Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee
Wednesday, September 11, 2019, 9:00 AM

I. Call to Order & Introductions 9:05
II. Recognition of outgoing member Vance Arnett 9:10
III. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please 9:15
IV. Members’ Interests 9:20
V. Approval of Minutes – August 14, 2019
VI. Action Item
   A. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments for Planning Funds, E. Busch Blvd, Hillsborough Ave & Appendix C - Performance Measures (Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO staff) 9:35
VII. Status Reports
   A. Transportation Demand Management Plans (Sara Hendricks, USF/CUTR) 9:45
   B. Draft 2045 Cost Feasible Plan (Sarah McKinley, MPO staff) 10:05
   C. US 41 at CSX Grade Separation Project Development & Environmental Study (Lilliam Escalera, FDOT) 10:35
VIII. Old Business & New Business 10:55
   A. Revised Comments on Tampa Interstate Study SEIS
   B. TBARTA Report – Rick Richmond
   C. Reminder: Evening Workshop for Q & A on Draft 2045 Plan (September 24, 6:00 PM, First Floor Multi-Purpose Room County Center)
   D. Next Monthly Meeting: October 16
IX. Adjournment
X. Addendum
   A. MPO Meeting Minutes & Standing Committee Reports

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.
I. **CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS**

Chair Bill Roberts called the meeting to order at 9:02 am. The meeting was held in the Plan Hillsborough Room on the 18th floor of the County Center Building.

**Members present:** Bill Roberts, Sky White, Rick Fernandez, Vance Arnett, Steven Hollenkamp, Nicole Rice, Cheryl Thole, Van Linkous, Artie Fryer, Bill Roberts, Edward Mierzelewski, Vivienne Handy, Cliff Reiss, Terrance Trott, Rick Richmond, Lindsey Eggware, Dennis LeVine, Amy Espinosa and Camilo Soto.

**Members excused:** Dayna Lazarus, Barbara Kennedy Gibson, and David Bailey

**Others present:** Rich Clarendon, Vishaka Shiva Raman, Johnny Wong, Lisa Silva, Cheryl Wilkening – MPO Staff; Bill Ball, TBARTA

II. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Luciano L. Prida, Jr. introduced himself for the CAC At-Large Nomination for Business Representative. He resides at 1108 North Franklin Street, Unit 705 Tampa, FL 33602. He was born and raised in Riverside Heights and lived his first couple years in Ybor City. His office is at 1106 N. Franklin Street Member which is a CPA firm. This is a three-generation business and has been at this location since December 1, 1984. He employs 26 people. Their homes range from Apollo Beach to Temple Terrace to Spring Hill. He served as Director of Internal Audit City of Tampa from 1983 to 1994. He is interested in transportation and believes it is very important. As a CPA and clients all over the world he looks at Tampa as the financial center. Tampa Bay competes in a market place.

- Joe Monaco introduced himself for the CAC At-Large Nomination for Business Representative. He resides at 3301 Bayshore Blvd, Tampa, FL 33629. He has been a resident of Tampa for 19 years starting in Wesley Chapel and moving into the city 15 years ago. He is senior Vice President for the Real Estate and Branch Support at Amscot Financial for 14 years now. Prior to that he was director of real estate for CVS in this area. He has been very involved with transportation and development in the area. He can identify the need in different areas. In addition, he is a member of the Westshore Alliance for over 10 years and currently holds the position of Vice President for the Alliance. He said we need to make Tampa Bay the best place for employers to relocate their businesses.

Rick Fernandez questioned if these potential members will be subject to questions when the presentation of the nominations is made. Rich Clarendon asked the nominees to stay for questioning, as it is first on the agenda.

Member introductions were made. Two new members, Ms. Eggware and Mr. Soto were welcomed by Bill Roberts.
III. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Steven Hollenkamp had a request from MPO Staff related to Plant City. He stated they don't have any projects related to mobility or alternative forms of transportation. He asked MPO Staff to put together any mobility projects that are already in the records for Plant City. Rich Clarendon mentioned they will be going to the Independent Oversight Committee. Each jurisdiction is supposed to come forward with their projects and submit to the IOC by the end of September. The MPO will advise when that comes forward of any projects. Also, the City of Plant City is a good resource for specific projects. They have showed an interest and the MPO prepared a Walk/Bike Plan for the City and more recently in developing a plan in public transit. Steven Hollenkamp responded they have funds for these projects and requested fellow members to approve a motion for these projects but first he would like a list of suggestions. Rick Fernandez was concerned if there was a lack of plan with this revenue. Steven Hollenkamp stated there is a desire to make Plant City more walkable, but they are not sure of the first step. He feels a mobility study will be the first step. Nicole Rice has a contact that is trying to get plans on the table in Plant City. Her name is Lone Townsend. Email loneTownsendhcdec@gmail.com.

Vance Arnett stated Tampa is a receptor to electric scooters and they don't seem to be regulated. He would like to see the legal implications to the scooter company and the city. Also, whose insurance responsibility is it if you hit someone on a scooter and it damages your car, or they get injured or killed. Someone needs to look at this instead of watching it play out in the press. It is a public safety concern.

Bill Roberts asked the committee to review the basic parliamentary procedures. He noted that he committee is nearly at full strength. We need to follow the right procedures including asking to be recognized by the Chair and focus on the issues. He asked the members that came in late to introduce themselves starting with Terrance Trott, Artie Fryer, Van Linkous, Vivienne Handy, Dennis Levine and Sky White.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman sought a motion to approve the June 12, 2019, minutes. Vance Arnett so moved, seconded by Rick Richmond and motion carried unanimously.

Rich Clarendon, MPO Staff, wanted to point out that the cameras are set up to video tape. The videos are being recorded and will be available upon request. In order to be posted it needs to be closed captioned and be accessible to persons with hearing disabilities as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). If it is posted with YouTube captioning it does not meet the ADA requirements for closed captioning. HTV can video tape CAC meetings and provide closed caption but it would $5000 a year for the CAC. For now, if you request a copy of the recording it is available. If the request needs to be closed captioned it can be done by special request. Nicole Rice reiterated if they are requested, a CAC member can share recordings on You Tube.

V. ACTION ITEMS

A. CAC AT-Large Nomination for Business Representative

Rich Clarendon stated we have a seat established a few years ago for an At-Large Business Representative. He put out a request for nominations with the Chamber of Commerce, Downtown
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Partnership, Westshore Alliance, Tampa Innovation Alliance and posted it online. They received a couple responses and 2 nominees are present today. He suggested that if desired, the CAC could recommend appointing one and the other as the alternate. Bill Roberts asked if there are any questions.

Rick Fernandez has a concern and asked Mr. Monaco about his relationship with the Westshore Alliance. Mr. Monaco stated he has been with the Westshore Alliance for 10 years and moved up to the Vice President role. He has been in the officer position for the last 5 years. Rick Fernandez responded that the Westshore Alliance has showed up to various meetings over time. The Westshore Alliance is always on the other side of a very specific issue of the expansion of the interstate highway system through the urban core. They have stated a position they approve and encourage the widening of the interstate through the urban core. He wonders if Mr. Monaco is bringing the voice of the Westshore Alliance or if he brings his independent opinion. Mr. Monaco responded the Westshore Alliance is supportive of transportation and mobility. He is personally in favor of moving Tampa Bay forward. There is the downtown interchange and Westshore interchange and through the EIS process these are connected. This will be done by the end of the year. He believes the 220 residences and businesses affected should have a voice and all options should be on the table and there should be a compromise.

Nicole Rice clarified the question was do you represent yourself or the Westshore Alliance? Mr. Monaco responded he can separate himself from the Westshore Alliance. Nicole Rice inquired about the membership fee for the Westshore Alliance and Mr. Monaco did not know the answer because he is not involved with membership but could get the answer. Nicole Rice said it was over $5000 and Tampa Bay Partnership is $50,000. She was questioning if this business seat is an extension of a lobbying organization or is it supposed to give a voice to small business people. What kind of voice do we want to give to this business seat?

Vance Arnett stated he did hear an answer and if you put on your resume that you are part of the Westshore Alliance then you wanted us to know that and that you do represent those issues. He noted that several months ago there was a request for a proclamation before the MPO that we give the Westshore Alliance a primary responsibility for transportation planning for that area. Mr. Arnett spoke highly against this request and wanted to know why this was asked for by the Westshore Alliance. Mr. Monaco stated the Westshore Alliance is an independent group who have a voice and they want to speak for the Westshore Business group.

Vivienne Handy commented on what a business representative is, and she feels the CAC represents the small business citizens.

Edward Mierzejewski communicated this is supposed to be a business representative and the Westshore Alliance has been enormous business partner for Tampa Bay for decades. Terrance Trott would like to echo this comment. He doesn’t love everything his company does, but he represents his constituents and that is the same for all us and that is not that relevant. Cliff Reiss agreed, and that level of expertise is a good balance to this committee.

Rich Clarendon stated there is not definition of what the Business Representative should be in the Bylaws.

Artie Fryer made a statement that the purpose of the CAC is to weigh different points of view. He thinks they are at disadvantage if they don’t evaluate a different point of view. Rich Clarendon stated Mr. Prida was suggested by the Downtown Partnership. He was the developer of the businesses of Franklin Street.
Camilo Soto posed a hypothetical question to both candidates asking if they had the funds how would take care of the transportation issues in the region. Mr. Prida answered you should connect the pearls of the city first which is the Airport, Westshore, South Howard, Port Tampa, Tampa Heights, Lowry Park to Raymond James. Mr. Monaco would go the way the voters approved and 45 percent to HART.

Van Linkous had a procedural question about the nomination application and wanted to know why it asks if they collect social security. Rich Clarendon responded so we know who is applying and know their income level without asking their exact income.

Vivienne Handy asked Mr. Prida if he owns a CPA business. He responded he is a senior partner in a CPA firm with 26 employees. Sky White is strong supporter of small businesses. Vance Arnett wanted to know how many positions we have open. Rich Clarendon stated one business representative and one for Tampa Port Authority. Rick Fernandez wanted to know what “At Large” means. Rich Clarendon advised it means they are selected through the Committee. Bill Roberts stated we have 2 qualified candidates and was ready to entertain a motion to nominate a business representative and as Rich Clarendon stated one can be appointed and the other an alternate. Vance Arnett disagreed because they may have two different opinions on matters coming before the CAC.

Nicole Rice made a Motion to nominate Mr. Prida to be the Business Representative. There was second by Mr. Fernandez. Bill Roberts asked if there was any further discussion. Edward Mierzejewski nominated Mr. Monaco. Bill Roberts advised we cannot accept a second motion on the floor but appreciated his opinion. Rich Clarendon clarified Mr. Mierzejewski wanted to nominate the other candidate, but the first motion must be handled first.

Vivienne Handy wanted to know options for other nominees such as those from small businesses. Rich Clarendon said that to establish different membership requirements, the MPO would have to amend the bylaws.

Bill Roberts restated there was Motion to nominate Mr. Prida. Motion carried 10 in favor and 4 opposed. Mr. Prida has been nominated as the business at-large representative.

B. Letter of Comment on Tampa Bay Next Section 4-6 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)

Rich Clarendon said that FDOT has prepared a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for federal and state reviewing agencies. FDOT will have a public hearing early next year and the MPO has an opportunity to provide a letter of comment before it is finalized. The CAC is the first to review it. The SEIS geography goes through the Westshore area through downtown, North to MLK and East to I-4 and 50th Street or US41. It is the heart of urban area and the interstate system.

Under consideration, the Westshore interchange consists of two possibilities, which are to build an interchange or no further action. The downtown area has four build options, no further action, and a short term or “quick fix”. The build option in Westshore has express lanes coming from the Howard Frankland Bridge through the interchange with access Northward towards the airport then from the airport thru the interchange and then north or south on I-275 in express lanes.

In the Downtown area, Option A would reconstruct the downtown interchange with express lanes going North, Option B would rebuild the interchange without the express lanes going North. Both are costly,
estimated at over $1 billion. The two smaller scale options both add express lanes and the current interchange stays as it is. Option C has an elevated express lane to the South and East side. Option D has an elevated express lane to the North and West Side. These are less impactful to right away and the cost would be $710-$740 million, and this does not include replacing bridge decks. The short-term operational and safety quick fix provides three movements: southbound I-275 to eastbound I-4, westbound I-4 to northbound I-275, and westbound I-4 to southbound I-275. The cost is around $200 million.

Mr. Clarendon continued that the staff evaluated the SEIS according specific stipulations given to the FDOT as a result of MPO motions made in 2016 and 2017 as part of the Transportation Improvement Program public hearings. There are a couple other observations made reviewing online documents, briefings and open houses. Mr. Clarendon noted that there is an open house on Monday, August 19 from 5pm – 7pm at the Robert Saunders Public Library to discuss traffic safety.

The first motion stipulation asked for a report on human impacts, consisting of homes, multifamily housing and businesses, and individual parcels including impacts on affordable housing. For example, in the Westshore area this requires 21 more business relocations, but no more homes will be moved. The downtown interchange reconstruction Option A has 369 parcels needed, 160 already purchased and 209 still need to be purchased. Option D has 200 parcels impacted, 133 already purchased and 67 need to be purchased. Business relocations would be a maximum of 52 for build Option A and 8 for option C.

The second stipulation is an analysis of affordable housing displacements for residents and business and including design elements. There is relocation assistance provided by FDOT that is designed to assist people who are displaced from their homes by a transportation project. The third stipulation is the environmental impact on studies completed for the different sections such as stormwater management, water quality, natural resource evaluation, economic and fiscal impact analysis along with park and recreational resource updates. The detailed reports are online. Mr. Clarendon noted that staff commented that impacts during construction need to be mitigated, smart work zones should be considered, and noise barrier locations identified.

Mr. Clarendon went over other stipulations including the traffic and revenue studies providing justification for the toll lanes, a follow-up report on the premium transit study to include consideration of the CSX-owned rail corridors, and a status report on Federal Civil Rights investigation. Another stipulation is that the FDOT report to the MPO Board on the cost of ad valorem tax revenue lost to the City of Tampa as a result of the TBX project, using the FDOT’s most recent right-of-way acquisition map. A fiscal analysis completed for the SEIS estimates the full reconstruction option results in a decrease in total property tax revenue of $424,146 from parcels removed as a result of the right-of-way acquisition. The draft comment letter recommends that the MPO request an estimate of the current value of ad valorem tax revenue lost to the City of Tampa for SEIS final preferred alternative be provided to the MPO board at a future meeting. Another comment is that the MPO requests that FDOT update the MPO with cost estimates for any proposed landscaping or design features requiring local upkeep during the design phase, as these arrangements are worked out with the City of Tampa.

Mr. Clarendon went over the stipulation concerning the impacts to air quality in Tampa. The SEIS analyzed carbon monoxide and mobile source air toxic emissions. The draft letter request that the design phase proactively addresses quality of life/health outcomes including mitigation of air quality impacts. Mitigation should address both the short-term construction-related and long-term health impacts. These may include designs such as green noise walls, greater landscaping and other techniques. There are other concerns highlighted by staff, notably the high-speed traffic exiting off the interstate ramps. The letter requests that the design phase proactively considered strategies such as signage, rumble strips to slow drivers down,
high-visibility markings for all areas where pedestrians cross off ramps, wide turning radii and turns that do not require a full stop. There was additional request for updates concerning these steps to be provided to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

Bill Roberts stated that the Action Item is to consider the Letter of Comments that Rich Clarendon has presented before them to forward to the MPO. Amy Espinosa requested a list of structures or businesses that will be impacted by these options and wanted to know if they are owned by FDOT. Rich Clarendon responded that there is not a specific list, but you can refer to the maps in the presentations and some of the parcels are owned by FDOT which are referenced on the map. Ms. Espinosa also questioned the flyover in C or D and wanted to know if they are going to build another one and Rich Clarendon responded they will build a ramp on the North or South side. Vance Arnett urged to look at two items which are to facilitate relocation and the second is the concept of global warning and air quality. Cliff Reiss asked that they look at the long-term view. We need to remain sensitive to the neighborhoods that impacted but consider the rest of the surrounding communities.

Rick Fernandez commented on Options A – D. He noted that the CAC had the opportunity to discuss these items on June 11 if they were left in the TIP but at the last minute FDOT removed them because Section 6 Option A-B is not a priority. He had this discussion with Secretary Gwynn 8 weeks ago. Yet today we still have these options open to present to the MPO when FDOT is telling him we don’t need to worry about this anymore. Option A basically wipes out Tampa Heights. It is a full blow out and it only saves 4-6 minutes of commuter travel time. Rich Clarendon referred to the range noted in the presentation. Rick Fernandez referred to Option C and D. Option C has the flyover to South and East and leaves Tampa Heights untouched, but Ybor City takes the impact of reconstruction. Option D moves the flyover to Tampa Heights and leaves Ybor City untouched and taking out several properties such as their community center. Both options are unacceptable, he said.

Mr. Fernandez said the Motions covered were made in 2016-2017 and 2-3 years later FDOT is still not fully compliant with these Motions. Mr. Fernandez wanted to know if there would be opportunity for them to make comments to this other than Public Comment to the MPO for review. Rich Clarendon stated to make recommendations through motions made at this meeting.

Nicole Rice commented on revenue loss along with county and city taxes. She believes that many of these items are important for FDOT to look at and would like to request proper information when they talk about the losses will be made up by new investment. She has numbers from a City Council meeting regarding the Salvation Army consolidating and moving parcels around in this area and there was one business owner that invested 3 million dollars in one building for redevelopment and it adds 35 thousand dollars in ad valorem taxes. This is a 300 percent increase over the last 5 years for that one property. She said we are throwing millions of dollars away if we don’t look at the numbers accurately in Tampa Heights. Bill Roberts stated we need to look at the accuracy and source of this data.

Camilo Soto pointed out that for Options A-D FDOT would have to purchase 209 additional properties and low end was 57. He wanted to know if there is estimated cost for acquisition of these properties and more accurate way to get this data. The no further action option represents property tax ad valorem gain for the city and county. He would like to see that data addressed someway. Rich Clarendon stated we can request right-of-way acquisition cost estimates.
Vivienne Handy commented that she is sold on the complete streets concept and that urban sprawl is her soap box item. If we reduce sprawl, then we are reducing the need to drive into town. We need to focus on livable core areas.

Rick Richmond asked about the time limit for submitting comments. Mr. Clarendon stated it is important to go on record sooner than later because SEIS is moving towards conclusion and FDOT is going to submit a draft sometime in the fall and then to a public hearing in the Spring. Vance Arnett stated you are commenting on what FDOT has given you thus far and what they are saying on some of the items we don’t trust and don’t make sense. He wants to know the timing on this. Rich Clarendon noted that the MPO can request more specific information on affordable housing and right-of-way cost estimates. Also, Mr. Fernandez’s request for fully addressing the Motions. We could go on record regarding these items right now.

Van Linkous requested more information on 50th and I-4 air quality index. Rich Clarendon stated that the air quality report is located online. In general, the air quality will get better with stronger emissions requirements for new vehicles. The build alternatives will lead to better air quality due to travel speeds. He will ask FDOT to provide more information on this topic.

Mr. Fernandez requested this letter specifically address the issue of induced demand and the fact of FDOT has not considered this in any of their estimates. Nicole Rice wanted to clarify the CRA in Tampa Heights expressing concern that millions of dollars of ad valorem tax revenue are going back to the city is not accounted for. She said we need to understand the actual economic impact in that area.

Amy Espinosa wanted to know if electric or automated vehicles were considered in the emissions impact. Rich Clarendon said emissions numbers were calculated through a model with changes in vehicle technology. Ed Mierzejewski commented that if you add capacity you promote development.

Vance Arnett made a Motion to table this for a month to allow Rich Clarendon to come back with language that addresses these issues and then they can address this again in next month’s meeting. Rick Fernandez seconded the Motion.

Rich Clarendon’s only concern is they miss the opportunity to go on record. Delaying for a month will interfere with the critical path. This will be submitted to MPO in September. He feels the MPO will wait until the SEIS is complete before they take a position on the options.

Camilo Soto moved an amended motion that this draft to incorporate these questions. Bill Roberts clarified that the amendment would add the CAC’s comments to the Comment Letter and proceed on to the MPO. Dennis LeVine seconded the Amendment to the Motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Bill Roberts returned to the original motion, stating that concerns will be deferred until next month and we will proceed to submit this letter forward as amended. The committee will review the information requested next month but the letter of comment will be submitted the MPO before we see it. Motion carried unanimously.

C. Transportation Improvement Program Roll Forward Amendments
Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO Staff, presented the Roll Forward Amendment for the Transportation Improvement Program through FY 2023/24. The MPO approves the TIP in June at the public hearing and it becomes effective in October. There are some projects from the prior fiscal year that do not go before the MPO at that time and because they have not been obligated, they are included in the Roll Forward Amendments. Ms. Raman identified projects that were not obligated in the previous fiscal year and shared a summary list of projects listed in FY 2020 roll forward amendment. This includes a project by the City of Tampa to upgrade the traffic signal systems, a project for the drainage on Dale Mabry Highway, a newly added project is intersection lighting in various locations, and a project for the resurfacing of SR 674 from College Chase Drive to Commercial Center Drive. The final project is a multimodal safety improvement in urban corridor that is outlined in the Heights vision plan. This is on US 41 to N. Tampa Street and N Florida Avenue from E Tyler to MLK. These are the five project that make up the TIP Roll Forward Amendment and the cost is around $78 thousand. Ms. Raman went over an example comparative report that list the details with the changes of the projects.

Ms. Raman recommended that the CAC approve the Roll Forward Amendments to the MPO Board.

Cheryl Thole made a Motion to approve the Transportation Improvement Program Roll Forward Amendment and forward to the MPO. The motion was seconded by Rick Richmond. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. Status Reports

A. TBARTA Regional Transit Development Plan

Bill Ball, representing TBARTA, introduced the Regional Transit Development Plan. This is the first ever Regional Transit Development Plan in the Tampa Bay area and the opportunity for TBARTA to identify their key role in regional transit in the coming years. There are three things that relate to a TDP. First, is the importance of the TBARTA to establish a vision with a blue print of regional development for the future. The second is to have a TDP in the State of Florida for funding and third is a good document to have to promote their services.

These are the traditional elements of a TDP, focusing on the role of TBARTA in the region. They do have guidance and they have direction on what needs to be covered in the TDP. It is a five-county area TBARTA serves and the five existing transit operators today. This includes all services, regional and local. Mr. Ball noted they are working with technical advisory group which includes the 5 transit operators, 2 DOT districts, a Representative from MPO staff directors and work force development groups.

The consultants have a sixteen-month schedule and will be spending a lot of time on outreach and base line conditions. There are number of projects that will be presented to the board in September. The target is a draft plan by February next year and then looking for TBARTA board to adopt the plan in May 2020. There are 5 objectives for the project. First is establishing that vision next ten years, second is TBARTA strategy of the next ten year, third identifying specific projects in the short term, fourth is the action plan to make this plan reality, the fifth is to make sure they are following the legislation.

TBARTA’s act specifically list these core areas: operations, funding, policy and planning, relationship and collaboration with local transit agencies. They have done outreach over the past couple months through an online survey and the TBARTA website. They have reached over 23,000 people so far throughout the five-county area. They received over 800 responses to their online survey. There is another online survey that will be launched in October and this is designed to help to get input how they prioritize regional transit plans. Next steps involve finalizing the results of the survey they have done so far and moving forward
with the evaluation of existing services as well as the peer regional analysis which is a key part of the presentation with the board in September and work session with the board in November.

Amy Espinosa questioned how many people responded to the survey and Bill Ball responded 811. Vance Arnett wanted to know when TBARTA was established by legislature. Bill Ball responded 10 -15 years ago and TBARTA became a transit authority 3 years ago. Vance Arnett stated you are trying to rebrand their effort to give them something and a legitimate purpose. Edward Mierzejewski stated this is the first time in three or four years that TBARTA has had the money to do anything.

B. 2045 Plan Needs Assessment for Investment Programs

Johnny Wong, MPO Staff, presented the five program areas for performance measurement. They allow MPO to prioritize each project based on how each is expected to improve performance in these categories. State of Good Repair & Resiliency maintains pavement, bridge, transit assets and resiliency to major storms. The Vision Zero program focuses on roadway safety. Smart Cities focus on reducing congestion using operational treatments. The Real Choices when not Driving program focuses on enhancing multimodal transportation options. There is a fifth program called major projects that focuses on adding capacity to facilitate economic growth.

Dr. Wong continued that this presentation only covers the top four programs because the fifth is using a separate process and it will be presented at another time. To assess how we are doing we considered a variety of metrics to figure out how these projects will perform in the future. We begin by taking this information and assess our performance today given the current level of funding. We take that number and compare to what the performance could be by 2045 with current funding levels plus a portion of the sales tax revenue.

The State of Good Repair & Resiliency program measures repair and replacement schedules for pavement, bridges, transit assets as well as the recovery time from a category 3 storm and the economic losses that would result. Vision Zero measures total crashes, fatal crashes, injury crashes and bike crashes. Smart Cities measures reliability of travel time and hours of delay. Real Choices when not Driving measures people and jobs served by the bus system and frequency of bus service the as well as walk bike facilities.

Dr. Wong said under the State of Good Repair & Resiliency program, for pavement the trend investment scenario falls short of meeting our standards of resurfacing our roads once every 17 years. With the amount of funding only 60 percent of our roads would be resurfaced on schedule which equates to resurfacing every 28 years. Alternatively, through the trend plus scenario all roads in the county would be resurfaced every 17 years on average thus meeting the standards. Another element in this program is maintaining bridges and under the trend plus scenario we would get 3 major and 11 minor replacement projects completed. The third element is transit asset maintenance these scenarios were based on HARTS current passenger fleet and utilized their ten- year transit development program. The trend scenario results in a funding short fall that would prevent HART from replacing their buses every 12 years. The trend plus scenario would allow HART to expand its fleet and the average bus age would be 7 years. The last element is resiliency to major storms and assessment was done for a tri-county area which has a current funding of 46 million dollars per year plus with an additional 22 million we could improve resilience on highly vulnerable and critical roads. With an additional 44 million we could invest in highly vulnerable, moderately vulnerable and critical roads. The treatments include: raise road profile, enhance sub-base, retention/detention ponds, depress medians and planting vegetation.
Continuing, Dr. Wong said the next program is vision zero, which focuses on safety. Under the trend scenario we could reduce all crashes by 15% on major roads and under the trend plus scenario we could reduce crashes by 35%. Under the Trend plus scenario we could fund 500 miles of streetlights, 1400 miles of missing sidewalks and complete streets treatments on 350 miles of high crash roads.

The next program is Smart Cities and the point of this investment program is reduced congestion. If no improvement by 2045, the hours of delay would increase more than 2.8 times. The trend scenario of 48 million dollars will produce more than 130 miles of major road improved and a 40% reduction in total delay. The trend plus scenario improves 220 miles of major roads and results in an 80% reduction in total delay. This scenario plus sales tax would enhance incident management, speed harmonization, ramp metering, smart messaging and advanced traffic management.

The real choices when not driving trend program anticipates funding trails at $2 million a year, serving more than 600,000 people and would provide 50 new miles of trails and side paths. It would also fund 22 transit routes with increased service. The trend plus sales tax scenario would serve more than 1,000,000 people and 150 new miles of trails and side paths, along with and 38 transit routes with increased service, 7 new BRT routes, 5 new local routes, 3 new express routes, new service in south county and Plant City, 3 new transit centers and new rail service.

Dr. Wong stated there is no action required today from the committee. Steven Hollenkamp requested a breakdown for Plant City and the real choices when not driving report for Plant City. Dr. Wong said that he will send both to Steven Hollenkamp. Camilo Soto questioned in the future will there be a plan for transit-orient development. Rich Clarendon clarified HART, City of Tampa and Planning Commission are working on beefing up transit orient development around specific stations.

C. It’s Time Hillsborough Survey Results

In view of the hour, this presentation was deferred but Lisa Silva, MPO Staff, distributed copies of her slides and was available for questions. Bill Roberts requested the number of surveys received. Ms. Silva responded 5219. This is Phase 2 of the survey which covers just Hillsborough County. Lisa Silva will come back to the next meeting to present the detail survey results. Rich Clarendon will send the presentation to the committee members.

VII. OLD BUSINESS & NEW BUSINESS

A. Evening Workshop for Q&A on 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan on September 24 at 6:00PM in the First Floor Multi-Purpose Room County Center.
B. Tour of Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority’s Traffic Management Center preceding CAC meeting on November 13.
C. Next meeting: September 11
D. MPO and HART Joint Workshop October 9 at 9:30am Plan Hillsborough Room
E. IOC meeting August 27 at 4:00pm in the Planning Commission Board room

Edward Mierzejewski pointed out that you cannot be a member of the IOC and a member of another advisory committee in Hillsborough County. He asked Rick Fernandez if he was going to give up the CAC. Rick Fernandez said he applied to three different agencies including HART. HART moved him forward because there was no issue. He plans on staying on the CAC. Rich Clarendon said he raised the question to the MPO attorney, who saw no conflict.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.
A full recording of this meeting is available upon request.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments:

#6. Hillsborough MPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (439336 2 & 402255 1) – Funding Rectification

#7. East Busch Blvd Corridor Study (441098 1) – Pedestrian Crossing Change

#8. Hillsborough Ave Surface Treatments (445824 1) – Added Project

Appendix C Add Transportation Performance Measures Consensus Planning Document

**Presenter**
Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO Staff

**Summary**
Amendment #6 rectifies the Hillsborough MPO’s planning funds to match the allocations shown in the MPO’s approved UPWP.

Amendment #7 follows the East Busch Blvd Corridor Study, which identified 19th St as a possible location for a pedestrian crossing. FDOT found this location not feasible and therefore identified Overlook Dr as a new location for a pedestrian crossing.

Amendment #8 adds a surface treatment project to Hillsborough Ave from W of Lagoon St to Sheldon Rd. The total project cost for construction is $447,996.

Last, this set of amendment adds the *Transportation Performance Measures Consensus Planning* document to Appendix C – Hillsborough MPO 2019/20 System Performance Report. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requested that the MPO include this information in the TIP.

**Recommended Action**
Recommend approval to the MPO Board.

**Prepared By**
Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
Comparative Reports for amendments #6 through 8
Factsheet for Amendments 7 & 8
Transportation Performance Measures Consensus Planning
### FDOT 5 Year TIP

#### Hillsborough County, District 7

**FLP: TRANSIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2020</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>&gt;2024</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>$6,189,814</td>
<td>$320,869</td>
<td>$329,907</td>
<td>$339,804</td>
<td>$349,998</td>
<td>$373,295</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,903,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$746,550</td>
<td>$40,109</td>
<td>$41,238</td>
<td>$42,476</td>
<td>$43,750</td>
<td>$46,662</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$960,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>$562,588</td>
<td>$40,109</td>
<td>$41,238</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$643,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPTO</td>
<td>$184,355</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,476</td>
<td>$43,750</td>
<td>$46,662</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$317,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>$26,335</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$26,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,709,642</strong></td>
<td><strong>$401,087</strong></td>
<td><strong>$412,383</strong></td>
<td><strong>$424,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>$437,498</strong></td>
<td><strong>$466,619</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,851,985</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 402255 1 Totals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2020</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>&gt;2024</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>$6,189,814</td>
<td>$320,869</td>
<td>$329,907</td>
<td>$339,804</td>
<td>$349,998</td>
<td>$373,295</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,903,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$746,550</td>
<td>$40,109</td>
<td>$41,238</td>
<td>$42,476</td>
<td>$43,750</td>
<td>$46,662</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$960,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>$562,588</td>
<td>$40,109</td>
<td>$41,238</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$643,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPTO</td>
<td>$184,355</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,476</td>
<td>$43,750</td>
<td>$46,662</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$317,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>$26,335</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$26,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,709,642</strong></td>
<td><strong>$401,087</strong></td>
<td><strong>$412,383</strong></td>
<td><strong>$424,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>$437,498</strong></td>
<td><strong>$466,619</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,851,985</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status:** Adopted  
**Adopted Date:** 06/11/2019

**Item Number:** 402255 1  
**Description:** HILLSBOROUGH CTY MPO TRANSIT PLANNING SECTION 5305  
**LRTP:** Goal IV  
**Extra Description:** SECTION 5305 MPO TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
**Type of Work:** PTO STUDIES
## FDOT
**FLP: TRANSIT**

### Item 402255 1
- **Description:** HILLSBOROUGH CTY MPO TRANSIT PLANNING SECTION 5305
- **LRTP:** Goal IV
- **Type of Work:** PTO STUDIES
- **Project Length:** 0
- **Status:** Amended
- **Amendment Date:** 10/1/2019
- **Amendment Number:** 6A
- **Extra Description:** SECTION 5305 MPO TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2020</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>&gt;2024</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modified DU</td>
<td>$6,189,814</td>
<td>$472,834</td>
<td>$329,907</td>
<td>$339,804</td>
<td>$349,998</td>
<td>$373,295</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,055,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified LF</td>
<td>$746,550</td>
<td>$59,104</td>
<td>$41,238</td>
<td>$42,476</td>
<td>$43,750</td>
<td>$46,662</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$979,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified DDR</td>
<td>$562,588</td>
<td>$59,104</td>
<td>$41,238</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$662,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPTO</td>
<td>$184,355</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,476</td>
<td>$43,750</td>
<td>$46,662</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$317,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>$26,335</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$26,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,709,642</strong></td>
<td><strong>$591,042</strong></td>
<td><strong>$412,383</strong></td>
<td><strong>$424,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>$437,498</strong></td>
<td><strong>$466,619</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,041,940</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 402255 1 Totals:
- **<2020:** $7,709,642
- **2020:** $591,042
- **2021:** $412,383
- **2022:** $424,756
- **2023:** $437,498
- **2024:** $466,619
- **>2024:** $0
- **All Years:** $10,041,940

*NON-SIS*
### TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

**Item Number:** 439336 2  
**Description:** HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY FY 2018/2019-2019/2020 UPWP  
**LRTP:** Pg. 179

**Status:** Adopted  
**Adopted Date:** 06/11/2019

**Type of Work:** TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>&gt;2024</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>$1,347,585</td>
<td>$1,258,356</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,605,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>$613,935</td>
<td>$403,288</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,017,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,961,520</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,661,644</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,623,164</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 439336 2 Totals:</td>
<td><strong>$1,961,520</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,661,644</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,623,164</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status:** Amended  
**Amendment Date:** 10/1/2019  
**Amendment Number:** 61

**Item Number:** 439336 2  
**Description:** HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY FY 2018/2019-2019/2020 UPWP  
**LRTP:** Pg. 179

**Type of Work:** TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>&gt;2024</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modified PL</td>
<td>$1,347,585</td>
<td>$1,275,437</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,623,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified SU</td>
<td>$613,935</td>
<td>$403,288</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,017,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,961,520</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,678,725</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,640,245</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 439336 2 Totals:</td>
<td><strong>$1,961,520</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,678,725</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,640,245</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HIGHWAYS

### Status: Adopted  
**Adopted Date:** 06/11/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number:</th>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>Related Project:</th>
<th>Type of Work:</th>
<th>Project Length:</th>
<th>Extra Description:</th>
<th>LRTA:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>441098 1</td>
<td>SR 580 / BUSCH BLVD MULTIPLE LOCATIONS 12ST, 19TH ST, PAWNEE AVE</td>
<td>CONSTRUCT 3 MID BLOCK CROSSWALKS W/ OVERHEAD ASSEMBLIES</td>
<td>PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>2.632</td>
<td>CONSTRUCT 3 MID BLOCK CROSSWALKS W/ OVERHEAD ASSEMBLIES</td>
<td>Reduce Crashes &amp; Vulnerability, Pg. 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>NON-SIS</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Construction - Managed by FDOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2020</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>&gt;2024</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACSS</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$988,339</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$988,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td><strong>$988,339</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td><strong>$988,339</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preliminary Engineering - Managed by FDOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2020</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>&gt;2024</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACSS</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$391,414</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$391,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td><strong>$391,414</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td><strong>$391,414</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 441098 1 Totals: $0, $391,414, $0, $988,339, $0, $0, $0, $1,379,753

---

## HIGHWAYS

### Status: Amended  
**Amendment Date:** 10/1/2019  
**Amendment Number:** 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number:</th>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>Related Project:</th>
<th>Type of Work:</th>
<th>Project Length:</th>
<th>Extra Description:</th>
<th>LRTA:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>441098 1</td>
<td>SR 580 / BUSCH BLVD MULTIPLE LOCATIONS 12ST, PAWNEE AVE, OVERLOOK DR.</td>
<td>CONSTRUCT 3 MID BLOCK CROSSWALKS W/ OVERHEAD ASSEMBLIES</td>
<td>PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>CONSTRUCT 3 MID BLOCK CROSSWALKS W/ OVERHEAD ASSEMBLIES</td>
<td>Reduce Crashes &amp; Vulnerability, Pg. 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>NON-SIS</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Construction - Managed by FDOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2020</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>&gt;2024</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modified ACSS</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,517,164</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,517,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td><strong>$1,517,164</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td><strong>$1,517,164</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 441098 1 Totals: $0, $1,517,164, $0, $0, $0, $0, $0, $1,517,164
**FDOT**

**5 Year TIP**

**Hillsborough County, District 7**

**HIGHWAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Amended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Date:</td>
<td>10/1/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Number:</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item Number:** 445824 1  
**Description:** US 92/SR 580/SR 600-HILLSBOROUGH AVE FROM W OF LAGOON ST TO SHELDON RD  
**Extra Description:** SKID HAZARD OVERLAY  
**LRTP:** System Preservation, p. 161  
*NON-SIS*

**Type of Work:** RESURFACING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2020</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>&gt;2024</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION - MANAGED BY FDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$447,996</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$447,996</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 445824 1 Totals:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$447,996</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Work Type</strong></th>
<th>Pedestrian Safety Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase</strong></td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limits</strong></td>
<td>at the intersections of 12th St., Pawnee Ave., Overlook Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>Tampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road</strong></td>
<td>Busch Blvd SR 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Cost</strong></td>
<td>$193,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### About

This project will add new high intensity pedestrian activated signalized crosswalks on SR 580 (Busch Blvd) at the intersections of 12th St, Pawnee Ave, and Overlook Dr.

The project is currently being designed. Construction is anticipated to begin in 2020.

### Contact Information

**Design Manager**  
Jake Hemingway  
813-975-6057  
jake.hemingway@dot.state.fl.us

**Media Contact**  
Kris Carson  
813-975-6060  
Kristen.carson@dot.state.fl.us
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project involves removing the existing top layer of asphalt and replacing it with a high friction surface treatment on the eastbound lanes of Hillsborough Avenue to correct rutting. Crosswalks will also be added to the intersections of Lagoon St. and Sheldon Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project is currently in the design phase with construction anticipated to begin in 2020. |
Transportation Performance Measures
Consensus Planning Document

Purpose and Authority

This document has been cooperatively developed by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Florida’s 27 Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) through the Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC), and, by representation on the MPO boards and committees, the providers of public transportation in the MPO planning areas.

The purpose of the document is to outline the minimum roles of FDOT, the MPOs, and the providers of public transportation in the MPO planning areas to ensure consistency to the maximum extent practicable in satisfying the transportation performance management requirements promulgated by the United States Department of Transportation in Title 23 Parts 450, 490, 625, and 673 of the Code of Federal Regulations (23 CFR). Specifically:

- 23 CFR 450.314(h)(1) requires that “The MPO(s), State(s), and providers of public transportation shall jointly agree upon and develop specific written procedures for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward achievement of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO, and the collection of data for the State asset management plan for the National Highway System (NHS).”

- 23 CFR 450.314(h)(2) allows for these provisions to be “Documented in some other means outside the metropolitan planning agreements as determined cooperatively by the MPO(s), State(s), and providers of public transportation.”

Section 339.175(11), Florida Statutes creates the MPOAC to “Assist MPOs in carrying out the urbanized area transportation planning process by serving as the principal forum for collective policy discussion pursuant to law” and to “Serve as a clearinghouse for review and comment by MPOs on the Florida Transportation Plan and on other issues required to comply with federal or state law in carrying out the urbanized transportation planning processes.” The MPOAC Governing Board membership includes one representative of each MPO in Florida.

This document was developed, adopted, and subsequently updated by joint agreement of the FDOT Secretary and the MPOAC Governing Board. Each MPO will adopt this document by incorporation in its annual Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) or by separate board action as documented in a resolution or meeting minutes, which will serve as documentation of agreement by the MPO and the provider(s) of public transportation in the MPO planning area to carry out their roles and responsibilities as described in this general document.
Roles and Responsibilities

This document describes the general processes through which FDOT, the MPOs, and the providers of public transportation in MPO planning areas will cooperatively develop and share information related to transportation performance management.

Email communications will be considered written notice for all portions of this document. Communication with FDOT related to transportation performance management generally will occur through the Administrator for Metropolitan Planning in the Office of Policy Planning. Communications with the MPOAC related to transportation performance management generally will occur through the Executive Director of the MPOAC.

1. Transportation performance data:

   a) FDOT will collect and maintain data, perform calculations of performance metrics and measures, and provide to each MPO the results of the calculations used to develop statewide targets for all applicable federally required performance measures. FDOT also will provide to each MPO the results of calculations for each applicable performance measure for the MPO planning area, and the county or counties included in the MPO planning area. FDOT and the MPOAC agree to use the National Performance Management Research Data Set as the source of travel time data and the defined reporting segments of the Interstate System and non-Interstate National Highway System for the purposes of calculating the travel time-based measures specified in 23 CFR 490.507, 490.607, and 490.707, as applicable.

   b) Each MPO will share with FDOT any locally generated data that pertains to the federally required performance measures, if applicable, such as any supplemental data the MPO uses to develop its own targets for any measure.

   c) Each provider of public transportation is responsible for collecting performance data in the MPO planning area for the transit asset management measures as specified in 49 CFR 625.43 and the public transportation safety measures as specified in the National Public Transportation Safety Plan. The providers of public transportation will provide to FDOT and the appropriate MPO(s) the transit performance data used to support these measures.

2. Selection of performance targets:

FDOT, the MPOs, and providers of public transportation will select their respective performance targets in coordination with one another. Selecting targets generally refers to the processes used to identify, evaluate, and make decisions about potential targets prior to action to formally establish the targets. Coordination will include as many of the following opportunities as deemed appropriate for each measure: in-person meetings, webinars, conferences calls, and email/written communication. Coordination will include timely

---

1 When an MPO planning area covers portions of more than one state, as in the case of the Florida-Alabama TPO, FDOT will collect and provide data for the Florida portion of the planning area.

2 If any Florida urbanized area becomes nonattainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, FDOT also will provide appropriate data at the urbanized area level for the specific urbanized area that is designated.
sharing of information on proposed targets and opportunities to provide comment prior to establishing final comments for each measure.

The primary forum for coordination between FDOT and the MPOs on selecting performance targets and related policy issues is the regular meetings of the MPOAC. The primary forum for coordination between MPOs and providers of public transportation on selecting transit performance targets is the TIP development process.

Once targets are selected, each agency will take action to formally establish the targets in its area of responsibility.

a) FDOT will select and establish a statewide target for each applicable federally required performance measure.

i. To the maximum extent practicable, FDOT will share proposed statewide targets at the MPOAC meeting scheduled in the calendar quarter prior to the dates required for establishing the target under federal rule. FDOT will work through the MPOAC to provide email communication on the proposed targets to the MPOs not in attendance at this meeting. The MPOAC as a whole, and individual MPOs as appropriate, will provide comments to FDOT on the proposed statewide targets within sixty (60) days of the MPOAC meeting. FDOT will provide an update to the MPOAC at its subsequent meeting on the final proposed targets, how the comments received from the MPOAC and any individual MPOs were considered, and the anticipated date when FDOT will establish final targets.

ii. FDOT will provide written notice to the MPOAC and individual MPOs within two (2) business days of when FDOT establishes final targets. This notice will provide the relevant targets and the date FDOT established the targets, which will begin the 180-day time-period during which each MPO must establish the corresponding performance targets for its planning area.

b) Each MPO will select and establish a target for each applicable federally required performance measure. To the extent practicable, MPOs will propose, seek comment on, and establish their targets through existing processes such as the annual TIP update. For each performance measure, an MPO will have the option of either:

i. Choosing to support the statewide target established by FDOT, and providing documentation (typically in the form of meeting minutes, a letter, a resolution, or incorporation in a document such as the TIP) to FDOT that the MPO agrees to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishments of FDOT’s statewide targets for that performance measure.

ii. Choosing to establish its own target, using a quantifiable methodology for its MPO planning area. If the MPO chooses to establish its own target, the MPO will coordinate with FDOT and, as applicable, providers of public transportation regarding the approach used to develop the target and the proposed target prior to

---

3 When an MPO planning area covers portions of more than one state, as in the case of the Florida-Alabama TPO, that MPO will be responsible for coordinating with each state DOT in setting and reporting targets and associated data.
establishment of a final target. The MPO will provide FDOT and, as applicable, providers of public transportation, documentation (typically in the form of meeting minutes, a letter, a resolution, or incorporation in a document such as the TIP) that includes the final targets and the date when the targets were established.

c) The providers of public transportation in MPO planning areas will select and establish performance targets annually to meet the federal performance management requirements for transit asset management and transit safety under 49 U.S.C. 5326(c) and 49 U.S.C. 5329(d).

   i. The Tier I providers of public transportation will establish performance targets to meet the federal performance management requirements for transit asset management. Each Tier I provider will provide written notice to the appropriate MPO and FDOT when it establishes targets. This notice will provide the final targets and the date when the targets were established, which will begin the 180-day period within which the MPO must establish its transit-related performance targets. MPOs may choose to update their targets when the Tier I provider(s) updates theirs, or when the MPO amends its long-range transportation plan by extending the horizon year in accordance with 23 CFR 450.324(c).

   ii. FDOT is the sponsor of a Group Transit Asset Management plan for subrecipients of Section 5311 and 5310 grant funds. The Tier II providers of public transportation may choose to participate in FDOT’s group plan or to establish their own targets. FDOT will notify MPOs and those participating Tier II providers following of establishment of transit-related targets. Each Tier II provider will provide written notice to the appropriate MPO and FDOT when it establishes targets. This notice will provide the final targets and the date the final targets were established, which will begin the 180-day period within which the MPO must establish its transit-related performance targets. MPOs may choose to update their targets when the Tier II provider(s) updates theirs, or when the MPO amends its long-range transportation plan by extending the horizon year in accordance with 23 CFR 450.324(c).

   iii. FDOT will draft and certify a Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan for any small public transportation providers (defined as those who are recipients or subrecipients of federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. 5307, have one hundred (100) or fewer vehicles in peak revenue service, and do not operate a rail fixed guideway public transportation system). FDOT will coordinate with small public transportation providers on selecting statewide public transportation safety performance targets, with the exception of any small operator that notifies FDOT that it will draft its own plan.

   iv. All other public transportation service providers that receive funding under 49 U.S. Code Chapter 53 (excluding sole recipients of sections 5310 and/or 5311 funds) will provide written notice to the appropriate MPO and FDOT when they establish public transportation safety performance targets. This notice will provide the final targets and the date the final targets were established, which will begin the 180-day period within which the MPO must establish its transit safety targets.
performance targets. MPOs may choose to update their targets when the provider(s) updates theirs, or when the MPO amends its long-range transportation plan by extending the horizon year in accordance with 23 CFR 450.324(c).

v. If the MPO chooses to support the asset management and safety targets established by the provider of public transportation, the MPO will provide to FDOT and the provider of public transportation documentation that the MPO agrees to plan and program MPO projects so that they contribute toward achievement of the statewide or public transportation provider targets. If the MPO chooses to establish its own targets, the MPO will develop the target in coordination with FDOT and the providers of public transportation. The MPO will provide FDOT and the providers of public transportation documentation (typically in the form of meeting minutes, a letter, a resolution, or incorporation in a document such as the TIP) that includes the final targets and the date the final targets were established. In cases where two or more providers operate in an MPO planning area and establish different targets for a given measure, the MPO has the options of coordinating with the providers to establish a single target for the MPO planning area, or establishing a set of targets for the MPO planning area.

3. Reporting performance targets:

a) Reporting targets generally refers to the process used to report targets, progress achieved in meeting targets, and the linkage between targets and decision making processes FDOT will report its final statewide performance targets to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as mandated by the federal requirements.

i. FDOT will include in future updates or amendments of the statewide long-range transportation plan a description of all applicable performance measures and targets and a system performance report, including progress achieved in meeting the performance targets, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.216(f).

ii. FDOT will include in future updates or amendments of the statewide transportation improvement program a discussion of the anticipated effect of the program toward achieving the state’s performance targets, linking investment priorities to those performance targets, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.218(q).

iii. FDOT will report targets and performance data for each applicable highway performance measure to FHWA, in accordance with the reporting timelines and requirements established by 23 CFR 490; and for each applicable public transit measure to FTA, in accordance with the reporting timelines and requirements established by 49 CFR 625 and 40 CFR 673.

b) Each MPO will report its final performance targets as mandated by federal requirements to FDOT. To the extent practicable, MPOs will report final targets through the TIP update or other existing documents.

i. Each MPO will include in future updates or amendments of its metropolitan long-range transportation plan a description of all applicable performance measures
and targets and a system performance report, including progress achieved by the MPO in meeting the performance targets, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.324(f)(3-4).

ii. Each MPO will include in future updates or amendments of its TIP a discussion of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the applicable performance targets, linking investment priorities to those performance targets, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.326(d).

iii. Each MPO will report target-related status information to FDOT upon request to support FDOT’s reporting requirements to FHWA.

c) Providers of public transportation in MPO planning areas will report all established transit asset management targets to the FTA National Transit Database (NTD) consistent with FTA’s deadlines based upon the provider’s fiscal year and in accordance with 49 CFR Parts 625 and 630, and 49 CFR Part 673.

4. Reporting performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of performance targets for the MPO planning area:

a) FDOT will report to FHWA or FTA as designated, and share with each MPO and provider of public transportation, transportation performance for the state showing the progress being made towards attainment of each target established by FDOT, in a format to be mutually agreed upon by FDOT and the MPOAC.

b) If an MPO establishes its own targets, the MPO will report to FDOT on an annual basis transportation performance for the MPO area showing the progress being made towards attainment of each target established by the MPO, in a format to be mutually agreed upon by FDOT and the MPOAC. To the extent practicable, MPOs will report progress through existing processes including, but not limited to, the annual TIP update.

c) Each provider of public transportation will report transit performance annually to the MPO(s) covering the provider’s service area, showing the progress made toward attainment of each target established by the provider.

5. Collection of data for the State asset management plans for the National Highway System (NHS):

a) FDOT will be responsible for collecting bridge and pavement condition data for the State asset management plan for the NHS. This includes NHS roads that are not on the State highway system but instead are under the ownership of local jurisdictions, if such roads exist.

For more information, contact:

Mark Reichert, Administrator for Metropolitan Planning, Office of Policy Planning, Florida Department of Transportation, 850-414-4901, mark.reichert@dot.state.fl.us

Carl Mikyska, Executive Director, MPOAC, 850-414-4062, carl.mikyska@mpoac.org
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**

Transportation Demand Management Plans

**Presenter**

Sara Hendricks, USF/CUTR

**Summary**

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is any action or set of actions intended to influence the intensity, timing and spatial distribution of vehicle demand for the purpose of reducing the impact of traffic, managing parking needs, reducing greenhouse gases, enhancing mobility options.

TDM is a program of information, encouragement and incentives provided by local or regional organizations to help people know about and use all their transportation options to optimize all modes in the system – and to counterbalance the incentives to drive that are so prevalent in subsidies of parking and roads. These are both traditional and innovative technology-based services to help people use transit, ridesharing, walking, biking, and telework.

**Recommended Action**

None; for information only.

**Prepared By**

Michele Ogilvie, MPO staff

**Attachments**

None.
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Agenda Item
DRAFT 2045 Cost Feasible Plan

Presenter
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

Summary
As MPO staff continues to work on the development of the 2045 Plan update. The presentation will focus on the draft 2045 Cost Feasible Plan (CFP). The draft CFP includes the revised funding allocations for the four investment programs presented as part of the Needs Assessment and the major investments. To be considered “cost feasible,” the Plan must demonstrate that future costs can be funded with funding available through 2045. Therefore, the investment programs identify available funding allocated to:

- **Good Repair & Resiliency** includes pavement & bridge maintenance, transit asset maintenance, stormwater and resiliency projects;
- **Vision Zero** includes safety projects for walking, biking, and driving;
- **Smart Cities** includes advanced traffic management and intersection improvements;
- **Real Choices When Not Driving** includes transit expansion and trails
- **Major Projects** includes specific capacity and fixed-guideway; and projects for economic growth.

The draft Plan will be reviewed by the MPO committees in September and then presented to the MPO Board in October. This will open a 30-day public comment period on the draft Plan. The final 2045 Plan is slated to be adopted by the MPO at a public hearing on the evening of November 5th.

Recommended Action
None; for review and comment only.

Prepared By
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

Attachments
Draft 2045 Plan Summary Report
The preparation of this report has been financed in part through grant(s) from the FHWA and FTA, USDOT, under the State Planning and Research Program, Section 505 or Metropolitan Planning Program, Section 104(f) of Title 23, US Code. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the USDOT.

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 by visiting: www.planhillsborough.org/non-discrimination-commitment
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welcome
letter from the chair

On behalf of the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), I would like to introduce you to our investment plan for funding local transportation options here in Hillsborough County – It’s TIME Hillsborough 2045.

Our communities continue to grow. Hillsborough County is a leading destination for many new arrivals to Florida, and this growth incentivizes us to fund a world-class transportation system for those living and traveling in our communities. The challenges of meeting the needs of our shared transportation system require bold solutions.

The Hillsborough MPO serves as a forum for building consensus and facilitating discussions on how to best prioritize transportation dollars in our communities.

We have collaborated with our partners in Pinellas and Pasco counties to create the first regional transportation vision that seeks to address mobility needs for over 2.9 million people.

It’s TIME Hillsborough 2045 is our objective-driven approach to funding local transportation investments that promotes our shared vision for a transportation system while balancing the need to accommodate growth, multimodal needs of all travelers, and fund sustainable options to preserve our system.

We invite you to join the Hillsborough MPO as we strive to be resilient and innovative in how we choose to fund our strategic priorities over the next 25 years.
Our team is excited to share our investment strategy for funding flexible transportation options, delivering innovative solutions, and promoting mobility in our region.

This long-range transportation plan for Hillsborough County presents an investment approach that details transportation priorities and associated funding for the next 25 years.

It’s TIME Hillsborough 2045 is organized around our five mission directives for the county and surrounding region: maintaining a state of good repair and promoting resiliency; reducing crashes through the Vision Zero initiative; alleviating congestion for commuters and visitors; providing multimodal transportation options; and stimulating economic development.

This plan is a culmination of the voices in our community and the hard work our staff has done to create funding scenarios that reflect your needs while balancing our constraints. As we strive towards our objectives, we will continue collaborating with our neighbors and regional partners to prioritize and fund transportation options in Hillsborough County that benefit the millions of residents and visitors who live, work, and play in the Tampa Bay area.

We are excited to present It’s TIME Hillsborough 2045 as our response to the challenges that uniquely face a region poised for continued growth in West Central Florida.

Beth Alden, AICP

We are excited to present It’s TIME Hillsborough 2045 as our response to the challenges that uniquely face a region poised for continued growth in West Central Florida.
**list of acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEBR</td>
<td>Bureau of Economic and Business Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPAC</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>Citizens Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>Communities of Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST</td>
<td>Fixing America’s Surface Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT</td>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>Hillsborough Area Regional Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC</td>
<td>Livable Roadways Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRTP</td>
<td>Long Range Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>State Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>Strategic Intermodal Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STWG</td>
<td>MPO School Transportation Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDCB</td>
<td>Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDP</td>
<td>Transit Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEA</td>
<td>Tampa Hillsborough Expressway Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDOT</td>
<td>United States Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOE</td>
<td>Year of Expenditure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
terms, definitions, and planning concepts

Communities of Concern (COC)
Transportation disadvantaged and historically marginalized communities. Indicators for COC include zero-vehicle households, limited English proficiency, single-parent households, disability, and age (i.e., youth and elderly).

Environmental Justice (EJ)
The equitable distribution of costs and benefits associated with any Federal investment on all members of the community. An environmental justice policy and analysis seeks to ensure that low-income persons and people of color, in particular, benefit from Federal investments and do not experience disproportionate adverse environmental and health impacts (E.O. 12898).

Fixed-Guideway
A mass transportation facility that uses and occupies a separate right-of-way (ROW) or rail for the exclusive use of mass transportation and other high occupancy vehicles.

FAST Act (Fixing America’s Surface Transportation)
Federal legislation that provides funding for surface transportation programs for fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

Key Economic Spaces
Clusters of at least 5,000 jobs representative of existing employment patterns and areas of future growth potential.

MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization)
An agency created under federal and state law to provide a forum for cooperative decision-making in regard to regional transportation issues. Membership includes elected and appointed officials representing local jurisdictions and transportation agencies.

Note: A complete transportation glossary is available at: www.planhillsborough.org/mpo_glossary

Regionally Significant Project
A project that serves regional transportation needs (such as to and from the area outside the region or major activity centers within the region), including, at a minimum all principal arterial highways and all fixed guideway transit facilities that offer an alternative to regional highway travel (23 CFR. §45.204). These types of projects also include any project which requires ROW acquisition.

SIS (Strategic Intermodal System)
A statewide network of high-priority transportation facilities, including the state’s largest and most significant commercial service airports, spaceport, deepwater seaports, freight rail terminals, passenger rail and intercity bus terminals, rail corridors, waterways and highways.

Surtax for Transportation Improvements (Surtax)
The surtax funds transportation improvements throughout Hillsborough County, including road and bridge improvements; the expansion of public transit options; fixing potholes; enhancing bus service; relieving rush-hour bottlenecks; improving intersections; and making walking and biking safer. The proceeds of the surtax are distributed and disbursed in compliance with F.S. 212.055 (1) and in accordance with the provisions of Article 11 of the Hillsborough County Home Rule Charter.

Title VI
The section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin in programs that receive federal financial assistance, including transportation projects (42. U.S. Code §200d).

YOE (Year of Expenditure)
All amounts in the LRTP are expressed in “year of expenditure” dollars, which is the dollars inflated to the year spent.
how our plan was developed

Generally, the development of the 2045 Plan consisted of examining:

1. Current and Changing Conditions
2. Various Scenarios for Future Growth & Transportation
3. Perspectives of the Public and Our Partners
4. The Transportation System’s Performance and Related Needs
5. Available Funding and Funding Eligibility Requirements

Our County is part of the Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) which stretches into Hernando, Pasco, and Pinellas Counties, and is adjacent to the Lakeland-Winter Haven MSA and Sarasota-Bradenton MSA. Its cities include Temple Terrace, Plant City, and Tampa, which also serves as the county seat. During the 25-year horizon of this plan (FY 2020-2045), the Hillsborough MPO has the discretion to program federal funds for infrastructure projects.

In developing this plan, we searched for opportunities to explore alternative futures. According to the most recent federal requirements and guidance, planning for this Plan incorporated a number of new elements that brought more information to the decision-making process. For example, the MPO enhanced its performance-based planning practice and expanded its use of contemporary planning tools, such as scenario planning to inform policy and other types of decisions.
Snapshot of Hillsborough

**TODAY**

1,440,800 current population (BEBR est.)

- Population share remains stable
- 50% of the tri-county area total

Pinellas County ↓ Pasco County ↑

- **Service sector industries** (office, professional, retail)
- **Majority of employment**

830,900 people currently employed

- **Single family residential development** is the predominant land use within the Urban Service Area.

**TOMORROW**

- **Population** expected to grow to 2 million people by 2045

- **18 to 34 largest age cohort.** Expected to decrease by 2045.

- **65+ expected to increase.**

- **Residential development** in the Central Business District (CBD) growing at a faster rate than the rest of the country.

Agricultural, industrial, and institutional land uses make up most land outside the Urban Service Area.
We used an alternative transportation and land use scenario analysis to give us an opportunity to envision potential futures that may address our current uncertainties related to outcomes, policy decisions, and infrastructure investments. Under the guidance of the MPO and Planning Commission along with the MPOs in Pasco and Pinellas Counties, the following alternative scenarios were developed and rated by the public:

**Scenario a:** trend + technology
**Scenario b:** belt + boulevard
**Scenario c:** transit oriented development

**Hillsborough County Growth Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,477,500</td>
<td>671,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,325,200</td>
<td>838,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,317,700</td>
<td>736,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hybrid Scenario**

Builds on the Transit Oriented Development Scenario while including the best elements from the Trend and Belt and Boulevard Scenarios; Provides capacity for 2,026,000 people at buildout (2045 projection is 2,007,000 people); Expands Hillsborough County’s urban service area by 5,400 acres to allow for 66,000 more people and to offset reduced intensity along corridors where rail would be eliminated (e.g., Linebaugh Avenue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Capacity</th>
<th>Employment Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,354,800</td>
<td>838,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowing that no single transportation solution would solve our current and future transportation issues, we shared our scenarios with the public through our It’s Time Tampa Bay public outreach campaign in 2018. The regional outreach effort was designed to establish preliminary guidance for the 2045 Plan and it included a public survey, social media campaign, presentations to advisory bodies, and public hearings.

What priorities emerged?

- Provide alternatives to driving (Rail, bus & walk/bike spaces)
- Use new technologies Improve transportation efficiency
- Minimize outward growth
- Reinvest in established neighborhoods
- Reduce congestion
- Strengthen downtowns Create spaces like them
What Hillsborough Will Need

**Problem**

Increasing traffic volumes, aging infrastructure, and limited budgets increase the rate of deterioration of our roadways, bridges and transit fleets. This threatens our ability to travel within our county and to surrounding areas.

Hillsborough has frequently ranked among some of the nation’s most dangerous counties for road users.

The traveling public and our economy depends on having reliable travel times, clean air, and reduced congestion by using intersection treatments and technology to help limit crashes, anticipating weather, special events, and construction.

People need access to work, school, health services and healthy food when they cannot drive or do not own a car.

Hillsborough County is expected to increase in population by 40% by 2045. Investments in major projects are critical to supporting a growing economy. Safe, reliable, and efficient transportation infrastructure is needed to efficiently move people and goods.

**Current Status**

- **Centerline miles of road**: 5,318
- **Bridges**: 757
- **Transit vehicle (HART)**: 201
- **Worst year for fatal crashes**: 2016
- **Fatalities (up 15% from 2015)**: 226
- **Fatalities in 2018**: 169
- **Non-interstate highways**: large proportion
- **Adult asthma rate**: highest in state
- **Live within 150 meters of high volume road**: 9.2%
- **11%**
- **14%**
- **20%**
- **43%**
- **24%**

**Needs**

- Meet roadway pavement standards
- Meet bridge safety standards
- Maintain an appropriate number of vehicles for service
- Maintain average age of transit fleet
- Reduce crash rates
- Reduce fatal crash rates
- Complete streets safety enhancements
- Complete streets improvements to traditional intersections
- Technology enhancements for congestion relief
- Travel time reliability
- Access to reliable bus services
- Access to bicycle and pedestrian networks
- Access to transportation disadvantaged services
- Road widenings
- Interchange improvements
- Fixed-Guideway investment
Funding That is Available to Our Partners to Meet Our Needs

Without surtax, 55% of all funds must go towards Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) & State Highway System (SHS)

With surtax, we have more funds to achieve our vision:

- 36% transit funds
- 54% safe and reliable roadway funds
Transportation projects can be funded through a variety of investment allocations that use federal, state, local, or a combination of money. To ensure that public dollars are being used appropriately, these allocations are categorized by intended purpose or funding source and have their own set of strict eligibility requirements.

The MPO manages only available (unprogrammed) federal dollars to plan transportation investments and can work with FDOT to prioritize preprogrammed projects such as those funded through the SIS, Other Arterials Construction & ROW, and Surtax. After assessing available funds, eligibility requirements, funding scenarios with and without surtax, and the region’s transportation needs, the Hillsborough MPO determined the cost feasibility of prospective projects (i.e., what we can afford and when) and matched it to our goals for the region.
Hillsborough County deserves a coordinated transportation system that provides access to key economic spaces and addresses the shared mobility needs for the Tampa Bay Area.

As a forum for consensus building, we believe in working with our local and regional partners to fund a transportation system that balances the need to accommodate growth, the multimodal needs of all travelers, and fund sustainable options to preserve our system.

Our vision for addressing mobility needs is twofold. We seek to promote opportunities that increase regional connectivity and move people.

We will invest in viable and dependable transportation options for a major transit system and important non-interstate roadways.

It's TIME Hillsborough 2045 presents a high-level system approach to funding transportation investments that prioritize innovation, technology, and mobility for everyone.
Our Vision for Hillsborough and How We Got Here

After establishing our tri-county, regional vision and transportation priorities with the public outreach campaign in 2018, we identified Hillsborough’s needs to help facilitate the implementation of the regional vision. In summer 2019, we set out to engage the community again to gain their input on local future projects.

The LRTP will include many kinds of projects including maintenance, safety, innovative transportation management systems, walk/bike, and bus projects. These projects do not have to be shown on maps; funding can be set aside for them, and locations of highest need determined later. We heard you – it’s already in the plan.

5,219 PARTICIPANTS

89% county residents
90% county workers

93,000+ data points
3,000+ comments

TWO MAJOR THEMES EMERGED

1. mass transit
   - Bus Rapid Transit
   - Streetcar Expansion
   - Light Rail
   - Passenger Rail

2. multimodal projects
   - Greenways
   - Trails
   - Right-sizing roads
   - Downtown Interchange
NEW ERA OF TRANSIT

Free. Fun. Frequent. Totally Tampa!
Our Vision for a Major Transit System

Our vision for a major transit system considers what can be achieved through coordination and investment with our partners to develop a long-term sustainable system. This vision promotes safe and reliable transportation options by funding vehicle replacement and providing recommendations on where new technology options could contribute to a world-class transportation system.

Hillsborough County can lead the charge in the Tampa Bay Area as an incubator for new technologies like fixed-guideway transit.

When considering new investments that best promote our vision for connectivity, resilience, and efficiency in our region, the following metrics become key in the decision-making process:

- **Capital Cost per Mile**
- **Capital Cost per Station**
- **Connections between Communities of Concern and Key Economic Spaces**
- **Annual Operating Cost**
- **Population Density**

### potential investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Range of Capital Cost Millions/Mile</th>
<th>Range of Capital Cost Millions/Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>$2.57 - $9.46</td>
<td>$2.43 - $6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar Expansion</td>
<td>$38.88 - $67.28</td>
<td>$12.64 - $15.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>$113.79 - $244.58</td>
<td>$113.60 - $149.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>$5.63 - $38.60</td>
<td>$68.68 - $114.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our Vision for Important Non-Interstate Roadways

Promoting livability and sustainability through our roadway network is a key priority in the long-term vision of Hillsborough County. We have heard the public’s concerns and have identified 148 roadways for potential improvement. Projects, like road widening and increasing access from our local roads to our highways, address major factors that would have an impact on our area, such as:

- Making roads safer for all users
- Improving Access to Jobs
- Linking People to Destinations
- Connecting to Key Economic Spaces
- Increasing Connectivity for Communities of Concern
- Alleviating Congestion
- Creating Environmentally Sustainable Infrastructure
- Promoting the Development of Underutilized Existing Urban Spaces

Working Together

We advise our partners from a funding position on where key economic spaces could benefit from investment in available funding sources, and organize momentum in the pursuit of discretionary grant opportunities.

For facilities owned, operated, and maintained by FDOT and THEA, we serve as an informed partner and assist local implementers in public engagement on regional priorities.
what our plan will build over the next 25 years

good repair and resilience

vision zero

smart cities

real choices when not driving

major investments for economic development
How We Will Fund Our Vision

Our plan identifies $32.2 billion in available funds through FY 2026-2045. We’ve collaborated with our state and local partners to seek consensus on how to fund transportation options for Hillsborough County. These partnerships led to the development of a cost feasible plan that allocates available federal, state, and local funds across five funding programs:

- **State of Good Repair and Resilience**
  - pavement, bridge, stormwater, transit maintenance

- **Vision Zero**
  - “complete streets” treatments and other safety enhancements

- **Smart Cities**
  - intersection operation fixes and advanced traffic management systems

- **Real choices when not driving**
  - expansion of bus services and trails/paths separated from roadways

- **Major investments for economic development**
  - rapid transit in a dedicated ROW, interchanges and additional through lanes on major roadways

### Who Administers Funds (In Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Hillsborough County</th>
<th>HART</th>
<th>Local (i.e., cities)</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>TOTAL FUNDS ADMINISTERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who Administers Funds (In Millions)</strong></td>
<td>13,760</td>
<td>9,030</td>
<td>7,208</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>32,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Distribution of surtax revenue is pursuant to statutory formula in F.S. § 218.62 and Sections 11.07 and 11.08 of the Hillsborough County Charter.
### Available Revenues vs. Anticipated Costs (In Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2026 - 2030</th>
<th>2031 - 2035</th>
<th>2036 - 2045</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal/State</td>
<td>$3,219</td>
<td>$5,158</td>
<td>$6,338</td>
<td>$14,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$1,507</td>
<td>$1,670</td>
<td>$4,305</td>
<td>$7,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Surtax</td>
<td>$1,881</td>
<td>$2,243</td>
<td>$5,863</td>
<td>$9,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Anticipated Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,608</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,072</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,507</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,186</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost Feasible Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2026 - 2030</th>
<th>2031 - 2035</th>
<th>2036 - 2045</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Needs-Based Costs</em></td>
<td>$3,704</td>
<td>$4,357</td>
<td>$11,194</td>
<td>$19,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Anticipated Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,608</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,072</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,507</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,186</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Balance</td>
<td>$2,904</td>
<td>$4,715</td>
<td>$5,313</td>
<td>$12,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See supporting technical memoranda for details.*

### Allocation of Available Funding by Program (In Millions)

- **Good repair and resilience**: $7,826 (26%)
- **Vision Zero**: $3,481 (11%)
- **Smart Cities**: $2,107 (7%)
- **Real choices when not driving**: $7,152 (23%)
- **Major investments for economic growth**: $9,895 (33%)

*$1,725 million or 5% of available funding is unassigned surtax revenue for transit and local road improvements.*
The **State of Good Repair and Resilience** program addresses the condition of our roadways, bridges, and transit fleets. Each of these assets must be maintained to meet the existing and future demand of the traveling public.

State of Good Repair and Resilience performance targets were established to improve pavement condition, increase bridge safety, maintain the number of vehicles needed for service, and decrease or maintain average age of fleet.

**14%** of all county bridges classified as functionally obsolete or deficient

A typical HART bus travels an average of 320,000 miles within the first seven years of operation.
This includes $3.3 billion in vulnerability reduction, averaging $164 million per year.
target funding allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 26-30</th>
<th>FY 31-35</th>
<th>FY 36-45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Maintenance</td>
<td>$204.8M</td>
<td>$533M</td>
<td>$530.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance</td>
<td>$682.8M</td>
<td>$696.2M</td>
<td>$1,767.0B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Maintenance</td>
<td>227.7M</td>
<td>592M</td>
<td>1,801.5B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability Reduction</td>
<td>$53.3M</td>
<td>$59.2M</td>
<td>$137.9M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dollars (in millions, YOE)
Vision Zero addresses traffic safety for drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists. It’s a movement to end road deaths and serious injuries by taking a data-driven approach to identify areas of concern and top factors in severe crashes.

Vision Zero performance targets were established to reduce fatalities, serious injuries, and non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries.

Hillsborough County frequently ranks amongst the most dangerous counties in the nation for road users.
intended of vision zero

We’ve allocated $2.1 billion toward implementing Vision Zero, averaging $105 million per year.

For more information on how we plan to improve the safety of our streets, please visit: www.planhillsborough.org/vision-zero.
Vision Zero

$2.1 billion

target funding allocation

dollars (in millions, YOE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 26-30</th>
<th>FY 31-35</th>
<th>FY 36-45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>$417.1</td>
<td>$479.6</td>
<td>$1,210.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 26-30
FY 31-35
FY 36-45
The Hillsborough MPO’s **Smart Cities** program develops strategies to alleviate congestion and improve safety at key intersections. This is done by implementing the appropriate design treatments at intersections and incorporating current and emerging technology enhancements.

Performance targets will measure travel time reliability on interstates and non-interstate roads, and improvement in air quality.

**Travel Time reliability improves decision making and minimizes aggravation experienced when a 30-minute commute turns into two hours due to game day traffic clogging up the network.**
We’ve identified $3.5 billion for Smart Cities solutions, averaging $174 million per year.

- Reduce traffic delays
- Lessen impact of high vehicle emissions
- Fund congestion management strategies
- Increase travel time reliability
- Improve air quality

intent of smart cities
target funding allocation

Smart Cities

$3.5 billion

FY 26-30: $723.6 million
FY 31-35: $807.8 million
FY 36-45: $1,949.1 million

dollars (in millions, YOE)
Real choices when not driving helps to make sure the traveling public has access to other reliable transportation options, such as transit services, pedestrian networks, and transportation disadvantaged services.

Performance targets were developed to monitor transit service availability, access to walking/biking facilities, transit on-time performance, access to jobs, and access to health-related destinations.

37% of total employment opportunities are within .25 miles of good transit facilities.

7.1% of county residents do not have a car, but still require access to jobs, schools, health services and healthy food.
intent of real choices when not driving

Address connectivity
Invest in public transportation and multi-use trails

Increase access to jobs and destinations
Connect communities of concern to key destinations

Nearly 80% of $6.5 billion in available funds will be allocated to support HART in providing safe and reliable transportation options for our communities.

Improve mobility for all

Invest in public transportation and multi-use trails

Increase access to jobs and destinations
Connect communities of concern to key destinations
target funding allocation

**Bus Transit**
$5.3 billion

**TD Paratransit**
$601 million

**Trails Sidepath**
$694 million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 26-30</th>
<th>FY 31-35</th>
<th>FY 36-45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Transit</td>
<td>$1,055.9</td>
<td>$1,204.9</td>
<td>$3,003.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD Paratransit</td>
<td>$120.5</td>
<td>$137.5</td>
<td>$342.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails Sidepath</td>
<td>$139.2</td>
<td>$158.8</td>
<td>$395.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major projects are a key component to growing our economy. Targeted investments for good transportation infrastructure promote economic growth by connecting people to key economic spaces, including our communities of concern.

43% of interstates and 24% of other roads are currently over capacity. We serve as a forum for discussing how to best fund our interstates, expressways, and explore options for new technologies like fixed-guideway transit.
We’ve worked with our partners to identify $9.9 billion to fund major projects, averaging approximately $370 million for our interstates and expressways, $79 million for new fixed-guideway transit, and $46 million for our non-interstate major roads per year.
Fixed Guideway Transit

$1.6 billion

Non-SIS Major Roadway

$916 million

FDOT SIS Projects

$7.4 billion

*For more information on detailed costs and project location, please view FDOT’s 2029-2045 Long Range Cost Feasible Plan: https://fdotwww.blob.core.windows.net/sitefinity/docs/default-source/planning/systems/programs/mspi/pdf/sis_2029-2045_cfp_pdc1a5a88b598246e1a055e616028df8ad.pdf?sfvrsn=5e27eec7_2
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
US 41 at CSX Grade Separation Project Development & Environmental Study

**Presenter**
Lilliam E. Escalera, FDOT District 7

**Summary**

FDOT District 7 is undertaking a re-evaluation to study grade separation improvements on US 41, from just south of the CSX Railroad Crossing to the north of Causeway Boulevard, a distance of approximately 1.5 miles. This re-evaluation will consider a full range of alternatives for improving mobility and safety along US 41, including a grade separation of US 41 and the CSX railroad crossing south of the intersection.

The proposed improvements have been identified in the MPO’s *Imagine 2040* Long Range Transportation Plan under the Hillsborough County Freight Hot Spots and a Goods Movement Corridor from I-4 to Manatee County Line and is a priority project for the National Highway Freight Program.

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

**Prepared By**
Gena Torres, MPO staff

**Attachments**
None.
OLD & NEW BUSINESS
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Revised Comments on Tampa Interstate Study Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)

**Presenter**
Rich Clarendon, MPO Staff

**Summary**
This is a follow-up to the item heard at the CAC’s August meeting.
The attached letter has been revised to incorporate issues raised by the CAC as well as the MPO’s other committees.
It will be on the agenda for approval at the MPO’s meeting scheduled for October 1, 2019.

**Recommended Action**
None; for information only.

**Prepared By**
Rich Clarendon, AICP

**Attachments**
- DRAFT Letter of Comment
[DATE]

Mr. David Gwynn, P.E., Secretary
Florida Department of Transportation District Seven
11201 N. McKinley Drive
Tampa, FL 33607

Re: Tampa Interstate Study, Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)

Dear Secretary Gwynn:

Thank you for all the efforts you and your staff have exerted to provide information and obtain the community's input on the SEIS. We particularly appreciate the three open houses arranged by the District for the benefit of the MPO and its advisory committee members, as well as numerous staff-to-staff coordination meetings and briefings.

In adopting the Transportation Improvement Programs over the past three years, the MPO passed motions asking that the District address impacts related to the Tampa Interstate Study, Tampa Bay Express and Tampa Bay Next. The attached comments are based on the requests made in these motions and other concerns articulated by the community as well as our review of available documents.

We look forward to continued coordination with you and other stakeholders as the Department works to finalize the SEIS over the coming months. We appreciate your regular updates to and discussion with the MPO board.

Sincerely,

Lesley "Les" Miller, Jr.
Chairman

Attachment: Comments on SEIS Sections 4-6
1. **MPO Motion**: A finalized study and report on human impact, that would delineate the total number of all homes and multifamily dwelling complexes and business, displayed in a map and showing individual parcels, including impacts on affordable housing and how to pay for replacing them. A final neighborhood mitigation plan for displaced residents and businesses, including design elements.

   **Summary of documentation provided by FDOT:**
   - **Comment**: The attached Right-of-Way and Relocations table shows the impact in terms of parcels, and remaining business and residential relocations for TB Next Sections 4, 5 and 6. Maps showing parcels to be relocated based on the conceptual designs for four "Build" options A through D for the Downtown Interchange are available at [http://tampainterstatestudy.com/hillsborough-mpo-special-briefing-1/](http://tampainterstatestudy.com/hillsborough-mpo-special-briefing-1/)
   - **Comment**: The Economic and Fiscal Impact Analysis also contains a detailed analysis of the existence of low-income populations along the corridor, stating that affordable housing and vacant apartment rentals are available.
   - The SEIS refers to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies of 1970 as amended. Relocation assistance is an entitlement program provided by FDOT that is designed to assist persons who are displaced from their homes by a transportation project. Provisions of the program include assistance finding a comparable dwelling, purchase price subsidies or multi-year rent subsidies to make the comparable replacement housing affordable, and reimbursement of moving expenses.
   - **Comment**: Although the Economic and Fiscal Impact Analysis prepared for the SEIS discusses the fact that seven out of the City’s eight Community Redevelopment Areas (CRAs) are adjacent to the Interstate Highways, we have not found any documentation of the impacts to affordable housing supply and how to pay for the replacement of affordable housing units that may be removed.

   **MPO response:**
   The removal of Presbyterian Village had a significant impact on the lives of many people who have limited resources. Even relocation assistance does not necessarily compensate for the disruption of social networks which may provide access to child care or health care, or for the reduced access to public transit that can result from being relocated away from the center of the city. The removal of Mobley Park would further extend these impacts. We reiterate our request to document the removal of affordable housing units.

2. **Motion**: Completed environmental impact studies for each segment.

   **Summary of documentation provided by FDOT** [available online]. These include:
   - TB Next Sections 4 & 5 (Howard Frankland Bridge to Rome Ave)
     - Alternate Stormwater Management
     - Contamination Screening Evaluation
Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization
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- Location Hydraulics
  - Natural Resources Evaluation
  - Water Quality Impact Evaluation

- TB Next Section 6 (Downtown Interchange including I-275 from Rome Ave to MLK Jr. Blvd and I-4 from I-275 to 50th St)
  - Contamination Screening Evaluation
  - Pond Siting
  - Natural Resources Evaluation
  - Location Hydraulics

- TIS SEIS All Segments
  - Economic and Fiscal Impact Analysis
  - Section 4(f) Parks and Recreational Resources Update
  - Project Traffic Analysis
  - Sociocultural Effects Evaluation
  - Air Quality
  - Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Update

Comment: The Sociocultural Effects Evaluation acknowledges in an overall statement that there will be construction impacts from noise, dust, fumes, etc. and that these impacts will be minimized by applicable regulations. In FHWA’s original Tampa Interstate Study Record of Decision (1997), FDOT committed to construction impact mitigation measures such as: the use of static rollers for compaction; restricting pile driving to the hours of 7 AM to 9 PM; minimizing heavy equipment back-up alarms; and restrictions on lighting of construction areas.

MPO Response:

Comment: We encourage FDOT to utilize Smart Work Zones to minimize delays, increase safety and avoid undue disruption to traffic flow during construction.

Comment: The documentation regarding noise impacts could be clarified. For example, a specific impact for the Carver City/Lincoln Gardens neighborhood is discussed in the Preliminary Engineering Report, stating that noise barriers are not financially feasible or will not be effective. However, an overall statement that noise barriers will be constructed to mitigate noise is included in the Sociocultural Effects Evaluation. We request that the SEIS clearly identify desired noise barrier locations for evaluation during the final design phase, and the criteria that will be used to determine whether the noise barriers are feasible. Where they are feasible, we further request that the construction of noise barriers occur first to mitigate construction impacts.

The latest forecast from the Tampa Bay Climate Science Advisory Panel identifies the potential for up to 8.5 feet of sea level rise by 2100. We request consideration of the sea level rise forecast during the design phase, especially as it affects Section 4. Because this is an essential route for people and goods, we request consideration of hardening the I-275/SR 60 interchange and its connection to the east end of the Howard Frankland Bridge, making it less vulnerable to inundation and/or less likely to be damaged when inundated.
3. **Motion**: Traffic and revenue studies providing justification for the toll lanes.

   - **Summary of documentation provided by FDOT**
     - **Comment**: The *Tampa Bay Express Planning Level Traffic & Revenue Study Report* addresses express toll lane utilization. It forecasts traffic using the toll lanes in the range of 9% to 31% of total volumes in the PM peak period (excluding I-275 north of Downtown Tampa, which has since been dropped as a potential toll lane location).
     - **Comment**: The Traffic and Revenue Study states that toll rates will fluctuate to manage Express Lane demand, to ensure typical speeds of at least 45 MPH at all times, providing a higher level of travel-time reliability. FDOT predicts that average speeds in the express toll lanes in the AM and PM peak will range from 53 to 58 MPH, versus 35 to 52 MPH in the general-use lanes. The “No Further Action” option is predicted to result in average speeds in the range of 30 to 38 MPH during the AM and PM peak.
     - **Comment**: FDOT predicts that the four “Build” options for the Downtown Interchange would reduce delay per vehicle mile in 2045. Compared to the “No Further Action” option, Options A and B (full rebuild) would reduce delay per vehicle mile in the 46 to 68% range, and Options C and D (express lane flyovers) would reduce delay per vehicle mile in the 22 to 39% range. In terms of the predicted minutes of delay in the AM and PM peaks, Options A and B result in 24 to 36 seconds of delay per vehicle mile, and Options C and D both result in 48 seconds, as compared to No Further Action, which is predicted to result in 90-114 seconds of delay per vehicle mile.

   - **MPO Response**: The experience of other cities with variable toll rates has been surprising to consumers in some cases, with rates sometimes becoming quite high at peak hour. We request to be informed during the design phase of the proposed toll rate policy, even if it is preliminary.

4. **MPO Motion**: Follow-up report on the premium transit study, to include consideration of the CSX-owned rail corridors.

   - **Summary of documentation provided by FDOT**
     - **Comment**: The Regional Transit Feasibility Plan was presented to the MPO in May 2018. The study identified a “catalyst” project that would compete well for FTA funding. The two top-ranked corridors were:
       - I-275 between Wesley Chapel, Tampa, Gateway and St. Petersburg, and
       - the CSX-owned freight rail track between downtown Tampa and USF. The study recommended BRT-style shoulder-running buses in the I-275 corridor; TBARTA is now conducting a follow up PD&E focused on that corridor.
     - **Comment**: The SEIS “build” options A and B for the Downtown interchange reserve a median “envelope” for premium transit. Options C and D do not.
MPO response:

- The MPO has raised concerns about and has not approved the project currently being studied by TBARTA, which uses I-275 through the center of Tampa. The MPO requests more robust consideration of the other top-ranked transit “catalyst” project identified in the Regional Transit Feasibility Plan, reusing the CSX-owned freight rail track. We have continued to include this project in our Long Range Transportation Plan and are working with HART to advance it.

5. Motion: Status report on Federal Civil Rights investigation

Summary of documentation provided by FDOT Comment:

- In the attached letter dated July 8, 2018, the FHWA’s Office of Civil Rights dismissed a complaint filed by Matthew Suarez alleging that the MPO and FDOT violated Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

6. Motion: That FDOT report to the MPO Board on the cost of ad valorem tax revenue lost to the City of Tampa as a result of the TBX project, using FDOT’s most recent right-of-way acquisition map.

6. Summary of documentation provided by FDOT:

Comment: Figures Right-of-way cost estimates compiled by FDOT range from $25 million for Option C to $131 million for Option A. FDOT estimates for needed ROW show a loss to the City of $491,422 in ad valorem revenue, and a loss of $1,347,018 to Hillsborough County; most of the parcels needed are in the Westshore District and have already by purchased by FDOT.

Comment: The Economic and Fiscal Impact Analysis prepared by TBRPC for the SEIS indicates that the loss in assessed property values in CRA districts will be offset later by a construction stimulus and economic growth, projecting a three percent (3%) annual growth rate after ROW has been purchased. Annual net TIF losses of $14,000 due to ROW purchases and construction impacts in the first four years, followed by annual net gains of $348,000 climbing to $788,000 over the next four years.

Comment: The Sociocultural Effects Evaluation reaches a similar conclusion, stating that the express lane alternative results in:

... potential conversion of residential and non-residential sites into public property for transportation purposes. This conversion would initially decrease property tax income for the City of Tampa. However, ... the impact could be positive as properties near the facility and throughout the TIS SEIS study area may experience an increase in value, with possible attendant increases in tax revenues if greater accessibility makes the properties more attractive for development. This would be particularly true for development opportunities on vacant land and non-residential uses near major interstate interchanges.
The MPO requests that an estimate of the current value of ad valorem tax revenue lost to the City of Tampa for the SEIS final preferred alternative be provided to the MPO board at a future meeting.

7. Motion: Cost to the City for operation and maintenance of any community impact mitigation

Summary of documentation provided by FDOT:
- Comment: FDOT anticipates providing this information following the SEIS public hearing next year.

MPO Response:
- The MPO requests that FDOT update the MPO with cost estimates for any proposed landscaping or design features requiring local upkeep during the design phase, as these arrangements are worked out with the City of Tampa.

8. Motion: The impact to air quality in Tampa

Summary of documentation provided by FDOT:

Comments:
- The draft Air Quality Technical Memorandum documents the results of air quality modeling for the SEIS for carbon monoxide (CO) and Mobile Source Air Toxic emissions (MSAT). MSAT includes nine different toxins such as ethyl benzene, formaldehyde, and diesel particulates.
- Regarding CO, future concentrations were predicted at five different interchanges for the No Further Action and the four “build” options. The model results were compared against the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for CO set by the federal government. The model predicts that CO concentrations at none of the five interchanges will exceed the NAAQS under the No Further Action and the four “build” scenarios.
- Again, regarding CO, there were no significant differences between the four “build” options. However, compared to the No Further Action option, the model predicts that the “build” options will increase CO levels at the I-275/MLK Jr. Blvd and I-4/50th St interchanges.
- Regarding MSAT, the draft Air Quality Technical Memorandum states that emission levels decrease as travel speed increases. In addition, emissions would likely be lower in future years than present levels in the current year because national standards for new vehicles are projected to reduce annual MSAT emissions by over 90 percent between 2010 and 2050. As a result, the 2045 No Further Action Alternative is forecast to result in an average decrease in all toxins combined by approximately 60 percent from 2018 Existing Conditions.
- Again, regarding MSAT, a comparison of the four “build” Options (A, B, C & D) to the 2045 No Further Action option forecasts that the “build” options would have lower MSAT emissions by an average of approximately 50 percent.
• At the macro (overall project) level, there was little difference between the “build” options, however, at the micro (segment) level, the model predicts that Options A and B result in lower MSAT emissions than Options C and D.
• The Air Quality Technical Memorandum further states that: Improvements proposed under the [“Build” Options] may have the effect of moving some traffic closer to nearby populated areas; therefore, under each alternative there may be localized areas where ambient concentrations of MSAT could be higher under certain Design Options than the No Further Action Alternative. However, the magnitude and the duration of these potential increases compared to the No-Further Action Alternative cannot be reliably quantified due to incomplete or unavailable information in forecasting project-specific MSAT health effects.

MPO Response:
• The predicted air quality outcomes depend greatly on assumptions and parameters embedded in the MOVES model. These relate to vehicle technology, alternative fuels, and emissions standards assumed to be enforced by the federal government. We request that these be more clearly identified and tested with sensitivity analyses.
• We also suggest that Transportation Demand Management and Transportation Systems Management and Operations strategies be considered in all options to reduce vehicular travel and delay.
• The MPO has adopted a Health in All Policies approach to transportation planning as well as compiling data in a Health Atlas. The Atlas demonstrates that chronic diseases such as asthma, high blood pressure and heart disease are prevalent along Interstate Highway corridors. These chronic diseases particularly affect communities of color, lower income individuals, older adults, persons with disabilities and children.
• Recent reports by the EPA (airnow.gov) identify moderate concentrations of regulated air pollutants in our community. Taking Particulate Matter as an example, sensitive populations are cautioned to watch for symptoms such as coughing or shortness of breath. Particle pollution is linked to several health problems, including coughing, wheezing, reduced lung function, asthma attacks, heart attacks and strokes.
• Studies and peer-reviewed articles suggest causal links between exposure to traffic-related air pollution and chronic diseases including cancer, asthma, dementia, and cardiovascular disease. Two examples are found at:
  o https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3855107/
  o https://www.news.gatech.edu/2017/08/25/brake-dust-may-cause-more-problems-blackened-wheel-covers
• Positive health outcomes are a local community concern and an MPO priority. Therefore, the MPO requests that the design phase proactively address quality of life/health outcomes including mitigation of air quality impacts. Mitigation should address both the short-term construction-related and long-term health impacts. These may include designs such as green noise walls, greater landscaping and other techniques.
9. **Other concerns**

- New, modified, and closed ramps, as well as new underpasses proposed in the “build” options will fundamentally change local traffic patterns in the Westshore and Downtown vicinity. Changes in traffic volumes and speeds could pose significant challenges to local plans to create more walk and bicycle-friendly communities. As a general comment, we are concerned about potential conflicts between bicyclists and walkers and high-speed traffic (40+ mph) exiting from these ramps. As we’re all aware through our partnership toward zero traffic deaths, the chance of death for a pedestrian hit at 40 mph is greater than 80%. The communities surrounding TB Next Sections 4-6 are some of the most walk/bike/transit focused in Florida and are becoming more so through redevelopment. We request that the new and reconfigured ramps be presented so that the MPO board has an opportunity to review and comment on them.

- We suggest that a comprehensive land use and transportation (including transit) circulation study be conducted for all local roadways, neighborhoods/parks affected, especially in the vicinity of Floribraska and Trask Aves, 14th/15th and 21st and 22nd Streets exits. Such a study should also address how the acreage under the Interstate structures could be used for recreational and neighborhood enhancements.

- Further, we request that the design phase proactively consider strategies such as road geometric/design techniques, signage, RRFBs and rumble strips to slow drivers down; high-visibility markings for all areas where pedestrians cross off-ramps today or in the future; and eschew wide turning radii and turns that do not require a full stop; particularly at the locations noted below. We further request that regular updates concerning these steps be provided to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

- In the Westshore district:
  - New ramps are proposed at Reo and Trask Streets, and new express lane ramps will be added to the Himes Ave exit. The proposed diverging diamond underpass on Reo Street does not clearly show how bicycle and pedestrian connections will function in this location. Previous discussions have indicated that FDOT is proposing shared lane markings on Reo between I-275 and connections to the north (Cypress Point Park). Given the access this will provide to the nearby U Path/Courtney Campbell Causeway Trail and future Howard Frankland Bridge Trail, we are concerned about potential conflicts with the increased traffic volume on Reo St as a result of the new ramps and underpass to the south side of I-275. The volumes and speed will be too high to accommodate cyclists using shared lane markings, and proposed pedestrian facilities are unclear on renderings and plans. We request that the design phase clarify the proposed facilities and connections.
  - Lemon Street and East Frontage Road both currently use shared lane markings for cyclists. Based on the proposed plans, these roads will both have new configurations that may result in higher volumes and speeds, potentially making them unsafe for non-motorists. We request that the design phase clarify the proposed walk/bike facilities on these roadways.
We are also concerned with potential conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians in the vicinity of Westshore Mall. Redevelopment is planned in and around the mall and will likely attract walkers and cyclists attempting to cross SR 60 and W Kennedy Blvd. High speed traffic exiting I-275 potentially poses pedestrian risks at SR 60 at W Kennedy Blvd and at the ramp from the Howard Frankland Bridge at Hoover Blvd.

- In Downtown Tampa, the “build” Options propose new ramps at North Blvd and new or reconfigured ramps providing express lane access at Ashley, Tampa and Morgan Streets.

  o We understand that the City is considering a new hotel and student housing proposed between Ashley and Tampa Streets. Special attention is needed to mitigate the risks to walkers, cyclists and scooters trying to cross Ashley and Tampa Streets from traffic coming off and getting on the Interstate ramps. **We request that the design phase clarify the proposed walk/bike facilities on these roadways.**

  o While it may be a longer-term proposal, we have the same concern for conflicts between vehicles and non-motorized traffic at the proposed North Blvd ramps and on Laurel St, especially because of the proximity to Julian B. Lane Park and the potential for younger cyclists and walkers in that vicinity. **We would prefer to see no new interstate highway ramps at North Blvd. If they are to be built, we request for our committees and board to be fully engaged during the design process.**

- In the Ybor City area

  o The City plans to extend the Green Spine Cycle Track through Ybor on Nuccio Parkway and northward on 15th St to Cuscaden Park. Cyclists are likely to face higher traffic volumes moving at fast speeds as they cross the new ramps and frontage roads.

  o Likewise, 13th Ave is proposed to become a frontage road between 14th/15th and 21st/22nd Streets and should be considered for safety strategies. **We request that the design phase clarify the proposed walk/bike facilities on these roadways.**

- In the East Tampa area

  o The proposed closure of the ramps at Floribraska Ave ramps provides an opportunity to remake it as a complete street, and we support the City’s plans for lane reductions and a cycle track on Floribraska.

  o At the same time, the East Tampa Community Revitalization Partnership has gone on record to express concern over the ramp closure’s “potential to negatively and significantly impact the economic development in East Tampa without careful design considerations.” As outlined in the attached letter, these include improved signalization, crosswalks, sidewalks, landscaping, lighting along the Nebraska Ave, Floribraska and 21st Ave corridors, gateway treatments and other improvements to support the East Tampa Strategic Action Plan. FDOT’s response is also included as an attachment.
We understand that FDOT has met with the Partnership, and therefore request that the Department brief the MPO on subsequent discussions, particularly to resolve issues pertaining to removal of several of the above improvements from the scope of the original Nebraska Avenue project (FPID 255853-1-52-01) due to cost reductions.

- **Trail and Greenway Gaps**

  To complete the Florida SUNTrail system, several gaps in the existing trail system within the SEIS study area need to be closed. These include segments identified as the West Tampa and I-275 Greenways along the south side of I-275 between Westshore and Downtown Tampa, for example from Westshore to Trask and from Cypress to Himes, including the Dale Mabry overpass. An extension of the Tampa Heights Greenway to connect to the Florida SUNTrail corridor would also be beneficial in supporting positive health outcomes. We request that the SEIS identify these gaps, and the criteria that will be used during the design phase to determine the feasibility of closing them. As noted above, there are several locations in which greenways are proposed to intersect ramps where trail users are likely to encounter high speed traffic exiting from the Interstate. Treatments to maximize the safety of cyclists and walkers should be identified as part of the design phase.
ADDENDUM ITEMS
MPO Board Meeting of Tuesday, August 6, 2019

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

The MPO Chairman, Commissioner Les Miller, called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m., led the pledge of allegiance and gave the invocation. The regular monthly meeting was held at the County Center Building in the 26th Floor, rooms A & B.

The following members were present:

Commissioner Les Miller, Commissioner Pat Kemp, Paul Anderson, Councilman Guido Maniscalco, Councilman Joseph Citro, Trent Green, Commissioner Kimberly Overman, Joe Lopano, Commissioner Mariella Smith, and Joe Waggoner.

The following members were absent:

Commissioner Ken Hagan, Mayor Rick Lott, Mayor Mel Jurado, David Mechanik, Councilman Luis Viera and Cindy Stuart.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – June 11, 2019

A motion was made by Councilman Maniscalco to approve the minutes of June 11, 2019. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Overman and carried unanimously.

RECOGNITION OF VISION ZERO HEROES

Ms. Torres spoke about teaching at summer camps at Tampa Heights Junior Civic Association and Dowdell Middle School in Palm River. Between the Planning Commission Staff and Teaching Urban Planning, Ms. Torres held classes on Vision Zero and bike safety and spent 24 days in June and July speaking to about 50 middle school aged children. She showed a video of the summer camp which highlighted what was learned. The Tampa police department bicycle and operation response unit generously accepted and hosted a bicycle rodeo. They fitted bicycle helmets and gave away over 25 bicycles. They also painted an intersection based on the designs created by the children at the summer camp. They hired an artist who interpreted the design and her fees were funded by two Tampa Bay Chapters which were the Women in Transportation and The Institute of Transportation Engineers. The Planning Commission paid for the paint and supplies. The following accepted the Vision Zero Hero Awards from the Tampa Police Department, Bicycle Operations & Response Unit was Officer Kevin Miller, from On Bikes, Julius Tobin, Co-Founder, Homa Fartash and Jennifer Musselman from Women from the Tampa Bay Chapter and Alex Bourne, RS&H and Craig Polifron, George F. Young, Inc. from Tampa Bay ITE and Kierra Zuokemefa from the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Josephine Amato founder and director for Safe Bus for Us who advocates for Safe Bus Routes for kids to school. She was there to speak about student transportation to school and congestion. She stated if you place a child in a car-seat they are 70 percent likely to survive the crash but when you place a child on a
school bus their chance of survival is 7000 percent more. The American school bus is a life saving intervention. We lose 4000 children during school travel hours every year. The number one of cause of children’s death in America is crashes. We lose 9 passengers on the American school bus annually and nationally. She is fully supportive of HART and public transportation. However, children should not be on public transportation. Our school bus drivers are highly-trained and it is a controlled environment. There is room in the budget to fund safe paths in the two-mile radius to school.

Chris Vela from Ybor City commented on the same topic of safety for our children. He stated that CDC statistic states that the number one killer of children is car crashes. His purpose of speaking today was on the State of the System Report that is noted on the agenda. He commented that Ybor is the lowest ranked on the report. He quoted a statement in the State of the System Report that says “while reliability on the majority of the interstate is meeting the statewide standard, the portions running through the urban core are moderately – to -severely unreliable, meaning that at certain times of day, travel time increase by 50 - 100 percent through these segments. A 20 – minute travel time could turn into 30 minutes or more.” A solution to this is to expand lanes.

Thomas Mixson commented reducing traffic using cable cars, sky buckets and gondolas. Cable cars are very economical to run, reasonable to build and maintain and will reduce traffic on major roads and corridors. He believes cable cars is a great idea because it moves more people and is cost effective.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS, ONLINE COMMENTS**

Bill Roberts, CAC Chairman, gave a brief report on the activity of the Citizens Advisory Committee. Under the public comment of the most recent meeting Mr. Camilo Soto introduced himself and expressed a strong interest in filling for the Hispanic member at large position of the CAC. He is a local professional engineer. Under action items the committee moved to recommend the appointment of Mr. Soto and unanimously approved the Temple Terrace Low Speed Electric Vehicle Study. Under new business the CAC voted to endorse the idea of the joint board meeting to MPO, HART and TBARTA to look at advancing utilization of the CSX. Upcoming items include having their November meeting at the THEA office and tour the Traffic Management System and CAC workshop on September 24 to discuss items coming up in the next couple months.

Gena Torres, MPO Staff, gave a brief report on the consent items from other committees. The Policy committee approved the USF Fellowship Contract Renewal. All committees approved and forwarded their updates. The Temple Terrace Low Speed Electric Vehicle Study was approved by all committees. In addition to participating in the It’s Time Hillsborough Survey, the BPAC held its annual retreat in July and identified future topics of discussion. The TAC held a workshop on the Technical analysis on the 2045 needs assessment and were briefed on congestion forecast for major roads and offered comments that you will hear at your next meeting. The ITS brainstormed ideas for updates of the ITS Master Plan. The Policy committee received an overview of how managed lanes in other cities are performing and clarifying the process of the updating TIP priority list with consideration of a nighttime workshop in advance of the TIP hearing. The Transportation Disadvantage Coordinating Board approved the Transportation Disadvantage service plan. A meeting was announced for August 28 hosted by DOT with TBARTA, Hillsborough, Pinellas and Pasco County transit agencies to discuss further partnership opportunities. The MPO chair’s coordinating committee held a public hearing and approved the annual update of priorities for the regionally significant multi use trails and the transportation regional center program projects. CCC also heard status reports on the DOT multi use corridors and regional economic significant initiative, Pasco county connective city project, and TBARTA regional development plan. They reviewed changes to the inter local agreement to distinguish their area at scope from TBARTA and reestablishing a separate entity and establish several sub committees. The changes were well received and will be referred to individual MPO’s before the next CCC meeting in December.
There were no Facebook posts. There were a few emails received one being from Ramond Chiaramonte to the BOCC encouraging support on the referendum approved by the voters. Mr. Mixson emailed us about his research and support on cable cars. Mike Lamarca was sharing his concerns that more bike, walk and vision zero attention were given to unincorporated Hillsborough county and he was encouraged to get more involved with various groups and presentations. There was an email correspondence regarding HTV and broadcasting meetings live on YouTube. We have actually been doing this since 2018.

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

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A. Committee Appointments

B. USF Fellowship Contract Renewal

Commissioner Miller requested a motion to approve the consent agenda. At that time, Mr. Waggoner asked to pull the committee appointments out of the consent agenda because he has a late committee appointment suggestion. There were no objections. Mr. Miller pulled the Committee Appointments out of the consent agenda.

**Commissioner Miller requested a motion to approve the USF Fellowship Contract Renewal on the Consent Agenda. A motion was made by Commissioner Overman and was seconded by Councilman Citro and the motion was carried unanimously.**

Mr. Waggoner stated THEA’s appointee resigned from the CAC back in February. Lindsey Eggware is very interested in filling this vacant position. He nominates Ms. Eggware to serve on the CAC as THEA’s representative. Commissioner Miller asked if there were any objections and stated they would accept Mr. Waggoner’s recommendation. There were no objections.

**Commissioner Kemp made a motion to approve the Committee Appointments. The motion was seconded by Councilman Citro and carried unanimously.**

Commissioner Kemp brought up an issue about the YouTube broadcast at the last MPO evening meeting on June 11 and stated the first hour of the broadcast was missed. Her office received several complaints. Beth Alden stated they sat down with HTV and there was a glitch with YouTube’s streaming.

Commissioner Overman wanted to confirm it was filmed by HTV and it can be uploaded. Beth Alden stated it is in our video archive and will be posted on our website if it has not already.

**ACTION ITEMS**

A. General Planning Consultant Contract Amendment

Jeff Trim, Sam Schwartz Engineering, informed they have a General Planning Consultant Contract under the Renaissance Planning Group. Sam Schwartz Engineering is a sub consultant to the Renaissance Planning Group which has a contract with the MPO. This request is to add two job classifications to their contract rate sheet. The first one is a Chief Engineer II classification and that rate is meant to be added to the contract so they can have Sam Schwartz, President and founder of the company, be able to work on future MPO projects as needed. The second rate is an Engineering Internship and this is a new position. He asked for approval of the new contract rates.
Commissioner Smith requested Jeff Trim to describe his relationship with Renaissance Planning Group. Jeff Trim confirmed they have worked with them before on several projects including Vision Zero Action Plan. Paul Anderson inquired if the rates are raw rates. Jeff Trim replied they are the raw rates with a 2.66 multiplier.

A motion was made by Commissioner Kemp to approve the new contract rate. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Smith. The motion was carried unanimously.

B. Temple Terrace Low Speed Electric Vehicle Study

Mr. Wade Reynolds, MPO Staff, presented the Temple Terrace Low Speed Electric Vehicle study, a golf cart crossing study. The purpose of the study was to look at seven potential intersections for golf cart crossings on East Fowler Avenue and 56th Street. There are a total of almost 600 registered golf carts during the years 2013-2019. The City is following up with a survey asking where the golf cart users travel and where they would like to go.

Temple Terrace is bisected by two main roadways, East Fowler Avenue and 56th Street. The study reviewed 7 major intersections for crossing locations. There are four on 56th street and three on Fowler Avenue.

Below is list of the various intersections for crossings:

1.) Temple Heights Road and 56th Street – there are some constraints. One is that the crosswalk goes into a private drive, but this intersection is on the low end of crashes.
2.) Mission Hills Drive and 56th Street- there are some utility conflicts but again on the low end of crashes and there is low side street traffic.
3.) Serena Drive and 56th Street- there are some challenges for example a bus stop and there are bike and pedestrian crashes.
4.) White Way Drive and 56th Street- this is the only intersection that meets the FDOT warrants. It has the most crashes and safety challenges.
5.) 62nd Street and Fowler Ave – 6 lane highway with high volume of traffic.
6.) Gillette and Fowler - 6 lane highway. It has narrow width issues and a record of rear-end crashes.
7.) Raintree and Fowler – Suggested to cross under the bridge over the Hillsborough River. There are no crashes and as an underpass avoids an at-grade crossing. This was suggested by FDOT.

A recap of additional items that were looked at with FDOT is that they will be following with any application for all signage and marking requirements. FDOT is reviewing the signal timing plans and review and approve any crossing at those intersections. The next step is the origin of destination survey. They will preparing a proposal and concept for one crossing on 56th Street and followed by a one year safety study on that crossing. Depending on which crossing is chosen there could be a need if it uses Hillsborough County roads to amend Hillsborough County golf cart ordinance in those locations. They will coordinate with FDOT on any additional requirements. Mr. Reynolds asked if there were any questions and asked for acceptance of this study.

Commissioner Overman stated after looking at this preliminary data it appears those roads are FDOT roads and the safety design on those roads would change those numbers. Also, a comparison of these roads seems like speed would be a bigger factor. Mr. Reynolds stated the speed on Fowler in particular would be a big factor on speed. FDOT has a controlling factor on these speeds. Commissioner Overman stated we would need to negotiate with FDOT on these speeds.

Commissioner Kemp stated this a great project and people having other ways to get around. In Gainesville there were scooters everywhere and now everywhere in New York. She echoes
Commissioner Overman in terms of looking at this study. She asked the Secretary of FDOT to comment on this study.

Secretary David Gwynn commented that they two studies going on right now and one is on Fowler and the other is part of BRT study from USF to downtown. They are actively looking at treatments on Fowler for speed reductions. The challenge of the speed limits is a state statue. If they change the speed limit it doesn’t automatically slow people down so they are working on changing the behavior of the people to get them slowed down. Commissioner Kemp commented that a robust transit system on Fowler will be part of this study. Trent Green questioned if the crosswalks will be used by other means of mobility other than golf carts and will this lead to a safer crossing. Mr. Reynolds replied if we are making improvements to an intersection that we should be able to have the opportunity for improvements for all users. He does not know the cost of these improvements.

Beth Alden shared a comment from Mayor Jurado. Mayor Jurado apologized for missing the MPO meeting. She wanted to thank the chair and the director for this work undertaken to support the first golf cart community in the country. She supports this project and looks forward to keeping Temple Terrace connected.

A Motion was made by Trent Green to approve the Temple Terrace Low Speed Electric Vehicle Study. It was seconded by Commissioner Overman. The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Miller stated Mayor Jurado was not able to be with them at the meeting but wanted to keep her in prayer for the loss of her husband on June 28. Mr. Rod Jurado was very active in Hillsborough County so please keep him in prayer.

Commissioner Miller asked for a motion to move item X.-A. Potential Cross Appeal of Transportation Surtax Litigation from New Business to Action Items. A motion was made by Commissioner Kemp and seconded by Councilman Citro. The motion was carried unanimously.

Attorney Cameron Clark stated this is in regards to the Surtax Litigation. The item arose late last week and it was too late to present to the Policy Committee. It is time sensitive. The Transportation Sales Surtax approved by the voters in November 2018 as an amendment to the county charter, is being appealed by the plaintiff in the case. Other defendants in the case, including Hillsborough County, HART, Cities of Tampa and Plant City have already filed cross appeals to preserve their right in this appellate action, or have indicated their intent to do so. This item is to request the board to direct their legal counsel to file such a Cross Appeal for the MPO. This item is being added to today’s agenda because the filing deadline for the cross appeal is August 8. This cross appeal will preserve the MPO’s rights in the appeal regarding the Transportation Surtax.

Trent Green requested further information on what a cross appeal is. Rob Brazel, Chief Assistant County Attorney, stated that a cross appeal is filed after someone has already filed an appeal. The defendants in this case are preserving their rights to argue any item we want to argue in the appeal. The defendants may want to argue the judge struck through certain items and wish he had not.

Commissioner Miller requested a motion to approve the Cross Appeal for Validation of Transportation Sales Surtax Revenue Bonds. A motion was made by Commissioner Kemp and seconded by Trent Green. The motion was carried unanimously.
A. THEA Connected Vehicle Pilot Project Phase III

Bob Frey, THEA Planning Director, gave an update on the Connected Vehicle Pilot program. The reason THEA is involved in the Connected Vehicle program is that they are looking for safest most efficient way to provide transportation for the residents of Tampa Bay so they decided to start the pilot for the Connected Vehicle program. THEA was selected as one of the 3 pilot sites on the United States. They are using the Selmon Expressway to test data due mainly to the frequency and consistency of the data. THEA overview on what they are looking at on how connected vehicles can work with mobility, safety and also the environment. They have up to 1200 privately owned vehicles on the Selmon Expressway that are real commuters, 9 streetcars, 10 HART and 44 roadside units. The drivers use a mirror in their car for the pilot. The benefits for connectivity is the entry level for technology for smart cities and provide benefits to a full transportation system. They are looking to make a safer more efficient system. All the data is going to the US DOT. The program ends May 2020.

Commissioner Smith asked if these are only opted-in participants. Bob Frey confirmed they are only voluntary participants. Joe Waggoner reiterated that the onboard unit is the mirror. Commissioner Kemp wanted to know how the road-side unit works. She also questioned if it picks up pedestrians. Bob Frey stated the pedestrians have to be in a crosswalk in order to be detected and the data is transmitted to the mirror.

Commissioner Overman stated that there is a challenge in funding for ITS and is there a competition for the funding. Bob Frey said there are complementary projects. This program is just beginning and if there is value they will pursue this project further. She wants to know where they are installing these units that are providing the measurements. Bob Frey said they are on lights, lanes, poles that exist in the locations needed. They are using fiber wherever possible. Joe Waggoner stated you want to use an open architecture and maintain flexibility. The total project funding is 2.2 million.

B. 2045 Plan Needs Assessment for Investment Programs

Johnny Wong, MPO Staff, presented the 5 program areas for performance measurement. They allow MPO to prioritize each project based on how each is expected to improve performance in these categories. State of Good Repair & Resiliency maintains pavement, bridge, transit assets and resiliency to major storms. Vision Zero program focuses on roadway safety. Smart Cities focuses on reducing congestion using operational treatments. The Real Choices when not driving category focuses on enhancing multimodal transportation options. There is a fifth program called Major Projects which focuses on adding capacity to facilitate economic growth. This presentation only covers the first 4 programs because the 5th category is using a separate process and it will be brought forward to you at a later time. To assess how we are doing we considered a variety of metrics and they allow us to figure out how these projects will perform in the future. We begin by taking this information and assess our performance today and compare our performance could be in 2045 given the current level of funding. We take that number and compare to what the performance could be by 2045 with current funding levels plus a portion of the sales tax revenue. For the State of Good Repair & Resiliency we measure repair and replacement schedules for pavement, bridges, transit assets as well as the recovery time from a category 3 storm and the economic losses. For Vision Zero we measured total crashes, fatal crashes, injury crashes and bike crashes. Smart Cities, we measured reliability of travel time and hours of delay. For Real Choices when not driving we measured people and jobs served by the bus system and the walk bike facilities, as well as frequency of bus service. Beginning with the State of Good Repair & Resiliency program we are looking at what we could get with current funding trend holds through 2045 comparing that to what would happen if we had a current funding trend plus the sales tax. For pavement, the trend investment scenario falls short of meeting our standards of resurfacing our roads once every 17 years. With the amount of funding only 60 percent of our roads would be resurfaced on schedule which equates to resurfacing every 28 years. Alternatively, through the
"trend plus" scenario, all roads in the county would be resurfaced every 17 years on average thus meeting the guideline standards. Another element in this program is maintaining bridges and under the trend plus scenario we would get 3 major and 11 minor replacement projects completed. The third element is transit asset maintenance; these scenarios were based on HART's current passenger fleet and utilized their ten year transit development program. Trend scenario results in a funding short fall that would prevent HART from replacing their buses every 12 years The trend plus scenario would allow HART to expand its fleet and the average bus age would be 7 years. The last element is resiliency to major storms and assessment was done for a tri-county area. Our current funding is $46 million dollars per year; plus an additional $22 million we could improve resilience on highly vulnerable and critical roads. With an additional $44 million we could invest in highly vulnerable, moderately vulnerable and critical roads. The treatments include: raise road profile, enhance sub-base, retention/detention ponds, depress medians and planting vegetation. Our next program is Vision Zero which focuses on safety. Under the trend scenario we could reduce all crashes by 15% on major roads, and under the trend plus scenario we could reduce crashes by 35%. Under the Trend plus scenario we could fund 500 miles of streetlights, 1400 miles of missing sidewalks and complete streets treatments on 350 miles of high crash roads. The next program is Smart Cities and this investment program is to reduce congestion. If no improvement by 2045 the hours of delay would increase more than 2.8x. The trend scenario, $48 million, funds more than 130 miles of major road improved and 40% reduction in total delay. The trend plus scenario improves 220 miles of major roads and 80% reduction in total delay. This scenario with the sales tax would enhance incident management, speed harmonization, ramp metering, smart messaging and advanced traffic management. The Real Choices when not driving trend scenario funding is $2 million a year, serving more than 600,000 people, with 50 new miles of trails and side paths, and 22 transit routes with increased service. The trend plus scenario, with sales tax, serves more than 1,000,000 people and includes 150 new miles of trails/sidewalks and 38 transit routes with increased service: 7 new BRT routes, 5 new local routes, 3 new express routes, new service in South County and Plant City, 3 new transit centers and new rail service. This is a status update so no action required.

Commissioner Overman inquired about the trails and sidepaths alternatives and how that relates to the improvements to help the children that need to walk 2 miles to school. Sarah McKinley noted that program did not look at specifically areas around schools. They utilized the Trail Prioritization Map for future trails and sidepaths. Commissioner Overman pointed out that safety and alternative mobility is part of what we are looking at for additional funding but there is a mandate for making sure children are actually walking to school. Sarah McKinley stated the Vision Zero program covers sidewalk improvement funds and the school improvements can be covered under that also.

Joe Lopano inquired about the new bus service and the pricing for the new routes. Johnny Wong stated they did not do the pricing for the buses. They relied on HART's Transit Development Plan.

Commissioner Kemp raised a few points on induced demand and wanted to know if it was included in any calculations. Sarah McKinley stated that relates to the Major Projects category which we'll be discussing further along. Commissioner Kemp inquired about ferry service and CSX in terms of emergencies and resiliency. Sarah McKinley responded we are looking at that through the transit analysis.

C. Bylaws Amendment for ITS Committee

Johnny Wong, MPO Staff, brought a status update requesting a change to the MPO Bylaws. At the July meeting of the Intelligent Transportation Systems Committee, the committee voted unanimously to add a seat for USF Center for Urban Transportation Research. The committee believes this seat adds valuable and academic perspectives to the committee’s work. Adding a seat to any committee requires an amendment to the bylaws and in the agenda packet we attached a strike-through version of the bylaws. There is no action required today. A change in the bylaws requires 2 readings with this being the first. We will bring this to you next month for action.
Commissioner Overman stated that we do a lot of work with CUTR, and wants to know if there is a conflict of interest. Cameron Clark responded they are just an advisory committee and do not take any final action. He does not believe there is an issue.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Ms. Alden followed up on the June 11 public hearing motions. The 6-hour video of the last meeting is on YouTube. There were a couple of motions at the end of meeting that we can provide status. First, there was a request for a Joint Board Workshop with HART and TBARTA. TBARTA is working through their regional transit development plan and their PD&E so they need more time. There is a tentative date for a Joint Board Workshop with HART on October 9 at 9:30AM. The topic is How to Advance Transit Jointly as discussed in our June meeting. Another action was a request to look at noise walls and how they can have the most positive impact on public health. We have asked consultants to do research and come back with ideas to consider. There were a number of board motions over the past years about the downtown interchange. District 7 has been working through these motions and analysis. We are getting to the end and next month you will see a draft letter of comment regarding these findings. There will be a public workshop on August 19 at the Saunders Library. Also, the first meeting for the oversight committee was postponed due to the delayed ruling of Judge Barbas. Despite the appeal the county attorney has stated, until there is another decision from the supreme court, Judge Barbas’ ruling is the law of the land. The implementing agencies for the sales tax will develop project plans for use of the sales tax dollars in the coming calendar year and will provide those to the oversight committee by the end of September. We are planning a meeting of the oversight committee to review those project plans after October 1. Before that meeting, we are planning to hold an organizational meeting for the oversight committee so they can approve bylaws, elect officers and review their charge. Commissioner Smith inquired as to when they plan to meet. Beth Alden responded we are polling the members now for the best possible date. Commissioner Smith believes there should be more than one meeting possibly in August.

Commissioner Smith made a motion to have the board direct MPO staff to set an initial meeting in August for the IOC. Commissioner Kemp seconded the motion.

Cameron Clark responded the MPO staff is only the administrative support and transition development and assistance to the IOC. The MPO will not be submitting project plans to the IOC. He feels the board does not need to vote to have the IOC meet. IOC is required to meet according to the charter amendment. The deadline for this is September 30th. There is not a restriction to how or when they should meet. The postponement was due to the 30 day window for an appeal on Judge Barbas’ ruling, so the first meeting should be after this 30-day window to make sure all rulings are set. Commissioner Smith said our charter is the law of the land and the MPO will assist the IOC. Commissioner Overman believes there is a big learning curve on any of these committees and since these members are not transportation professionals more meetings will help them serve more effectively. Commissioner Kemp is very supportive.

Commissioner Miller stated a motion was made by Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Kemp. The motion was carried unanimously.

Beth Alden wanted to update on the Civil Service Board dissolution. Plan Hillsborough has hired a Civil Service employee to help with the transition, and new SOPs will be discussed at the next Planning Commission meeting.

The next MPO meeting is September 4th on the 26th Floor and the next TMA Leadership meeting is on September the 6th on the 18th Floor in the Planning Commission Board Room.

Commissioner Overman requested to call in for the next meeting. Cameron Clark advised this is possible as long as there is a quorum physically present in the room.
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OLD & NEW BUSINESS

There was no old or new business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.
Committee Reports

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

Under public comment, Mr. Lou Prida and Mr. Joe Monaco introduced themselves, as both had applied to fill the seat representing the business community on the CAC. Members of the CAC followed up by asking questions of each applicant about their background and perspectives.

Under Action items, the CAC approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- Appointing Luciano L. Prida, Jr. to fill the At-Large Business Representative seat on the CAC.
- Transportation Improvement Program Roll-Forward Amendments.
- The letter of comment on the Tampa Bay Next Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, but noting additional concerns about:
  - The relocation of displaced residents and availability of affordable housing
  - Global warming and air quality
  - FDOT still not fully being compliant with the original MPO motions passed in 2016 and 2017
  - The validity of information on how tax impact will be made up by new investment
  - Right-of-way acquisition costs
  - Assumptions behind the air quality model; what is assumed about cleaner running vehicles, alternative fuels, electric and autonomous vehicles
  - Induced demand
- The roll-forward amendment to the FY 2020 Transportation Improvement Program

The CAC also received reports from
- TBARTA on the Regional Transit Development Plan;
- MPO staff on the 2045 Needs Assessment for Investment Programs.

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

The TAC approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- The letter of comment on Tampa Bay Next Section 4-6 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)
  - There was committee support for early consideration of air quality impacts, noise mitigation, landscaping, and mitigating local impacts.
The Transportation Improvement Program Roll-Forward Amendments.
The TAC heard status reports on It’s TIME Hillsborough Survey Results, 2045 Plan Needs Assessment for Programs, and TBARTA’s Transit Development Plan. It had a Round Robin Discussion on health-related metrics, reviewed the MPO’s Health in All Policies Resolution, and discussed the impacts of a transportation systems on the health of the community. The EPC noted that Hillsborough has the highest levels of ozone in the state, and the airport shared about its wellness focus. The City of Tampa representative commented on the importance of shade and trees to add comfort to walking and biking. The committee also commented that more specific goals and outcomes would be helpful.

Meeting of the Policy Committee on August 27
The committee approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:
✓ Transportation Improvement Program Roll-Forward Amendments.
✓ The letter of comment on the Tampa Bay Next Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, but noting additional concerns about:
  o The need for a stronger response to the East Tampa CRA’s letter;
  o Confusion regarding which statements in the letter are MPO findings and which are FDOT’s;
  o The need for stronger statements of the health effects of living near interstate highways, including from particulates, brake dust and tire wear; examples include cardiovascular disease, cancer, dementia, asthma;
  o The potential for induced demand to lead to ongoing congestion even after investments;
  o The possibility that tolls at peak hour could be very high;
  o The need for stronger language about walk/bike safety in East Tampa and Ybor City;
  o Preference that there be no new ramps at North Blvd, and that if such are to move forward there should be further vetting and review;
  o Potential for the I-275/SR60 interchange area to be affected by sea level rise, which may be 4’-8’ in the latest forecast;
  o The relocation of displaced residents and availability of affordable housing;
  o Need for more robust consideration of the Regional Transit Feasibility Plan #2 catalyst project, commuter rail on the CSX-owned freight corridors.

The committee heard status reports, and asked for slides to be distributed, on:
  o Managed lanes: lessons learned from other cities;
  o Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plans.

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), August 14
The BPAC heard status reports on It’s TIME Hillsborough Survey Results, 2045 Plan Needs Assessment for Programs, and updates on Trails in Hillsborough County and the Gulf Coast Corridor.
The BPAC heard public comment on the new vertical delineators installed to protect bike lanes on Fowler Ave. and asked FDOT representatives in attendance about this project and if other locations were considered.
Committee members commented on the new all-red phase at the intersection of Main St. and Rome Ave. This concept, also called a pedestrian scramble, allows pedestrians to cross in all directions while vehicular traffic is stopped.

USF Transportation day was announced tentatively for February 2020.

Meeting of the Livable Roadways Advisory Committee (LRC) on August 21

The LRC approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ The letter of comment on the Tampa Bay Next Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, but suggested adding:
  o A request for a comprehensive land use and transportation (including transit) circulation study for all local roadways, neighborhoods/parks affected, especially Floribraska and Trask Aves, 14th/15th and 21st and 22nd Streets exits.
  o Add 13th Ave to the list of exit ramps for safety strategies, and add road geometric/design techniques to the list of safety strategies to be considered at new/modified exit ramps.
  o Review Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) strategies for each option, and how they could be applied to each.

The LRC also heard status reports on:
  o Hillsborough County Trails Update
  o 2045 Plan Needs Assessment for Investment Programs

Meeting of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board on August 23

The Board approved removal of the co-pay requirement out of the eligibility section of the Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan, based on the recommendation and findings from the Hillsborough County’s Enterprise Solutions and Quality Assurance Department. Collection of the co-pay cost $24,039 more than is received.

The Board learned about a FDOT sponsored program in Broward County- A Ride Away. This is an advocate’s guide for riders with disabilities to plan, travel and stay safe when traveling.

The Board also received an update on the Health Department’s Community Health Assessment. Board members questioned why, for example, in asset rich zip code 33612, residents felt that they had limited access to health services and asked the Health Department staff to explore this mismatch further.