Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee
Wednesday, September 18, 2019, 9:00 a.m.

I. Call to Order

II. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

III. Approval of Minutes – August 21, 2019

IV. Status Reports
   A. It's Time Hillsborough Survey Results (Lisa Silva, MPO)
   B. DRAFT 2045 Cost Feasible Plan (Sarah McKinley, MPO)
   C. US41 at CSX Grade Separation Project Development & Environmental Study (Lilliam E. Escalera, FDOT)
   D. Transportation Demand Management Plans (Sara Hendricks, USF-CUTR)
   E. Columbus Drive Complete Streets (Cal Hardie, City of Tampa)

V. Old Business & New Business

VI. Adjournment

VII. Addendum
   A. MPO Board Meeting Minutes and Committee Report
   B. Safe Routes and Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit Flyer
   C. Gulf Coast Safe Street Summit Nomination Form
   D. Article link: Best and Worst Cities to Drive In
   E. Article: War on Cars

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

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

Persons needing interpreter services or accommodations for a disability in order to participate in this meeting, free of charge, are encouraged to contact Johnny Wong, 813-273-3774 x370 or wongj@plancom.org, three business days in advance of the meeting. Also, if you are only able to speak Spanish, please call the Spanish help line at (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.
Si necesita servicios de traducción, el MPO ofrece por gratis. Para registrarse por estos servicios, por favor llame a Johnny Wong directamente al (813) 273-3774, ext. 370 con tres días antes, o wongj@plancom.org de 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.
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
LIVABLE ROADWAYS COMMITTEE (LRC)
MEETING OF AUGUST 21, 2019

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Green called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance took place. The meeting was held in the Plan Hillsborough Room on the 18th Floor of the County Center Building. A quorum was present at the start of the meeting.

Members Present: Karen Cashon, Melissa Collazo, Trent Green, Cal Hardie, Sara Hendricks, David Hey, Emily Hinsdale, Gus Ignas, Arizona Jenkins, Karen Kress, Michael Maurino, Kris Milster, Sandra Piccirilli, Anna Quinones and Neale Stralow

Others Present: Beth Alden, Rich Clarendon, Gena Torres and Lisa Silva – MPO; Mariann Abrahamsem and Sharon Snyder – Planning Commission; Wiatt Bowers – Atkins; David Aylesworth,; Roger Roscoe – FDOT; Monica Martin – Hillsborough County; Nicole McCleary - HART

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chris Vela, Tampa resident, spoke regarding the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. He is asking the MPO Board to do a “stay” and not proceed with this letter. He and the public affected by TB Next need more time to comment on the letter. Mr. Vela stated his reasons for opposition to moving forward with the letter.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the June 19, 2019 minutes (Maurino - Hey). The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Letter of Comment on Tampa Bay Next Section 4-6 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) (Rich Clarendon, MPO)

Mr. Clarendon stated the purpose of the supplemental environmental impact statement is to bring an earlier environmental impact statement up-to-date. He presented the limits of the SEIS and explained the options for the Westshore and the Downtown Interchanges. Mr. Clarendon explained how the MPO has evaluated the SEIS with MPO Motions following public hearings and other observations. He also distributed and explained the Status of MPO Board Motions spreadsheet.

Mr. Clarendon provided a summary of the requests: (1) mitigate construction impacts; (2) consider smart work zones; (3) clarify noise barrier locations in design phase; (4) FDOT provide updated Tax Loss Estimate for SEIS Final Preferred Alternative; (5) FDOT update the MPO with cost estimates for any proposed landscaping or design features requiring local upkeep during the design phase; (6) Design Phase address Quality of Life & Health Outcomes, such as construction mitigation, green noise walls, greater landscaping; (7) Design Phase consider Strategies to slow drivers down, such as: signage, flashing beacons, rumble strips and high visibility markings; (8) Clarification of Bike/Ped facilities on Reo Street, Lemon Street and E. Frontage Road; and (9) Design Phase address Closing Gaps in Trails & Greenways.
During the presentation, questions were asked regarding if the property tax loss is a one-time estimate for each year (yes); if FDOT pays property tax (no, they don’t pay property tax); if the loss of revenue will be for Westshore or Downtown (both); and if the projected pollution levels consider future traffic with induced demand or are the estimates based on current traffic (future traffic with induced demand). Mr. Ignas stated the projected pollution levels were explained to him that less cars sitting in the same space and the cars will be moving faster. Mr. Hey stated the projected reduction in pollution as one of the reasons used the last time there was a major update to the interchange, but cars are still stuck in traffic, therefore, creating pollution (Mr. Clarendon stated he is just reporting what is in the document and the previous Environmental Study called for a much larger interchange than what is there today. Also, new vehicles run cleaner). Mr. Ignas commented he lives near the interstate and the traffic generates a large amount of unhealthy particle matter.

Chair Green asked Mr. Clarendon to clarify the purpose of the letter and what it will initiate as it goes up the chain to the MPO Board. Mr. Clarendon stated the MPO would like to go on record to FDOT before the SEIS goes to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in early 2020. Chair Green asked if there will be other opportunities for the Committees to weigh in and Mr. Clarendon replied everyone can comment at the Public Hearing on November 5th.

Discussions followed regarding if the Floribraska ramp will be closed (yes, as a full rebuild is beyond what can be done today. The quick fix may happen in the next 5-10 years.); one member’s opinion that this is a bad idea as cars will have to go to the Martin Luther King or 14th/15th Street exits (there will be changes to the traffic circulation in this area); if some ramps are being considered for removal and new ramps built (yes, they are looking at these options); and if the impacts are looking at traffic issues, land use or anything else (They are broadening the scope to look at other issues, such as bike/pedestrian safety, but traffic impacts are being studied).

Ms. Silva reminded the Committee members the letter is addressing the SEIS alternatives and FDOT has an informative video regarding this project on their website.

Mr. Jenkins stated he lives in the affected neighborhood which will be interrupted with the additional traffic.

Discussions further continued regarding the impacts to land use along 14th and 15th Street, particularly at Cascade Park, which will be in the middle of the exits, and the need for a study to determine the impacts on areas of Ybor Heights; a clarification on where East Frontage Road listed on the slide is (Westshore location); suggestion to add to the study East 13th Street in Ybor, which is basically a frontage road for 14th and 15th Streets; and if the concerns listed in Section 10 of the letter are from staff or from public comments (not necessarily what the MPO said). Mr. Maurino concurs with the Westshore District comment section and feels Reo, Occident and Trask should be done early in the construction stages to help incorporate circulation. Mr. Maurino also expressed surprise that the streetcar extension wasn’t mentioned and asked if there are any discussions between the MPO and FDOT regarding the streetcar extension as it wasn’t mentioned in the four interchange options. He also asked if the standard bus system is protected so bus riders aren’t intimidated, and current transit options aren’t impeded as a transit rider is basically a pedestrian. It is Mr. Clarendon’s understanding from previous briefings is that the downtown interchange won’t impede the streetcar northward and the westbound option, using the transit envelope, is still open to discussion.

Discussions ensued regarding, in the comments about preserving the transit envelope, what portion of the interstate system is being referred to in Options C & D (the downtown interchange...
from I-4 headed west through Westshore. Mr. Hardie stated the downtown interchange doesn’t currently have a transit envelope, but Options A or B will create one. Options C & D do not create any space in the middle.; HART picks up a lot of wheelchair-bound riders and this plan will make the bus routes very hectic; if increased freight part of the model (yes, all types of freight); what the traffic volumes are on Floribraska (Mr. Clarendon does not have this information, but it is available online. Mr. Hardie stated Floribraska has about 7K vehicles per day and isn’t heavily traveled; however, there is a significant uptick between Florida and Nebraska.); if all Options have the Floribraska ramps being closed and new ramps built at 14th and 15th Streets (yes); if 21st and 22nd Streets will be closed in all five options (No. Mr. Clarendon stated his understanding is 21st and 22nd Street will have an option to get onto I-4 headed east.).

Mr. Hardie stated the total tax revenue for the 362 properties along the interstate is a total of approximately $1.8 million. Mr. Hey asked what the financial impact to the City of Tampa is after taking the property tax revenue away from the City, but adding the burden of maintenance to the City? Ms. Cashon stated the City of Tampa Parks and Rec has a contract maintenance budget.

Chair Green asked how much acreage will be created under the bridges and ramps, what the conditions will be on either side and what would the property become? Would the property be improved or just fenced off? He feels these items need to be considered now, not after construction. Mr. Hardie stated Options A & B might allow for additional space, but the ramps already exist in the Westshore area but there are future punch-throughs at Reo, Trask and Occident. Mr. Hey asked if the MPO is working with FDOT regarding underneath the ramps for opportunities other than parking lots.

Ms. Hendricks asked for clarifications on the MPO Board motions and if they are stipulations? Mr. Clarendon stated they are stipulations that came out of the Board’s motions and the checkmarks indicate how/if they’ve been addressed. Ms. Hendricks specially asked if the “final neighborhood plan for displaced residents and businesses, including design elements” is a process that has happened already or if it will happen before construction? Mr. Clarendon stated that is also a concern of the MPO, especially the impacts on affordable housing. The DOT does have to follow strict guidelines in terms of displaced persons but what that means needs to be explained. Ms. Silva stated there will be a greater level of detail as the process moves along. She encouraged members to review the information on FDOT’s website.

Finally, Mr. Milster suggested reducing the speed on the off-ramps, including roadway geometry. Mr. Ignas feels the 100-500 block of North Trask needs to be re-evaluated and the City needs to stop allowing residences to be built.

Ms. Hendricks asked if the letter includes a review of assumptions with regards to the application of transportation systems management and operations and transportation management strategies applied to the different options. Mr. Clarendon relied not TDMs, per se, but there is a lot related to traffic systems management and operations. He asked Ms. Hendricks what her suggestion is and she answered a review of TDM strategies as applied to each of the different options and how they could affect traffic.

Mr. Ignas asked if the Committee will make a recommendation as to which of the five alternates the Committee prefers? Ms. Silva replied a draft is coming to the Committees in September with a recommendation for the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Ms. Alden stated the MPO does not need to identify in the LRTP specific alternatives for downtown interchange but
must provide sufficient detail with cost feasible projects, what the project would cost and where it would be located so that it would be able to be interpreted what the MPO’s preference is. Even though you might not be able to distinguish between Options A & B or C & D, but one would be able to tell if the MPO is recommending A or B as a cost feasible project, C or D as a cost feasible project, a quick fix or nothing in the cost feasible plan. This is why the MPO structured their outreach the way they did in the survey this summer. It will be coming back for the public hearing on November 5, 2019 which will give the public opportunity to address the Board directly about their preferences for how the downtown interchange is shown in the cost feasible plan.

Motion: Review and approve comments on the Tampa Bay Next Section 4-6 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), to include:

- Suggest completing a comprehensive land use and transportation (including streetcar and transit) circulation study for all local roadways, neighborhoods/parks affected, especially Floribraska and Trask Avenues, 14th/15th and 21st and 22nd Streets exits;
- Add 13th Avenue to the list of exit ramps for safety strategies and add road; and geometric/design techniques to list of safety strategies to be considered for exit ramps;
- Review Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) strategies for each Tampa Bay Next option and how they could be applied to each.

(Hey – Collazo). The motion passed unanimously.

V. STATUS REPORTS

A. Hillsborough County Trails Update (Monica Martin, Hillsborough County Strategic Infrastructure Planning)

Ms. Martin provided an update on the Trails and Shared-Use Paths for Hillsborough County. The priority is closing the gaps on the two major regional trails, which are the Upper Tampa Bay Trail and the South Coast Greenway. Ms. Martin reviewed the status of each trail, from north to south. She also reviewed the Strategic Implementation Plan which encourages trails as a mode of transportation, to maximize the County’s investment and prioritize connectivity to create a multi-modal network County-wide.

Discussions followed regarding if the gap on the Upper Tampa Bay Trail Phase IVA/B is the gap that has been discussed for a long time (yes); which areas the gap on Van Dyke Road covers (it’s a connection); if the funded amount is $4M or $40M (it is $40M because it includes the entire Van Dyke Road on both sides of the Expressway); if all of the eminent domain and realignment issues have been worked out (no, currently under PD&E so they won’t know the results until that is completed in early 2020); do the school safety improvements consist of sidewalk connections (yes); if the study is considering e-bikes or e-scooters (Ms. Martin stated they weren’t allowed on trails, but the Florida Statues has recently changed to allow e-scooter use on trails along with bicycles. Ms. Martin will discuss with her team.); how are the trails funded (they apply for private and SunTrail grants. Some of these projects may be funded through the new surtax.); if the surtax goes away, will these projects not get completed (no, but they may be reprioritized); a dedicated yearly budget for trails would be nice; if the County’s sidewalk reprioritization project is separate from this update (no, it is part of this update); if there is coordination between the City of Tampa and the County regarding trails (yes, with Karla Price in the City Parks Department); the need for shade trees, not only for shade but to help control exhaust fumes, if the trails are being considered
for use by commuters (*the landscape architect is working on shade, but they are limited by the right-of-way*).

**B. 2045 Plan Needs Assessment for Investment Programs (Johnny Wong, MPO)**

Dr. Wong presented the 2045 Plan Needs Assessment for Investment Programs. He discussed the first four Program areas: State of Good Repair & Resiliency, Vision Zero, Smart Cities, and Real Choices When Not Driving. Major Projects will be considered in a separate process.

The State of Good Repair and Resiliency performance measures are the pavement resurfacing schedule, bridge repair and replacement schedule, transit assets replacement schedules and time to recover following a major storm and economic losses avoided. The performance measures for Vision Zero are total crashes, fatal crashes, serious injury crashes and crashes involving vulnerable users. Smart Cities metrics include reliability of travel times and hours of delay experienced and Real Choices When Not Driving includes people and jobs served by the bus system and trail and sidepath network and frequency of bus service.

Dr. Wong presented the comparisons of the Trend Investment Scenarios to Trend & Sales Tax Investment Scenarios and described the performance measures in more detail.

A discussion followed regarding when HART will be receiving new buses and new paratransit vans (*Nicole McCleary stated the turnaround time is one year for buses and 4 - 6 months for HARTPlus vans*).

Chair Green asked how rail isn’t part of the discussion for the 2045 needs and he feels it is time to start factoring it in. Dr. Wong feels we’ll be receiving more information in the very near future. HART is revisiting their short term service plan within the next year and a medium term plan (10-15 years out) with more details on fixed guideway transit that can be purchased with surtax.

**C. It’s Time Hillsborough Survey Results (Lisa Silva, MPO)**

Due to time constraints, this presentation has been tabled until September.

**VI. OLD BUSINESS & NEW BUSINESS**

**A.** Next LRC Meeting: September 18, 2019

**B.** Mr. Jenkins informed the Committee of a new service, *Advantage Ride*, and he provided contact information for the service. Their phone number is 813-440-4646 and the service is available Monday – Friday from 7:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m. and Saturday and Sunday from 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
It’s TIME Hillsborough Survey Results

**Presenter**
Lisa Silva, MPO Staff

**Summary**
During 2018, It’s TIME Tampa Bay was implemented as a collaboration of the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) of Hillsborough, Pasco, and Pinellas counties. Federal law requires MPOs to evaluate trends, project future growth, and identify fiscally constrained multimodal transportation investments for at the next 20 years as part of their Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) update.

It’s TIME Tampa Bay represented the first tri-county planning initiative the three counties have undertaken as part of the LRTP planning process. Each MPO is utilizing the results of the tri-county public outreach effort to help identify county-specific and inter-county projects that support and enhance regional mobility.

Based on the tri-county survey success staff designed a second MetroQuest outreach plan to seek more detailed input on specific projects and priorities in our county: It’s TIME Hillsborough. During June and July 2019, the Hillsborough MPO conducted its public engagement campaign, collecting input on specific types of projects Hillsborough citizens want to see in the 2045 Plan.

The entire outreach plan has been designed with a focus on increasing responses from our Communities of Concern.. The survey provided the public the opportunity to weigh in on Bus Rapid Transit, Major Investments and the Downtown Interchange.

The results of this survey will help the MPO team identify the best ideas, projects, and policies to be adopted into the 2045 Plan, due to be completed and presented at the November 5, 2019 Public Hearing.

**Recommended Action**
None

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

**Attachments**
Draft Summary Report Link
It’s TIME Hillsborough Marketing Summary
PowerPoint LRTP 2019 MetroQuest Survey Results
The overall goal: Maximize our reach into the community to engage and involve as many people as possible in the long range transportation planning process. Every voice matters. Hearing what citizens want and how they view our future is critical to making the right transportation investments to better serve all members of our community.

**cast the widest net**
- **Choosing MetroQuest** as key public engagement tool that is easy and fun and can be used on any device, any place, and at any time at the convenience of the survey-taker
- **Supporting the online survey** with paper surveys available in both English and Spanish to provide full access
- **Focused community presentations**, bus ride-a-longs, and events inclusive of communities of concern
- **Incentivize participation** with prizes, resulting in...

**take advantage of social media**
- **Facebook advertising campaign** (conducted by consultant)
- **Hillsborough MPO twitter** account has more than 6500 followers

**It’s TIME to get people talking**
- **Big kick off event** – June 10 – News Radio WFLA AM Tampa Bay Live remote broadcast with Jack Harris and Aaron Jacobson at Fred’s Market Restaurant from 5 am – 9 am with MPO Board member transportation agency guest speakers, preceded by one week of on-air promotion
  - **Radio cross promotions** on both iHeartRadio (promotion through July 15) and Beasley Media Group (July promotion) with negotiated partnerships with bonus media beyond minimal radio buys and provision of prize incentives
  - **Kids Day 2019** – A Beasley Media Group event and our biggest event during the survey period, with an amazing 15K diverse people attending at Raymond James Stadium, generating hundreds of surveys taken in one day and setting us for a strong finish in our final week!
  - **Tie in radio marketing with a digital schedule** across iHeartRadio & Beasley Media station streaming and on click-thru banners linked to the survey on station web sites and key station emails
Please TAKE & SHARE the #ItsTIMEHillsborough survey NOW thru 7/28. Leave your email to quality for drawings for 10 great prizes! Tell us where you’d like to see major project investments; bus rapid transit; and what you’d do with the Downtown Interchange. shar.es/a0cXI3 pic.twitter.com/ouYgAPE0i

What are you doing Monday morning? Join us 5AM-9AM at Fred’s Market Restaurant for a @WFLANews live radio remote with @whackyjack on #AMTampaBay! We’ll have transportation conversation, #ItsTIMEHillsborough survey, and just $5 for a blue plate breakfast with drink at Fred’s! pic.twitter.com/WlUcigoUmc

Two replies 5 retweets 11 likes
news media highlights across tv, online, print, and radio

It's TIME Hillsborough Survey
https://wflanews.iheart.com/content/2019-06-03-its-time-hillsborough-survey/

Joe Lopano - New Flights To Amsterdam & TPA All Access Program
Full Article
Date Collected Jun 10, 2019 9:48 AM EDT Source 970 Wfla

David Gwynn - Tampa Bay Next
Full Article
Date Collected Jun 10, 2019 8:55 AM EDT Source 970 Wfla
Ben Limmer - Bus Rapid Transit
Full Article
Date Collected Jun 10, 2019 8:55 AM EDT Source 970 Wfla

Beth Alden - Long Range Transportation Plan
Full Article
Date Collected Jun 10, 2019 9:18 AM EDT
Source 970 Wfla

Melissa Zornitta - It's TIME Hillsborough survey
Full Article
Date Collected Jun 10, 2019 8:15 AM EDT
Source 970 Wfla
Hillsborough leaders seeking public input on transportation plan


Time Jun 11, 2019 08:10 AM EDT Source News Channel 8 Market Tampa, FL

Hillsborough County looking for input on long range transportation plan


Posted: 4:04 PM, Jun 21, 2019

It’s TIME Hillsborough on “The Current” with Roxanne Wilder

https://myq105.com/2019/07/01/its-time-hillsborough/

Aired June 27 and June 28, 2019

Tampa Bay's Morning Blend

Direct Link

Time Jul 17, 2019 10:32 AM EDT , Length 4:24
Call Sign WFTS (ABC)
2045 Transportation Plan

Survey Results

Hillsborough MPO
Metropolitan Planning for Transportation

Plan Hillsborough
planhillsborough.org
Over 5,200 responses!

Public Transit continues to be a high priority

Survey Snapshot
Background
What’s a Long-Range Transportation Plan?

- The LRTP directs federal and state dollars towards transportation investments we value in our community.
- It looks out at least 20 years and must be updated every 5 years.
- The LRTP will be adopted in November 2019.
Creating the 2045 Plan

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

Spring 2018

Summer 2018
ESTABLISH GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
You spoke, we listened. With input received from nearly 10,000 citizens in the It's TIME Tampa Bay survey, the MPO developed goals and objectives for how we want our region to grow.

Spring 2019

Summer 2019
IDENTIFY NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS
What is It's TIME Hillsborough? The Hillsborough MPO is collecting input on specific projects people in Hillsborough County want.

Summer 2019

Plan Adoption
November 5, 2019 at 6:00 pm
Public Hearing of the Hillsborough MPO Board
Hillsborough County Center
601 E. Kennedy Blvd., 2nd Floor

WE ARE HERE!

Engagement on Future Projects
How can I share my input?
Take the online survey at planhillsborough.org/2045inhp/
Share the link with your friends and family.

Fall 2019

Book an It's TIME Hillsborough presentation.
We are scheduling presentations for community groups in June and July. May we schedule you?
What Regional Priorities Emerged

Provide alternatives to driving
Rail, bus, & walk/bike spaces

Reduce congestion

Reinvest in established neighborhoods

Minimize outward growth

Use new technologies
Improve transportation efficiency

Strengthen downtowns
Create spaces like them

Nearly 10,000 citizens responded to the 2018 regional survey!
Phase 1 results to Phase 2 questions

- 55% highly rated express bus rapid transit
- 81% highly rated local & regional rail
- 73% highly rated a focus on walk/bike
- 52% highly rated water ferry
- 55% highly rated new/expanded interchange ramps

Screen 2: Where would you like to see bus corridors?

Screen 3: What major investments should be prioritized for study?

Screen 4: What would you like to see done with the Downtown Interchange?
In addition to transit and roadway projects (Major Investments), the LRTP will include many other kinds of projects LRTP include maintenance, safety, innovative transportation mgmt. 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.
Engagement
Multimedia news

TV | Radio | Online | Print

$550K+

total publicity / earned media value

Tune in Monday morning, June 3, at 8:20!

Melissa & Beth will be talking transportation and growth in Hillsborough County.

Learn more: planhillsborough.org/2045LRTP

Tune in this weekend to learn why.

It's time... in Hillsborough.

THE CURRENT WITH ROXANNE WILDER

Beth Alden, AICP; Hillsborough MPO Exec Dir | Debra Acosta, Pedestrian/Trans King Pr | Ben Limmer, WAT CIO

in your community:

WILD 94.1 FM • Sunday 6-7 A.M.
The Shark 98.7 FM • Sunday 6-7 A.M.
99.5 WQYK FM • Sunday 6 A.M. | 99.5 WQYK HQ2 • Sunday 10-11 P.M. (HD Radio)
104.7 Q105 FM • Sunday 6-6 A.M. | 104.7 Q105 HQ2 • Saturday 6-7 A.M. (HD Radio)
Money Talks 1010 AM • Sunday 6-7 A.M.

Take the survey now: planhillsborough.org/2045LRTP/

NEWSDAY WFLA Newsradio 1010 AM, 107.3 FM on your side

It's time... in Hillsborough.

Transportation • Innovation • Mobility for Everyone

News Channel 8

WEBT - TV 28
Radio partnerships

Kick off event - June 10
News Radio WFLA AM Tampa Bay
Live remote broadcast

Kids Day - July 21, 2019
15K diverse people at Raymond James
Hundreds of surveys on one day

Incentives – ticket, tickets, tickets!

Thank you to our marketing partners!
Social Media Advertising

Website 55% direct
Email, LinkedIn, Instagram, Twitter, Newsletters, Partner promotion

44% referrals from Facebook

65% of participants left emails

2596 NEW survey-taker emails added to MPO mailing list
Outreach

43 events (vs. 84)
20 groups spread the word
9 bus ride-alongs (new COC routes)
676 surveys completed through outreach events
1,200 attendees
Survey Results
More voices... Better results

**MetroQuest engagement tool**
- Intended to cast a wider net
- Allow more people to weigh in at their convenience without having to come to a meeting

**Checked for a representative dataset**
- Demographic comparisons
- Geographic coverage
- Valid responses
The Basics

5,219 PARTICIPANTS
89% HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY RESIDENTS
90% HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY WORKERS
93,000+ DATA POINTS
3,000+ COMMENTS
County-wide Representation

Resident Representation

Worker Representation

Most Represented

Least Represented
Demographics
Bus Rapid Transit
Order the top 5 BRT Priorities

Order your top 5 items above this line

- I-275 Limited Stop BRT
- Brandon Boulevard BRT
- Busch-Linebaugh BRT
- Downtown-USF BRT
- Bruce B Downs Blvd BRT
- Dale Mabry Highway BRT
- Hillsborough Ave BRT
- US 301 South BRT

Transit as an alternative to driving
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) provides fast, high-quality bus service. BRT typically includes pleasant stations, shorter wait times, modern vehicles, smart technology, and speedier trips. Tell us what roads you want BRT on.
Major Investments
Respond Yes or No for each project.

This map shows some potential major projects. Select the projects you feel should be a priority for further study or suggest a different one. These projects are designed to reduce congestion and may include walk and bike facilities. Projects in black are already in the plan.

Indicate which project you would approve.
Major Investments – Overall Results

- Reuse freight rail tracks
- Rapid transit Downtown-Airport
- Extend Downtown Streetcar
- Greenway Trail corridors
- Rightsizing Tampa multilane roads
- Elevated Exp Lanes major roads
- New water transit system
- I4-I75 Interchange area roads
- USF New Tampa Temple Terrace
- Interstate Expressway toll lanes
- Bloomingdale Fishhawk roads
- Airport North Westchase roads
- SouthShore roads
- Road widenings near rural area
- Plant City new wider roads

Legend:
- Percent Positive
- Percent Abstain
- Percent Negative
Major Investments – Reuse Freight Rail Track

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – Plant City
New Wider Roads

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Rate each scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>No further construction, Existing lanes stay the same, Severe crash hotspot, Airport ↔ Ybor in 15-30 minutes, Airport ↔ MLK in 10-30 minutes, Impacts 0 homes/businesses, Construction cost: $0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate this scenario:
Downtown Interchange – Overall Results (1=lowest, 5=highest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>2,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Traffic Quick Fix</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Express Lane Flyover</td>
<td>1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Rebuild w Exp Lanes</td>
<td>1,257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 4 approx. = 3,819 responses

Star Ranking

- 1: 3,819 responses
- 2: 3,848 responses
- 3: 3,873 responses
- 4: 3,862 responses

- 1 and 5 almost equal
- 4.3X greater
Downtown Interchange – Results by Home Zip Code

Preliminary Survey Results through June 30th, 2019

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed.
Downtown Interchange – Results by Home Zip Code

Preliminary Survey Results through June 30th, 2019

No-Build Score

High Star Rating

Low Star Rating

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Downtown Interchange – Results by Home Zip Code

Safety and Traffic Quick Fix Score

High Star Rating

Low Star Rating

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Downtown Interchange –
Results by Home Zip Code

Express Lane Score

High Star Rating

Low Star Rating

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Downtown Interchange – Results by Home Zip Code

Preliminary Survey Results through June 30th, 2019

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed

Full Rebuild Score

High Star Rating

Low Star Rating

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
What's happens next?

Draft Plan for review
Posted online on or before October 5, 2019
planhillsborough.org/2045lrtp

Plan adoption
November 5, 2019 at 6:00 pm
MPO Public Hearing
County Center
601 E. Kennedy Blvd., 2nd Floor
Major Investments – USF-New Tampa-Temple Terrace

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – SouthShore

Results by Home Zip Code

- Mostly Positive
- Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – Airport North Westchase Roads

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Pasco County
Pinellas County

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – I-4/I-75 Interchange Area Roads

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – Elevated Express Lanes Major Roads

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – Interstate Expressway Toll Lanes

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – Greenway and Trail Corridors

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – Right-sizing Tampa Multilane Roads

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Pasco County
Pinellas County

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – Road widenings near rural area

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – Bloomingdale Fishhawk roads

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – Rapid Transit from Downtown to Airport

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – New Water Transit System

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Major Investments – Extend Downtown Streetcar

Results by Home Zip Code

Mostly Positive

Mostly Negative

Note: Zip codes with less than 5 responses removed
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
DRAFT 2045 Cost Feasible Plan

**Presenter**
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

**Summary**
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 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
prepared in cooperation with

---

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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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.

“...

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
# list of acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</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>
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.
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.

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
### Snapshot of Hillsborough

#### TODAY

**Population Share**
- Current population: 1,440,800 (BEBR est.)
- Population share remains stable: 50% of the tri-county area total

**Service Sector Industries**
- Majority of employment

**Zero-car Commuters**
- Concentrated near downtown Tampa and USF, while student populations are larger in more outlying suburban areas.

**Employment**
- 830,900 people currently employed

#### TOMORROW

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

**Age**
- Largest age cohort: 18 to 34
- Expected to decrease by 2045.

**65+ Age Group**
- Expected to increase.

**Residential Development**
- In the Central Business District (CBD) growing at a faster rate than the rest of the country.
Imagining the Region Tomorrow

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>Scenario</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>trend + technology</td>
<td>1,477,500</td>
<td>671,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belt + boulevard</td>
<td>1,325,200</td>
<td>838,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transit oriented development</td>
<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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-interstate highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerline miles of road</td>
<td>5,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit vehicle (HART)</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities in 2016</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities in 2018</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-interstate highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large proportion of roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult asthma rate highest in state</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live within 150 meters of high</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volume road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have access to good bus service</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live near a reliable pedestrian</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of interstates are over capacity</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of other roads are over capacity</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without Surtax (2026-2045) in Billions, YOE</th>
<th>With Surtax (2026-2045) in Billions, YOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal &amp; State (for SIS only) 33% $7.39</td>
<td>Total $22.20 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal &amp; State (for non-SIS) 34% $7.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Roads &amp; Transit 33% $7.33</td>
<td>Total $32.19 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

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

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.
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

- **Bus Rapid Transit**
  - Range of Capital Cost Millions/Mile: $2.57 - $9.46
  - Range of Capital Cost Millions/Station: $2.43 - $6.09

- **Streetcar Expansion**
  - Range of Capital Cost Millions/Mile: $38.88 - $67.28
  - Range of Capital Cost Millions/Station: $12.64 - $15.45

- **Light Rail**
  - Range of Capital Cost Millions/Mile: $113.79 - $244.58
  - Range of Capital Cost Millions/Station: $113.60 - $149.46

- **Commuter Rail**
  - Range of Capital Cost Millions/Mile: $5.63 - $38.60
  - Range of Capital Cost Millions/Station: $68.68 - $114.93
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

Our Vision for Important Non-Interstate Roadways

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.

Working Together
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
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:

### 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>State</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>Hillsborough County</strong></td>
<td>$9,030</td>
<td>$9,030</td>
<td>$7,208</td>
<td>$1,682</td>
<td>$506</td>
<td>$32,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HART</strong></td>
<td>$7,208</td>
<td>$7,208</td>
<td>$7,208</td>
<td>$1,682</td>
<td>$506</td>
<td>$32,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local (i.e., cities)</strong></td>
<td>$1,682</td>
<td>$1,682</td>
<td>$1,682</td>
<td>$1,682</td>
<td>$506</td>
<td>$32,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPO</strong></td>
<td>$506</td>
<td>$506</td>
<td>$506</td>
<td>$506</td>
<td>$506</td>
<td>$32,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDS ADMINISTERED</strong></td>
<td>$32,186</td>
<td>$32,186</td>
<td>$32,186</td>
<td>$32,186</td>
<td>$32,186</td>
<td>$32,186</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.*

### How We Will Fund Our Vision

- **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
### 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>

<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>*Needs-Based Costs</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.

intent of good repair
and resilience

Strengthen infrastructure assets
Address vulnerability

Fund investments in resiliency
Safeguard economic stability
target funding allocation

- **Bridge Maintenance**: $963 million
- **Road Maintenance**: $3.2 billion
- **Transit Maintenance**: $250 million
- **Vulnerability Reduction**: $3.3 billion

dollars (in millions, YOE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Bridge Maintenance</th>
<th>Road Maintenance</th>
<th>Transit Maintenance</th>
<th>Vulnerability Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 26-30</td>
<td>$204.8 million</td>
<td>$696.2 million</td>
<td>$59.2 million</td>
<td>$137.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 31-35</td>
<td>$682.8 million</td>
<td>$759.0 million</td>
<td>$530.1 million</td>
<td>$1,767.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 36-45</td>
<td>$696.2 million</td>
<td>$773.8 million</td>
<td>$1,801.5 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
intent 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)

FY 26-30: $417.1
FY 31-35: $479.6
FY 36-45: $1,210.0
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.

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

37% of total employment opportunities are within .25 miles of good transit facilities.
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.
The target funding allocation is as follows:

- **Bus Transit**: $5.3 billion
- **TD Paratransit**: $601 million
- **Trails Sidepath**: $694 million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Bus Transit</th>
<th>TD Paratransit</th>
<th>Trails Sidepath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 26-30</td>
<td>$1,055.9</td>
<td>$120.5</td>
<td>$139.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 31-35</td>
<td>$1,204.9</td>
<td>$137.5</td>
<td>$158.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>$342.8</td>
<td>$395.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total allocation: $3,003.5 million

Dollars (in millions, YOE)
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.
target funding allocation

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_pdce1a5a88b598246e1a055e616028df8ad.pdf?sfvrsn=5e27eecc7_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 are 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.
**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.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Columbus Drive Complete Street

**Presenter**
Calvin Hardie, City of Tampa Transportation and Stormwater

**Summary**

The 0.4-mile segment of Columbus Drive from Nebraska Avenue to 14th Street is a 2-lane (one travel lane in each direction) arterial roadway with a posted speed of 30 mph and has an average daily traffic volume of 10,210 vehicles per day. This project is supported as documented and prioritized as number four in the MPO-City of Tampa Walk-Bike Plan Phase I – Final Report.

The original concept that was presented at the public meeting comprising construction of 5-foot bike lanes on both sides of the road and removal of parking from the north side. Based upon public comment, the City has amended the design to provide for the following:

- Widening of sidewalks on both sides to approximately 8 feet along the corridor and approximately 15 feet at intersections.
- Maintaining parking on both sides of the road.
- Adding street trees to both sides of the roadway.
- Narrowing lane widths to 11 feet (minimum for this classification).
- Providing share-the-road markings on the travel lanes.

The new design prioritizes pedestrian safety, enhances the transit stops along the corridor, and provides cyclists with options, while maintaining the vehicular capacity and on-street parking.

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

**Prepared By**
Wade Reynolds, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
City of Tampa Project Web Page
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 Zukoemefa 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 You Tube. 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 You Tube 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 You Tube’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.**
**STATUS REPORTS**

**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/sidepaths 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.
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:
  o The relocation of displaced residents and availability of affordable housing
  o Global warming and air quality
  o FDOT still not fully being compliant with the original MPO motions passed in 2016 and 2017
  o The validity of information on how tax impact will be made up by new investment
  o Right-of-way acquisition costs
  o Assumptions behind the air quality model; what is assumed about cleaner running vehicles, alternative fuels, electric and autonomous vehicles
  o 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)
  o 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:
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - 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:

- Hillsborough County Trails Update
- 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.
The Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit is being held immediately following and in conjunction with the 2019 Safe Routes to School National Conference being held November 12 - 14 at the Hilton Tampa Downtown. The Hillsborough MPO is honored to be the local host of both events.

View the full 3-day national conference schedule: http://azbvtb.attendify.io/

Tickets for the Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit are just $50.

Register for either or both events: http://saferoutesconference.org/

2ND ANNUAL GULF COAST SAFE STREETS SUMMIT SCHEDULE AT-A-GLANCE:

2:00p - 2:30p | Welcome & Introductions
2:30p - 4:00p | Session 1 moderated by Jeff Speck
Human-centered Mobility Bill of Rights
4:00p - 5:15p | Session 2
Outside the Box Funding
5:15p - 5:30p | Session Wrap Up
5:30p - 8:00p | Reception & Awards Program

More info: planhillsborough.org/gulf-coast-safe-streets-summit/

From the Summit, to the Streets...

SAFE STREETS NOW
VISIONZERO
ONE TRAFFIC DEATH IS TOO MANY

WALK OF SILENCE • 11.15.19 • 7:30AM
meet up at Hilton Tampa Downtown to honor lives of loved ones lost this year

Help carry the Safe Streets message through Tampa's Downtown during rush hour!
Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit Award Nominations

**Required Question(s)**

Nominations are now being accepted for the 2019 Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit Bob the Builder and Vision Zero Hero Awards! [Deadline for submitting: October 18th]

Awards will be presented at a reception following the Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit (GCSSS) on **Thursday, November 14, 2019**. The GCSSS is being held at the Hilton Tampa Downtown at 2pm with the Awards Program beginning at 5:30pm.

We want to recognize community leaders, from the elected official to the local activist, who have gone above and beyond in their commitment to improving driving, bicycling, and walking safety - whether in redesigning a roadway or educating those around them, we want to celebrate their great work!

**Bob the Builder - AWARD CRITERIA**

- Reconstructed a high crash roadway with complete street features
- Installed bike racks, transit shelters, benches, shade
- Prioritized safety, speed management, signal coordination, leading pedestrian intervals
Vision Zero Hero - AWARD CRITERIA

• Spearheaded a community safety awareness event
• Provided time, expertise, and engaged the community in safety education
• Advanced the Vision Zero movement through personal and/or professional actions

1. Information about the person you are nominating:
   NAME:
   CITY:
   EMAIL:
   PHONE:
It is **FREE** to nominate someone. Please also consider registering for the GCSSS for only $50 per person. Cost includes refreshments. We have a goal of making the summit accessible to all, if the cost is prohibitive please contact Lisa Silva (813) 273-3774 x329 and arrangements can be made to ensure your attendance. [Click Here to Get Tickets](#)

Finish
2019’s Best & Worst Cities to Drive in

Sep 3, 2019 | Adam McCann

Most Americans rely on cars to get around. According to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, “87 percent of daily trips take place in personal vehicles.” And even with growing access to public transportation in U.S. cities, most people still choose to travel by car, mainly for reasons such as “comfort and reliability.”

In truth, however, driving is often a major hassle and expense. Drivers annually spend an average of more than 310 hours on the road. That’s nearly 13 days. Add the costs of wasted time and fuel due to traffic congestions, and our collective tab comes to about $124 billion annually, or $1,700 per household.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, America’s highways and bridges are underfunded, with an $836 billion backlog of repairs needed. The World Economic Forum ranks U.S. roads at 11th in quality out of 140 economically developed nations. It’s clear there’s room for improvement.

GET YOUR FREE CREDIT SCORE & REPORT

Some cities are better for those behind the wheel. To determine those places, WalletHub compared the 100 largest cities across 30 key indicators of driver-friendliness. Our data set ranges from average gas prices to annual hours in traffic congestion per auto commuter to auto-repair shops per capita. Read on for our findings, tips and insight from a panel of experts, and a full description of our methodology.

1. MAIN FINDINGS

2. ASK THE EXPERTS

3. METHODOLOGY

Main Findings
## Best & Worst Cities to Drive in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank (1 = Best)</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>‘Cost of Ownership &amp; Maintenance’ Rank</th>
<th>‘Traffic &amp; Infrastructure’ Rank</th>
<th>‘Safety’ Rank</th>
<th>‘Average Main’ R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
<td>69.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>66.26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE</td>
<td>66.21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Winston-Salem, NC</td>
<td>65.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>64.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Corpus Christi, TX</td>
<td>64.78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Boise, ID</td>
<td>63.78</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>63.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Greensboro, NC</td>
<td>63.44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>63.35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td>63.35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Plano, TX</td>
<td>63.06</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>62.97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>62.90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2,884 SHARES

GET YOUR FREE CREDIT SCORE & REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>‘Cost of Ownership &amp; Maintenance’ Rank</th>
<th>‘Traffic &amp; Infrastructure’ Rank</th>
<th>‘Safety’ Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>62.08</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, FL</td>
<td>61.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>61.46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Durham, NC</td>
<td>61.33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Laredo, TX</td>
<td>60.95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Virginia Beach, VA</td>
<td>60.73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lexington-Fayette, KY</td>
<td>60.73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Wichita, KS</td>
<td>60.51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>60.45</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Arlington, TX</td>
<td>60.31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Gilbert, AZ</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>60.15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mesa, AZ</td>
<td>60.15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>60.09</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Irving, TX</td>
<td>60.04</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Chandler, AZ</td>
<td>60.03</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Fort Worth, TX</td>
<td>59.99</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>‘Cost of Ownership &amp; Maintenance’ Rank</td>
<td>‘Traffic &amp; Infrastructure’ Rank</td>
<td>‘Safety’ Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Irvine, CA</td>
<td>59.75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Colorado Springs, CO</td>
<td>59.66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Chesapeake, VA</td>
<td>59.62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Omaha, NE</td>
<td>59.46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Oklahoma City, OK</td>
<td>59.42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Lubbock, TX</td>
<td>59.36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Garland, TX</td>
<td>59.32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
<td>59.07</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Fort Wayne, IN</td>
<td>58.53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Norfolk, VA</td>
<td>58.22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
<td>58.11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Toledo, OH</td>
<td>57.93</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Henderson, NV</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>56.57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>56.51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>56.38</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>56.21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>‘Cost of Ownership &amp; Maintenance’ Rank</td>
<td>‘Traffic &amp; Infrastructure’ Rank</td>
<td>‘Safety’ Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>56.06</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Tulsa, OK</td>
<td>55.44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>55.11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>54.92</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>54.86</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>54.51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>54.37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>53.80</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Aurora, CO</td>
<td>53.47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Chula Vista, CA</td>
<td>53.46</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>52.92</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>52.73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>52.68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Memphis, TN</td>
<td>52.68</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>52.66</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>‘Cost of Ownership &amp; Maintenance’ Rank</td>
<td>‘Traffic &amp; Infrastructure’ Rank</td>
<td>‘Safety’ Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>52.59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Glendale, AZ</td>
<td>52.49</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Riverside, CA</td>
<td>52.41</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>52.39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA</td>
<td>52.30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Santa Ana, CA</td>
<td>52.18</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>52.16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Hialeah, FL</td>
<td>52.03</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Fremont, CA</td>
<td>51.77</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>51.59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>51.33</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>North Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>51.25</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>51.05</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>49.95</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Jersey City, NJ</td>
<td>49.94</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>‘Cost of Ownership &amp; Maintenance’ Rank</td>
<td>‘Traffic &amp; Infrastructure’ Rank</td>
<td>‘Safety’ Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>49.60</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>49.35</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Stockton, CA</td>
<td>48.59</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>47.68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>47.54</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>47.17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>San Bernardino, CA</td>
<td>45.82</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>45.35</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>45.22</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>44.04</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>43.87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>43.72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.24</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>‘Cost of Ownership &amp; Maintenance’ Rank</td>
<td>‘Traffic &amp; Infrastructure’ Rank</td>
<td>‘Safety’ Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>39.73</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>37.40</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lowest Annual Hours Spent in Congestion per Auto Commuter**

1. Fort Wayne, IN
2. Winston-Salem, NC
3. Lubbock, TX
4. Boise, ID
5. Birmingham, AL

**Highest Annual Hours Spent in Congestion per Auto Commuter**

64. New York, NY
65. Chicago, IL
66. Seattle, WA
67. Washington, DC
68. Boston, MA

---

**Fewest Days with Precipitation**

1. Las Vegas, NV
2. Henderson, NV
3. North Las Vegas, NV
4. Long Beach, CA
5. Anaheim, CA
5. Santa Ana, CA

**Most Days with Precipitation**

96. Pittsburgh, PA
97. Portland, OR
98. Seattle, WA
99. Cleveland, OH
100. Buffalo, NY
### 2019’s Best & Worst Cities to Drive in

#### Lowest Accident Likelihood in City vs. National Avg.

1. Boise, ID
2. Madison, WI
3. Laredo, TX
4. Mesa, AZ
5. Scottsdale, AZ

#### Highest Accident Likelihood in City vs. National Avg.

96. Philadelphia, PA
97. Los Angeles, CA
97. Washington, DC
97. Boston, MA
97. Baltimore, MD

#### Lowest Car Theft Rate

1. Gilbert, AZ
2. Laredo, TX
3. New York, NY
4. Irvine, CA
5. Scottsdale, AZ

#### Highest Car Theft Rate

94. San Bernardino, CA
95. Portland, OR
96. Detroit, MI
96. Oakland, CA
96. Albuquerque, NM

#### Most Auto-Repair Shops per Capita

1. Las Vegas, NV
2. Orlando, FL
3. New York, NY
4. Miami, FL
5. Houston, TX

#### Fewest Auto-Repair Shops per Capita

96. New Orleans, LA
97. Washington, DC
98. Laredo, TX
99. Irvine, CA
100. Boston, MA

#### Most Car Washes per Capita

T1. Las Vegas, NV
T1. Miami, FL
T1. Orlando, FL
4. San Diego, CA

#### Fewest Car Washes per Capita

95. Garland, TX
97. San Bernardino, CA
98. Boston, MA
99. Jersey City, NJ
2019’s Best & Worst Cities to Drive in

Lowest Avg. Gas Prices
1. San Antonio, TX
2. Baton Rouge, LA
3. Laredo, TX
4. Corpus Christi, TX
5. New Orleans, LA

Highest Avg. Gas Prices
100. San Francisco, CA
99. Oakland, CA
98. Bakersfield, CA
96. Fremont, CA
95. San Jose, CA

Lowest Auto Maintenance Costs
1. Jacksonville, FL
2. Memphis, TN
3. El Paso, TX
4. Laredo, TX
5. Indianapolis, IN

Highest Auto Maintenance Costs
96. Boston, MA
97. New Orleans, LA
98. New York, NY
99. Seattle, WA
100. Honolulu, HI

Lowest Parking Rates
1. Corpus Christi, TX
2. Reno, NV
3. Jacksonville, FL
3. Anaheim, CA
3. St. Petersburg, FL

Highest Parking Rates
82. Philadelphia, PA
81. Washington, DC
80. San Diego, CA
79. Boston, MA
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cost, safety and environmental impact ranking among the top concerns for the auto industry, we asked a panel of experts to share their thoughts on the following key questions:

1. What money-saving tips do you have for drivers now that gas prices have increased over the last six months?

2. When do you think there will be more self-driving than human-driven cars?

3. Considering all potential consequences, do you think that automated vehicles will be a net benefit or net negative for society?

4. When evaluating the best cities for drivers, what are the top five indicators?

5. What can local authorities do to reduce traffic and improve safety?

Nicholas E. Lownes  
Ph.D., PE – Associate Professor, Associate Head for Undergraduate Education and Outreach, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Connecticut

Robert Cervero  
Ph.D. – Professor, University of California, Berkeley

Ken Small  
Professor Emeritus of Economics, University of California at Irvine

Mary Angelica Painter  
Ph.D. Candidate, Transportation, Technology, & Research Methodology, University of Missouri-Saint Louis

Lester A. Hoel  
L.A. Lacy Distinguished Professor of Engineering Emeritus, University of Virginia

Sarah L. Catz  
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Methodology

In order to determine the best and worst cities for drivers, WalletHub compared a sample of the 100 most populated U.S. cities across four key dimensions: 1) Cost of Ownership & Maintenance, 2) Traffic & Infrastructure, 3) Safety and 4) Access to Vehicles & Maintenance. Our sample considers only the city proper in each case and excludes cities in the surrounding metro area.

We evaluated those dimensions using 30 relevant metrics, which are listed below with their corresponding weights. Each metric was graded on a 100-point scale, with a score of 100 representing the most favorable conditions for drivers. Data for metrics marked with an asterisk (*) were available at the state level only. For metrics marked with two asterisks (**), the square root of the population was used to calculate the population size in order to avoid overcompensating for minor differences across cities.

Finally, we determined each city’s weighted average across all metrics to calculate its overall score and used the resulting scores to rank-order our sample.

Cost of Ownership & Maintenance – Total Points: 30

- Cost of New Car: Full Weight (“4.29 Points)
- Average Gas Prices: Double Weight (“8.57 Points)
- Average Annual Car Insurance Premium: Full Weight (“4.29 Points)
- Auto Maintenance Costs: Full Weight (“4.29 Points)
- Total Extra Vehicle Operating Costs per Driver: Full Weight (“4.29 Points)
  Note: Additional vehicle operating costs (VOC) are the “result of driving on roads in need of repair, lost time and fuel due to congestion-related delays, and the costs of traffic crashes in which roadway features likely were a contributing factor,” according to transportation research firm TRIP.
- Average Parking Rate: Full Weight (“4.29 Points)

Traffic & Infrastructure – Total Points: 30

- Annual Hours Spent in Congestion per Auto Commuter: Full Weight (“3.64 Points)
Number of Days with Precipitation: Full Weight (~3.64 Points)
Number of Cold Days: Full Weight (~3.64 Points)

Note: This metric specifically measures the average number of days with a minimum temperature of 32 degrees F or lower.

- Average Commute Time by Car (in Minutes): Full Weight (~3.64 Points)
- Number of Alternative-Fuel Stations per Capita: Full Weight (~3.64 Points)
- Quality of Roads: Full Weight (~3.64 Points)
- Quality of Bridges: Quarter* Weight (~0.91 Points)
- Roadway Miles per 1,000 Persons: Full Weight (~3.64 Points)
- Waze Driver Satisfaction Rating: Full Weight (~3.64 Points)

Safety – Total Points: 30

- Accident Likelihood in City vs. National Average: Full Weight (~3.53 Points)
- Traffic Fatality Rate per 100,000 Population: Full Weight (~3.53 Points)
- Share of Adults Who Always or Nearly Always Wear a Seatbelt: Full Weight (~3.53 Points)
- Number of Hard-Braking Events per 1,000 Miles: Full Weight (~3.53 Points)
  Note: Hard-braking data is based on customers voluntarily enrolled in Allstate’s Drivewise® telematics program from 2015-2016.
- Share of Uninsured Drivers: Full Weight (~3.53 Points)
- Rate of Car Thefts: Full Weight (~3.53 Points)
- Rate of Larceny: Full Weight (~3.53 Points)
- Strictness of DUI Punishment: Half* Weight (~1.76 Points)
  Note: This metric is based on WalletHub's “Strictest & Most Lenient States on DUI” ranking.
- Punitiveness of High-Risk Driver’s Insurance: Half* Weight (~1.76 Points)
  Note: This metric is based on WalletHub's “States with the Highest & Lowest Insurance Premium Penalties for High-Risk Drivers” ranking.
- Driving Laws Rating: Half* Weight (~1.76 Points)

Access to Vehicles & Maintenance – Total Points: 10

GET YOUR FREE CREDIT SCORE & REPORT
Car Dealerships per Capita**: Full Weight (~2.00 Points)  
Auto-Repair Shops per Capita**: Full Weight (~2.00 Points)  
• Car Washes per Capita**: Full Weight (~2.00 Points)  
• Gas Stations per Capita**: Full Weight (~2.00 Points)  
• Parking Lots and Garages per Capita: Full Weight (~2.00 Points)

Videos for News Use:  
• YouTube (for web embedding National)  
• Raw files (for editing into clips)

Sources: Data used to create this ranking were collected from the U.S. Census Bureau, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Council for Community and Economic Research, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety, INRIX, National Centers for Environmental Information, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, American Automobile Association, The Road Information Program, Federal Highway Administration, Insurance Research Council, Waze Mobile, Allstate Insurance Company, U.S. Department of Energy, QuinStreet Insurance Agency, Yelp, TrueCar and WalletHub research.
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This list is bullshit. I drive for a living and the fact is Atlanta is one of the worst places to drive...period. Whoever wrote this must not drive much...lol

Reply
The 'War on Cars' Is a Bad Joke

There is no war on cars. Everybody, including motorists, benefit from a more diverse and efficient transportation system. Let there be peace!

Todd Litman | August 23, 2019, 7am PDT

Roman Eugeniusz / Wikimedia Commons
Some people complain that new multi-modal planning practices, such as bike- and bus-lanes, traffic speed reductions and new parking fees, are a "war on cars." Much of their evidence is ridiculous, some of which has already been refuted on the Planetizen website.

Framing this as a "war" implies that motorists are victims of violent assaults. Should motorists really fear ferocious pedestrians, berserk bicyclists, and armed buses? Of course not. Their complaints are unfounded, like the grousing of drunks at a late night bar, but their claims have been widely circulated on the internet and published in newspapers, and if left unchallenged may discourage efforts to make our transportation system more diverse, efficient and equitable.

Complaints about a "war on cars" demonstrate that automobiles make people selfish. The majority of transportation investments and road space are devoted to automobile travel, yet motorists are not satisfied, they want even more.

Claims that motorists are under attack are particularly cruel because pedestrians and bicyclists really do face violence from motor vehicle traffic. Much of what motorists call a “war on cars“ consists of efforts to increase the safety, convenience and comfort of other travel modes. Let’s examine in detail, and in some cases laugh, at claims of a “war on cars."

A War on Cars? Let There Be Peace!

Let’s be clear: there is no war on cars. During the last century, transportation planning was automobile-oriented: the majority of planning resources (money, road space, and design priorities) were devoted to improving automobile travel, often to the detriment of other travel modes. Wider roads and higher traffic speeds create barriers to walking and bicycling, increase risks to all road users, and minimum parking requirements subsidize car travel and encourage sprawled development, creating sprawled communities where it is difficult to reach destinations without a car. The result is automobile dependency and sprawl (see figure below), which increases economic, social and environmental costs.
In response, many communities are starting to implement more multi-modal transportation planning that improves travel options, encourages more efficient travel, and creates more compact communities. However, this is no more a “war on cars” than a healthy diet is a “war on food.” Multi-modal planning allows travellers to choose the most efficient mode for each trip: walking and bicycling for local trips, public transit on busy urban corridors, and driving when it is truly optimal, considering all impacts. Multi-modal transportation planning neither requires nor prohibits driving. It is a middle way between Automobile-Dependent and Car-Free transportation planning (see below). Motorists benefit from multi-modal planning that reduces their traffic and parking congestion, the risk of being the victim of other drivers’ errors, and chauffeuring burdens.

**Auto-Dependent, Multi-Modal, and Car-Free Planning**

Some motorists argue that driving is more important than other travel modes. They say things like, "You can’t deliver furniture by bicycle" or "I shouldn’t be forced to walk ten miles to work." This misses the point: each mode has a role to play in an efficient and equitable transport system. It would be inefficient to deliver heavy freight by bicycle or walk ten miles to work, but it is also inefficient if parents must drive children to school due to a lack of sidewalks or crosswalks, or if people who want to bicycle commute cannot do so due to unsafe riding conditions.
Multi-modal planning requires motorists to share roads with other modes, drive slower and pay for parking in some areas, but does not prevent people from driving when and where they want. Even ambitious goals, such as California [pdf] targets to reduce vehicle travel 15%, cars will continue to be the most common travel option.

**Why Here? Why Now?**

Current demographic and economic trends justify more multi-modal planning:

- **An aging population** [pdf] is increasing the number of adults who cannot or should not drive, and so require other travel options.
- Changing consumer preferences. **Surveys** indicate that many people want to drive less and living in a walkable urban neighborhood. Multi-modal planning responds to these preferences.
- Affordability and social justice. Housing and transportation are most household’s **two largest household spending categories**; multi-modal planning increases affordable travel options and reduces parking costs that must be incorporated into rents and mortgages. It also ensures that people who cannot, should not, or prefer not to drive for some trips receive a fair share of public resources.
- Increasing urbanization. Urban land is scarce and valuable, and expanding urban roads and parking facilities is costly. As a result, improving and encouraging use of space-efficient modes is often the most cost effective and beneficial solution to urban traffic problems. The figure below illustrates the optimal auto mode shares in various locations.

\[\text{Image of graph showing optimal mode shares by income and location.}\]

- In affluent, sprawled rural areas and suburbs, most trips can be by automobile, but this should decline with density, particularly in neighborhoods where many households cannot afford cars or many residents have mobility impairments. More multi-modal planning creates communities where it is easy to get around without a car.

- Increasing health and environmental concerns. Multi-modal planning allows people to walk and bicycle for fitness and health, and reduces per capita pollution emissions and pavement area.
• Local economic development. Multi-modal transportation helps support economic development by increasing affordability and community livability and supporting local industries.

Do People Walk and Bicycle? Do We Spend Too Much on Non-Auto Modes?

Critics sometimes claim that few people walk, bicycle or use public transit, so investing in these modes is wasteful and unfair. Let’s look at some numbers.

According to the 2017 National Household Travel Survey about 11% of personal trips are by walking and 1% bicycling, with higher rates during peak periods and in central cities where traffic problems are greatest. Yet, only about 2.1% of federal transportation funding is devoted to these modes, according to the "Bicycling & Walking Benchmarking Report," as illustrated below.

![Graph showing U.S. Active Mode Share and Spending](image)

Similarly, bicycling and public transit receive less than their fair share of road space. In San Francisco [pdf], 37% of trips are by transit, but only 1.2% of road space is dedicated to bus lanes, and 4% of trips are by bicycle, but only 1.5% of road space is dedicated to bike lanes.
There are several reasons to increase public transit investments, beyond its mode share. Public transit [pdf] plays two different and often conflicting roles in an efficient and equitable transportation system: resource-efficient mobility on dense urban corridors, and basic mobility for non-drivers. Although only about 2.8% of total personal trips are by public transit (bus, train and paratransit), plus 1.9% by school bus, its mode share is much higher in denser urban areas, and it is often cheaper overall than alternatives, such as expanding urban roads and parking facilities, and providing taxi services for non-drivers. High quality public transit provides a catalyst for more compact, multi-modal neighborhood development, which leverages additional savings and benefits. For these reasons, governments traditionally devote about 20% of their transport budget to public transit, and more in larger cities. This suggests that it would be efficient and fair to at least 12% of transport investments to active modes and 20% on public transit, and even more could be justified for the following reasons:

1. **To make up for past underinvestment.** During the last century most communities invested little in non-auto modes, so additional investments are justified for several years to catch up.

2. **To serve latent demand.** Consumer surveys indicate that many people want to drive less, rely more on other travel options, and live in more compact, walkable neighborhoods, provided they are convenient and affordable. Additional investments are justified to satisfy these demands.

3. **To efficiently solve traffic problems.** Expanding roads and parking facilities is very costly. Improving alternative modes is often the most cost-efficient way to reduce traffic problems. Even people who always drive benefit from improvements to other modes that reduce congestion, accident risk, pollution and chauffeuring burdens.

**Do Motorists Pay for Roads? Is it Unfair to Spend Tax Dollars on Pedestrians and**
Bicyclists?

Some people consider it unfair to spend motorists’ road user fees to support other modes. However, road user fees do not actually cover all roadway costs. For example, in the U.S., fuel taxes and tolls provide only $111 (51%) of $219 billion total roadway spending. This averages 7¢ for each of the 3,100 billion vehicle-miles driven, about 3.5¢ funded by user fees and 3.5¢ funded by general taxes. Similarly, a major Transport Canada study, The Full Cost Investigation of Transportation in Canada [pdf], estimated that in 2000, provincial and municipal governments spent $35 billion on roadways (Table 6-3), which averages 12¢ for each of the 300 billion vehicle-kilometers driven [pdf], more than twice what motorists contribute in road user taxes and fees.

In addition, in a typical city there are 2-6 government-mandated off-street parking spaces per vehicle each with $500-3,000 annualized value, considering land, construction and operating costs. These costs incorporated into mortgages, rents and the price of other goods. Walking and bicycling have much lower facility costs, probably about 1¢ per mile, plus $50-300 per year for bicycle parking. Because motor vehicles require more costly infrastructure than other modes, and motorists travel more than other mode users, motorists impose far greater road and parking facility costs. Much of these costs are borne by general taxes, and incorporated into mortgages, rents and prices of other goods that people pay regardless of how they travel. As a result, people who drive less than average tend to overpay their share of infrastructure costs, subsidizing road and parking costs for their neighbors who drive a lot.

For example, a typical motorist who drives 12,000 annual miles and consumes 600 gallons of fuel, receives $2,000 in parking subsidies (parking costs not paid directly by users), and imposes about $840 in total roadway costs, but pays only about $400 annually road user taxes; their remaining facility costs are paid through general taxes and the prices of other goods. Somebody who walks and bikes 10 miles a day only imposes about $150 annually in facility costs.

**Facility Costs and Tax Payments**

![Facility Costs and Tax Payments](image-url)
A major portion of parking subsidies and roadway costs are paid by general taxes and incorporated into mortgages, rents and consumer good prices that residents pay regardless of how they travel. As a result, motorists tend to underpay and non-drivers tend to overpay their share of facility costs.

Do Bicycle Improvements Increase Bicycling and Traffic Safety?

Some people, including some experienced bicyclists, question whether protected bike paths increase ridership and safety. Protected bike lanes are intended to attract less experienced bicyclists. They are not ideal for all cyclists, particularly experienced bicyclists who want to ride fast. Numerous academic studies indicate that they generally do increase bicycle travel [pdf], and safety for all road users. One major study found that segregated bike paths are both safer and tend to increase cycling by travellers who want to bicycle but feel unsafe riding on roadways. A recent study published in the American Journal of Public Health, “Safer Cycling through Improved Infrastructure,” found that cities that invest most in protected bikeways achieve the largest increases in ridership and safety.

An extensive body of research [pdf] indicates that total traffic casualty rates, including risk to motorists, tend to decline as walking and bicycling mode share increases, an effect called “safety in numbers” [pdf]. Several factors probably contribute to these benefits: many strategies for improving pedestrian and bicycle safety, such as lower traffic speeds, also increase motor vehicle safety, and as walking and bicycling increase, driving declines, particularly by higher risk groups such as youths, seniors and people impairments, reducing motorists’ risk of being the victim of other drivers’ errors.

Do Bicycle Improvements Force People to Bicycle?

One senior argues, “the idea of being pressured into riding a bike again, against my wishes or physical capability, is akin to being encouraged to move back into a cave like our far-distant forefathers.” That is silly, nobody is forced to use bicycle facilities, and motorists benefit when other travellers shift to bicycling. Perhaps the best response was this letter by another senior, Gail Meston:. from an article titled "Ice cream and the ‘War’ on Cars":


I am delighted with the city’s determination to create viable transportation alternatives, including the network of separated bike lanes that make it safe to ride downtown. Recent letter writers creaming Victoria city council for just that, might want to chew on this: When new flavours of ice cream were introduced, it wasn’t deemed to be a “war” on chocolate. It was simply about providing new and exciting alternatives to those inclined to venture beyond familiar tastes and habits. As alternative flavours became increasingly popular, smart vendors added the new items to their confectionary menus. It was good for business and the bottom line to add a variety of choices. Chocolate hasn’t disappeared. It remains popular and is still widely available for committed chocolate lovers. Who knows — as word spreads about how yummy some of the new flavours are, even some of the chocolaters may be tempted to try a taste of something new. It seems like a win-win-win situation to me. Those who insist that because they love driving so much, everyone else must drive too, may want to check out the local ice cream shop!

**Aren’t Bicycles Zero Emission Vehicles?**

Vehicle fuels have large external costs, so many jurisdictions offer thousands of dollars in subsidies to purchase “zero emission” electric vehicles. However, this is a misnomer: because electricity generation produces pollution they should be called “elsewhere emitting vehicles.” Electric vehicles avoid most road user taxes, providing hundreds of dollars in additional annual subsidies. Walking and bicycling are true zero emission modes but receive no comparable subsidy. Because shoes and bikes are inexpensive, they don’t need subsidies, instead, we want walking and bicycling facility improvements.

**Should Governments Mandate Housing for Cars But Not People?**

No law mandates that communities provide housing for people, but most jurisdictions governments require property owners to provide abundant, expensive, and generally free housing for cars, typically totalling 2-6 parking spaces with thousands of dollars in total annualized value per motor vehicle. These costs are incorporated into mortgages, rents and taxes which everybody pays regardless of how they travel. Every time somebody purchases a car they expect governments to force other people to pay for its parking. This is perverse: they force poorer car-free households to subsidize the parking costs of affluent motorists, and increases and traffic problems. Parking mandates are a fertility drug for cars. Why do they exist? Because motorists demand these subsidies and efforts to change these practices are criticized as a “war on cars.”

**Is Multi-modal Planning “Social Engineering”? Does it Reduce Freedom?**
Some critics claim that regulations, such as fuel economy standards, and transportation management programs that encourage efficient travel, reduce people's personal freedom and opportunity. These are distorted and incomplete claims. According to Washington State Transportation Center director Mark Hallenbeck, “All transportation planning is social engineering. We've spent 100 years making it easy to drive. We've spent 100 years making it really hard to [walk, bicycle or] take a bus. So people drive, because it makes sense.”

Automobile-oriented transport planning increases some freedoms but reduces others: it reduces urban motorists’ ability to drive fast and park for free, but increases freedom to travel by other modes, which tends to increase financial freedom, and increases freedom from traffic risks and pollution impacts, and from government-mandated parking subsidies.

### Multi-modal Planning Impacts on Personal Freedom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduces Freedom and Opportunity</th>
<th>Increases Freedom and Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Less freedom to drive fast.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less freedom to park for free.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More freedom to walk, bicycle, and use public transit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More affordable transport options increases financial freedom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More freedom from traffic risk and pollution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Freedom for parking subsidy costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multi-modal planning reduces some freedoms but increases others.**

Surveys indicate that many people want to drive less and rely more on other mode, provided they are convenient, comfortable and affordable. For example, the National Association of Realtor's National Community Preference Survey found that most respondents like walking (80%), about half like bicycling, more than a third (38%) like public transit, and nearly 60% report being forced to drive due to inadequate alternatives. Younger people are much more likely to prefer walkable neighborhoods, bicycling, and transit, suggesting that demand for these modes will increase. To the degree that multi-modal planning responds to these demands it is not “social engineering.”

Much of the opposition to multi-modal planning reflects a general reluctance to change. Some people are so accustomed to driving that they cannot imagine taking the bus when travelling downtown, or walking and bicycling for local errands. However, after people try new transport options they often find them appropriate and useful, and their opposition declines.
Is There a Shortage of Children’s Feet? Should Children Be Free-range?

Automobile-dependent planning deprives young people of independence. Two generations ago most children walked or biked to school, but now most are driven in cars. Why? Is there a shortage of children’s feet? No, these changes result from planning that favors driving over active modes, which creates a self-fulfilling prophecy: as more parents drive their children to school, walking and bicycling become more difficult, dangerous and stigmatized. Ultimately, everybody is worse off. Children’s physical, mental and social development requires independent travel: they should be “free range.” What do they need to do this? Better walking, bicycling and public transit, of course! Criticizing multi-modal planning as a “war on cars” deprives future generations of health, freedom and happiness.

Traffic Inducing Traffic

Should Governments Continue to Encourage Drunk Driving and Sprawl?

A guy walks into a bar and buys a drink. Another guy drives to the bar and also buys a drink. About 50¢ of the cost of each drink goes to finance the bar’s parking. As a result, the guy who walks subsidizes the drivers’ parking of the guy who drives, thanks to local zoning laws.
This is foolish! We tell people not to drink and drive, but at the same time governments mandate that restaurants, pubs and bars provide abundant parking that encourages driving. This is particularly harmful because those parking requirements often prevent the development of neighborhood restaurants and bars that customers could reach by walking: an old storefront or house might make a terrific restaurant or pub, but cannot meet parking requirements. Why do these foolish laws exist? Because motorists insist! Whenever reduced and more flexible parking requirements are proposed, motorists complain that they will be inconvenienced, and criticize reforms as part of the “war on cars.”

**Smart Dating Advice: Ditch the Car!**

Some of the fear of multi-modal planning reflects misguided assumptions about what makes people happy and successful. For example, many young men devote their time and money to buying a car because they believe that it will improve their chances of dating a popular partner. However, smart singles realize that they are actually better off dating car-free guys, who will have more money to spend on their dates, and he’ll look better with his pants off since driving makes people fat and lazy.

**Are Signal Controls Really Set to Delay Traffic?**

One critic claims, without evidence, that traffic engineers intentionally adjust signals set to delay traffic. He should have talked with a traffic engineer first. Although it is sometimes possible to give traffic a continuous “green wave” on one road in one direction, this is impossible to achieve on all urban roads. For example, signals can be optimized into downtown during the morning and out of downtown during the afternoon, on north-south streets, but that will conflict with traffic optimization on east-west streets. In addition, signals must accommodate bus priority, pedestrians, and emergency vehicles.

Stop blaming traffic engineers for congestion problems! If you want to know the real culprit, look in the mirror. Every time you drive during rush hour, you contribute to congestion. Shifting just 10-20% of peak-period car trips to other times, modes or destinations would significantly reduce traffic problems.

**Are Complete Streets Policies Unfair? Will They Backfire?**

Roads are most municipal government’s most valuable asset. It is important that they are designed and managed to serve all residents, including the needs of non-drivers. Complete streets policies ensure that public roads accommodate diverse users and uses, including walking, bicycling, transit, driving, sitting and parking, plus local residents and businesses. Motorists sometimes criticize complete streets programs as a “war on cars,” because they reassign road space from automobiles to other modes and they reduce traffic speeds. However, these changes tend to benefit all road users overall, including motorists, by improving travel options and reducing total crash risks.
Critics sometimes threaten that such programs will backfire because bike- and bus lanes, traffic calming, and more walking and bicycling will increase pollution due to more idling, cause accidents due to driver frustration, or discourage local visitors and business activity. However, **abundant research** indicates that multi-modal planning and complete streets make communities overall **safer** [pdf], **healthier** [pdf], more **affordable** [pdf] and **inclusive, less polluting** [pdf], and **economically successful** [pdf], because any negative impacts are more than offset by shifts from driving to efficient modes and **more attractive streets**.

**Are Most Bicyclists Irresponsible Scofflaws?**

Some critics argue that bicyclists do not deserve facilities or safety programs because of their irresponsible behaviors, citing examples of bicyclists who violate traffic law or ride without proper lighting or helmets. “They must earn their right to use public roads,” they argue.

But all types of road users violate traffic laws. **Field surveys** find that bicyclists and motorists violate traffic laws at similar rates, but in different ways. Motorists frequently exceed posted speed limits, avoid paying required parking fees, fail to wear seatbelts, and text while driving. Researcher **Wesley Marshall** found that many bicyclists violated traffic laws in ways intended to increase their safety, such as riding on sidewalks, passing on the right while vehicles are stopped at a traffic signal, and failing to make a full stop at stop signs and red lights in order to maintain momentum and balance. A **Florida study** found 88% law compliance rates by bicyclists, slightly higher than the 85% compliance rate for drivers.

**What Is the Real War on Cars?**

There is now a real war on cars, a "worldwide fight to undo a century's worth of damage wrought by the automobile" with its own **YouTube Channel** and **Podcasts**. However, this is a war of hearts and words, rather than violent attacks against motorists. It has enlisted diverse allies including **The Economist**, and even **Car and Driver Magazine**, which recently recognized that, "Maybe its [the city’s multi-modal] policies will cut down on congestion and provide a boon to those who actually like to drive."

**Conclusions**

Most communities are automobile dependent, making it difficult to get around without a car. This is no accident; for the last century, transportation planning emphasized automobile-oriented infrastructure design and investments to the detriment of other modes. This ultimately harms everyone, including motorists who face increased congestion, crash risk and chauffeuring burdens. As a result, smart communities are starting to implement more multi-modal planning, with more investments in walking, bicycling and public transit, complete streets roadway designs, and reduced parking subsidies. That creates a more efficient and equitable transportation system in which travellers can choose the most appropriate mode for each trip, and people who cannot, should not, or prefer not to drive receive their fair share of public resources.
Some people only see problems and overlook the benefits of these changes. They claim there is a “war on cars,” which is inaccurate, unfair and dangerous. Many of their complaints are wrong or exaggerated, and by claiming to be victims of a “war,” they contribute to conflict and violence. How should we respond? With facts and humor.
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