concrete action and not just to continue to study impacts. He suggested sending “ambassadors” out into the community, perhaps hosting community engagement events funded by the sales surtax dollars. He said he also is bothered by the MPO’s recertification process and recommendations potentially leading to combine with other MPOs in the region. He feels that our MPO needs to represent our own communities.

Discussion continued about the upcoming TIP public hearing scheduled for June 11th and the Independent Oversight Committee.

Members also expressed the need for graphically depicting plans and projects like the Green Artery and its connections to enable the public to visualize and understanding them. The recent presentation of the Boulevard concept is a good example of how powerful a good visualization can be.

Discussion continued about how difficult and frustrating it is to keep up with changing priorities identified in the draft TIP, the disappearance of references to the SEIS, and capacity projects on I-275 north of downtown. Members discussed the pros and cons of dynamic toll pricing on express lanes in the Washington DC area.

Mr. Clarendon referred to the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan survey and asked for the CAC’s help to get the word out and getting the survey distributed to neighborhood, civic and community groups that members may be affiliated with. The MPO is trying to maximize survey participation during the survey period that runs from early June through the end of July.

Chairman Roberts asked if members felt this workshop was useful. Members said it was helpful to have informal discussions among themselves, unstructured by an agenda, to share views, ask questions, seek better understanding of plans, projects and issues before they come up for a vote.

Chairman Roberts thanked the members for attending. The workshop closed at 8:42 PM.
I. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

In the absence of Chair Bill Roberts, Vice-Chair Rick Fernandez called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. The meeting was held in the Plan Hillsborough Room on the 18th floor of the County Center Building and member introductions were made.

Members present: Rick Fernandez, Vance Arnett, David Bailey, Vivienne Handy, Steven Hollenkamp, Nicole Rice, Van Linkous, Artie Fryer, Dayna Lazarus, Cliff Reiss, Amy Espinosa, Rick Richmond, and Barbara Kennedy Gibson.

Others present: Rich Clarendon, Beth Alden, Johnny Wong, Sarah McKinley, Wanda West – MPO Staff; James Shirk – BPAC; Lena Young Green - Tampa Heights resident; Shane Ragiel – Tampa Heights resident; Topher Morrison, resident; Michelle Cookson – Sunshine Citizens; Chris Vela – Historic Ybor resident; Wally Blain – Tindale Oliver; Rochelle Gross – THCA; Stephen Benson, Ed McKinney – FDOT.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Vice-Chair Fernandez informed the group of two emails (attached as requested by Vice-Chair Fernandez) from citizens who were unable to attend the meeting, (1) from Nicole Perry and (2) Edward Ringwald, commenting on road expansion projects. Copies of the emails were distributed to CAC members in attendance.

- Mr. Shane Ragiel spoke regarding the expansion of the flyover and recommended deprioritizing items 27 and 28 from the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Ms. Lena Young Green, Tampa Heights resident, commented on ongoing changes and explanations to the TIP. She requested the process for getting information on the TIP be adjusted so communities can have a chance to better understand the material. Ms. Young reflected Mr. Ragiel’s comments regarding line items 27 and 28.
- Mr. Vela, Historic Ybor resident, provided comments on the TIP document, Segments 4, 5, 6 and 8 which cut through the urban core. He asked the CAC to deliberate and recommend to the MPO Board no additional work on Segments 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. In addition, declare no SEIS work and non-SEIS work until everyone sees all of the plans. He requested all plans for the Downtown Interchange from FDOT, and to date has not received the information. Following Mr. Vela’s comments, members asked for clarification of the Segments that he referenced. Mr. Vela stated that he does not want any interstate work completed due east of the Howard Frankland and due north.
- Ms. Michelle Cookson thanked the committee for their commitment to transportation planning and for listening to the citizens. The community is demanding a focus on people first, not cars, and finding ways for them to safely move around and more efficiently. She asked the CAC to make a motion and forward to the MPO Board informing them to look at the TIP and strike lines 27 and 28 from Table 2. She stated that the community does not want to see capacity added.
- Ms. Laurel Ureña, resident of North Ybor, commented on the I-275 expansion and neighborhoods that are being destroyed. She suggested the CAC ask the MPO Board to request a modified “no build” option and prioritize Vision Zero and CSX studies and complete other pending studies. She
would like to see Tampa being able to compete with other cities for new companies. In addition, she would like to see transit and innovative solutions.

- Mr. Topher Morrison, Downtown resident, provided the following written comments: I am strongly against the TBNext Project – while being regionally focused is important. It shouldn’t be considered at the expense of local economy, lifestyle and environment. TBNext will not solve our congestion issues.

Mr. Clarendon informed the group that he emailed a link (https://youtu.be/3KZ9z3ObgyY) to a video that Mr. Mauricio Rosas made, from the March 26th public hearing held by FDOT for the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study for I-275 Section 7. Mr. Rosas requested distribution of the video to the CAC. Vice-Chair Fernandez stated that he asked FDOT for a written report of the program but has not received it. He received an email from Secretary Gwynn stating that something would be put together by May 15, but he still has not received the information. Mr. Fernandez suggested that members view the video if they have not.

### III. MEMBERS’ INTERESTS

Ms. Lazarus wanted to know the status of a previous meeting discussion to live stream CAC meetings. Mr. Clarendon stated that video recording process will begin at the June meeting as a trial basis. Vice-Chair Fernandez wanted to know if public comment could be facilitated for Facebook comments at the level it is done for the MPO board meetings, so members do not have to rely on last minute emails. Ms. Kennedy Gibson pointed out that Facebook is not necessarily technology that everyone uses.

Ms. Lazarus pointed out that the no build option does not mean nothing will be done. She also requested a future presentation on Transportation Demand Management which shows how to get cars off the roads and move traffic.

Ms. Linkous stated that she is struggling along with many of the public commenters, who are trying to understand the TIP process and the information that was provided. She stated maybe there will be a better understanding of the big picture following Ms. McKinley’s presentation.

Mr. Fernandez wanted to know if clarification has been received on his previous request on the MPO Chair’s expectations on rules of engagement for the TIP Public Hearing and citizens ceding their speaking time. He wanted to know if citizens who have transferred minutes to another speaker must be present when the speaker is called to the podium.

Ms. Beth Alden, MPO Executive Director, has met with Commissioner Les Miller, the Chair of the MPO Board, and the following rules of engagement have been set and appear on the public hearing flyer, which she read for the committee:

**Planning to speak in person at the June 11th Public Hearing? Sign up to speak on June 11th from 4pm until 8pm in the first-floor lobby of County Center. If you intend to transfer your minutes to another speaker, you must sign up together, notifying staff to obtain consecutive speaker numbers, and the entire group must be present in the boardroom when your name/number is called. Spontaneous transfers will not be honored. The amount of time allotted to each speaker may be adjusted by the chair to accommodate as many speakers as possible.**

This information will be published in the newspaper and distributed by mail to people who live near the capacity projects for the TIP.

Mr. Fernandez made an appeal for Ms. Alden to revisit discussion with Commissioner Miller on the rules. He does not want friends and neighbors, who cede their speaking time, to have the obligation of having to be in the boardroom when the speaker is called. He feels that it is an unnecessary burden on the public.
Mr. Fernandez commented on a motion that passed unanimously at the MPO Board for approval for a study on the Boulevard Concept. He also informed the group that the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee supported the motion, as well as, the Technical Advisory Committee.

Mr. Fernandez informed the committee of his intent to make a motion removing line items from the TIP. He also informed Mr. Clarendon of his issue with the Action Item amending the Long Range Transportation Plan, I-275 Section 7 and the proposed language.

Ms. Rice inquired about funding for Pasco County that previously appeared in the TIP. Ms. McKinley stated that the item was a TMA Leadership priority and has been removed from the TIP.

Ms. Linkous asked for clarification on what is being decided at the June 11th TIP Public Hearing and inquired about the typical rules of public engagement for the hearing. Mr. Clarendon stated that the June 11th Public Hearing is to adopt the TIP and a list of priorities. The rules of engagement are in place to accommodate as many speakers as possible.

Mr. Fernandez suggested if the committee has a suggestion or recommendation to pass on to Commissioner Miller, they could do just that. He also stated that he does not want any surprises regarding rules of engagement for the community on the day of the hearing. Mr. Arnett suggested, in the essence of time, that additional discussion on the rules of engagement be taken up in Old Business of the agenda, and a motion can be considered at that time.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Richmond made a motion for approval of the April 10, 2019 minutes. Ms. Espinosa seconded the motion. There was no discussion or corrections, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

V. ACTION ITEMS

A. “Imagine 2040” Long Range Transportation Plan Amendment for:

i. FAST Act Consistency
Dr. Johnny Wong, MPO Staff, presented information on a proposed amendment. In 2015, MAP-21 and the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation ACT (FAST Act), which is Federal Legislation, required Department of Transportations (DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to track federally prescribed performance measures related to safety, bridge, pavement, infrastructure conditions, transit assets, and travel time reliability. Any long range transportation plans amended or adopted after May 20, 2019, must include a System Performance Report with the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to federally-required performance measures, adopt performance targets, and reports on progress achieved in pursuit of meeting the targets.

Following Dr. Wong’s presentation, Mr. Arnett inquired about the performance requirements and assessments and asked for clarity on how they are reconciled with the new tax dollars. Dr. Wong stated that with respect to pavement conditions the targets are being exceeded for three of the four measures, but it does not reflect the conditions of the local roads. The NHS is performing great; however, the local roads are not. The issues will be reviewed in the LRTP 2045 update. Mr. Arnett also wanted to know who makes the decision on arterial versus local roads. Dr. Wong stated that the jurisdiction or the municipality that owns the road would have the discretion of investing.

Ms. Lazarus inquired about social equity performance measures. Dr. Wong stated that the Hillsborough MPO does not have targets for equity performance, but there has been discussion as part of internal processes for the Title VI Plan Update.

Mr. Bailey inquired about the standards for local roads. Dr. Wong stated that Phase 2 Outreach for the 2045 LRTP Update will begin on June 3, and the goal of the survey is to obtain public information about what the level of performance is for local pavement. The information gathered will help identify the amount
of resources necessary to bring pavement to the desired level of performance. The Surtax also has a revenue stream allocated specifically for pavement improvements.

ii. I-275 Section 7 (from N of MLK Blvd to N of Bearss Ave) Project Development and Environmental Study
Mr. Rich Clarendon, MPO Staff, presented information on the PD&E Study’s preferred alternative for I-275 Section 7 (from north of Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. to north of Bearss Ave). The project will add one general use lane in each direction; improve operations at Hillsborough Avenue and Bearss Avenue; enhance connectivity to thirteen underpasses; accommodate potential transit opportunities; provide landscape opportunities; and include sound walls where feasible. The project will not acquire right of way from north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. (SR 574) to north of Bearss Avenue or in the Seminole Heights Historic District. Minor right of way acquisition will be needed near the Bearss Avenue interchange for storm water ponds.

Following the presentation, there was a lengthy discussion.

Mr. Fernandez commented and inquired about proposed descriptions and general use lanes. Mr. Clarendon clarified one lane in each direction. Mr. Fernandez suggested, if the LRTP is being amended to remove the express lanes, that is the action that should occur and there should not be a reference to the PD&E Study or to the Section 7 preferred alternative. He confirmed that he does not want to see any capacity projects on I-275. Mr. Clarendon stated that if this was the proposal, it would have to be noticed to the general public, since it is a change from what has been proposed.

Ms. Espinosa commented on future use and approving the information on the general purpose lanes. She wanted to know if the lanes will eventually be tolled. Mr. Stephen Benson, FDOT Representative, stated that current law does not allow them to toll existing lanes on the interstate. Ms. Espinosa also wanted to know if the language change had to do with making sure funds are allocated for the project and wanted to know the consequences for removal of the item. Mr. Clarendon stated for the project to move forward, it must be consistent with the LRTP and vice versa. If the LRTP is not amended, then the toll lanes will remain in the LRTP and the PD&E would not be consistent and would not move forward.

Ms. Lazarus inquired about the land being taken. Mr. Clarendon stated for the most part that it is within the existing right of way and some of the currently striped pavement will be utilized. Mr. Arnett assisted in clarifying Ms. Lazarus’ question and stated right of way that is paved and not used for travel will be turned into a travel lane. It was confirmed that there is no right of way being taken. Ms. Lazarus stated that adding lanes will increase induced demand, and she does not feel that it is a good use of millions of dollars.

Ms. Rice stated that the information was manipulative, and the door is being opened for the opportunity of toll lanes. She feels the Section 7 amendment is in direct conflict with the study of the Boulevard Project. Money is going to be spent to put up sound walls to be torn down. She does not feel that it makes fiscal sense.

Ms. Handy commented on the toll lanes being removed and changes to the project limits. Mr. Clarendon stated that the limits on the south end have changed. Ms. Handy also wanted to know if changes to the project limits have anything to do with the Boulevard Project. Mr. Clarendon stated that the Boulevard Project came after the changes to the project limits. Ms. Handy wanted to know why changes happened with the project limits. Mr. Benson clarified that the lines and the limits the way they were laid out in the 2040 Plan were determined in 2015, based upon what the plans were conceived to be at that time, and that is why there is some overlap. In addition, FDOT is trying to make as consistent as they possibly can with the current plan. The southern limit identified in 2015 for the 2040 LRTP is now part of the Downtown Interchange and not part of the Section 7, I-275 North Project.

Ms. Linkous wanted to know how the plan will converge with the next stage. Mr. Benson stated that there is a transition area that will eventually tie into the Downtown Interchange.
Mr. Bailey wanted to know by approving the amendment, in no way does it cut off the ability to have the study for the Boulevard Concept. Mr. Clarendon stated that the improvements that are shown would not happen in totality until 2030 and would not start until 2021. This allows time for evaluation of the Boulevard Concept.

Mr. Richmond wanted to know the consequences of removing the two general purpose lanes from the LRTP. Mr. Clarendon stated that the traffic congestion problem will get worse. Mr. Richmond wanted to know if the SEIS Study would go away and the impact on existing studies for the corridor. Mr. Clarendon stated that it would not necessarily affect the Downtown Interchange and the SEIS Study, but it would stop any further projects on I-275 North until there is consistency in the LRTP, and that FDOT could not continue advancing the preferred alternative from the PD&E Study.

Mr. Hollenkamp wanted to know who proposed the amendment. Mr. Clarendon stated that the MPO was requested to make the amendment by FDOT.

Mr. Arnett wanted to know if the CAC approved the amendments as submitted, what happens when the group gets to the section of the agenda and there is pushback on lines items 27 and 28 in the TIP. He wanted to know what the impact on the Plan would be. Mr. Clarendon stated that the LRTP is a planning document and it does not program money, that depends on the TIP. Dollars are assigned to projects with the TIP.

Mr. Clarendon provided clarification on the requested amendments.

Mr. Arnett wanted to know why the group would have to agree to accept all of the additions and expand capacity in order to get sound walls built. Mr. Benson stated that it has to do with when the highway was originally built, when the requirements for sound walls changed, and how it is going to be paid for. If FDOT is doing a capacity project on the interstate that allows for the use of funds designated by the legislature for capacity improvements on the SIS and addressing any mitigation activities that occur as a result of the project. They do not have funds to mitigate the noise on its own.

Ms. Rice provided current Florida law on general use lanes from the Legislative Session.

**Motion:** Approve amending the LRTP for consistency with the FAST Act by including the System Performance Report and eliminating the express toll lanes that are currently stated in the plan. (Arnett-Bailey).

Following the motion, Mr. Clarendon asked for clarification on how many lanes were left. The response was whatever was listed as a toll lane, is no longer a toll lane.

Mr. Bailey requested an explanation on the impacts of the motion. Mr. Benson could not answer because he was confused about the motion. He asked for clarification on the total number of all through lanes that would like to be seen on I-275. The response was no additional capacity.

Mr. Benson stated that the project, as listed, is to add two express toll lanes.

Mr. Bailey removed his second to the motion, and Ms. Rice seconded the motion.

**The motion passed 11 to 2 with Mr. Bailey and Ms. Kennedy Gibson opposing.**

C. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: Crosswalk at N. Florida Ave. & Idlewild Ave.

Ms. McKinley, MPO Staff, requested to present item C first, in hopes of alleviating confusion between the two items. The amendment is for the currently effective TIP, that is effective between now and September 30, 2019. This amendment adds a design phase for a crosswalk at the intersection of Florida Avenue and
Idlewild Avenue, to go along with a sister project that adds a crosswalk at Florida Avenue and Wilder that is already in design. Approval of the amendment will allow work to begin sooner on the design phase.

Mr. Arnett wanted to know if the project included flashing beacons. Ms. McKinley stated it does include flashing beacons and it is part of the Heights Mobility Plan.

**Motion:** Approval of the TIP amendment. *(Arnett-Rice).*

Ms. Linkous stated that the project is a good step forward, but the area could use continued study.

The motion carried unanimously.

**B. FY20-24 Transportation Improvement Program & Priorities**

Ms. Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, presented information on the TIP document FY 2019/20 -2023/24. The TIP document includes projects programmed by FDOT based on priorities adopted by the MPO on June 11, 2019.

Following the presentation, Ms. Espinosa wanted to know how the priority projects list gets prioritized. Ms. McKinley stated within the table the criteria is listed in the green headers for each program and it shows how the projects are prioritized. Staff annually visits each jurisdictional and partner agencies to review previous priorities for status updates, as well as, obtain new priorities to be added to the list. The criteria are used to rank the priorities. Ms. Espinosa asked about the information listed in the prioritization criteria. Ms. McKinley provided clarification.

Mr. Arnett wanted to know why the group received a revision of the Priority List of Projects on the morning of the discussion. Staff received a request from FDOT three days prior to the meeting to add information to the priority list. Mr. Arnett commented on impacts when changes are made after members have reviewed and prepared to discuss the material distributed prior to the meeting. He pointed out that some of the information in the table sends a confusing message.

**Motion:** Strike line item 40 (Big Bend Extension) and line item 44 (Balm Rd.) from Table 2 of the TIP. *(Handy-Lazarus).*

There was discussion following the motion. Ms. Handy expressed her view that the projects promoted sprawl development and were not consistent with the community plan for the area. Discussion ensued about already existing and approved development and a new high school planned for Balm Rd. An aerial view of the area was displayed.

Mr. Arnett wanted to know if there has ever been a case in which a PD&E was stopped by a community. Ms. Alden stated that there was a lot of controversy years ago with a PD&E Study for the Lithia Pinecrest Road widening. When it was presented to the MPO, it resulted in the MPO only including enhancements without widening the road in the LRTP.

There was additional discussion.

**The motion passed 9 to 3 with Mr. Bailey, Mr. Fryer and Mr. Richmond opposing.**

Ms. Rice recommended an acronym list be included with Table 2 when presented to the Board. Ms. McKinley pointed out that the information is included in the appendix of the TIP document.

Vice-Chair Fernandez passed the gavel to Mr. Arnett.

**Motion:** Strike line items 27 (I-275 from north of MLK to Bearss Ave) and 28 (safety and operational improvements to the downtown interchange) from Table 2 of the TIP. *(Fernandez-Handy).*
Following the motion, there was discussion. Mr. Fernandez said that the surrounding community has spoken out against further capacity expansion of the Interstate.

Mr. Bailey commented on federal funding for projects and contingency plans. Mr. Ed McKinney, FDOT Representative, responded to Mr. Bailey’s questions and stated that the continuing discourse adds to confusion and it appears that Tampa is not ready.

There was additional discussion.

Mr. Arnett wanted to know if the line items are removed from the TIP can FDOT come back next year and add them. Ms. McKinley was not aware of anything that would prevent them from that action.

Following additional comments, the motion passed 10 to 2 with Mr. Bailey and Mr. Richmond opposing.

The gavel was returned to the Vice-Chair.

Motion: Recommend approval of the TIP for FY 2019/20 – 2023/24 as amended and the Priorities (Arnett-Richmond).

Following the motion Ms. Linkous inquired about the Safety Enhancement 56th/50th (SR60 to Busch Blvd). Mr. Benson stated that the project limits can be extended to Fowler.

There was no additional discussion on the motion, and the motion passed 11 to 1 with Mr. Bailey opposing.

D. Appoint At-Large Hispanic Representative

Mr. Clarendon, MPO Staff, informed the group that Mr. Ramos who applied, recently withdrew his application for membership; therefore, the seat that Mr. Rob Davila stepped down from due to other commitments remains vacant.

VI. STATUS REPORTS

A. 2045 Needs Assessment

Mr. Wally Blain, Tindale Oliver – MPO Consultant, presented information on the 2045 LRTP. Public involvement will take place over the summer with Phase 2 of the MetroQuest Survey. Adoption by the MPO Board is scheduled for November. Work is being done to have some of the results available by the July 30th Policy Committee meeting. Formal updates to the committees will be provided in August.

There was brief discussion.

Mr. Clarendon informed the group that staff will send out an email on information for members interested in receiving group presentations on the 2045 LRTP. The information will also be promoted on social media.

VII. OLD BUSINESS & NEW BUSINESS

A. TBARTA CAC Report

Mr. Rick Richmond stated that the TBARTA CAC met in April. TBARTA has to develop a Regional Transit Development Plan and Tindale Oliver will develop it. Consultants led by WSP USA will complete the PD&E Study for BRT. Ms. Rice stated that she sent a lengthy email regarding hiring urban designers to TBARTA and she has not received a response. Mr. Richmond will follow-up. Ms. Espinosa suggested adding Information Architects to the inquiry.

Mr. Clarendon informed the group of expiring terms that have been extended for another two years: Ms. Espinosa, Ms. Kennedy Gibson, Mr. Arnett, Mr. Mierzejewski and Mr. Reiss.
Motion:  Recommend to Commissioner Miller rules for public presentation would be no more than four individuals can reassign their time to any one speaker and no one speaker can speak for longer than fifteen minutes and it has to be on the topic that is on the agenda. At no time will any one speaker’s time be reduced to less than two minutes based upon the volume of speakers that attend. You do not have to be present to donate time as long as a signature is there indicating that the time was donated. (Arnett-Richmond). There was no discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Lazarus wanted to know if there will be another special evening meeting of the CAC prior to June 11. Mr. Fernandez stated the evening meeting was very well received. Mr. Clarendon will poll the group in reference to Ms. Lazarus’ inquiry. Ms. Lazarus inquired about notes from the special meeting. The notes will be made available for the group.

Mr. Fernandez requested the emails from Ms. Perry and Mr. Ringwald be included with the minutes.

VIII.  ADJOURNMENT

A quorum was maintained for the duration of the meeting. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:39 p.m. The next meeting will be held June 12, 2019.
Dear Mr. Ringwald,

Thank you for your comments; we will make sure they get forwarded to the Citizens Advisory Committee.

Wanda, would you print copies for the CAC members tomorrow?

Thanks again,

Rich Clarendon, AICP  
Assistant Executive Director  
Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization for Transportation  
clarendonr@plancom.org • 813.273.3774 x368  
planhillsborough.org  

From: Edward Ringwald <edward.ringwald@edwardringwald.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2019 9:23 AM  
To: Rich Clarendon <clarendonr@plancom.org>  
Subject: Comments to the CAC

To whom it may concern:

I don’t believe it. Just adding more lanes on Interstate 275 will mean more congestion, both weekday and weekend. And adding bus lanes? That’s out of the question!

Without rail based mass transit, it is going to get to the point that major employers consider relocating out of the Tampa Bay region as well as people fleeing the Tampa Bay region for other commute friendly metros. In fact, a recent Tampa Bay Times article mentioned that two companies are considering leaving the region.

Just this past Mother’s Day weekend alone I was at the Florida Railroad Museum in Parrish volunteering as a train crew member. The lounge car I was assigned to was full on both the 11 AM and 2 PM runs. If the lounge car was full, how many cars could be potentially taken off Interstate 275? Multiply by a few train coach cars and the result would make a difference. (When Sky Connect opened at Tampa International Airport, that meant a difference by helping to relieve congestion at the departing and arriving drives!)

Rail based mass transit is the answer if the Tampa Bay region wants to be competitive. Buses and widened Interstate 275 are not the answer.
Please feel free to visit my Tampa Bay transit page on my website of all things Interstate 275 in the Tampa Bay region at http://interstate275florida.com/tampabaytransit.html - it demonstrates the need for a more robust system of transit in the Tampa Bay region including the implementation of light and commuter rail as a choice. After all, the Tampa Bay region deserves a better choice when it comes to getting around especially for commuting to work, not more buses and certainly not a twenty lane Interstate 275 and the perpetual congestion as a result.

Edward Ringwald
PO Box 21846
Tampa, FL 33622
Edward.Ringwald@edwardringwald.com

Sent from my iPhone
MPO CAC,

Please help Tampa progress into the future and not be stuck in ways of the past. The last thing Tampa needs in regards to its transportation options are wider highways. Highways have already done enough to destroy much of Tampa’s urban history. Increasing the number of lanes has proven time and again across the world to be the wrong choice. It is unsustainable, short-sighted and reactionary. This is the time in Tampa’s History to choose what type of city we want to become and leave for future generations. Do we want to leave a city void of most of its past, that continues to have traffic problems as populations continue to grow, and one that is heavily polluted or one that is environmentally friendly, values its residents’ livelihoods, and offers safe and efficient means of commuting when necessary. NO BUILD to FDOT’s highway widening options is the only option that puts Tampa residents first. This issue is especially important and sensitive to our family as we are in the process of renovating a property in beautiful Historic Tampa Heights, right near the DTI. Our property was purchased from FDOT who never explicitly stated that the lot next door was directly impacted by proposed plans. Only after we had spent thousands of hours and dollars on our future home (which btw first has to be picked up and moved next door) did we learn from our own research that the lot next door (which it was previously on) was directly impacted by some of the highway expansion plans. We were under the impression the lot was to be used as a buffer zone from the highway. Any highway widening would have an extremely detrimental effect on the livelihoods and property values of all those in historic Tampa Heights, including our young family who worked so hard to renovate a beautiful historic home. The Community Garden, the Greenway, the history are all part of the reason why families have flocked to the area and why it is in such great demand. Communities like Historic Tampa Heights are what make the urban core and Tampa such a special place. Please help preserve that.

Tampa needs mass transit. This is the only sustainable plan for the future that will help Tampa to continue to grow in a positive way. Busincoco want to invest in cities that are investing in bettering themselves. Widening highways is not bettering Tampa, it is keeping Tampa stuck in the unhealthy and destructive ways of the past. There are so many historic homes, businesses, landmarks, etc that will be negatively affected again by any highway widening. I-275 should have never been constructed through the urban core. It is not too late to work to correct some of the mistakes of the past. The Boulevard concept which was proposed by Josh Frank is visionary and EXACTLY what Tampa needs. It puts PEOPLE first. It allows for healthier ways of life. It incorporates mass transit. It is a plan for long term growth and success. While some people won’t understand it initially, they will. It may be hard to believe for some that it can be done without negative effects, however, we only need to look at cities around the world such as Seoul, Portland, San Francisco, etc that have already done this and the countless others that are looking to do so themselves. We also can look to cities such as Atlanta and Seattle as to what happened when their major highways closed for some time. People thought the worst would happen and… it just didn’t. Induced Demand is a powerful and very negative result of wide open highways. Of course the highways are going to be congested now and even if highways widen. They are the only option currently. I don’t care for doughnuts but if you put a huge plate in front of me, I would probably eat one. Same concept. Give residents transit options and they will utilize them. Tampa is full of citizens who are BEGGING for mass transit, road improvements, safer streets, less noise and environmental pollution, more bike and walkability, etc. thus is why the transportation tax was just passed. Please help utilize that tax to suit the needs of this and future generations of Tampansians and say “NO!” to FDOTs expansion plans and “YES!” to the Boulevard/mass transit!

Thank you for your time!

Nicole Perry
Ndperry0917@gmail.com
678-468-5748

Matthew Perry
mrperryems@gmail.com
404-368-2713
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
CAC At-Large Nomination for Hispanic Representative

**Presenter**
Rich Clarendon, MPO staff

**Summary**
The CAC has a vacant at-large seat for a person of Hispanic origin.

To be appointed to an at-large seat, a candidate must first be recommended by the CAC. The MPO board then makes the final appointment.

Attached for your consideration is an application from a recent candidate who wishes to be considered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camilo A. Soto</td>
<td>Seat for a person of Hispanic origin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Soto plans to attend the CAC meeting to introduce himself under public comment and express his desire to be appointed.

**Recommended Action**
Nominate the candidate to fill the vacant at-large seat for a person of Hispanic origin.

**Prepared By**
Rich Clarendon, AICP

**Attachments**
CAC Application
1. Which Board or Committee are you interested in? **Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)**

2. My name is: **Camilo A. Soto**

3. My email address is

4. My current place of employment is **Land Use/Zoning Attorney, Tampa, FL 33602**

5. I reside at **Tampa, FL 33602**

6. I prefer to be contacted and receive documents at **Home**

7. Gender: **Male**

8. Race: **Hispanic**


10. US Citizen: **Yes**

11. I have a disability: **No**

12. Felony or misdemeanor offense: **I have never been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor offense.**

13. Registered voter: **Yes**

14. Receive Medicaid, SSI or WIC benefits? **No**

15. Resident of Hillsborough County since: **12/20/2004**

16. Education:

   High School: **Cooper City High School, 1997**

   Secondary: **University of South Florida, Tampa, FL May 2017 Master of Urban and Regional Planning Western Michigan University--Cooley Law School, Lansing, MI May 2005 Juris Doctor, with concentration in Litigation University of South Florida, Tampa, FL August 2002 Bachelor of Arts in Political Science, minor in International Studies**

17. Professional license or certificate: **Yes**
18. **Qualification:** My experience with the City of Clearwater and private sector has provided me an opportunity to hone my urban planning and legal skills. I am interested in volunteering with the Citizen's Advisory Committee, so that I can put those skills to potentially effectuating policies that help Hillsborough County develop in a responsible, resilient manner. As Clearwater’s land-use/zoning attorney, I addressed a diversity of development-related legal issues. I aided Clearwater in implementing the largest rezoning in the history of Pinellas County. The U.S. 19 Redevelopment Project laid the foundation toward helping the U.S. 19 portion of the city grow to its best economic potential. Clearwater’s city council is also in the process of implementing a proposed master plan known as "Imagine Clearwater." This master plan can also really be transformative for Clearwater’s urban core, and I actively counseled the city’s Planning Department in anticipating legal issues that could impact the eventual adoption of “Imagine Clearwater.” I have experience drafting ordinances, comprehensive plans, and a litany of other development-related documents. I have worked very closely with local government staff, elected officials, and Clearwater’s development community in multiple facets. I also represented the Planning Department before Clearwater’s Community Development Board in quasi-judicial and legislative hearings. I have extensive experience and understanding of “Government in the Sunshine” and Florida’s expansive public records laws. Experience in these two areas are key to effective urban planning in this state. To help bolster my experience, I completed my Master of Urban and Regional Planning (M.U.R.P) from the University of South Florida. As an attorney—planner, this provides me the technical know-how regarding land use and zoning matters and further enhances my knowledge of land use/zoning and local government law. I am also fully fluent in Spanish and can read and write equally as effectively. As a Latino, I feel I could also bring my unique perspective to Hillsborough’s CAC. I would really appreciate your consideration for my involvement in this position. Cordially, /s/ Camilo A. Soto, Esq.

19. **Schedule conflicts:** No,

20. **Organizations I am a member of:** Sigma Lambda Beta International Fraternity, 1997 - present Florida Bar, 2006 - present American Planning Association, 2014 - present

21. **Selling goods and services to Hillsborough County, Tampa, Temple Terrace or Plant City:** No
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
It's TIME Hillsborough Survey

**Presenter**
Committee Liaison

**Summary**

This June 2019, the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) kicks off the next phase of its public engagement campaign, collecting input on specific types of projects Hillsborough residents want to see in the county’s 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan.

**Book an It’s TIME Hillsborough presentation now**
We are scheduling presentations now for community groups and neighborhood associations meeting in June and July. May we schedule you?

**Take and share the online survey in June and July**
Contact us, we’ll send you a [direct link](#), along with information to share with your colleagues, friends and neighbors.

You’ll have an opportunity to respond online and at community meetings. [Survey](#) found at: [www.planhillsborough.org/2045lrtp](http://www.planhillsborough.org/2045lrtp)

Survey participants will be eligible for prizes:
- One pair of tickets to Rays;
- One pair of tickets to Bucs;
- One pair of tickets to Lightning.

If you know someone else who wants to participate, please share the link with your family, friends, neighbors, and local businesses. Together we can create a vision for Hillsborough County.

**Recommended Action**
Take the survey.

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

**Attachments**
Flyer
IT’S TIME TO TAKE A SURVEY ON THE FUTURE OF TRANSPORTATION IN HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

YOU COULD WIN TICKETS TO THE RAYS, BUCS, OR LIGHTNING
THANKS TO OUR SPONSORS:

BEASLEY MEDIA GROUP, LLC

NEWSRADIO WFLA

Take and share the survey at planhillsborough.org/2045lrtp/
The Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) directs federal and state dollars towards transportation projects we value. It looks out at least 20 years and is updated every five years. The LRTP, which will be adopted in November 2019, identifies future projects recommended for state and federal funding.

CREATE GROWTH SCENARIOS
Why It’s TIME! Tampa Bay is growing up. We feel it every day as traffic congestion worsens and commutes get longer. Add another one million people to the region over the next 20 years, and it’s easy to see why It’s TIME to address our mobility needs.

ESTABLISH GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
You spoke, we listened. With input received from nearly 10,000 citizens in the It’s TIME Tampa Bay survey, the MPO developed goals and objectives for how we want our region to grow.

IDENTIFY NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS
What is It’s TIME Hillsborough? The Hillsborough MPO is collecting input on what specific projects Hillsborough residents want to see.

PLAN ADOPTION
November 5, 2019 at 9:00 am
Meeting of the Hillsborough MPO Board
Hillsborough County Center
601 E. Kennedy Blvd., 2nd Floor

For more information or to request a presentation for your community group, contact Lisa Silva silval@plancom.org.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Temple Terrace Low Speed Electric Vehicle Study

**Presenter**
Wade Reynolds, MPO Staff

**Summary**
The City of Temple Terrace, which has historic roots as a golf course centered community, currently allows golf carts on city streets, but is bisected by two state roads. This causes portions of the city to be disconnected from the golf courses and limits the ability of residents to use golf carts for other tasks such as shopping for groceries. Golf cart crossings of state roads are restricted by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) based on speed, volume, number of lanes, and other factors. Based on this need, the City of Temple Terrace requested a study to examine connections for golf carts across state roads.

The Temple Terrace Low Speed Electric Vehicle Study has evaluated the locations of crossings on 56th Street and Fowler Avenue. This study is focused primarily on golf carts and evaluating speed, volume, and crash data to determine whether one or more locations would meet FDOT warrants for a crossing, and if not, what variations to the standards will be required. Seven crossing locations were evaluated with input from Temple Terrace staff and FDOT.

**Recommended Action**
Recommend approval to MPO Board

**Prepared By**
Wade Reynolds, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
Draft Presentation
Draft Update
05.23.19
Project Overview

• Purpose:
  • 7 potential intersections for low speed electric vehicle crossings
    • East Fowler Avenue
    • 56th Street

• Other Florida Examples:
  • Dunedin
  • Sun City

• Fowler Avenue Project
Registered Golf Carts

• Current Registrations:
  • Total: 579 from 2013 - 2019

• Registration Clusters:
  • Whiteway Dr/Druid Hills Rd & Gillette Ave
  • Temple Terrace Golf Course

• City following up with survey
A = Temple Heights Rd at 56th St
B = Mission Hills Dr at 56th St
C = Serena Dr/Druid Hills Rd at 56th St
D = Whiteway Dr at 56th St
E = Raintree Blvd at E Fowler Ave
F = Gillette Ave at E Fowler Ave
G = Hillsborough River at E Fowler Ave
Temple Heights Road at 56th Street

Opportunities:
- Utilize right turn lane as a shared bicycle and golf cart lane
- Consider easement on the east of the intersection
  - Permission from Frontier & Church

Constraints:
- Sidewalks are close to the street near 56th street; pavers on sidewalk
- Drainage concerns
- Lack of a pedestrian crossing on the North side
- Eastbound and westbound travel lanes do not have exclusive left turn lanes
- Steeper grades East and West of intersection
- Church owns property on east side
Temple Heights Road at 56th Street

Traffic Counts:
- AM Peak Hour 9:00 AM
  - Eastbound: 143
  - Westbound: 14
- PM Peak Hour 7:30 PM
  - Eastbound: 100
  - Westbound: 7

Crash Data (2014 – 2018)
- Total: 40
- Rear End: 20
- Angle: 6
- Pedestrian: 2
- Sideswipe: 3

Crossing Distance
- Crosswalk measures about 68 feet on 56th Street
- 2 thru lanes & 1 left turn lane on 56th Street

*Crashes not shown are located outside of picture boundary*
Mission Hills Drive at 56th St

Opportunities:

- Good amount of right-of-way and separation of sidewalk

Challenges

- Utility conflicts at the intersection, less space with utility poles
- Westbound travel lanes does not have exclusive left turn lane
Mission Hills Drive at 56th Street

Traffic Counts:
AM Peak Hour 7:00 AM
- Eastbound: 89
- Westbound: 89
PM Peak Hour 5:00 PM
- Eastbound: 88
- Westbound: 68

Crash Data (2014 – 2018)
- Total: 28
- Rear End: 11
- Angle: 7
- Left-Turn: 5

Crossing Distance
- Crosswalk measures about 73 feet on 56th Street
- 2 thru lanes & 1 left-turn lane on 56th Street

Main Crash Types for Intersection
- Orange circle: Angle
- Blue triangle: Rear End

*Crashes not shown are located outside of picture boundary
Serena Drive/Druid Hills Rd at 56th Street

Opportunities:
• Consider RRFB or HAWK for school crossing, not a golf cart crossing

Challenges:
• Would require a mid-block crossing
  • Crossing hasn’t been warranted in the past
Serena Drive/Druid Hills Road at 56th Street

Traffic Counts:
- N/A

Crash Data (2014 – 2018)
- Total: 40
- Bike/Pedestrian: 4
- Angle: 20
- Rear End: 7
- Hit-Fixed Object: 4

Crossing Distance
- No traffic signal or marked crosswalk on 56th street
- Crosswalk measures about 72 feet from curb to curb
- 2 thru lanes & 1 left-turn lane in each direction on 56th street
  - 1 right-turn lane North side

Main Crash Types for Intersection
- Angle
- Rear End
- Hit Fixed Object
- Pedestrian

*Crashes not shown are located outside of picture boundary
Whiteway Dr at 56th Street

Opportunities:
- Decrease turn radii
- Good amount of right-of-way and separation of sidewalk
- Connects Greco Softball Complex
  - Additional coordination with the City of Tampa
- Connects to Temple Terrace Family Recreation

Challenges:
- Buffer decreases between sidewalk and roadway at Holland Ave
- Large turn radii

Traffic Counts:
- AM Peak Hour 9:00 AM
  - Eastbound: 139
  - Westbound: 150
- PM Peak Hour 7:30 PM
  - Eastbound: 148
  - Westbound: 89

Constraints:
- None
Whiteway Drive at 56th Street

Traffic Counts:
- AM Peak Hour 9:00 AM
  - Eastbound: 139
  - Westbound: 150
- PM Peak Hour 7:30 PM
  - Eastbound: 148
  - Westbound: 89

Crash Data (2014 – 2018)
- Total: 83
- Bike/Pedestrian: 5
- Angle: 34
- Rear End: 26
- Left Turn: 6

Crossing Distance
- Crosswalk measures about 144 feet on 56th Street
- 4 thru lanes & 2 turn lanes in each direction on 56th Street
Raintree Blvd and East Fowler Ave

Opportunities:

- Close to several commercial options at E Fowler Ave & 56th Street
- Potential to decrease posted speed
- Good connection to Linwood Park
  - Address missing sidewalks
- Mix golf carts with traffic (on Raintree Blvd)
  - Bicycle lane/shoulder along Raintree Blvd
  - 62nd Street – narrow sidewalks & West side gaps

Challenges:

- Discuss with FDOT ability to run golf carts on sidewalks for approximately 120’
  - Wider multi-use path to accommodate
- No crossings on west side
- AM Peak Hour exceeds 200 vehicles per hour
- Golf Cart crossings not permitted at “T” intersections
- Crossing exceeds more than 5 lanes of traffic
Main Crash Types for Intersection

- Angle
- Bike
- Sideswipe

*Crashes not shown are located outside of picture boundary

Raintree Blvd and East Fowler Ave

Traffic Counts:
AM Peak Hour 7:00 AM
- Southbound: 256
PM Peak Hour 4:30 PM
- Southbound: 137

Crossing Distance
- Crosswalk measures about 137 feet across E Fowler Ave
- 4 lanes East and 5 lanes West on E Fowler Ave

Crash Data (2014 – 2018)
- Total: 67
- Bike/Pedestrian: 1
- Rear End: 39
- Sideswipe: 6
- Angle: 7
Gillette Ave and East Fowler Ave

Opportunities:
• Consider wide sidewalks on both sides of Gillette
• Potential to decrease posted speed
• Wider crossings along Fowler
  • Extend nose on eastern side of intersection

Challenges:
• Have to cross a 6 lane state roadway
• Southbound traffic does not have exclusive left turn lane
• Crossing exceeds more than 5 lanes of traffic
• Sidewalks don’t meet the 8 foot minimum FDOT requirement
  • Narrow on the west side with columns (3’2’’)
  • Slight buffer between the street and sidewalk (3’6’’).
Main Crash Types for Intersection

- **Orange Circle**: Pedestrian
- **Blue Triangle**: Rear End
- **Purple Pentagon**: Hit Fixed Object
- **Purple Triangle**: Left-Turn

*Crashes not shown are located outside of picture boundary

---

**Gillette Ave and East Fowler Ave**

**Traffic Counts:**
- **AM Peak Hour 7:00 AM**
  - Northbound: 192
  - Southbound: 36
- **PM Peak Hour 5:00 PM**
  - Northbound: 142
  - Southbound: 30

**Crash Data (2014 – 2018)**
- Total: 51
- Rear End: 35
- Angle: 5

**Crossing Distance**
- Crosswalk measures about 118 feet across E Fowler Ave
- 4 lanes East and 4 lanes West on E Fowler Ave

---

**DRAFT**
Hillsborough River at Fowler Avenue

Opportunities:
- Connection to 114th Avenue
- Connection to Riverhills Drive
- Potential to decrease posted speed
- Potential underpass underneath Fowler
  - No crossings needed
  - No intersection AADT requirement

Traffic Counts:
AM Peak Hour 7:00 AM
- Northbound: 455
- Southbound: 388
PM Peak Hour 5:00 PM
- Northbound: 584
- Southbound: 353

Challenges:
- Coordination with the County
- Running golf carts on Gail Drive
- Riverhills Drive Connection
- Northbound and southbound AM/PM Peak Hour traffic counts exceed 200 vehicles per hour.
- Analyze feasibility of path underneath bridge
  - Grade to the south of the bridge
April FDOT Meeting Recap

Overall Comments:
• Review additional demand data
• City responsibility for all intersection improvements
• All registered golf carts must have a turn signal
• Hillsborough County will need to change its ordinances to allow golf carts on County Roads
• ‘After’ safety study takes place 1 year after installation of improvements.

56th Street Overall Comments:
• FDOT to review signal timing plans
• Will need standard golf cart crossing signs on the side streets only
• Propose 1 recommended 56th street crossing proposal be sent to FDOT

Fowler Avenue Overall Comments:
• More challenging to cross intersection with golf carts
• Reference the Traffic Engineering Manual for all location crossings
• FDOT would prefer a different crossing location than Raintree Boulevard
# Crossing Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Golf Cart Crossing and Operation on State Highways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Signalized Intersection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Heights Rd. at 56th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Hills Dr. at 56th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteway Dr. at 56th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raintree Blvd. at E. Fowler Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette Ave. at E. Fowler Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough River at E. Fowler Ave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Warrants H and I are considered in design phase and implementation.*

---

**Full Signalized Intersections Criteria**

To be considered for a golf cart crossing at a roadway intersection with full signal control, the location along any state road shall meet the following criteria:

(A) Side street maximum vehicular volume 1,500 ADT and AM/PM Peak Hour not to exceed 200 vehicles per hour single direction.

(B) Side street posted speed limit or 85th percentile intersection approach speed is 35 miles per hour or less.

(C) Maximum crossing distance equal to five (5) lanes or less not including any right turn lanes, bike lanes and crosswalks.

(D) Side street approaches should have at least one (1) exclusive left turn lane and at least one (1) exclusive through or shared through-right turn lane.

Other lane approach configurations will be considered on case-by-case basis.

(E) Side street intersection alignment shall be a 90 degrees (not more than 105 degrees) angle to the mainline tangent. Skewed or offset intersections are not recommended for golf cart crossings.

(F) Golf carts shall not use pedestrian crosswalks or sidewalk ramps for the purpose of crossing the mainline state road.

(G) Golf cart crossings are not permitted at “Y” intersections.

(H) For existing signalized “Y” intersections, a proposed forth leg approach and receiving lane for the exclusive use of golf cart crossing shall not be permitted.

(I) Approach traffic control signs and pavement markings shall be in accordance to MUTCD and Department’s Standard Plans, Index No. 711-001.
Next Steps
ELECTRIC VEHICLE STUDY
OLD & NEW BUSINESS
May 29, 2019

Dear Tampa Bay Elected Leaders, Partners and Project Stakeholders:

On behalf of the TBARTA Governing Board, I am sharing the results of the “MPO Regional Coordination Structure Research & Best Practices for the Tampa Bay Region” final report, unanimously approved by resolution at the TBARTA Board meeting held on May 17, 2019.

This study, funded by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District 7, included three overarching objectives, listed below. The research into these objectives was conducted by Stantec and the Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) and managed by TBARTA. A link to the full 142-page report is found on page 2 of this transmittal and summary of the recommendations on page 5.

**MPO Research Overarching Objectives**

1. Define successful Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Regional Coordination;
2. Outline barriers to achieving that success, and;
3. Develop implementable scenarios to achieving success.

In addition to the consultant’s research, recommendations were developed with contributions from agencies and officials within and outside of the Tampa Bay region. Over 20 regional transportation planning agencies outside Florida provided their input through interviews and peer-to-peer exchanges, including MPOs, Regional Councils of Governments (COGs), and Departments of Transportation (DOTs). Results were vetted through a committee that included staff from the six individual MPOs in Tampa Bay, as well as the Urban Land Institute (ULI), the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TBRPC), FDOT District 7, and the Tampa Bay Partnership. Six public workshops were also conducted to build further consensus around the most feasible short-term and long-term strategies for streamlining and improving the metropolitan planning process on a regional scale.

The entire report is being provided to the boards of each Tampa Bay MPO, FDOT Districts 1 and 7, the Bay Area Legislative Delegation (BALD), the Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development (TTED) Committees of the Florida House and Senate, House and Senate Leadership, and participants in the project Study Management Team (SMT).
The full final report is available at

If you have any questions about the study, please contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Michael A Case
Principal Planner and Project Manager

Attached: A Resolution Accepting the MPO Regional Coordination and Best Practices Final Report
MPO Research Summary: Pathways to Better Regional Coordination and/or Consolidation
TAMPA BAY AREA REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

RESOLUTION NO. 2019-05

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING
THE MPO REGIONAL COORDINATION
AND BEST PRACTICES STUDY
FINAL REPORT

WHEREAS, the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transit Authority ("TBARTA") is an agency of the State of Florida created to plan, implement, develop, finance, construct, own, operate, maintain and manage multimodal systems in Hernando, Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco, and Pinellas Counties; and

WHEREAS, TBARTA’s purpose is to improve mobility and expand multimodal transportation options for passengers and freight throughout its five-county region; and

WHEREAS, to achieve its purpose, TBARTA regularly coordinates with multiple partners across the region, including but not limited to local transit agencies, the Florida Department of Transportation ("FDOT") Districts 1 and 7, and the individual Metropolitan Planning Organizations ("MPOs") of Citrus-Hernando, Pasco, Pinellas, Hillsborough, Sarasota-Manatee and Polk Counties, whom together comprise the TBARTA MPOs Chairs Coordinating Committee ("TBARTA MPOs CCC"), as well as the Transportation Management Area ("TMA") Leadership Group, whose membership includes the MPOs of Pinellas, Pasco and Hillsborough; and

WHEREAS, as described in its enabling statute, TBARTA provides administrative support and direction to the TBARTA MPOs CCC, whose main purposes include developing coordination mechanisms with one another to expand and improve transportation, and reviewing all proposed regionally significant transportation projects that affect more than one of its eight counties; and

WHEREAS, on June 27, 2017, the Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA") and Federal Transit Administration ("FTA") issued a joint proposed rulemaking (hereinafter "Proposed Rule") that would require multiple MPOs sharing an urbanized area to consider merging their Metropolitan Planning Area’s ("MPAs"), or alternatively, coordinate to prepare unified planning products where the size and complexity of the MPA justifies maintaining multiple MPOs in a single MPA; and

WHEREAS, the MPOs of Pasco, Pinellas and Hillsborough (hereinafter "Core MPOs") sponsored a public workshop on May 12, 2017 (hereinafter "First Workshop"), to develop an understanding of the desired benefits, outcomes and guiding principles of greater regional coordination between MPOs and their partners in response to the Proposed Rule, which was rescinded on the same day; and

WHEREAS, the Florida Department of Transportation, District 7, recognizing the value of greater regional coordination, funded TBARTA to manage a study that builds on the
results of the First Workshop, and develop options for improving regional coordination and responsibility between the Core MPOs, with effective mechanisms for providing consistent, relevant information to elected officials and the public, based on examination of identified peer regions and nationwide best practices; and

WHEREAS, TBARTA contracted with Stantec and the Center for Urban Transportation Research (hereinafter “Consultants”) to achieve the above objectives, as well as conduct additional public workshops to develop consensus around coordination issues and alternatives for addressing them, and ultimately recommend short-term and long-term recommendations for implementing policy and organizational modifications that improve results and achieve common goals; and

WHEREAS, on April 26, 2019, the Consultants presented the completed final report to the TBARTA Governing Board for its review and acceptance to close out the project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the TBARTA Governing Board that:

1. TBARTA has received the final report and all other documentation as described in the contract with the Consultants, and has verified the thoroughness and accuracy of its completion; and

2. The TBARTA Governing Board formally accepts the final report as provided by the Consultant, closing the project; and

3. TBARTA shall provide electronic copies of this resolution and the final report to each MPO Board in TBARTA’s service area, as well as FDOT Districts 1 and 7, Florida Senate and House leadership, members of the Transportation, Tourism and Economic Development (TTED) committees, and members of the Bay Area Legislative Delegation (“BALD”); and

4. TBARTA will continue to make the final report and all other technical project documentation available on its website.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the TBARTA Governing Board on this 17th day of May 2019.

FOR THE BOARD: ATTEST:

JIM HOLTON, Chairman Commissioner Janet Long, Secretary-Treasurer
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Appendix D

Content Analysis: Correspondence and Comments Received for June 12, 2018 Public Hearing to Adopt TIP

Introduction

NVivo qualitative analysis software was used to code the content of all emails, voicemails, Facebook comments submitted on the TIP ‘events’ page, and public comments made during the public hearing. The correspondence received does not necessarily constitute a representative sample of the general public.

Leading up to the June 12th, 2018 public hearing on the TIP adoption, the MPO received 39 emails, 6 Facebook comments, and 6 voicemail messages. At the hearing, 39 speakers provided public comment, 3 written comments were submitted to the record, and 1 comment was entered into the live chatroom.

General Overview of Email & Facebook Comments

Many of the email comments received were templated responses that had been pre-prepared for commenters. In journalistic parlance, pre-prepared letters are often disdainfully referred to as “astroturf,” which reinforces the perception that such responses are “canned” and may be indicative of an artificial grass-roots campaign.¹ Advocates of templated responses, on the other hand, argue that pre-prepared letters are a useful tool for encouraging public participation and staying on-message.²,³ Many of the pre-prepared letters received in 2018 specifically identified safety improvements to be implemented along Bayshore Blvd, a corridor in Tampa which experienced two high-profile pedestrian fatalities just weeks before the TIP hearing. Several additional letters were pre-prepared with a different template and identified safety-related problems and solutions in the Tampa Heights and Seminole Heights neighborhoods.

The prevalence of templated responses compared to ‘unique’ responses suggests a proliferation of organized campaigns focusing on specific calls-to-action at the corridor or neighborhood-level. Of the 39 emails received, 20 were templated letters related to a campaign entitled, Make Bayshore Safe. Another 8 emails were templated letters related to a safety campaign focusing on the Tampa Heights and Seminole Heights neighborhoods.

Themes Emerging from Email & Facebook Comments

The most common themes emerging from the emails and Facebook posts received include:

- Traffic
  - “Closing traffic lanes”
  - “Traffic flow”

Across these comments, the theme of traffic occurred most frequently. The frequency is attributable to its appearance in a line of text from the pre-prepared letters asking for “a study of pedestrian safety on Bayshore…including the option of closing traffic lanes…”. Others advocate for safety improvements at the intersection of Hillsborough Ave and Florida Ave in order to “improve traffic flow.” See Figure 1 below.
Figure 1: Textual Word Tree of the comments related to ‘traffic’ and its stemmed words. The larger font size indicates that a sub-theme emerged, which was often stemmed to the predominant theme.

Like the previous two years, safety was again cited as one of, if not the most, critical/important issue for the region, especially with respect to the future development of the region. Commenters sympathize with the calls-to-action for implementing car-centric safety improvements along Bayshore Blvd, while simultaneously expressing that Tampa’s safety challenges are multimodal and not limited to a single corridor. In these emails and Facebook posts, the theme of complete streets is often connected to safety-related comments, which extoll the Vision Zero initiative and advocate for an expanded Compete Streets program to address safety issues.

**General Overview of In-person Comments and Written Comments**
During the live public comment period at the TIP hearing, 39 speakers signed up to speak. An additional three hearing attendees opted to submit their comments in written form rather than speaking at the podium. Finally, one comment was submitted to board members using the online chat forum. While many of the comments made in-person at the hearing echoed the themes which emerged from the emails and Facebook posts, references were also made to conversations about the future of Tampa Bay Next being dragged out over several years; requests that Complete Streets projects be elevated as top priorities of the TIP; and, multiple requests for installation of more traffic signals.

**General Overview of Public Comments at the TIP Public Hearing**

The 2018-2019 TIP Public Hearing was held on June 12, 2018 in the County Center building. Thirty-nine members of the public signed up to offer comments to the Board regarding projects included in the TIP.

Following MPO staff’s presentation of the *Transportation Improvement Program Annual Update*, public comment was offered prior to Board action on the TIP.

Figure 2, shown below, is a word cloud indicating the 100 most frequently occurring concepts found in the entirety of comments submitted, including in-person comments, emails, Facebook posts, written comments, voicemail messages, and chatroom comments. Larger words appear more frequently than smaller words.

**Discussion**

For the 2018-2019 TIP hearing, comments regarding the Tampa Bay Next initiative were not as abundant as during the previous two years, perhaps due to FDOT’s improved community engagement program. During the 2017-2018 TIP hearing, 55 commenters issued remarks related to Tampa Bay Next projects. According to the MPO’s estimate, 10 commenters expressed support while 45 expressed disapproval of the initiative. For 2018-2019, however, only a handful of commenters mentioned the Tampa Bay Next initiative or the Supplemental Environmental Impact Study (SEIS) on the Downtown Interchange. One commenter asked the
MPO Board to remove Tampa Bay Next projects from the TIP, while another criticized FDOT’s conduct regarding the SEIS, namely that the study is “improper” and that the maps presented to the public during SEIS outreach are not accurately displaying the City of Tampa.

The content analysis performed in 2017 noted that “the vastly-diminished number of comments received may be an indication of the community’s collective weariness with the process, also known as ‘activism burnout.’ Several studies have found that those engaged/involved in public activism may find the lengthy process to be a significant stressor, often leading to mental exhaustion and withdrawal from their activism.4,5 Given that the TBX project experienced a reset, and as mentioned earlier, it may also be possible that the community is adopting a wait-and-see approach toward Tampa Bay Next.

In light of that assessment, it appears that this year comments have shifted priorities toward safety advocacy, specifically for pedestrians and cyclists. Recent high-profile crashes have engaged a different segment of the community to provide comments toward the TIP than those who appeared in previous years to discuss TBX and Tampa Bay Next. Unlike the interstate modernization projects, safety is a populist and unifying priority, and one which may continue to motivate community members to become more engaged in transportation planning in the future.

---


ADDENDUM ITEMS
CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

The MPO Chairman, Commissioner Les Miller, called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m., led the pledge of allegiance and gave the invocation. The regular monthly meeting was held at the County Center in the 2nd Floor Boardroom.

The following members were present:

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

The following members were absent:

Mayor Rick Lott and Cindy Stuart.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – April 2, 2019

A motion was made by Commissioner Overman to approve the minutes of April 2, 2019. The motion was seconded by Councilman Maniscalco and carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Doug Jessup commented on the Tampa Bay Next Update agenda item.

Mr. Rick Fernandez commented on Tampa Bay Next and the Boulevard Tampa Project and the MPO’s Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) motion to further study the Boulevard Project. He requested removal of Sections 6 and 7 from the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Mr. Chris Vela provided comments regarding the Boulevard Project and line 29 of the TIP. He would like to see the merger study removed from documentation of the Annual Joint Certification of the Hillsborough MPO.

Ms. Connie Burton thought the BOCC was meeting and came to thank them for the 5.2 million dollars that was set aside for a housing initiative. Ms. Burton commented on the 40th Street business district and the possible shutdown of the Floribraska exit. She expressed concerns about the economic impacts on well needed communities.

Mr. Ron Weaver expressed concerns regarding congestion relief for I-275 North.
Chairman Miller introduced Bill Roberts, CAC Chair, who was in attendance to satisfy the request from Board members to have CAC committee reports presented in person by the CAC Chair or a designated member. Commissioner Miller informed the group that he had an opportunity to attend and have a discussion with the CAC at their first informal evening workshop, which was a request from the CAC members.

Mr. Roberts thanked the Board for the opportunity to present CAC reports in person. His report was included in the board member folders. The committee approved TIP amendments and an amendment to the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). In addition, the committee had a robust discussion on the Boulevard concept, which resulted in a motion to the Board to approve further study of the project.

Following Mr. Robert’s update, Commissioner Overman suggested that board members attend a CAC meeting if they have not had an opportunity to attend one of the meetings. She thanked the entire committee and staff that supports the committee for the work. Commissioner Kemp thanked the CAC for their expertise and is looking forward to the monthly in person reports from the committee. Mr. Robert’s stated that he will relay comments to the committee.

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

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) approved Action Items on the MPO Board agenda.

The Bicycle – Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) passed a motion supporting the CAC’s motion on the Boulevard Concept and asked that impacts on pedestrians and cyclists be included as part of the study. The committee also approved and forwarded items that appear on the MPO Board’s Consent Agenda, as well as, a letter requesting the Tampa Police Department to speak to the committee regarding their policies on car parking on sidewalks and in bicycle lanes. Wanda Vinson was appointed to the committee as a Member At Large.

The committees received presentations on the Tampa Bay Next update and the Transportation Sales Surtax. The committee offered to act as a sounding board at any time needed during the Independent Oversight Committee process.

The Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Committee discussed the data and analytics platform and will be forming a working group to get into details to develop a scope.

The Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board (TDCB) re-approved the 2019/2020 raters per trip for Sunshine Line. Overall rates per trip, effective July 1, 2019, will increase one dollar over the current fiscal year and customer co-pays are not affected. The TDCB also approved its Grievance Procedures, noting that there have been no complaints in the last 10 years regarding Sunshine Line’s services.

The MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee discussed the Regional Chapter of the upcoming Long Range Transportation Plans (LRTP). Members expressed interest in creating a stand-alone regional LRTP next year. The regional document will include the tri-county vision created by Hillsborough, Pinellas and Pasco MPOs, and the relationship between the tri-county area and the adjacent MPOs to the north, south, and east. There was discussion of the evolving relationship between TBARTA and the MPOs. TBARTA is focusing on its Regional Transit Development Plan. The next meeting of the MPO Chairs will be held on July 19, 2019 at the Florida Hospital Ice Center in Pasco County. There will be a briefing on Pasco’s Connected City Project and a welcome from Commissioner Kathryn Starkey.

The following people’s email remarks, in full, were provided to board members with their meeting material:

MPO Meeting of May 8, 2019 – Page 2
Ms. Michele Cookson shared a Facebook post requesting that the CAC recommendations be included for the Boulevard Study and removal of item 29 from the TIP. In addition, she opposed a merger of the MPOs.

Ms. Ingrid Jacoba’s Facebook comments asked that the CSX rail lines be bought to link USF to Downtown. In addition, she does not want Tampa Bay Next funded, would like to see a “No Build” option, and the Boulevard concept be developed. She would like to see Vision Zero objectives made a reality.

Mr. Fernandez’s Facebook posts referenced a motion to approve a study of the Boulevard Concept and requested removal of Sections 6 and 7 from the LRTP.

Mr. Mauricio Rosas emailed and shared a video clip regarding a speeding vehicle crashing into a home in Seminole Heights. He also shared a link from Josh Frank’s presentation of the Tampa Heights Civic Association.

Ms. Lena Young Green emailed regarding best complete streets policies.

Ms. Kaitlyn Ranze shared concerns regarding problems on Symmes Road between US41 and Highway301.

Mr. Joe Bohn thanked Wade Reynolds for a great presentation to USF students.

Mr. Eric Goldstein thanked Beth Alden for taking time to address members of the Westchase Community Association.

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

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A. Committee Appointments
B. Letter Requested by BPAC on Parking in Bike Lanes

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

**ACTION ITEMS**

A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment for HART Grants

Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, presented information on two amendments to the TIP on HART grants that were received. The $1,000,000 resilience grant from FDOT will be used to repair damaged infrastructure. HART’s Transit Oriented Development (TOD) grant will fund a joint study with Plan Hillsborough and the City of Tampa to revise the TOD policies within the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The study will focus on the Florida and Fowler corridors and coordinate with ongoing efforts. $800,000 are funds from Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and $200,000 are local funds.

There was no discussion or questions following the presentation.

A motion was made by David Mechanik to approve the TIP Amendment. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Overman. Upon a roll call vote, the motion carried 14-0.

B. Unified Planning Work Program Amendment: Annual Update & New Surtax Funds for Planning
Allison Yeh, MPO Staff, presented information on amendments to the UPWP. The administrative document outlines the MPO’s major planning tasks and documents federal, state, and local funding between the MPO, HART, and FDOT.

The CAC Committee requested added to Task 2, in Corridor/Subarea/Environmental Studies section – a study of the I-275 Boulevard Conversion Concept in FY20, and the BPAC Committee supported the CAC’s request.

Following the presentation, Commissioner Smith wanted to make sure that the BPAC’s request to include the impacts on pedestrians and cyclists in included in Task 2 as well. Ms. Yeh stated that all of the information will be included in the project scope.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Kemp made a motion to approve and add committee requested information to the UPWP. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Overman.**

Commissioner Kemp stated that she would like to see a Transportation Equity Planner added to review equity issues, as well as, transportation disadvantaged.

**Following brief discussion, the motion carried unanimously.**

**C. Annual Joint Certification of the MPO**

Mr. Rich Clarendon presented information on the MPO/FDOT yearly joint certification. He pointed out the It’s Time Tampa Bay survey; Vision Zero efforts; Resilient Tampa Bay; the School Safety Study; and the Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit as notable achievements. Recommendations included eliminating duplicate projects and funding from the TIP; establishing a review process for grant invoices; and considering committee effectives and time management. There were no corrective actions recommended.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Kemp to support re-certification of the MPO and authorization for the MPO Chairman to sign a Joint Certification Statement. The motion was seconded by Councilman Maniscalco.**

There was brief discussion following the motion.

Following additional discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

**STATUS REPORTS**

**A. Tampa Bay Next Update**

Secretary David Gwynn, FDOT District 7, provided the update on Tampa Bay Next. The Howard Frankland Bridge is currently in an active procurement for the design-build project and plan to award the contract in late 2019. Construction will begin in 2020 with an anticipated completion of 2024. The SEIS process began in early 2017 and viable alternatives are being refined through the process. There are two TIS Alternatives Workshops being held: (1) May 21 at the Cuban Club from 5:30 – 7:30 p.m. and (2) May 23 at the Tampa Marriott Westshore located at 1001 N. Westshore Boulevard in Tampa. A public hearing is anticipated in early 2020.

**B. 2045 Plan Need Assessment for Major Projects**

Mr. Wally Blain, Tindale Oliver, MPO Consultant presented information on the 2045 LRTP. The LRTP must be cost-feasible, reflect local priorities, and look at least twenty years into the future (effectively a 25-
year horizon). A public hearing for the MPO to adopt its 2045 Plan is scheduled for Tuesday, November 5, 2019 and a draft will be made available 30 days in advance for public review.

Following the presentation, there was brief discussion.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Ms. Alden informed board members of the FY19 – Quarter 3 Review that was provided in their meeting material. The next Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group will be held on June 7 in Pasco County. The next MPO Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 11 and is the Public Hearing for the TIP.

**OLD & NEW BUSINESS**

Mayor Jurado thanked Beth Alden and Gena Torres and other MPO staff who forwarded to the City of Temple Terrace the benefits of street painting. The City of Temple Terrace are having their first project of street painting on Saturday, May 18 with the goal of calming traffic, safety and beautification.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A quorum was lost during the meeting. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:57 a.m.
Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on May 15

Under public comment, five citizens commented on the TIP, urging the MPO not to prioritize improvements to the downtown interchange or the section of I-275 north of Downtown Tampa.

Under action items, the CAC voted to:

✓ Recommend by an 11 – 2 vote an amendment of the Imagine 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for FAST Act Consistency, and eliminating express toll lanes on I-275 Section 7 north of downtown Tampa; however,
  • The CAC did not concur with the PD&E preferred alternative of adding two general use lanes in place of the express toll lanes;
✓ Unanimously recommend approval of a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendment for a Pedestrian Crosswalk at Florida and Idlewild;
✓ Recommend the FY20–FY24 TIP, by a vote of 11–1, with the following revisions to the draft priority list:
  • By a vote of 9–3, to strike priorities #40 (Big Bend Rd ext.) and #44 (widening Balm Rd) due to concern about promoting sprawl development;
  • By a vote of 10–2, to strike priorities #27 (I-275 from north of MLK to Bearss Ave) and #28 (safety and operational improvements to the downtown interchange) because the surrounding community has spoken against further capacity expansion;
  • Members also expressed concern about making revisions to the draft list of TIP priorities after the draft is distributed to the committee for review.

The CAC also received a status report on the Needs Assessment for the 2045 update of the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Under new business, the CAC voted to recommend that the MPO consider the following rules for public comments for tonight’s TIP Hearing:

✓ Speakers should be allowed more time if they represent groups of not more than four people who have signed up to speak;
✓ Allow not more than 15 minutes per group;
✓ Allow not less than 2 minutes per individual speaker.
✓ You do not have to be present to donate time as long as a signature is there indicated that the time was donated.
Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on May 20

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

- ✓ Imagine 2040 Plan Amendment for Tampa Bay Next Section 7 PD&E and FAST Act Consistency: the TAC chose to take two actions, with the FAST Act Consistency amendment passing unanimously, and the Section 7 PDE amendment passing 11-1 with a concern by one member that no additional lanes should be built;
- ✓ TIP Amendment for Pedestrian Crosswalk on Florida Ave at Idlewild;
- ✓ FY20-24 Transportation Improvement Program and Priorities: was approved 11-1, with one member requesting that Line #27 be struck from the TIP.

The TAC members were engaged and interested in the status reports presented:

- 2045 Needs Assessment: members asked for a workshop – perhaps in July, instead of recessing – to review the major projects moving forward.
- THEA Connected Vehicle Pilot Phase III;
- MPO Shared Data and Analytics Platform project.

Meeting of the Policy Committee on May 21

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

- ✓ TIP Amendment for Pedestrian Crosswalk on Florida Ave at Idlewild.

The committee held a follow-up, deeper-dive discussion on the 2045 Needs Assessment for Major Projects presentation heard by the board on May 8. Members discussed the importance of street network connectivity; evaluating road improvements systemically rather than in isolation; and considering how land use decisions might affect the need (or lack of need) for specific projects.

The MPO Speed Management Study kick-off was announced, and there was brief discussion of next steps on the board’s motion to study the I-275 boulevard conversion concept.

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on May 8

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

- ✓ Reappointment of BPAC Chair Jonathan Forbes to a Citizen-at-Large seat on the Committee;
- ✓ FY20-24 Transportation Improvement Program and Priorities: was approved 13-3, with concerns that infrastructure for bicycles and pedestrians makes up only 1.4% of TIP funding.

The BPAC also heard status reports on:

- The 2045 Long Range Transportation Program needs assessment: with comments that urban sprawl needs to be addressed, and questions about parking requirements, traffic modeling, and specific corridors;
- Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) Sustainable Transportation Course projects: members appreciated the students’ out of the box ideas and proposals for different corridors in Tampa’s urban core.

The BPAC also heard a public comment from Well Bikes about their program to build bicycles for those in need.
Meeting of the Livable Roadways Advisory Committee (LRC) on May 22

The committee received three public comments asking for removal of Items #27 and #28 from the TIP Priority List. Later motions regarding both were not seconded during Action Item discussion.

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

- FY20-24 Transportation Improvement Program and Priorities, with a recommendation that the MPO work with FDOT on a comprehensive review of the I-4 interchange revisions from I-275 to 22nd Avenue, and how these changes impact the land use and adjacent areas of 14th and 15th Street, and 21st and 22nd Avenues.

- A request that the MPO Board establish a performance measure that is the percent of non-single occupancy vehicles (non-SOV) travel, and set an ambitious target for growing non-SOV trips; by doing so, they are making progress towards the other performance measure targets under congestion management, bridge wear and tear, and safety.

The LRC also heard status reports on:

- 2045 Needs Assessment
- THEA Connected Vehicle Pilot Phase III
Freight Priorities Program (FPP)
Approval of the 2019 Project List

Presented to MPOAC Freight Committee
April 30, 2019
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• Program purpose
• Overview of process
• What Funding Programs are We Trying to Influence?
• 2019 Freight Priorities Project List
• ACTION: Request Freight Committee approval
• Remaining Actions and Next Steps
Purpose of Program

• To provide MPOs with an additional opportunity to identify high priority freight projects on an annual basis, and use the MPOAC as a united voice to promote and endorse these priorities on behalf of its members, for consideration by FDOT.

Overview of Process

• Program consists of the following:
  • Each MPO can submit up to 3 freight projects
  • Projects must fall on state highway system, and be post-PD&E or PD&E underway, or PD&E funded, or project does not require PD&E (ready for design and/or construction)
  • Projects must be able to accept funds in the current work program (e.g., be unfunded, partially funded, able to accept accelerated funding)
  • Screening check list must be completed for each project and submitted to MPOAC
  • Staff need to respond to any follow up questions from consultant team
  • Project list will be developed for Florida and presented to MPOAC for approval
  • Approved list will be transmitted to FDOT to inform annual work program development activities
What Funding Programs are We Trying to Influence?

• Funding eligibility is tied to network designations
  • National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) and Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) allocations are controlled by FDOT Central Office
  • Funding for all other state highways are primarily controlled by FDOT District Offices in coordination with MPOs
  • Project list will include projects on the entire of state highway network
• Final list of projects will identify network designations to facilitate consideration by appropriate funding program(s)

Summary of Submittals

• 14 of Florida’s 27 MPOs participated, submitting a total of 30 projects
• Projects were provided by MPOs in 6 of 7 FDOT Districts
• 100 percent of projects submitted have a PD&E completed, underway, planned or not needed
• 24 projects are on designated SIS roadways and 9 are on the NHFN
• All projects support at least 3 FTP goals with two-thirds supporting 5 or more
• Funding requests totaled $2.7 billion across the 30 projects; note one project request was $1.5 billion
  • 12 asked for funding to be advanced ($375 million)
  • 15 asked for projects to be funded ($2.2 billion)
  • 3 asked for both advancement of current funds and additional funding ($87.6 million)
• List includes two of FDOT’s FY2019 INFRA project applications
### 2019 Project Priority List

**Florida Department of Transportation – District 1 (Fireight Coordinator: Keith Robbins)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>State Road</th>
<th>FHWA Number</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>POLE Status</th>
<th>NHIEN CURC CREC SIS</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Other Networks</th>
<th>FTP Goals Melt</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Match Funding</th>
<th>Defined Action</th>
<th>Renewed Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Florida Department of Transportation – District 3 (Fireight Coordinator: Holly Cohen)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>State Road</th>
<th>FHWA Number</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>POLE Status</th>
<th>NHIEN CURC CREC SIS</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Other Networks</th>
<th>FTP Goals Melt</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Match Funding</th>
<th>Defined Action</th>
<th>Renewed Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Florida Department of Transportation – District 4 (Fireight Coordinator: Aaron Young)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>State Road</th>
<th>FHWA Number</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>POLE Status</th>
<th>NHIEN CURC CREC SIS</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Other Networks</th>
<th>FTP Goals Melt</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Match Funding</th>
<th>Defined Action</th>
<th>Renewed Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Florida Department of Transportation – District 6 (Fireight Coordinator: Jeremy McNiece)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>State Road</th>
<th>FHWA Number</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>POLE Status</th>
<th>NHIEN CURC CREC SIS</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Other Networks</th>
<th>FTP Goals Melt</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Match Funding</th>
<th>Defined Action</th>
<th>Renewed Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Florida Department of Transportation – District 7 (Fireight Coordinator: Brian Hunter)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>State Road</th>
<th>FHWA Number</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>POLE Status</th>
<th>NHIEN CURC CREC SIS</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Other Networks</th>
<th>FTP Goals Melt</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Match Funding</th>
<th>Defined Action</th>
<th>Renewed Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2019 Project Priority List

**2019 Freight Priorities Program Projects Map**

---

**Legend**

- **District 1**
- **District 2**
- **District 3**
- **District 4**
- **District 5**
- **District 6**
- **District 7**
Remaining Actions

- MPOAC Freight Committee approved the 2019 Freight Priorities Project List
- Staff Directors’ approval of 2019 Freight Priorities Project List
- Governing Board approval of 2019 Freight Priorities Project List
- Transmittal of 2019 Freight Priorities Project List to FDOT

Next Steps

- Document and discuss lessons learned with Freight Committee
- Follow Up with FDOT to evaluate impact of list
- Continue to evolve the program
About the Principles.

These Sidewalk Labs Street Design Principles reflect our belief that cities can leverage new and emerging mobility technologies, such as connected and autonomous vehicles, to make their streets safer, more comfortable, and more efficient — for all modes.

Sidewalk Labs’ mission is to radically improve quality of life in cities. The ability to confidently and comfortably ride a bike or meander down the street is critical to that mission. So is the ability to get where you need to go as efficiently as possible, which often involves traveling in a vehicle. These two needs can often be at odds with each other, but while the vehicle usually wins today, the balance is starting to shift.

Many cities, like Boston and Toronto, have published Complete Streets Guidelines to promote design standards for pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and public space. In 2017, NACTO released its Blueprint for Autonomous Urbanism to “proactively guide the [self-driving vehicle] technology to prioritize people-first design.” Sidewalk Labs aims to build on these ideas by asking: “Instead of teaching new mobility services to operate on today’s streets, can we take advantage of new technologies to fundamentally redesign the street?”

This living document proposes design principles that strive to harness these advances to create safer and more flexible streets. These principles will be updated periodically based on collaboration with city planners, engineers, mobility providers, and technology companies — and by Sidewalk Labs itself, as we test designs in prototype and pilot environments.
Cities often have the worst of both worlds when it comes to street design: top speeds that create safety risks but average speeds that frustrate everyone. The common solution is often to add lanes and buffers, but that approach can do more harm than good.

Streets today are designed to allow vehicles to move quickly. But this decision requires streets to be designed defensively as well — because speed kills. As a result, engineers design wider lanes to account for drivers who drift or veer, and they design buffer spaces like shoulders, medians, and street-parking areas to try to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety. But they are not safe; more than 6,700 pedestrians and cyclists died on streets in the United States in 2017 due to automobile crashes. Neither pavement markings nor bollards are enough to protect vulnerable bicycles and pedestrians — and certainly not enough to make them feel comfortable.

This approach doesn’t help move people, either.

Despite being engineered for speed, today’s streets are often congested — and frustratingly slow. Congestion caused by double-parking and uneven distribution of traffic volume across the day leads to lower average speeds overall. In 2018, nearly every major U.S. city recorded a downtown last-mile travel speed below 20 mph. In downtown Toronto, the speed limit is 40 km/h (~25 mph), but most vehicles travel at an average speed of 24 km/h (~15 mph) — and some much slower than that. As a result, drivers and passengers are still frustrated with long, stop-and-go commutes.

One common solution is to add even more lanes, but this leads to streets that can feel empty, because they’ve been designed for the worst-case traffic scenario.

In an effort to accommodate more vehicles, engineers have defaulted to calculating the space needed to handle peak, rush-hour demand. The result is acres of pavement that are empty most of the time and are neither pleasant to walk around nor conducive to the types of welcoming urban spaces that encourage street life. Part of the reason engineers feel the need to plan for worst-case traffic scenarios is because curbs and pavement markings are set rigidly into place and unable to adapt to changing needs.

---


2 INRIX defines inner city last-mile speed as “the speed at which a driver can expect to travel one mile into the central business district during peak hours.” “INRIX 2018 Global Traffic Scorecard,” INRIX, February 2019, http://inrix.com/scorecard/.

The Opportunity.

Technology is not a cure-all solution to mobility challenges. But it offers the chance to fundamentally redesign our street system with narrower, safer streets that still get people where they need to go.

Connected and autonomous vehicles (CAVs) can be required to follow speed limits and can operate in narrow streets where lanes may appear, disappear, or change direction.

Connected vehicles are vehicles driven by people that receive warnings on speed limits, potential conflicts, hazardous conditions, and other detailed information to improve safety. Autonomous or self-driving vehicles are able to ingest this information and have the vehicle itself respond, without a person driving.

Together, CAVs can be expected to follow speed limits, stay out of areas that are restricted, and obey rules of interaction with cyclists and pedestrians. These advances also apply to e-bikes and e-scooters that could be programmed to remain in vehicle or bike lanes. Similarly, CAVs could safely travel on narrower streets that are prioritized for transit, bicycles, and pedestrians, including pedestrians using wheelchairs or other assistive devices.

Dynamic (LED-embedded) pavement and moveable street furniture can help adapt the number of lanes, the width of the sidewalk, and even the direction of the street, meaning that a narrower street can serve multiple uses based on demand.

The operation and character of a street can change daily when raised concrete curbs can be removed in favor of dynamic pavement and moveable street furniture. Several companies have started to experiment with dynamic pavement, which embeds LEDs into the surface to change the color and shapes of markings. These design features can be used to create travel lanes, bike lanes, transit lanes, or pick-up/drop-off zones. They can also be used to change a lane’s travel direction, providing more flexibility than a fixed, grade-separated curb ever could.

Spatial occupancy sensors can give cities a better understanding of street conditions by generating real-time feedback like curb space availability or congestion on a given road. That information can be communicated directly to travelers through digital signage or via integration with vehicles and navigation apps. It can also identify patterns that emerge over time, information that is critical to urban planners and traffic engineers. For example, BriskLUMINA sensor applications have helped planners in Atlanta and Pittsburgh identify intersections with higher than normal risk of pedestrian injury. Other cities have used sensors to help optimize traffic light timing.

Traffic management tools can recommend changes to lanes, speed limits, and pricing to maintain person-throughput or meet policy goals, such as Vision Zero.

Traffic management tools can make the most of roadway space and increase "person throughput," or the total amount of people traveling through an intersection, across all modes (not just vehicles). These tools include low-cost sensors, edge computing capabilities, machine-learning simulation models, and adaptive traffic signals that can adjust green times to optimize flow or prioritize certain modes. Together, these tools can form a mobility management system that can adapt to real-time street conditions by reallocating lanes and adjusting signal timings to keep all modes moving — and safe.

One promising management advance is the bicycle “green wave,” which works with adaptive traffic signals to give cyclists a premium experience. LED indicators embedded at the edge of a bicycle lane can light up in front of cyclists to form a moving green segment. The segment sets the ideal travel speed for cyclists, so they arrive at intersections when the traffic signal is green. Information on speed and green times can be communicated by fleets and navigation apps.
The Principles.

With these new capabilities in mind, Sidewalk Labs developed an overlapping network of streets, each designed to prioritize certain modes, that can improve safety and the public realm without restricting movement.

We used four principles to design four different types of streets. These principles and street types are introduced briefly here and described in greater detail on the pages that follow.

Principle 1. Tailor streets for different modes.
New capabilities make it possible to design streets that prioritize certain modes, instead of aiming to accommodate all uses at all times of day. Laneways prioritize pedestrians while Accessways prioritize cyclists. Transitways give priority to public transit through dedicated lanes and signal priority. Boulevards are intended for all modes but primarily for vehicles.

Principle 2. Separate streets by speed.
CAVs and digital navigation tools enable faster street types to focus on moving people with vehicles and public transit, and slower street types to provide a safe and active environment for cycling and walking. Laneways operate at fast walking speed of 4 mph (8 km/h) while Accessways operate at 14 mph (22 km/h) - a brisk speed for most urban cyclists. Boulevards and Transitways have a speed limit of 25 mph (40 km/h), which evidence shows is the maximum speed consistent with pedestrian safety.

Principle 3. Incorporate flexibility into street space.
Adaptable infrastructure and real-time traffic insight make it easy for lanes to become "dynamic," serving different purposes across the day. Sidewalk Labs is exploring a concept we call the "dynamic curb" which could be reserved for vehicles or converted into public space, depending on priorities. Optimizing this space requires a management system to understand demand and congestion patterns at various times and can vary depending on local policy objectives.

Principle 4. Recapture street space for the public realm, transit, bikes, and pedestrians.
CAVs, adaptable infrastructure like dynamic pavement, and moveable street furniture enable cities to recapture space once devoted to parking and vehicles. This space can be reallocated to the public realm and high person-throughput modes, such as transit, while still enabling all travelers to get where they need to go.

These principles come together in the design of four different street types.

**Laneway**
Tailored to Pedestrians
4 MPH / 8 KM/H

**Accessway**
Tailored to Bicycles
14 MPH / 22 KM/H

**Transitway**
Tailored to Transit
25 MPH / 40 KM/H

**Boulevard**
Tailored to All Modes
25 MPH / 40 KM/H
Principle 1.
Tailor streets for different modes.

Because each transportation mode is different in size, top speed, and the vulnerability of the person traveling, we designed four types of streets that each prioritize one particular mode. Streets are narrower overall and tailored to the size and speed of the priority mode that they serve, with the goal of improving safety and comfort. This principle is consistent with "complete streets" principles, as space is provided on each street for every mode except for traditional vehicles driven by people, which are restricted to streets specifically designed for their movement.

For instance, streets designed for pedestrians and cyclists allow them to travel naturally, without being hemmed into “safe zones” — instead, the majority of space on that street is dedicated for their use. Street furniture and landscaping can create changes in width and travel paths that can slow vehicles. In addition, pavement texture, color, and patterns can be used to send tactile, auditory, visual, and other accessibility cues to pedestrians. However, for this approach to reach its full potential, it is critical to ensure that vehicles follow the designated speed limits for a given street — which would require restricting access by vehicles or requiring CAVs, ebikes, and other new mobility modes to limit their speed and behavior based on rules.

All streets are designed to accommodate emergency vehicles and disabled access, as necessary.

---

**Boulevards**

Boulevards are the only street type designed to accommodate traditional vehicles, which require buffer space between other modes for safety. However, Boulevards will be designed to safely accommodate transit vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians as well.

**Transitways & Boulevards**

On Transitways, priority is given to transit vehicles — through designated lanes and signal priority — to travel at their desired speed. Bike-share and scooter-share stations are co-located with transit stops to enable convenient transfers to other modes. Transit can also travel on Boulevards, but may not be given the highest priority.

**All Streets priority on Accessways**

On Accessways, center-running bike lanes with green waves will allow comfortable cycling.

**All Streets priority on Laneways**

On Laneways, street furniture and greenery will create safe yet lively paths for pedestrians whether they are trying to get somewhere quickly or just want to stroll through the city.

**All Streets**

CAVs defer to transit, cyclists, and peds. When they have proven an ability to follow speed limits and yield to other users, CAVs will be able to use every type of street, maintaining building accessibility for those who need it.
**Principle 2.** Separate streets by speed.

Each street type is designed for the preferential speed of its priority mode. For example, the speed limit for every mode on Accessways is the average speed of a bicycle, about 14 mph (22 km/h). Streets become characterized by their speed and overall width for safety and comfort.

This design principle should translate into much greater safety, especially for cyclists and pedestrians. Research has found that collisions at 14 mph (22 km/h) may cause injury but are less likely to be fatal than ones over 30 mph (48 km/h), and a vehicle traveling at 4 mph (6 km/h) doesn’t create discomfort or a safety risk for nearby pedestrians and cyclists.4

We designed Boulevards with barriers and buffer spaces so traditional vehicles can travel at 25 mph (40 km/h) and keep other modes safe, but we restrict all other streets to connected and autonomous vehicles that can adhere to the speed limit and yield to bikes and pedestrians.

Speed limits on each type of street will lead CAVs to naturally select the faster, wider streets for the most efficient trip — as a result, the only vehicles on Laneways and Accessways are likely to be those on the final leg of a door-to-door trip.

---

Incorporate flexibility into street space.

Management tools can help traditional vehicles, CAVs, transit, and bikes flow at consistent travel speeds by reallocating flexible lanes to meet demand throughout the day. This process of optimizing streets requires several capabilities:

1. a real-time and historical understanding of travel demand and supply of road and curb space,
2. analytics to identify allocation of space alongside any pricing or regulation changes, and
3. physical or digital infrastructure to communicate those changes to travelers.

Sidewalk Labs plans to test this ability to manage flexible lanes in real time through its dynamic curb concept, which envisions a curbside lane that can change uses throughout the day, becoming a passenger loading zone at peak times or public space at off-peak times. The hope is to build technical capabilities through the dynamic curb that can ultimately be applied to travel lanes as well.

The dynamic curb integrates several technologies to actively manage passenger pick-up and drop-off space, including availability sensors, digital signs, dynamic pavement indicators, dynamic pricing, vehicle dispatching, and reservations to create quick turnover of spaces when needed.
Principle 4.

Recapture street space for the public realm, transit, bikes, and pedestrians.

The improved performance of streets based on the first three principles should allow less space overall to be devoted to mobility, especially if cities and planners focus on “person throughput” rather than vehicle throughput as their guiding metric. The safety of vehicles that are self-regulating in terms of speed allows every address to be reached by vehicles without undermining the focus of a given street on pedestrians, cyclists, or transit. The potential to do away with on-street vehicle storage and instead use dynamically-managed drop-off spaces offers width for other uses. As a result, streets can have a much greater amount of space devoted to human uses.
Bringing It Together:

A New Street Network.

Collectively, these principles enable the design of a new street network that can accommodate the same throughput as today’s streets while drastically improving safety and creating a robust public realm.
To ensure accessibility without compromising comfort, Laneways permit self-driving vehicles as long as they travel at walking speeds. CAV usage and pick-up/drop-off is infrequent due to the pedestrian speed limit.

Retractable bollards at the ends of the Laneway can allow only bikes or small CAVs to enter. Bollards can be lowered by emergency vehicles or those who require larger vehicles for accessibility.

Laneways help people get places, but also are places unto themselves, filled with pop-up shops, street fairs, and other types of community gatherings.

Laneways can be closed entirely for a summer block party. Laneways can still provide easy access for emergency and accessibility vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person-throughput capacity estimates*</th>
<th>Laneways with CAVs</th>
<th>Locals in a typical downtown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed limit</td>
<td>4 mph / 8 km/h</td>
<td>25-30 mph / 40-50 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical average speed</td>
<td>4 mph / 8 km/h</td>
<td>15 mph / 24 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In vehicles</td>
<td>~120 persons/hour</td>
<td>~200 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On transit</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On bikes</td>
<td>~400 persons/hour</td>
<td>~700 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On foot</td>
<td>~2,250 persons/hour</td>
<td>~600 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total person-throughput</td>
<td>~2,770 persons/hour</td>
<td>~1,500 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Laneways.

35 FEET / 11 METERS WIDE

Laneways are primarily pedestrian pathways where walking or strolling is pleasant. Cycling or slow vehicle travel is permitted at the designated speed limits to ensure pedestrian priority and discourage Laneway use for long-distance travel.

To ensure accessibility without compromising comfort, Laneways permit self-driving vehicles as long as they travel at walking speeds. CAV usage and pick-up/drop-off is infrequent due to the pedestrian speed limit.
Moveable street furniture helps to create a barrier between travel lanes and pedestrian zones.

To ensure accessibility without compromising comfort for pedestrians and cyclists, Accessways permit self-driving vehicles as long as they travel at cycling speeds.

**Accessways.**

50 FEET / 16 METERS WIDE

Accessways are narrower streets that prioritize micromobility modes like bikes and scooters — when connected, Accessways form a bicycle network that rivals the travel time and convenience of transit and vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed limit</th>
<th>Accessways with CAVs</th>
<th>Collectors in a typical downtown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 mph / 22 km/h</td>
<td>25-30 mph / 40-50 km/h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical average speed</td>
<td>14 mph / 22 km/h</td>
<td>15 mph / 24 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In vehicles</td>
<td>~850 persons/hour</td>
<td>~430 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On transit</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On bikes</td>
<td>~2,600 persons/hour</td>
<td>~700 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On foot</td>
<td>~380 persons/hour</td>
<td>~200 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total person-throughput</td>
<td>~3,830 persons/hour</td>
<td>~1,330 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transitways prioritize public transportation over all other modes, with emphasis given to light rail and dedicated bus lanes — linking the neighborhood to the city’s greater transit system.

Person-throughput capacity estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transitways with CAVs</th>
<th>Minor Arterials in a typical downtown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed limit</td>
<td>25 mph / 40 km/h</td>
<td>25-50 mph / 40-80 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical average speed</td>
<td>25 mph / 40 km/h</td>
<td>15 mph / 24 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In vehicles</td>
<td>~1,500 persons/hour</td>
<td>~850 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On transit</td>
<td>~3,000 persons/hour</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On bikes</td>
<td>~1,400 persons/hour</td>
<td>~700 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On foot</td>
<td>~280 persons/hour</td>
<td>~120 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total person-throughput</td>
<td>~6,180 persons/hour</td>
<td>~1,670 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boulevards accommodate all modes but are geared towards moving people efficiently without sacrificing safety.

These streets are designed to carry the highest vehicle volumes but also to make up a minority of the street network. They are ideally spaced far enough apart to create significant zones of pedestrian and bicycle-only streets. On Boulevards, modes are separated from each other by barriers and buffers, and speeds are restricted to 25 mph (40 km/h).

Though meant for faster traffic, Boulevards still improve safety for all street users by featuring separated bikeways for cyclists and traditional (though curbless) sidewalks for pedestrians.

Boulevards include dynamic curb space that can be used as ride-hail or taxi pick-up/drop-off zones during heavy travel periods.

The Boulevard is the only street type designed to accommodate traditional (person-driven) vehicles. Parking facilities for traditional vehicles are accessible via Boulevards.

**Person-throughput capacity estimates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boulevards</th>
<th>Major Arterials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed limit</td>
<td>25 mph / 40 km/h</td>
<td>25-50 mph / 40-80 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical average speed</td>
<td>25 mph / 40 km/h</td>
<td>15 mph / 24 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In vehicles</td>
<td>~2,000 persons/hour</td>
<td>~1,300 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On transit</td>
<td>~3,000 persons/hour</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On bikes</td>
<td>~1,400 persons/hour</td>
<td>~700 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On foot</td>
<td>~250 persons/hour</td>
<td>~120 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total person-throughput</td>
<td>~6,650 persons/hour (~3,650 w/o transit)</td>
<td>~2,120 persons/hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Streets for an Integrated Mobility System.

The Street Design Principles should be considered just one part of an overall mobility strategy. Even the best-designed street network can only realize its full potential as part of an integrated transportation system with many trip options.

Much of Sidewalk Labs’ thinking on streets has been developed in the context of our Sidewalk Toronto project in Toronto, Ontario, which also shows how we believe these street design principles should be applied in the context of overall mobility planning.

At Sidewalk Toronto, our planning is anchored by the extension of a high-capacity light rail transit network — knowing that public transit is by far the most efficient way to connect people and jobs across dense urban areas. It continues with expanded walking and cycling infrastructure to encourage the use of active transportation modes, with bike-share, scooter-share, and other low-speed vehicle options playing an increasing role.

Finally, new mobility options — such as carshare, taxi, and ride-hail services — can help reduce the need for residents or workers to own a car while still facilitating vehicle trips.

Successful mobility management most likely requires that one entity be empowered to manage the mobility tools in concert. In addition to allocating space dynamically, this manager should be empowered to use tools like regulation changes, pricing, and adaptive traffic signal management to achieve the policy goals and performance targets that are set.

The Street Design Principles are the foundation for this integrated mobility system, providing the infrastructure and framework for cities to balance the need to move people with the re-emergence of streets as vital community space.
Next Steps.

In the coming year, we’ll test our principles — and the designs and technologies that enable them — through real-life prototypes, always seeking feedback from experts and communities.

The goal of these prototypes will be to gauge how drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists react to these designs and, in particular, the dynamic elements.

Over the course of 2018, Sidewalk Labs hosted a series of co-design sessions, events, and workshops in order to engage with the accessibility community and co-create our accessibility principles with them. We remain committed to these principles, which will evolve as we receive more feedback, and we will continue to work with the accessibility community to ensure our street designs work for all people with lived experience of disability.

We’ll have a better understanding of how dynamic pavement, bicycle LEDs, and sensor hardware work — and begin to test operational, maintenance, and life-cycle costs.

We’ll bring these elements together in order to test for safety, operability, and throughput.

Most importantly, we’d like to hear from you — the mobility engineers, planners, advocates, providers, disrupters, and enthusiasts. Let us know what you think, and help us drive towards the next version of these designs.

streetdesign@sidewalklabs.com
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SEATTLE—Three years ago, this fast-growing, hilly city of 725,000 people took a huge leap toward a longtime civic dream: becoming a place where it’s easy to live without driving every day or without owning a car at all.
In March 2016, the region’s Link light-rail system, which ran through 13 stations between the airport and downtown, added two stations, one in the Capitol Hill neighborhood and one at the University of Washington. “All of a sudden, you could get from Capitol Hill to downtown in two minutes,” says Keith Kyle, president of the advocacy group Seattle Subway. “Compared to what people were used to, you might as well be teleporting.”

New riders flocked to the trains. “Even though we extended only two stops, we brought light rail to two of the densest-populated sections of the entire state,” says Peter Rogoff, CEO of Sound Transit, which operates the rail line. By tunneling under the ship canal that bisects Seattle, the light-rail extension created a connection to downtown from the north. The 4-mile trip from the university, which could take 20 minutes by car on a good day or 40 minutes on a gridlocked day, shrank to eight minutes. Buses from across North Seattle changed routes to end at the university station, where riders can switch to the train and speed underground into the central city at 55 miles per hour.

The results of this project, the latest in a long string of mass-transit investments, have been remarkable, and Seattle loves to tout them: As the city has grown in population, adding jobs and buildings, its car traffic has actually gone down. City Hall says average daily traffic in Seattle proper has stayed flat, and even declined a little, since 2006—and during that time, the city added more than 116,000 people, the second biggest percentage increase among America’s 50 largest cities. Meanwhile, its light-rail ridership is surging; after the most recent expansion, the number of daily users jumped 89 percent, to 65,100 people on an average weekday, compared with the year before.

As other cities experiment with congestion pricing in their business districts and even banning cars from major thoroughfares, Seattle is trying another strategy: investing in more commuting options to take the pressure off its roadways. Delays on I-5, the Seattle region’s main north-south freeway, have grown by two-thirds in the past several years. So the shift to carless commuting is transformational. And the push for change isn’t slackening—it’s growing. In November 2016, inspired by Link light rail’s success, voters across Seattle’s tricounty area approved a staggering $54 billion tax levy to further expand the region’s Sound Transit system. With the funding, the light-rail system is set to grow six-fold by 2041, to 117 miles, making it as large as Washington, D.C.’s Metro system.

Seattle’s enormous investment in mass transit comes after decades as a car-dominated city. Many larger cities, encumbered by 19th-century footprints and 20th-century car fixations, have paid for their booming economies with steadily worsening commute
times. Census data from 2017 shows 14 million commuters spend an hour or more a day getting to and from work. Commuting time—often spent alone in a car—is getting longer every year. Seattle, as car-influenced and geography-bound as any city, has defied that trend.

Seattle’s embrace of car-free commutes is a story of good fortune, a prosperous and progressive city whose rising fortunes make it easier to invest in managing its rapid growth. But it’s also an example of a virtuous circle, a city investing in the very things that make it attractive, its compact downtown and environmental ethic, and attracting more residents who value the same things. And it’s an example of a city voting to change itself, make up for lost time and opportunities, and catch up to other regions that made different choices decades ago.

“There’s huge demand,” says Dongho Chang, the city’s traffic engineer, who measures his success not by reducing delays for cars, but by reducing car miles driven. “People want transit here. People are willing to invest and pay for it. They’re voting for transit investment. And the reason why is because a lot of our streets are already constrained, and transit is the most efficient way for us to move forward.”

***

Twenty years ago, Seattle residents had few ways to get around: cars, buses, a few electric trolleys, and ferries across the Puget Sound. Amtrak and the 1962 World’s Fair monorail — a 1-mile ride between downtown and the Space Needle — were the only trains in town. Now, a commuter standing in Seattle’s Union Station Square can choose from a 20-mile light-rail line, commuter-rail lines that run 34 miles north to Everett and 47 miles south through Tacoma, one of two downtown streetcars, double-decker regional express buses to far suburbs, electric trolleys climbing one of downtown’s toughest inclines, and e-bikes rentable via smartphone apps.

None of this is cheap, but progressive Seattle is willing to pay for it. Beginning in 2014, residents voted to raise their taxes three times in three years, to expand bus service; build bus, bike and pedestrian street infrastructure; and vastly expand the region’s light-rail system.

Geography is a big reason Seattle residents want alternatives to cars. Seattle was built on a narrow isthmus between the Puget Sound and Lake Washington, with the Lake Washington Ship Canal cutting across it, so there are only a few routes in and out of downtown. Culture, economics and politics are other reasons: the Pacific Northwest’s
environmental mindset, the young tech workers who like working in vibrant urban places and don’t want cars to be their only commuting option. Since the 1990s, Washington state laws have required regional growth management and obligated large employers to encourage employees to take transit to work, car pool, walk, or—this is big in outdoorsy Seattle—bike.

In 12 minutes, cyclists can ride all the way through the city’s downtown without fear. Riders whiz past glassy new buildings, construction cranes, classic theaters and the Seattle Art Museum along Second Avenue’s two-way protected bike lane. Rows of parked cars and plastic posts separate bikes from car traffic. Bike stoplights at rider’s-eye level show green for go as red left-turn lights keep cars at bay.

Chang, a committed cyclist, stood recently on Second Avenue with his red nine-speed steel bike and pointed to an intersection. Three concrete planter boxes, bursting with wild grasses and yellow flowers, formed a wall next to the white line where bikes stop for a red light.

“It becomes a buffer area for riders, so it feels a lot more comfortable,” Chang told me.

Seattle hasn’t banished cars, nor does it want to. Rather, it is finally achieving a balanced multimodal system, remaking itself from a city built for cars into one built for all the ways people get around.

And the need is growing. Local leaders talk of a “Seattle Squeeze,” as downtown construction and the demolition of an elevated freeway jam up streets and commuters await another expansion of light-rail and streetcar service.

“It’s a huge transition from how the region operated—get in a car—to an entire region where transit is a viable choice,” says Dow Constantine, executive of King County, which includes Seattle, and former chair of the Sound Transit board. “In less than a decade, people’s whole perspective has changed.”

***

**Transit used to be a punchline in Seattle.**

In 1992, the Gen X love story *Singles* featured a transportation-planner protagonist whose dream transit system, the Supertrain, is nixed by the mayor. At that point, Seattleites had been proposing and rejecting rail systems since 1968. The “Boeing bust,” when the aerospace industry tanked in the early ’70s, deflated the public’s enthusiasm
for major infrastructure projects. But by the mid-'90s, the region’s growing congestion clashed with its green ethos.

The turning point came in 1996, when voters in three counties approved a sales tax hike and a tax on car registrations to fund Sound Transit’s plan for light-rail, commuter-rail and regional bus service. “People are tired of just sitting around in traffic,” the ballot effort’s campaign manager declared on the victorious election night.

The agency, mismanaged at first, lost some federal funding before a dynamic CEO, Joni Earl, whipped it into shape. In 2008, amid the Great Recession no less, voters approved a second sales tax increase to expand the system. By that point, the light-rail line was nearing its debut, and Amazon, the city’s largest employer, had started building its headquarters near downtown, where it expected to move 6,000 employees.

Linking transit and density isn’t just good sense. It’s part of a statewide vision for how to grow. Since the 1990s, Washington state’s Growth Management Act has required local governments in fast-growing areas to reduce sprawl and its Commute Trip Reduction law requires large employers to encourage employees not to drive to work alone. To combat gentrification, state law requires Sound Transit to attract affordable housing to the land it used for construction staging around new stations. Meanwhile, to encourage transit-oriented development, Seattle allows developers to build housing without off-street parking in areas with frequent transit service.

Sound Transit has already bored a tunnel for the next extension and is building tracks and three stations in North Seattle that are set to open in 2021. Riders from those stations can take advantage of light rail’s new route to downtown under the ship canal.

“A lot of the imperatives for transit here are driven in part by geography,” Rogoff says. “We’re surrounded by mountains and water.”

In 2016, the year light rail expanded, Seattle’s booming downtown was headed toward 300,000 jobs. Local officials had only to look at the clogged lanes of I-5 at rush hour to see demand for transit was escalating. Delays on the region’s major freeways grew 7 percent between 2015 and 2017—but rush-hour transit ridership grew twice as fast. The light rail’s success had superseded Sound Transit’s track record of overly ambitious timelines and overbudget transit projects. Polling showed more support for a big ballot proposal than a small one.

“People’s appetite had grown considerably,” says Constantine. “The more ambitious it was, the more people embraced it. They realized we’d waited way too long.”
Seattle Subway’s activists capitalized on that, creating a “vision map” of seven light-rail lines crisscrossing the region. “We made the point that bigger is better, and people want more,” says Kyle, Seattle Subway’s president.

The resulting ballot proposal, called Sound Transit 3, asked for 25 years of funding: a total of $54 billion in increased sales taxes, car taxes and property taxes. Campaigning for the ballot proposal as part of a broad coalition of alternative-transportation groups, Seattle Subway volunteers argued with opponents on the internet and promoted a yes vote at weekend festivals. They chalked potential commute times to downtown on sidewalks near proposed rail stations. The measure passed with 54 percent of the vote regionwide, led by 70 percent in Seattle itself.

“I think more people are realizing the personal benefits of biking, walking, and transit,” says Hester Serebrin, policy director for Transportation Choices Coalition, a statewide group that played a key role in the ballot effort. “Being stuck in traffic is mentally and physically harmful. People get that. They also see the difference in their checkbooks.”

Despite their superambitious light-rail plans, Seattle residents don’t see their city as a train-and-bike utopia. They say they’re still decades behind other cities, scrambling to catch up their transportation network to the city’s job growth.

“We have a geometry challenge,” says Jon Scholes, president and CEO of the Downtown Seattle Association. “We want to continue to grow jobs in the downtown in a vertical way, but our horizontal space is limited.” He gestures out the association’s office windows at the four new skyscrapers of Amazon’s expanding headquarters complex, which now accounts for 45,000 jobs. How do you get more and more employees to work when there’s no more room to build highways?

The answer, for 70 percent of large downtown Seattle employers, is to offer discounted or free transit passes as part of their employee benefits package. ORCA cards — whose names are a tribute to the Puget Sound’s beloved, endangered killer whales, and an acronym for One Regional Card for All — work on all Seattle area trains, buses and ferries. Commute Seattle, a partnership between the Downtown Seattle Association and local government, helps businesses set up ORCA card programs, showers and bike storage for cyclists and parking-garage pricing that encourages short-term stays over daily commuting.

“Employees don’t want to be stuck in their cars for hours on end each day,” says Scholes. “They want some certainty of getting to work on time. And they value the ease of having
that ORCA pass in their wallet.”

In 2014, Seattle voters approved a ballot proposal to buy increased bus service from King County Metro, the local bus agency. Thanks to a $60 vehicle license fee and a 0.1 percent sales tax increase, 67 percent of Seattle residents have bus service every 10 minutes within a 10-minute walk of their home, up from 25 percent of residents three years ago. Low-income residents can get discounted ORCA cards, and Seattle high-school students get them for free.

City Councilman Mike O’Brien, who chairs the transportation committee, says Seattle can’t keep up with the demand for expanded bus service. “We’re close to $50 million a year in extra service that the city buys on top of what Metro provides, and we would buy more if they had more to give,” he says. But King County Metro is at capacity: It’s hard to hire drivers, and the bus maintenance bases are full at night. “I can tell my constituents that we have more bus service than we’ve ever had. And my constituent says, ‘That doesn’t sound right because my buses are fuller than they’ve ever been.’”

In 2015, Seattle voters approved a property tax levy, called Move Seattle, to remake streets to be more friendly to bikes, pedestrians and buses. But today, Seattle’s bike activists are growing impatient. They’re unhappy that Seattle Mayor Jenny Durkan has canceled some bike-lane projects after complaints from neighbors.

They say City Hall ought to deliver more protected bike lane projects like downtown’s Second Avenue. “You can have the greatest bike lanes, but if there’s even a one-block gap through dangerous-feeling, fast-moving, multiple lanes of traffic, you’re not going to see the impact,” says Vicky Clarke, policy director for Cascade Bicycle Club, a longtime cycling advocacy group. “A network is only as strong as its weakest link.”

Durkan, a former U.S. attorney elected mayor in 2017, says her administration has expanded bike access through the city’s rapidly growing private bike-share system. She’s reevaluating the city’s bike network plan after discovering, she says, that “our predecessors had oversold people on what we could build with the dollars we had.” Likewise, Durkan delayed a plan to connect the city’s two streetcar lines, a priority of downtown businesses, out of concern about rising costs.

But Durkan is hardly a transit antagonist. Her administration, King County Metro and Sound Transit recently funded an on-demand, app-based shuttle van service that takes southeast Seattle residents to and from light-rail stations—a pilot program meant to help lower-income residents bridge what planners call the “last mile” between home and
transit.

And Seattle, like a number of major American cities, has committed to following the Paris climate agreement despite President Donald Trump’s decision to take the United States out of it.

“To meet our climate goals, we have to reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled,” Durkan says. “We have to continue to move people and freight through and around our region. That means reducing congestion. Less cars on the road is healthier for everybody.”
Roads Suffer When States Focus on Expansion Over Repair, Report Says

If federal leaders do work out a deal on a $2 trillion infrastructure spending package, advocacy groups say a lot of the money should go toward road repairs, rather than new highway construction.

The shameful condition of roads across the country took center stage this year during many state legislative debates. But a new report charges that state policymakers too often contributed to the ailing infrastructure, with 23 states in recent years spending more on road expansion than on needed repairs.

“Lawmakers and officials like a good ribbon cutting at a new road, but repair is too often treated like flossing teeth: A tedious, sometimes painful
extra step that's all too easily skipped. Except that it's critical and saves taxpayers cash and pain down the road,” said Steve Ellis, executive vice president of Taxpayers for Common Sense, in a statement.

The report, written by Ellis’ group and Transportation for America, highlights the growing number of roads classified as in “poor condition,” which increased from 14% of roads in 2009 to 20% in 2017, as a common policy challenge for states. The percentage of roads labeled “poor” grew in 37 states from 2009 to 2017.

The report estimates that it would cost around $231 billion per year to keep existing roads in good condition while repairing all the “poor” roads. But that type of investment has an uncertain future, said Beth Osborne, director of Transportation for America.

“IT's a lot of money and it's significantly more than we spend now. One of the additional challenges to getting that money is the reasonable public lack of confidence that it would be spent for that purpose,” said Osborne.

Federal government policies also contribute to the focus on building over fixing. In 2015, government highway expenditure hovered around $105 billion, with only a portion of that money allocated to repairs.

Osborne says that low spending on repairs is partially blamed on the structure of the federal highway program, which was designed to build new roads. “We've inherited a lot of policies that push us to build. We give DOTs a fraction of the money they need, and then say ‘do it all!' But in establishing everything as a priority, we have established nothing is a priority,” she said.

President Trump recently reached a tentative agreement with Democratic congressional leaders on a $2 trillion federal infrastructure package. He is expected to reconvene soon with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer to discuss funding options for the measure.

Osborne says she’d like to see any new infrastructure package structure the highway program more like the transit program, which has flexible spending for basic maintenance. That way, if a state wants an investment from the federal government to build new roads, they have to prove that they are not forgoing other responsibilities, like maintenance.
“As it stands, states can go into debt on projects that aren't particularly needed. And then we wonder why we have a backlog of poor roads that need to be fixed,” she said.

The report also makes note of a gap between urban and rural roads. Rural infrastructure has been a Trump administration priority, as a means to better connect rural residents to employment opportunities and vital services. But the report notes that many states spend comparably on road repairs in urban and rural areas, despite the fact that just 18% of rural roads are in poor condition while 37% percent of urban roads are. “Urban roads impact more people and see more wear and tear and therefore require more investment in upkeep—yet our spending priorities ignore this reality,” the report states.

Interestingly, states that are largely rural are leading the country in the amount of their highway budget that they dedicate to repairs. South Dakota comes first, with 69% of its budget, followed by North Dakota with 68%.

Steve Salwei, the director of transportation programs with the North Dakota Department of Transportation, said that maintaining current infrastructure is the department’s top priority. “With limited resources available we need to make sure we are making the most economical improvements to our roadways in order to meet the long term needs of the state. We have found that if you maintain your roadways on a regular basis, it costs you a lot less money than having to reconstruct them,” he said.

The outlook for those hoping more states will follow the Dakotas’ lead is mixed. The gap between spending on expansion and spending on repair has improved in recent years, but many states are still vastly overspending on expansions that they will not be able to maintain over time, the report says.

For example, states overall spent $21.3 billion on road expansion annually between 2009 and 2014, while spending about $21.4 billion on repairs. And even states that did allocate more money to maintenance often didn’t spend enough, the report says.

The emphasis on growth means that in future years states will have even more roads to maintain, and likely not enough money. Every new mile of
road costs about $24,000 per year to maintain, the report estimates.

The two advocacy groups suggest a four-pronged course of action moving forward. The authors argue that the next transportation bill should set “measurable outcomes” and prioritize repairing roads in poor condition. Congress should also require that states spend highway funding on repairs before expanding their road systems, and create requirements around new roadway projects to ensure sponsors prove their ability to maintain them during long-term upkeep. Finally, they suggest that the Federal Highway Administration should have stronger public reporting standards for road performance targets.

Emma Coleman is the assistant editor for Route Fifty.
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A new analysis finds that liberalizing zoning rules and building more