Meeting of the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Wednesday, October 16, 2019 5:30 PM

I. Call to Order

II. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

III. Approval of Minutes – September 11, 2019

IV. Members’ Interests (2 Minutes Each)

V. Action Items
   A. Draft 2045 Cost Feasible Plan (Sarah McKinley, MPO)
   B. FDOT Tentative Work Program; Letter of Comment (FDOT)

VI. Status Reports
   A. Gandy Bridge PD&E Preview (Lilliam Escalera, FDOT)

VII. Old Business & New Business
   A. CSX US 41 Crossing
   B. Messaging for Parking on Sidewalks
   C. Temporary relocation of Committee meetings in November & December
      (26th floor Conference Rooms A & B)

VIII. Adjournment

IX. Addendum
   A. FDOT Tentative Work Program Open House & Notification Postcard (FDOT)
   B. MPO Meeting Summary & Committee Report
   C. Micromobility Report
   D. NYCDOT Public Space Activations
   E. Bikes & CV Technology
   F. The Latest Evidence Bike Lanes are Good for Business

The full agenda packet is available on the MPO’s website, [www.planhillsborough.org](http://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.
I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Forbes called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. A quorum was reached at 5:40 p.m.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

Members present: Katrina Corcoran, Lynda Crescentini, Jonathan Forbes, Tim Horst, Jason Jackman, John Kubicki, Mara Latorre, John Marsh, Faye Miller, Allison Nguyen, Diana Ramirez, Jaime Rubscha, and Wanda Vinson

Others present: Rich Clarendon, Wade Reynolds, and Sarah McKinley - Hillsborough MPO; Sharon Snyder - Planning Commission; Alex Henry – Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT); Monica Martin – Hillsborough County; Robert Hatton – Convitali; Rodd Brauer – Whitehouse Group; Siobhan Gale – RK&K; Cal Hardie – City of Tampa; Mike Campo - KCA

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: Approval of the minutes of August 14, 2019 (Marsh - Nguyen). The motion passed unanimously.

V. MEMBERS’ INTERESTS (2 minutes each)

Mara Latorre stated the City of Plant City Assistant City Engineer informed her the City is getting ready to bid sidewalk extensions and additions for more sidewalk connectivity. Ms. Latorre is stepping down from the Committee as she embarks on a new life chapter.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

There were no Action Items.

VII. STATUS REPORTS

A. Draft 2045 Cost Feasible Plan (Sarah McKinley, MPO)

Ms. McKinley presented the Draft 2045 Cost Feasible Plan. She described how the plan was created, the public recommended priorities for round 1 and round 2, and the MPO’s role in the funding decisions. She explained how the cost feasible plan is determined and the additional factors to consider prior to the plan adoption deadline of November 5, 2019. Ms. McKinley discussed investment programs, proposed allocation of projected revenue, projected outcomes
of the performance-based program and major investments for economic growth. She presented the SIS Cost Feasible Projects, projects along important State roads and other arterials, important local roads and high performing County roads, and the Tampa Hillsborough Expressway Authority (THEA) projects. Ms. McKinley also discussed the Fixed Guideway Transit test corridors and ridership density. Ms. McKinley summarized the cost feasibility plan and the steps that will be taken after the plan is adopted.

Discussions followed regarding who provided the estimates for pavement and bridges repair/replacement (the MPO worked closely with Leland, Richard, and John Patrick with Hillsborough County Public Works); if the funding numbers include the surtax (yes); and what happens if the surtax doesn’t pass (the needs assessments were done with and without the surtax so both sets of figures will be shown in the technical documents. This will probably be adopted before any outcome on the surtax). Mr. Reynolds stated the MPO is operating under the Judge’s current decision until the appeal is heard by the Supreme Court.

B. US 41 at CSX Grade Separation PD&E Study (Mike Campo, KCA)

Due to Lilliam Escalera’s (FDOT) absence, Mike Campo, KCA, presented the US41 at CSX Grade Separation PD&E Study. He provided the project overview, project needs and FDOT’s ongoing efforts. Mr. Campo discussed the development of four alternatives, which are (1) Flyover, (2) Quadrant, (3) Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI) and (4) Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI). He displayed the anticipated public involvement schedule as well as the project status and schedule.

Discussions ensued regarding what width of sidewalk is being proposed (for the frontage roads, FDOT is still evaluating whether to use 6’ sidewalks adjacent to the curb, adjacent to a 7’ buffered bicycle lane or to use a 10’ wide-walk separately slightly off the curb); and if a wide-walk is being proposed if bicycle lanes are not being installed (yes, FDOT has approved wide-walks in lieu of on-street bike lanes in the frontage system on US 41. The final decision hasn’t been made and they are open to suggestions). Mr. Horst stated he would feel safer on a wide-walk due to the heavy volume of vehicles and the high-speed limit. Mr. Campo stated the design speed will be lowered from 50 to 35 mph for the vehicles traveling next to the sidewalks along the frontage roads. This applies to all four alternatives along US 41 which have the frontage system that will benefit from the lower design speed.

The discussions continued regarding whether there will be a grade separation at the railroad crossing on Causeway, to the east of this intersection (that is currently being evaluated by FDOT but is not part of this project).

C. Columbus Drive Complete Street (Cal Hardie, City of Tampa)

Mr. Hardie presented the Columbus Drive complete streets project, from North Nebraska Avenue to North 14th Street, approximately 0.4 miles. He provided details from the Public Meeting in April 2019. The City received a lot of public input and changed the design significantly following that meeting. Mr. Hardie presented the original design, proposed improvements and intersection design. He also discussed the public’s concerns, such as they do not want to lose on-street parking for bike lanes nor do they want designated on-street parking, bus shelters or a reduction in the width of the travel lanes. The public is also concerned about the poor sidewalk conditions and speeding. They feel there is a need for a place for trash cans on trash pickup day and better street lighting. Mr. Hardie presented the project features of the updated design, including wider sidewalks, bulb-outs with street trees, bulb-outs at all intersections, striped crosswalks with
pedestrian-activated warning devices, narrowed travel lanes and rehabilitated roadway pavement and on-street parking. He showed examples of existing and proposed typical sections and explained how the tree wells function. Mr. Hardie presented renderings of the proposed solutions, explained the benefits of the redesign, discussed suggestions from the Barrio Latino Commission August 2019 public hearing and gave the summary of project costs and schedule.

Discussions followed regarding what the speed limit is for this roadway (it will be kept at 30 mph); if the change in design will impact future maintenance issues, due to the sidewalk, asphalt and vegetation (There shouldn't be much maintenance for the sidewalks and roadway and the trees are maintenance free once they are established. The City and County are discussing maintenance agreements for the crosswalks, etc.; however, the historical signs maintenance falls under the neighborhood CRA.); if the City has considered the oak tree roots growth (the tree wells have structured soil and are open on three sides. The trees are trained to grow along the road, but not into the road, so that will not be an issue.); what the percentage of parking is currently being used along this roadway (there aren’t assigned parking spaces so that is difficult to determine. They did not conduct a parking study. This section of Columbus Drive has a Main Street feel and the focus was mainly on pedestrian and transit.); and if there were any discussions regarding re-zoning (It is currently residential and commercial; however, the City’s Planning and Development Department would handle this).

Mr. Reynolds thanked Mr. Hardie for the great work and stated he attended the public hearing and feels the City has been very responsive to the community. The owners are committed to renovating their buildings and rebuilding the community. Ms. Ramirez is impressed that all of the public’s comments have been addressed. She remembers a property owner’s concerns with the homeless population in the area and is concerned the issue won’t improve with the addition of shade trees. Mr. Hardie stated they can’t design for every situation, but studies show an active street corridor helps improve safety and crime.

Ms. Ramirez asked if the same or a similar design will be done further west on Columbus Drive. Mr. Hardie stated it could be expanded, but nothing is currently planned. Projects are spaced out 7 – 10 years. Mr. Hardie feels bike lanes would need to be added to the portion of Columbus Drive to the west. There is a cycle track planned for 15th Street, at Floribraska and eventually on 21st Avenue.

VIII. OLD AND NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Forbes reminded the Committee to carefully review the 2045 Draft Cost Feasible Plan as it will become an action item.

A discussion was held regarding preferred days and times for the Tri-County BPAC Meeting. They are currently held every four months; however, the September meeting in Pasco County has been cancelled. The Committee voted informally on whether to keep the meetings on Wednesday night or have them on Friday, during working hours. Friday afternoon meetings were slightly preferred.

Mr. Forbes thanked Ms. Latorre for her participation and wished her best.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:39 p.m.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Draft 2045 Plan

**Presenters**
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

**Summary**
After two years of work, public surveys and coordination with local governments and state agencies, staff has prepared a draft Long Range Transportation Plan.

The draft 2045 Plan is required to be cost-feasible. To be considered "cost feasible," the Plan must demonstrate that project costs in future years can be funded with funding available through 2045. Therefore, the investment programs identify available funding allocated to:

- **Good Repair & Resiliency** including pavement & bridge maintenance, transit asset maintenance, stormwater and resiliency projects;
- **Vision Zero** including safety projects for walking, biking, and driving;
- **Smart Cities** including advanced traffic management and intersection improvements;
- **Real Choices When Not Driving** including transit expansion and trails
- **Major Projects** including specific road capacity and fixed-guideway transit projects for economic growth. Road capacity is defined as additional through lanes, road extensions, and separated-grade interchanges. Fixed-guideway transit is defined as any bus or rail system running in its own right-of-way so that it does not get stuck in traffic. These projects are required to be itemized in the plan, unlike the types of projects listed above, which can be described by category.

To support the Plan’s recommended programs and projects, staff has also prepared the attached background reports and technical memoranda that go into detail about the investment programs, including their expected benefits and performance outcomes.

Elements of the draft Plan have reviewed by the MPO committees in September and the draft plan was presented to the MPO Board on October 1st. This opened 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**
Adoption of the draft 2045 Plan.

**Prepared By**
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff
Attachments
Newspaper Notice for Long Range Transportation Plan Public Hearing
2045 Plan Summary Report – draft for 30-day public comment period
"It’s TIME Hillsborough" Survey – draft summary report
Background documents for 2045 Plan
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Tentative Work Program Letter of Comment

Presenter
FDOT Staff Representative

Summary
In preparation of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) development, FDOT staff will present the Tentative Work Program Highlights. The FDOT Work Program is the main component of the TIP and lists all projects by phase and year funded. The highlights focus on what projects are proposed to be funded in the FDOT Work Program through FY2025.

Some of the project highlights include:

- Heights Mobility Plan construction projects added
- MLK Blvd from 40th St to I-4, safety improvements
- Busch Blvd from Dale Mabry Hwy to Nebraska Ave, safety improvements
- Busch Blvd multiple locations, construction, pedestrian improvements
- Green Spine & West final segments, construction added
- SR 60/Brandon Blvd, intersection improvements
- West River Greenway from Stewart Middle School to Willow Ave
- And various resurfacing, drainage, lighting, and bridge repair

MPO staff will draft a letter of comment regarding the proposed Work Program. This presentation is the first opportunity to provide comments towards preparation of the FY 2021-2025 TIP, which will be adopted at a public hearing in June of 2020.

Recommended Action
Motion to provide comments on the FY2021-2025 Tentative Work Program for inclusion in the MPO letter of comment.

Prepared By
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

Attachments
Draft Tentative Work Program FY 2021-2025 – Project Highlights:

- District 7 Projects
- Turnpike Projects

Notice of Online Public Hearing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>FPN</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Work Mix</th>
<th>Project Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>429251-1</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>I-75 (SR 93A) FM 5 OF CSX/BROADWAY AVE TO EB/WB I-4 EXIT RAMP</td>
<td>INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES</td>
<td>Advance CST from 2022 to 2021; SIS, DDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>441288-1</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SR 60/BRANDON BLVD AT VALRICO FROM 5 OF SR 60 TO N OF SR 60</td>
<td>INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>Deferred from 2021 to 2028 to let with 435750-1; CIGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>443969-2</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SR 60/BRANDON BLVD @ ST CLOUD DR</td>
<td>INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>Deferred from 2024 to 2028 to let with 435750-1; TRIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>435750-1</td>
<td>ROW/CST</td>
<td>SR 60 FROM VALRICO RD TO E OF DOVER RD</td>
<td>ADD LANES &amp; RECONSTRUCT</td>
<td>Deferred ROW from 2022 and 2023 to 2026, CST from 2025 to 2028; SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>435726-1</td>
<td>PE/ROW</td>
<td>I-4 (SR 400) FM W OF I-75 NB OFF RAMP TO E OF MANGO RD</td>
<td>INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES</td>
<td>Deferred PE from 2024 to 2026; ROW from 2026 to 2027; SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>430337-1</td>
<td>ROW/CST</td>
<td>I-4/SR 400 WB FM W OF ORIENT RD TO WEST OF I-75 (SR 93A)</td>
<td>ADD AUXILIARY LANE(S)</td>
<td>Deferred ROW from 2024 to 2026, CST from 2026 to 2028; SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>424513-3</td>
<td>DSB</td>
<td>BIG BEND ROAD/CR 672 @ I-75/SR93A FROM W OF COVINGTON TO E OF SIMMONS</td>
<td>INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES</td>
<td>Advanced CST from 2022 to 2021; LF, Payback $20M remains in 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>439481-1</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SOUTH COAST COUNTY GREENWAY-PH 1A FROM E SHELL POINT RD TO 19TH AVE NE</td>
<td>BIKE PATH/TRAIL</td>
<td>Advanced CST from 2021 to 2020; LF, TA payback in 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>439336-5</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY FY 2024/2025-2025/2026 UPWP</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td>Added Planning to 2025; SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>414963-2</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>HART - FHWA SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>PURCHASE VEHICLES/EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>Added $4M to 2025; SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>443852-1</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>HART BUS STOP CAPITAL REPAIRS</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SHELTER</td>
<td>Added $1M to 2025; SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>445652-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>SR 580/FOWLER AVE FROM I-275 TO I-75</td>
<td>URBAN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added PE to 2025; SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>445651-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>US 41/SR 599/50TH ST/S6TH ST FROM SR 60/ADAMO DR TO FLETCHER AVE</td>
<td>TRAFFIC ENGINEERING STUDY</td>
<td>Added PE to 2025; SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>431492-3</td>
<td>PD&amp;E</td>
<td>SR 569/N 39TH/N 40TH ST FROM E SR 60/ADAMO DR TO HILLSBOROUGH AVE</td>
<td>PD&amp;E/EMO STUDY</td>
<td>Added PD&amp;E to 2025; SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>440511-3</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>TAMPA ST/HIGHLAND AVE &amp; FLORIDA AVE FROM MLK BLVD TO S OF WATERS</td>
<td>URBAN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added CST to 2025; SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>440511-4</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>N HIGHLAND AVE FROM WEST VIOLET STREET TO SR 574/HILLSBOROUGH AVENUE</td>
<td>URBAN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added CST to 2025; SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>443583-2</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SR 685/USB 41/FLORIDA AVE AT IDLEWILD AND KNOLLWOOD ST</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNALS</td>
<td>Added CST to 2022; TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>436911-2</td>
<td>ROW/CST</td>
<td>SR 574/W DR MLK JR BLVD FROM N 40TH ST TO I-4</td>
<td>URBAN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added ROW to fully fund in 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>435906-2</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>SR 580/W BUSCH BLVD FROM N DALE MABRY HWY TO N NEBRASKA</td>
<td>URBAN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added Advanced Acquisition to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>441098-1</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SR 580 / BUSCH BLVD MULTIPLE LOCATIONS 12ST,PAWNEE AVE, OVERLOOK DR</td>
<td>PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>Advanced CST from 2022 to 2020; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>441098-2</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SR 580 / BUSCH BLVD FROM WEST OF N BROOKS ST TO EAST OF N BROOKS ST</td>
<td>PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>Advanced CST from 2022 to 2020; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>443401-1</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>SR 574/W MLK JR BLVD FROM N DALE MABRY HWY TO 40TH AVE.</td>
<td>CORRIDOR/SUBAREA PLANNING</td>
<td>Added Planning to 2025; SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>FPN</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Work Mix</td>
<td>Project Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>436489-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>USB41/SR685/SR60/W KENNEDY FR W OF WOODLYNNE AVE TO W OF BREVARD AVE</td>
<td>RESURFACING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2021, CST to 2023; includes complete street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improvements (TA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>439476-4</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>E/W GREEN SPINE CYCLE TRACK - PH 3C FROM 13TH AVE TO 21ST AVE</td>
<td>BIKE PATH/TRAIL</td>
<td>Added CST to 2022; TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>439476-5</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>E/W GREEN SPINE CYCLE TRACK - PH 2A FROM HOWARD AVE TO WILLOW AVE</td>
<td>BIKE PATH/TRAIL</td>
<td>Added CST to 2022; TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>440733-1</td>
<td>PE/ROW/</td>
<td>SR 39/ALEXANDER ST AT JL REDMAN PKWY</td>
<td>ADD RIGHT TURN LANE(S)</td>
<td>Inhouse PE advanced from 2022 to 2021, added ROW to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and CST to 2023; SU. Goes with resurfacing 445598-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>445598-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>SR 39/J L REDMAN PKWY FROM CHARLIE GRIFFIN RD TO ALEXANDER ST</td>
<td>RESURFACING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2021, CST to 2023 include intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improvement project 440733-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>443355-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>BIG BEND RD FROM W WATERSET BLVD TO COVINGTON GARDENS DR</td>
<td>BIKE PATH/TRAIL</td>
<td>Added PE in 2021; SunTrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>445662-1</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>WEST RIVER GREENWAY FROM STEWART MIDDLE MAGNET SCHOOL TO WILLOW AVE</td>
<td>BIKE PATH/TRAIL</td>
<td>Added CST to 2024; TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>437650-2</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>1-75/SR 93A AT GIBSONTON DRIVE</td>
<td>INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES</td>
<td>Added PE to 2025; Freight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>427454-3</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>1-75 NB ON RAMP FROM NB US 301 TO I-75 NB</td>
<td>INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES</td>
<td>Advanced CST from 2025 to 2021; SIS Quick Fix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>444434-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>I-4/SR 400 FROM W OF COUNTY LINE ROAD TO COUNTY LINE ROAD</td>
<td>ADD TURN LANE(S)</td>
<td>Added PE to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>446131-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>I-4 WB AUXILIARY LANE FROM E OF 50TH ST T W OF MLK JR BLVD</td>
<td>ADD AUXILIARY LANE(S)</td>
<td>Added PE to 2023, CST to 2025; Freight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>430573-3</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>I75/I275 CD ROAD FM S OF COUNTY LINE RD TO COUNTY LINE RD (PHASE II)</td>
<td>NEW ROAD CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>Project goes with Pasco County Segment 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445668-1</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SR 600 FROM W END OF EB GANDY BRIDGE TO DALE MABRY HWY</td>
<td>ITS COMMUNICATION SYSTEM</td>
<td>Advanced CST 2025; ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>443347-1</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SR 573/S DALE MABRY FROM S OF PINewood ST TO N OF BALLAST POINT BLVD</td>
<td>ITS COMMUNICATION SYSTEM</td>
<td>Advanced CST from 2023 to 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>441660-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>SR 582/E FOWLER AVE FROM W OF TAMPA BYPASS CANAL TO US 301/SR 41</td>
<td>RESURFACING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2021, CST to 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>441661-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>SR 60 FROM E OF CLARENCE GORDON JR RD TO POLK COUNTY LINE</td>
<td>RESURFACING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2021, CST to 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>443347-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>SR 573/S DALE MABRY FROM S OF PINewood ST TO N OF BALLAST POINT BLVD</td>
<td>RESURFACING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2021, CST to 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445380-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>I-4/SR 400 FROM E OF MCINTOSH RD TO COUNTY LINE RD</td>
<td>RESURFACING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2021, CST to 2023; SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445494-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>I-275/SR 93 FROM S OF BEARSS AVE TO S OF NEBRASKA AVE</td>
<td>RESURFACING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2021, CST to 2023; SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>446026-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>US 41/SR 45/S 50TH ST FROM DENVER S TO N OF 27TH AVE S</td>
<td>RESURFACING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2023, CST to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>446051-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>SR 60 FROM W OF TURKEY CREEK RD TO W OF JAMES L REDMAN PKWY</td>
<td>RESURFACING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2023, CST to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>443630-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>I-75/SR 93A FROM US 301 TO CSX R/R /BROADWAY AVE</td>
<td>RIGID PAVEMENT REHABILITATION</td>
<td>Added PE to 2021, CST to 2023; SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>440630-2</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>I-75/SR 93A FROM CSX R/R /BROADWAY AVE TO S OF SR 582/FOWLER AVE</td>
<td>RIGID PAVEMENT REHABILITATION</td>
<td>Added PE to 2021, CST to 2023; SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445392-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>US 301/SR 43 AT SYMMES ROAD</td>
<td>RIGID PAVEMENT REHABILITATION</td>
<td>Added PE to 2021, CST to 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445393-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>SR 39 AT TRAPNELL ROAD</td>
<td>RIGID PAVEMENT REHABILITATION</td>
<td>Added PE to 2021, CST to 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445674-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>US 92/SR 580/W HILLSBOROUGH AVE AT DANIELS ROAD</td>
<td>DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added PE to 2023, CST to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>FPN</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Work Mix</td>
<td>Project Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>445676-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH AVE DRAINAGE - S FR FISH CREEK BRIDGE TO HILLSBOROUGH AVE</td>
<td>DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added PE to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>445677-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>US 92/SR 580/W HILLSBOROUGH AVE AT GEORGE RD</td>
<td>DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added PE to 2023, CST to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>445679-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>US 92/SR 580/W HILLSBOROUGH AVE AT VETERANS EXPRESSWAY</td>
<td>DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added PE to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>437249-1</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>US 92/SR 600/S DALE MABRY HWY FR NEPTUNE STREET TO HENDERSON BLVD</td>
<td>DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Advanced CST from 2023 to 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>422929-5</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>HENRY CANAL FROM ANDERSON RD TO HESPERIDES ST</td>
<td>DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added CST to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437646-2</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SR 573/S DALE MABRY HWY FROM PINewood ST TO GANDY BLVD</td>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td>Added CST to 2021; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445551-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>SR 582/FOWLER AVE FROM N NEBRASKA AVE TO MORRIS BRIDGE RD</td>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2022, CST to 2024; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445552-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>S DALE MABRY FROM SR 90/W KENNEDY BLVD TO HILLSBOROUGH AVE</td>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2023, CST to 2025; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445554-1</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>US 92 FROM 56TH STREET TO I-4 RAMPS</td>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td>Added CST to 2021; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445555-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>SR 45/NEBRASKA AVE FROM FOWLER AVE TO FLORIDA AVE</td>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2022, CST to 2024; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445559-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>US 41 FROM GULF CITY RD TO 19 AVE NE</td>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2024; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445560-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>SR 574 FROM SYDNEY DOVER RD TO TURKEY CREEK RD</td>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td>Added PE to 2024; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437819-1</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>US 92/BAKER ST AT RAIL CROSSING 624409-E W OF N MICHIGAN AVE</td>
<td>RAILROAD CROSSING</td>
<td>Added CST to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437822-1</td>
<td>ROW/CST</td>
<td>SR 45/NEBRASKA AT RAILROAD CROSSING 626893-P S OF BUSCH BLVD</td>
<td>RAILROAD CROSSING</td>
<td>Added ROW to 2024, CST to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>416856-2</td>
<td>ROW/CST</td>
<td>SR 60/KENNEDY BLVD AT WILLOW AVE RR CROSSING 626304-X</td>
<td>RAILROAD CROSSING</td>
<td>Added ROW to 2022, CST to 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445828-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>I-75 OVER ALAFIA RIVER DECK PANEL REACEMENT/REHABILITATION</td>
<td>BRIDGE-REPAIR/REHABILITATION</td>
<td>Added PE to 2023, CST to 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445832-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SUBSTRUCTURE REPAIR VARIOUS LOCATIONS</td>
<td>BRIDGE-REPAIR/REHABILITATION</td>
<td>Added PE to 2023, CST to 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445833-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY BRIDGE PRESERVATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS</td>
<td>BRIDGE-REPAIR/REHABILITATION</td>
<td>Added PE to 2023, CST to 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437607-1</td>
<td>PE/CST</td>
<td>I-75/SR93A OVER RIVERVIEW DRIVE BR 100356 AND 100357</td>
<td>BRIDGE-REPAIR/REHABILITATION</td>
<td>Deferred PE from 2022 to 2024, CST from 2023 to 2025, Deterioration slower than anticipated. Moved in higher priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>446873-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>E 21ST AVENUE FROM US 41/N NEBRASKA AVE TO US 41/50TH STREET</td>
<td>URBAN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added PE in 2021 with Local Funds only to assist the City of Tampa with project production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>446874-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>N 22ND STREET FROM SR 580/E BUSCH BLVD TO SR 582/FOWLER AVE</td>
<td>URBAN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added PE in 2021 with Local Funds only to assist the City of Tampa with project production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>446875-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>N 109TH AVE FROM US 41/N NEBRASKA AVE TO N 30TH ST</td>
<td>URBAN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added PE in 2021 with Local Funds only to assist the City of Tampa with project production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>446876-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>TAMPA PALMS BLVD FROM EBENSBURG DR TO BRUCE B DOWNS BLVD</td>
<td>URBAN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added PE in 2021 with Local Funds only to assist the City of Tampa with project production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>446877-1</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>INTERBAY BLVD FROM MANHATTAN AVE TO BAYSHORE BLVD</td>
<td>URBAN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Added PE in 2021 with Local Funds only to assist the City of Tampa with project production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>439460-1</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SR 583 (56TH STREET) AT WHITeway DRIVE</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL UPDATE</td>
<td>Advanced CST from 2023 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>FPN</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Work Mix</td>
<td>Project Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436244-1</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SR 582/FOWLER AVE AT RAINTREE BLVD, GILLETTE AVE, N RIVERHILLS DR</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL UPDATE</td>
<td>Advanced CST from 2023 to 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430056-2</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>US 41 FROM S OF PENDOLA POINT/MADISON AVE TO S OF CAUSEWAY BLVD</td>
<td>ADD LANES &amp; RECONSTRUCT</td>
<td>Advanced PE from 2023 to 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRICT SEVEN PROJECT OVERVIEW

In FY 2020, Florida’s Turnpike Enterprise contributed funding to construct a new interchange on the Suncoast Parkway / SR 589 at Ridge Road (FPN: 258958-1).

Florida’s Turnpike Enterprise continues to make project investments in District Seven. In FY 2021 through FY 2025, Turnpike projects total over $106 million within Pasco and Citrus Counties.

The following summarizes project phase information that is referenced in subsequent project tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Funding Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>PE Preliminary Engineering 31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>ROW Right of Way 41, 43, 45, 4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRU</td>
<td>RRU Railroad and Utilities 56, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>CST Construction 52, 53, 54, 58, 61, 62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Major Project Funding by Project Type

The table below summarizes the funding programmed for the major Turnpike projects in the Tentative Five-Year Work Program (FY 2021 through FY 2025) that are located in District Seven.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>5 Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2021</td>
<td>FY 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$3,705,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Interchange</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Road Construction</td>
<td>$18,510,000</td>
<td>$3,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$20,830,000</td>
<td>$7,065,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Major Projects by County

Pasco County Projects

Interchange Improvements on the Suncoast Parkway / SR 589 at SR 54 (MP 19)
FPN: 444486-1

The project improves ramp operations at the SR 54 interchange to address existing issues. The northbound exit ramp will be enhanced with the addition of one left turn lane, one right turn lane, and one deceleration lane. The southbound on-ramp will be enhanced by extending the existing taper style on-ramp into a parallel type entrance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>5 Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2021</td>
<td>FY 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,705,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$3,705,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Interchange on the Suncoast Parkway / SR 589 at Ridge Road (MP 25)
FPN: 258958-1

This is a partnership project between Florida’s Turnpike Enterprise and Pasco County that constructs a new interchange on the Suncoast Parkway / SR 589 at Ridge Road. Florida’s Turnpike Enterprise is a funding partner. A full interchange is being constructed, with access provided to/from the Suncoast Parkway / SR 589 in both the northbound and southbound directions. Construction began in FY 2020 and the FY 2021 funding reflects the remaining cost to complete the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>5 Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2021</td>
<td>FY 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citrus County Projects

Construct Suncoast Parkway 2 / SR 589 – SR 44 to CR 486
FPN: 442764-1

The project constructs a section of Suncoast Parkway 2 / SR 589 between SR 44 and CR 486. Four toll lanes will be provided. The project includes optional design services for an extension of the facility to US 19. The project is subject to a test of economic feasibility according to Florida Statutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>5 Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2021</td>
<td>FY 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$3,510,000</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRU</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$18,510,000</td>
<td>$3,360,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Minor Project Funding by Project Type

Minor projects may include bridge paintings, intelligent transportation systems (ITS), guardrail/safety improvements, landscaping, signing/pavement markings, and other miscellaneous types. The table below summarizes the funding programmed for minor projects for Turnpike facilities throughout the District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>5 Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2021</td>
<td>FY 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Paintings</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Message Signs</td>
<td>$3,110,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Upgrades</td>
<td>$801,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Projects Total</td>
<td>$3,911,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of All Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>5 Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2021</td>
<td>FY 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Projects Total</td>
<td>$3,911,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects Total</td>
<td>$20,830,000</td>
<td>$7,065,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$24,741,000</td>
<td>$7,065,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of September 26, 2019
Florida’s Turnpike Enterprise
Tentative Five-Year Work Program - FY 2021 through FY 2025
Summary of Projects
FDOT District Seven

Summary of Projects

FDOT District Seven – As of September 26, 2019

- FPN: 442784-1
  - Construct Suncoast Parkway 2 / SR 589
  - SR 44 to CR 486
  - CST - FY23

- FPN: 405270-4
  - Under Construction
  - Suncoast Parkway 2 / SR 589
  - South of W Grover Cleveland Blvd to SR 44

- FPN: 405270-3
  - Under Construction
  - Suncoast Parkway 2 / SR 589
  - Hernando / Citrus C/L to
  - South of W Grover Cleveland Blvd

- FPN: 405270-1
  - Under Construction
  - Suncoast Parkway 2 / SR 589
  - US 19 to Hernando / Citrus C/L

- FPN: 258958-1
  - New Interchange at Ridge Rd (MP 25)
  - CST - FY20

- FPN: 444486-1
  - Interchange Improvements at SR 54 (MP 10)
  - CST - FY22
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Gandy Boulevard Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study

**Presenter**
FDOT District 7 Representative

**Summary**

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is conducting a study to analyze multimodal transportation improvement alternatives along US 92/SR 600/Gandy Blvd from 4th Street North to West Shore Boulevard, including existing Gandy bridge replacement and/or widening and trail facilities connection. New grade separations and roadway improvements are to be considered at the intersections along the corridor (Pinellas side).

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

**Prepared By**
Gena Torres, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
None.
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, DISTRICT SEVEN

TENTATIVE FIVE-YEAR WORK PROGRAM

ONLINE PUBLIC HEARING

VISIT D7WPPPH.COM BEGINNING OCTOBER 28, 2019

FISCAL YEAR 2021 TO FISCAL YEAR 2025
VISIT D7WPPH.COM BEGINNING OCTOBER 28, 2019
PUBLIC COMMENTS DUE BY NOVEMBER 11, 2019

ATTEND THE OPEN HOUSE ON OCTOBER 30, 2019
9:00 AM TO 6:00 PM
FDOT DISTRICT 7 OFFICE,
11201 N MCKINLEY DR, TAMPA, FL 33612

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Alex Henry, at (813) 975-6405, (800) 226-7220 or email: D7wpph@dot.state.fl.us.

Si usted tiene preguntas o comentarios o si simplemente desea mas informacion sobre este proyecto, favor de ponerse en contacto con la señora Lilliam Escalera, al teléfono (813) 975-6445 o correo electrónico lilliam.escalera@dot.state.fl.us.
MPO Meeting of Tuesday, October 1, 2019

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

The MPO Chairman, Commissioner Les Miller, called the meeting to order at 9:00 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 Conference Rooms A & B.

The following members were present:

Commissioner Les Miller, Commissioner Pat Kemp, Commissioner Ken Hagan, Paul Anderson, Councilman Guido Maniscalco, Mayor Rick Lott, Councilman Joseph Citro, David Mechanik, Councilman Luis Viera, Trent Green, Commissioner Kimberly Overman, Janet Scherberger, Commissioner Mariella Smith, Cindy Stuart and Joe Waggoner, Cameron Clark and Beth Alden.

The following member was absent: Mayor Mel Jurado

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 6, 2019

Chairman Miller sought a motion to approve the August 6, 2019 minutes. Commissioner Overman so moved, seconded by Councilman Maniscalco and motion adopted.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sharon Calvert introduced herself and stated that she lives in Tierra Verde, Pinellas County. She is concerned if this a transportation or political committee. On April 1, in the deposition of the Chair for All for Transportation Tyler Hudson, he was asked how and why they calculated the spending percentages that they did in transit tax referendum. The answer that was provided was a political speech protected by the 1st amendment so the voters were not entitled to that information. Last year in August, Ms. Alden presented the All for Transportation political speech representing the MPO insinuating the MPO supports the tax. In addition, Ms. Calvert commented on the 2045 Phase 2 Survey. She stated it is a push pull survey. This is a marketing technique commonly employed during political campaigns in which an individual or organization manipulates voter’s views in an opinion poll.

Jim Davison commented on the Letter of Comment on the FDOT Tampa Bay Next and the concern of the burden on the environmental impact. He urged to apply to transit and fixed guideways. He would like to include a member of the affordable housing task force on their board. He pointed out that the Long Range Transportation Plan format keeps changing which makes it hard for the people to examine it.

Tophem Morrison, a resident of Tampa, Hillsborough County. He wanted speak specially about the concept of expanding lanes. You cannot build yourself out of congestion. Additional lanes never solves the problem and if it does it is because they have robust transit systems and affordable housing. Two percent less cars on the road reducing congestion. When you build more roads you only create opportunity for congestion. We need to focus our energy on mass transit systems.
COMMITTEE REPORTS, ONLINE COMMENTS

Bill Roberts, CAC Chairman, gave a brief report on the activity of the Citizens Advisory Committee. In the CAC August meeting had a discussion about the Letter of Comment. Their were concerns about the relocation of displaced residents and affordable housing, global warming and air quality, FDOT being in full compliance with the original MPO motions passed in 2016 and 2017, validity of the information and calculations of poverty taxes will be impacted by the proposed investments, right away costs, assumptions of the air quality model, and concept of induced demand. In the September meeting, the committee recognized an outgoing member Vance Arnett who served for a number of years. The committee welcomed Mr. Lou Prida representing the Business community. Mr. Hoyt Prindle was in attendance is expected to be appointed by the board as an appointee of Commissioner Pat Kemp. Commissioner Pat Kemp expressed her strong support of the ferry between South Shore and MacDill Air Force Base. Under Action Items the CAC approved the following and forwarded to the MPO Board for action. The CAC approved the Amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program. CAC heard presentations from Sara Hendricks with CUTR discussing the Transportation Demand Management strategies for consideration. MPO Staff gave a preview of the draft 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan, the FDOT provided a report on alternatives being considered in the PD&E Study at US41 CSX Grade Separation Project Development & Environmental Study and MPO gave a report on the Tampa Interstate Study SEIS. CAC discussed induced demand and requested this to be a future topic of discussion. There was CAC workshop to discuss the 2045 LRTP.

Gena Torres, MPO Staff, gave a brief report on the consent items from other committees. CAC and TAC have recommended approval of the Amendments to the TIP. There was extensive input from committees on action item Letter of Comment on Tampa Bay Next SEIS. The Draft 2045 Cost Feasible Plan was presented as a status report to the committees in September and up for Action in their October meetings. TMA leadership meeting discussed needs and priorities for the upcoming legislative session with Senator Rouson. There was a resolution drafted supporting the I275 and State Road 60 Interchange. They also talked about options clarifying roles and responsibilities with the MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee. There were no Facebook comments. There were a few emails. An article was shared by Mauricio Rosas called the Brookings Institution and it highlights racism and the poor in designing roadways. Rick Fernandez requested a summary of the key differences between the 2040 and 2045 Plan. Caitlin Johnson with Tampa Bay times requested crash data around schools. Willie Hassle requested information regarding a non-emergency medical transport business. Sky White requested transit ridership numbers. Lastly, FHWA sent a thank you for the Emergency Response & Evacuation planning discussion.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Committee Appointments

B. Bylaws Amendment for ITS Committee

Commissioner Miller requested a motion to approve the consent agenda.

A motion was made by Councilman Guido Maniscalco and was seconded by Commissioner Kimberly Overman and motion was carried unanimously.
**Roll-Call Vote for TIP Amendments Approved by Committees**

Commissioner Miller introduced the item to approve the TIP amendments. There were no Motions.

Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, presented a summary on the Amendments. These include #6 Hillsborough MPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), #7 East Busch Blvd Corridor Study, and #8 Hillsborough Ave Surface Treatments. Also, Appendix C to add Transportation Performance Consensus Planning Document.

**Commissioner Kemp moved approval and was seconded by Mr. Mechanik. Upon Roll Call vote, Motion was carried fifteen to zero.**

Commissioner Overman questioned if there was public comment on Amendment #7. Sarah McKinley replied there was an overall study done for possible locations of the crosswalks.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**A. Letter of Comment on Tampa Bay Next Sections 4-6 SEIS**

David Gwynn, FDOT, introduced the SEIS and explained the study started in 2017 when they decided to consider tolled express lanes, triggering a re-evaluation of the project and a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Sections 4, 5 and 6 of the Tampa Bay Next. FDOT held 2 public workshops on the SEIS last May. In addition, the MPO and FDOT hosted 3 public open houses to inform committee and board members about potential impacts. FDOT is working on a draft SEIS that will go to the public hearing early next year. Today is the 9th formal presentation to the board and will provide a preview of FDOT’s draft recommendation. He shared 2 videos explaining the recommended draft. The first video is more technical and the second video is prepared for the public and more watchable.

Commissioner Miller asked if they are closing 21st Street and will there be two lanes exiting 275 to I4. Mr. Gwynn replied there will be a parallel ramp to get off on 14th and 15th and 21st and 22nd and there will be two lanes form SB 275 to EB I4 and from WB I4 to NB 275 and additional lane from WB I4 to SB 275. Another concern of Commissioner Miller is the Floribraska entrance on I275 N. Mr. Gwynn stated you will still need to move over but the Floribraska traffic is fairly low compared to other ramps and the lane will extend past Hillsborough.

Commissioner Overman had questions about the exit ramp to 14th and 15th and will they be right turn on red and she highly recommends no right on red because they are coming onto an interstate. Mr. Gwynn responded they have not gotten to that point yet. Additionally, is there going to be additional signage on SB 275 maybe at Slight Ave directing traffic to the proper lanes. Mr. Gwynn advised there will be more signage. She inquired about the property on the Southside in Ybor off of North Palm and 10 on the Northside and are they single family homes. Mr. Gwynn stated it is only six homes and in between properties they already own. They will work with the homeowners on the purchase and believes its only seven homes.

Mr. Mechanik mentioned only seeing changes to the downtown interchange. Mr. Gwynn said that is correct the Westshore interchange and segments in between have no changes.

Commissioner Smith is glad to see responses to the neighborhoods and communities like keeping Floribraska open. Are there concerns of bottle necks at the toll expressway that dumps at Ashley? Mr. Gwynn stated their modeling shows it will work. Commissioner Smith stated the properties that you own maybe were inquired in anticipation of a much larger footprint. Any idea what the plan would be for those long term since you no longer need them? Mr. Gwynn responded they will have to look further into.
Commissioner Smith wanted to know the timeline for community input and finalizing? Mr. Gwynn said between now and February then the formal public hearing is in February.

Commissioner Kemp stated she is very pleased the North Boulevard is no longer considered an option. She commented on that the fact that she is opposed to the widening of Section 7.

Rich Clarendon, MPO Staff, presented MPO comments on the Draft Letter of Comment on the SEIS. It focuses on two major interchanges or improvements. The Westshore area there were only two options to build or no further action. The downtown interchange had options A-D but they are off the table now. No further action is an option but the preferred alternative is the quick fix. Mr. Clarendon explained the different options and how they evaluated SEIS. They had clear guidance from the MPO Board since 2016-17 in a form of Motions, series of briefings and open houses. The first Motion dealt with human impact and there is map showing parcels that have been acquired and ones needing to be acquired. The second part of the Motion deals with environmental impacts and all available online. They are concerned with mitigation impacts that results from the construction itself. Another part of the Motion is the justification of the toll lanes and there is a traffic and revenue study with this information. Mr. Clarendon showed a slide regarding the difference in travel speeds predicted and delays. A concern is equity impacts. A part of the motion is to follow up on premium transit which is largely focused on the 275 expressed bus system. We would like to see more of the CSX lines. Property tax revenue loss due to right of way acquisition based on the full build option. They would like updated estimates based on the preferred alternative when they can be provided by the department. There is a cost for the city for maintaining community impact mitigation and during the design phase they would like an estimate of the costs. Air Quality is a concern in all models and Mr. Clarendon elaborated on all impacts. Safety is also a concern so they would like to see a presentation on the reconfigured ramps and strategies to slow traffic down. They would like clarification of bicycle and pedestrian travel and trails. East Tampa revitalization Partnership would like to be brought up to speed. A timeline for the community enhancements proposed for Heights Mobility Study which is close to the downtown interchange. Lastly, a more robust analysis of the induced traffic.

**Commissioner Miller requested a Motion to allow MPO to take out what has already been covered.**

*Motion was made by Cindy Stewart and seconded by Councilman Joseph Citro.*

Commissioner Kemp commented on the air pollution and letter minimizes this issue and its extreme.

Commissioner Overman addressed the air quality in item 7 and 8. She would like FDOT to address the air quality and environmental impact and take care of it.

Beth Alden noted that Commissioner Overman address at the public hearing in June to look into options for how noise walls can have as much benefit as possible for community health and reducing the spread of emissions. We are planning to come back to you with some best practices and case studies. They have been talking to the District Seven 7 about that and how those strategies can be integrated into this project going forward. They should expect to see this on a future agenda.

Councilman Citro commented on the junk and trash from entrance and exit ramp and would like this to looked at also. Mr. Green had a questioned about the physical impact analysis.

*Motion was made by Cindy Stewart and seconded by Councilman Joseph Citro. The motion was unanimous and adopted.*
B. Draft 2045 Cost Feasible Plan: Open Public Comment Period

Lisa Silva presented the 2045 LRTP Outreach Phase 2 Survey Results. The MPO received over 5,200 responses and public transit continues to be a high priority. More than 3,000 comments were received, 89% of the participants live and 90% work in Hillsborough County.

The Draft Plan will be online at www.planhillsborough.org/2045lrtp. Comments on the Draft Plan need to be posted online on or before October 5th, 30 days prior to the Public Hearing for the plan adoption on November 5th, 2019.

Todd Brauer, MPO Consultant, explained the Draft 2045 Cost Feasible Plan. Over the last 2 years staff has been engaged in the public and planning partners. They looked at needs, funding, understanding community impressions of the needs and projects. The plan is a statement of what you are going to build, services you are going to provide and when are you going to do it by. All fits into a federal regulation that requires us to look at cost feasibility. There are four programming investments state of good repair and resiliency, vision zero, smart cities, real choices when not driving and major investments for economic development. The number one priority is the state of good repair and resiliency, second is major investments and then real choices. All of these are multimodal.

Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, presented the Draft 2045 Cost Feasible Plan projects. She explained the technical analysis. Fixed guideway was a top priority so they looked at freight rail, rapid transit, street car and water transit ferry. As part of the major economic projects on roadways, they looked at the strategic intermodal system, new express lanes I4, I275, Westshore Interchange, widening of the Selmon, CSX grade separation project and the downtown interchange. They looked at other major investments through congestion analysis and delay reduction. The plan shows performance-based outcomes for the four projects. After we adopt this plan, HART will have discussions on CSX, fixed guideway, and work with jurisdictional partners and the expressway authority which roads should be included.

Trent Green questioned how does multimodal transits and intermodal projects factor into this plan. Joe Waggoner commented on delay times and wanted to know if it was present time. Mayor Lott asked how the projects were ranked and if it maximizes FDOT ability to get federal funding. Beth Alden commented that Section 7 is included in the plan. Commissioner Overman inquired on the percentage of matching dollars. Joe Waggoner stated that they are in competition for the State and Federal dollars. Commissioner Kemp has concerns and wants more discussion on these projects. Cindy Stewart concerned if we don’t get prioritized by the state then we won’t have the money to stay at the top of the priority list and wants to know what we FDOT needs from them. Mayor Lott made a final statement that the roads mentioned are important to us but if they are ranked low on the list of the 2045 plan they will not be built.

Public comment: Ronald Weaver admires the plan North of downtown and I 275 but he believes a quick fix will hold up another 2 ½ years getting on with our future. Jim Davison states if you deny what you have now you will not get it later. Sharon Calvert stated the interstate is a regional asset and it is a major evacuation route. There have been more conversations over I 275 and malfunction junction and now there is time for action.

Commissioner Miller spent 14 years in Tallahassee. He watched Orlando and Miami get the money for transportation and now Jacksonville gets part of the money. We need to work with FDOT to get the money for Tampa.

Commissioner Miller made a motion for Secretary Gwynn’s Staff and MPO Staff to sit down together to work it out. The motion was seconded by Mayor Rick Lott and Cindy Stewart.
Beth Alden stated it is clear we need to change the description of I 275. Cindy Stewart responded we need to make sure our priorities are about funding. Secretary Gwynn agreed to meet this week to make the change and this can be done quickly.

Commissioner Kemp recapped that Commissioner Miller’s made a motion for FDOT and MPO to meet to discuss changes. It was seconded by Mayor Lott and Cindy Stewart. The motion carried unanimously.

**Executive Director’s Report**

Beth Alden stated Legislative delegation resolution supporting I-275/ SR60 interchange. FDOT Tentative Work Program to be discussed at MPO Policy Committee: Tuesday, October 22, 9:00am, 18th Floor. Joint board workshop with HART: Wednesday, October 9, 9:30am, 18th Floor. Next Board Meeting and Public Hearing on 2045 Plan: Tuesday, November 5, 2019, 6:00pm, 2nd Floor.

**OLD & NEW BUSINESS**

There was no old or new business.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A quorum was met, and the meeting adjourned at 11:57 a.m.
Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on August 14

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

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

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

The CAC also received reports from

- TBARTA on the Regional Transit Development Plan;
- MPO staff on the 2045 Needs Assessment for Investment Programs.

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

The TAC approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- The letter of comment on Tampa Bay Next Section 4-6 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)
  - There was committee support for early consideration of air quality impacts, noise mitigation, landscaping, and mitigating local impacts.
✓ The Transportation Improvement Program Roll-Forward Amendments.

The TAC heard status reports on It’s TIME Hillsborough Survey Results, 2045 Plan Needs Assessment for Programs, and TBARTA’s Transit Development Plan. It had a Round Robin Discussion on health-related metrics, reviewed the MPO’s Health in All Policies Resolution, and discussed the impacts of a transportation systems on the health of the community. The EPC noted that Hillsborough has the highest levels of ozone in the state, and the airport shared about its wellness focus. The City of Tampa representative commented on the importance of shade and trees to add comfort to walking and biking. The committee also commented that more specific goals and outcomes would be helpful.

Meeting of the Policy Committee on August 27

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

✓ Transportation Improvement Program Roll-Forward Amendments.

✓ The letter of comment on the Tampa Bay Next Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, but noting additional concerns about:
  - The need for a stronger response to the East Tampa CRA’s letter;
  - Confusion regarding which statements in the letter are MPO findings and which are FDOT’s;
  - 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;
  - The potential for induced demand to lead to ongoing congestion even after investments;
  - The possibility that tolls at peak hour could be very high;
  - The need for stronger language about walk/bike safety in East Tampa and Ybor City;
  - 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;
  - Potential for the I-275/SR60 interchange area to be affected by sea level rise, which may be 4’-8’ in the latest forecast;
  - The relocation of displaced residents and availability of affordable housing;
  - 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:
- Managed lanes: lessons learned from other cities;
- 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.
INTRODUCTION

Driving and public transportation have historically been the most popular ways to travel, but the explosion of micromobility technology has brought a wide variety of new options that could make urban mobility more efficient, accessible and convenient. The emergence of micromobility-as-a-service – defined as shared bikes, e-bikes and e-scooters – highlights both the consumer and commercial appeal.\(^1\)

McKinsey Institute estimates the micromobility market size to be between $200 and $300 billion by 2030, and if deployed and managed effectively, will enable time savings, better travel experiences and reduced travel costs for people.\(^2\) Cities will experience decreased vehicle emissions, potentially lower congestion and greater accessibility for non-drivers.

The benefits of micromobility services stem from their higher efficiency in terms of energy and space. For example, the minimum square footage of one parallel parking space is 212 square feet, whereas scooters and bikes require three to six square feet to park.\(^3\) There’s also a sharp contrast in energy efficiency; an e-scooter can travel up to 83-miles with the same amount of energy it takes an average gas vehicle to travel one-mile. However, nuance is needed in their adoption.\(^4\) Not all modes and deployment strategies are equal in all environments (e.g. scooters on cobblestone roads or free-floating bikes parked on crowded sidewalks).

INRIX Research analyzed trillions of data points from hundreds of millions of connected devices to rank the Top 25 American, Top 5 British and Top 5 German cities where micromobility services could have the most significant impact on replacing vehicle trips. To come to this conclusion, we looked at the proportion of existing vehicle trips in a market that are three miles or less. Three miles was used as the ceiling for observation based upon the National Association of City Transportation Officials trip distance estimates.\(^5\) However, differences in utilized trip length do emerge based upon mode. Scooters are frequently used for short-distance trips between a half-mile and a mile, while bike travel distances are typically more than one mile and less than three miles in length.

While some have started to accept these popular mobility platforms as the new normal, cities have faced significant challenges in managing them due to inadequate parking facilities, vehicle conflicts, pedestrian safety concerns and network coverage. Maximizing the potential of these services requires investment, analysis of road space and an understanding of local travel needs.

---

\(^1\) The National Association of City Transportation Officials defines shared micromobility as: “all shared-use fleets of small, full or partially human-powered vehicles such as bikes, e-bikes, and e-scooters.”


RESULTS

This study provides two major insights that will dictate the success of micromobility. First, it reveals the high proportion of trips across major urban markets that are suited to micromobility distances. Second, the city case studies identify particular neighborhoods with disproportionately high percentages of short car trips that could see the greatest benefit from micromobility deployments.

UNITED STATES ANALYSIS AND RANKING

Analysis of INRIX data, consisting of more than 50 million car trips taken during October 2018, showed 48% of all car trips in the Top 25 most congested US metro areas are less than three miles. Digging deeper, 20% of trips were less than 1 mile, 16% were 1-2 miles, and 12% were 2-3 miles. If a fraction of these vehicle trips were replaced with micromobility trips, American cities could reap significant benefits.

Honolulu, Hawaii; New Orleans, Louisiana; and Nashville, Tennessee comprise the Top-3 cities with the greatest profile for micromobility options to succeed. These three cities also feature warm or temperate climates with minimal topographic variation, providing further support for micromobility. The high proportion of short-distance trips, no matter a city’s density or maturity of the public transit network, highlights the universal applicability of micromobility services. While automobile-centric sunbelt cities like Phoenix and Dallas have a lower proportion of very short distance trips (17% and 18% respectively) compared to denser cities like Chicago or New York (both 22%), they still have suitably-sized markets for micromobility. Micromobility-as-a-service has potential applications throughout the United States, independent of city size, location or characteristics. With the right data and analysis, any city can develop the structures necessary to achieve strategic success.
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## FIGURE 2: US CITIES BY MICROMOBILITY POTENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>TRIPS 0-1 MILE</th>
<th>TRIPS 1-2 MILES</th>
<th>TRIPS 2-3 MILES</th>
<th>COMBINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City Averages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>12%</th>
<th>48%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

INRIX RESEARCH | INTELLIGENCE THAT MOVES THE WORLD
CITY-LEVEL STUDIES

While overall travel trends provide insight into the potential, city-level analysis identifies where shared bikes and scooters could provide the most significant impact. By mapping trips down to the census block level, localized travel patterns emerge. Based upon this information, decision-makers have a powerful tool to identify and prioritize investments. INRIX Research analyzed Los Angeles and New York City to highlight how vehicle trip data could be employed in the development of micromobility services.

LOS ANGELES: SANTA MONICA, HOLLYWOOD, AND DOWNTOWN

When mapping trip origins and destinations to census block tracts, a clear pattern emerges in Los Angeles spanning from Santa Monica, through Beverly Hills to Hollywood (darker blue band from west to east in Figure 3). This corridor exhibits a higher proportion of short-distance trips compared to elsewhere in Los Angeles. The high number of short trips highlights the current lack of appealing mass transit services, which is being addressed via the expansion of the Purple Line. Micromobility solutions provide a valuable alternative to driving even before the opening of the Purple Line and will expand the serviceable area of the line following its opening.
NEW YORK CITY: MANHATTAN

The highest number of short-distance trips in Manhattan occur in Midtown and the Upper East Side. While Manhattan has the highest transit coverage of any major American city, the Upper East Side has lower access than the Upper West Side, which corresponds to greater proportion of short-distance trips. Similar to Los Angeles’ Purple Line Extension, New York City has pursued rail expansion to address low transit accessibility via the 2nd Avenue Subway Extension, with its first phase opening 2017, and proposed second phase to 125th St. Micromobility-as-a-service could provide a valuable alternative to driving in lower transit service areas, and increase the catchment area for existing stations. With congestion tolling and the continued expansion of the protected cycle network in New York City, shared micromobility services could safely provide critical first- and last-mile connections to neighborhoods throughout the city.
UNITED KINGDOM ANALYSIS AND RANKING

Analysis of the over 30 million car trips in the UK reveals a much higher proportion of short-distance vehicle trips compared to cities in the US. It is attributable to higher density levels than typically seen in the US (e.g. UK drivers have shorter distances to travel to find the same goods), which comes from cities that were developed before the automobile or around public transit. The pattern of land use makes UK cities, on average, more appealing for micromobility solutions due to the greater opportunity for car trip displacement. The effect of density is reflected in the higher proportion of short trips than in the US with 18% of trips being 0-1 mile, 39% 1-2 miles and 10 % 2-3 miles, versus 20%, 16% and 12% for the US. In total 19% more of vehicle trips in the UK are less than 3 miles compared to the US.

FIGURE 5: UK CITIES BY MICROMOBILITY POTENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>TRIPS 0-1 MILE</th>
<th>TRIPS 1-2 MILES</th>
<th>TRIPS 2-3 MILES</th>
<th>COMBINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Averages</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LONDON

London exhibits a highly balanced distribution of short duration trips compared to Los Angeles and New York City. It is a product of high public transport coverage and the prevalence of distinct neighborhoods, a reason for London being called a ‘city of villages.’ London’s unique form connected by public transport reduces the need for vehicle trips by providing services easily accessible by walking or public transport. Due to this legacy of walking and public transport (the Metropolitan subway line having opened in 1863), means fewer identifiable areas for the adoption of micromobility services, since the city has a highly efficient spatial form. However, according to INRIX trip data, West London has the highest potential for micromobility services based upon trip length data.

FIGURE 6: LONDON VEHICLE TRIPS BY CENSUS BLOCK

FIGURE 7: UK PERCENTAGES
GERMANY ANALYSIS AND RANKING

From the nearly 25 million trips observed in Germany, INRIX research found the proportion short-distance trips fall between those of the UK and the US with 15% of trips being 0-1 mile, 34% 1-2 miles, and 9% 2-3 miles. It is attributable to city population densities that are greater than those typically found in the US, but less than those in the UK. Unsurprisingly, the top two German cities are also the two densest cities in Germany—Munich and Hamburg.

### FIGURE 8: GERMAN CITIES BY MICROMOBILITY POTENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>TRIPS 0-1 MILE</th>
<th>TRIPS 1-2 MILES</th>
<th>TRIPS 2-3 MILES</th>
<th>COMBINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cologne</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Averages</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MUNICH

Munich has the highest proportion of short distance trips in Germany with 60% of vehicle trips being less than 3 miles. When looking at the distribution of trips across the city, a disproportionate number fall in the city center and region directly north of it. With concentrated investments in micromobility services, Munich could achieve outsized impacts due to the high number of short distance trips in a relatively small geographic area.

### FIGURE 9: MUNICH VEHICLE TRIPS BY CENSUS BLOCK

### FIGURE 10: MUNICH PERCENTAGES
CONCLUSION

Micromobility faces a promising future by replacing short distance vehicle trips and providing currently underserved first- and last-mile solutions for public transit riders. The exceptionally high number of short duration trips found in all three countries highlights micromobility’s massive market potential. Their flexible networks enable dynamic management of transportation networks providing travelers with fast, efficient alternatives to driving.

The ultimate success of these new offerings will be predicated on two key steps: cities having a clear understanding of where micromobility is best positioned to offset vehicle travel; and cities having the necessary tools to engage with and manage these services. Leveraging trip data and insights can provide a foundational view of how people currently move through a city’s road networks.

The next challenge has proven more difficult. Cities must effectively partner with and integrate private micromobility offerings. A key challenge being how cities, which have traditionally managed road space with paint and signs, incorporate app-based services.

In July, INRIX expanded its AV Road Rules platform to include support for rules and regulations for on the road, at the curb, and on the sidewalk for micromobility offerings, including features like bike lanes and pick-up/drop-off areas for dock-less scooters or bikes. By leveraging a common platform to manage diverse mobility options, cities can ensure more micromobility solutions will solve transportation problems and deliver on the promises of safety, efficiency and access.
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS - ACTIVATIONS

The purpose of this request for proposals (RFP) is to compile a list of non-profit organizations that may be called upon to activate NYCDOT public spaces and events as needed. The list, known as the Public Space Activations List, will be a compilation of partners that will provide all types of activations for NYCDOT public spaces and events. Activation typologies are described in further detail on page 4, but any proposal must be appropriate and safe for all New Yorkers. Respondents should assume their proposed activation could be provided for any or all of the Public Space programs described in this RFP. Acceptance to the Public Space Activations List does not guarantee selection or funding for activations. In addition to contracting with NYCDOT, respondents may work with community based organizations that NYCDOT partners with to execute various programs. While this RFP is a joint effort between NYCDOT Public Space and Art & Event Programming, it does not include Car Free Earth Day and Summer Streets—calls for those NYCDOT sponsored events are issued under separate RFPs.

PUBLIC SPACE PROGRAMS

WEEKEND WALKS
Multi-block, multi-day events on commercial corridors that promote the use of streets as public space. Community based organizations apply to close commercial streets and provide activations that highlight local businesses and New York City’s unique neighborhoods.

SEASONAL STREETS
Temporary transformations of streets into vibrant public space. NYCDOT works with community partners to design and manage street closures that feature activations and events for pedestrians.

In addition to the programs listed above, NYCDOT may provide activations to other initiatives.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS BACKGROUND

PEDESTRIAN PLAZAS
NYCDOT works with organizations to create and manage neighborhood plazas throughout the City to transform underused streets into vibrant, social public spaces. There are currently 79 pedestrian plazas in New York City.

PARTNERSHIPS
Most Public Space programs are executed in collaboration with community based organizations. If selected, respondents will work in conjunction with NYCDOT and its community partners to activate public spaces and events. These programs include:

PEDESTRIAN PLAZAS
NYCDOT works with organizations to create and manage neighborhood plazas throughout the City to transform underused streets into vibrant, social public spaces. There are currently 79 pedestrian plazas in New York City.

W 8th St, West Village

Seasonal Streets, Doyers Street

Weekend Walks, Third Ave, Bay Ridge

Pedestrian Plazas, Diversity Plaza

In addition to the programs listed above, NYCDOT may provide activations to other initiatives.
OVERVIEW
This RFP seeks to identify non-profit organizations that can provide activations to enhance NYCDOT’s public spaces and events. This RFP will be issued on an annual basis—respondents that are chosen from the RFP will be added to the Public Space Activations List and will be eligible to provide activations between November 18, 2019 and November 17, 2021. After this two year period, respondents will be able to apply again in the next application cycle. Respondents to this or any future RFPs are not guaranteed opportunities or funding to execute their proposals.

ELIGIBILITY
All activations should be free to the public and designed for people of all ages and abilities. Respondents should submit proposals that are suitable for all Public Space programs as described in this RFP. Activations should be appropriate for the diverse neighborhoods across New York City. Proposals targeting specific geographic areas or citywide are acceptable. Respondents to this RFP must be nonprofit organizations. Acceptance to the Public Space Activations List does not guarantee funding will be provided.

TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 9, 2019</th>
<th>November 18, 2019</th>
<th>November 17, 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Opens</td>
<td>Activation Period Begins</td>
<td>Activation Period Ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18, 2019</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Closes</td>
<td>Review RFP responses</td>
<td>Activations continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New RFP Released</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bedford Ave, Williamsburg
Van Brunt St, Red Hook
Story Ave, Soundview
Each of the typologies described below are general categories to which respondents can apply to. However, respondents may also submit applications that do not fit into the below typologies. Organizations are able to submit multiple applications, but only one activation typology can be included in each application. See page 6 for more details on submitting proposals.

**ACTIVE AND HEALTHY LIVING**
Eligible activities include, but are not limited to, those that promote a healthy and active lifestyle. These activities could be exercise classes, meditation, learn-to-ride or bike safety classes, education or outreach related to bike maintenance/storage, demonstrations, and other activations that are consistent with promoting a healthy and active lifestyle.

**LEARNING AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES**
Eligible activities include, but are not limited to, those that seek to educate New Yorkers on a wide variety of subject matter, such as science, literature, design, mathematics, social studies, geography, the environment, etc. Educational activities should have components to them that draw in users and are available to all ages and abilities. Activations offered in multiple languages are highly encouraged.

**CRAFTS AND DESIGN**
Eligible activities include, but are not limited to, those that engage individuals of all ages and abilities to create crafts, employ design skills, and other creative pursuits. Each of these opportunities could also include a learning or outreach component, such as highlighting the design field (e.g. architecture, graphic design, landscape architecture, etc.).

**PERFORMANCE BASED**
Eligible activities include, but are not limited to, those that engage in some type of performance, such as dance, singing, etc. Activities could also include those that provide lessons, such as teaching individuals how to dance, sing, etc. Performers and instructors from all creative backgrounds are encouraged to respond to the RFP.
Each proposal must be submitted using the Public Space Activations application. Organizations are able to submit multiple applications, but only one activation typology can be included in each application. The application is in a separate document and addresses the below items:

1. A brief description of past work, including activation details and photos/videos of the proposed activations (only send URL links to photos/videos)
2. A list of any government agencies or community based organizations that you have worked with in the past
3. A complete price proposal that includes the following:
   - Cost per deployment* to execute the activity. Include all staff costs, transportation, and other necessary items to successfully execute the proposed activation
   - Typical deployment time window the activation requires, including set up and breakdown times

All applications and accompanying materials should be sent via email as a PDF to activations@dot.nyc.gov or mailed to NYCDOT Public Space Activations, 55 Water St, 6th Floor, New York, NY 10041. Please include URL links to any photos or videos. Failure to include any required items or not follow instructions will result in the immediate disqualification of the respondent. Questions about the RFP should be directed to activations@dot.nyc.gov. The deadline for submission is October 18, 2019.

PROPOSAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Activation partners may be provided funding to implement activations at events or in public spaces, however it is not guaranteed
- A strong activations partner proposes a high quality, all inclusive activation that is suitable for outdoor public spaces and events that take place on New York City streets
- All activations should be movable and/or easily installed and removed and should not introduce any safety hazards for pedestrians or cyclists at outdoor events or public spaces
- All activations must be self-supporting/self-contained
- NYCDOT and/or its community partners will work to secure event permits and space for activations at events and in public spaces
- All necessary materials to execute activations are the responsibility of the activation partner

ADDITIONAL LEGAL INFORMATION

- This RFP is not intended as a formal offering for the award of a contract or for participation in any future solicitation;
- NYCDOT, the City and their officials, agent and employees make no representation or warranty and assume no responsibility for the accuracy of the information set forth in this RFP;
- No information contained in submissions shall be deemed confidential and such information may be shared with other governmental entities. Therefore, please do not submit any information that may be deemed proprietary in nature;
- All submissions shall become the property of NYCDOT and the City and shall not be returned;
- Any future activations agreement between NYCDOT and the partner can be dissolved at any time by both parties;
- Neither NYCDOT nor the City shall be liable for any costs incurred by any respondent in the preparation, submittal, presentation or revision of its submission;
- Neither NYCDOT nor the City shall be obligated to pay and shall not pay any costs in connection with the preparation of such submissions;
- NYCDOT at its sole discretion reserves, without limitation, the right to:
  - Withdraw the RFP at any time;
  - To discuss various approaches with one or more respondents (including parties not responding to the RFP); and
  - Change any terms of this RFP

The deadline for submission is October 18, 2019.
EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Proposals will be evaluated by an evaluation committee that shall be comprised of a minimum of five (5) persons qualified to evaluate the components of this RFP (the “Evaluation Committee”). Members of the Evaluation Committee will include representatives of NYCDOT and may include other City Agencies or community partners. Although NYCDOT may conduct various post-submission inquiries and negotiations with proposers, NYCDOT reserves the right to award the contracts on the basis of initial proposals received, therefore, the proposer’s initial proposal should contain its best programmatic and price terms.

1. Demonstrated successful relevant experience 25%
2. Quality of proposed approach and activations provided 40%
3. Demonstrated level of organizational capability 35%

Based on these rankings, the Public Space Activations List will be established of only those proposers who submit relevant proposals with adequate qualifications, experience, and a demonstrated level of organizational capability. NYCDOT reserves the right to request that proposers exhibit or otherwise demonstrate or clarify the information contained in their proposals.

BASIS FOR SELECTION AND FUNDING

At its sole discretion, NYCDOT may select qualified respondents from the Public Space Activation List to provide services to one or multiple NYCDOT public space programs or initiatives. In no case shall any one respondent receive more than a total of $20,000.00 from contracts awarded for the two year period via the Public Space Activation List.
PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS
Weekend Walks are multi-block, multi-day events on commercial corridors that promote the use of streets as public space. Community based organizations apply to close commercial corridors and provide activations that highlight local businesses and New York City’s unique neighborhoods. Successful respondents would provide activations at events that are held across the 5 Boroughs.
79 pedestrian plazas across New York City
31 pedestrian plazas part of OneNYC Plaza Equity Program

NYCDOT works with selected organizations to create neighborhood plazas throughout the City to transform underused streets into vibrant public spaces. The NYC Plaza Program is a key part of the City’s effort to ensure that all New Yorkers live within a 10-minute walk of quality open space. Successful respondents would provide activations in plazas that are part of the OneNYC Plaza Equity Program, where NYCDOT provides high and medium need plazas with funding, technical assistance, and maintenance services.
Seasonal Streets are temporary transformations of streets into vibrant public space. DOT works with community partners to design and manage the street for various uses, from activations and events for pedestrians, to managed access and deliveries for businesses. Since 2017, two Seasonal Street projects have been implemented in the Garment District and Chinatown.
QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS?
All enquiries regarding the Public Space Activations RFP should be sent to: activations@dot.nyc.gov

The deadline for submission is October 18, 2019

Visit nyc.gov/DOT for more information about NYCDOT
The latest evidence that bike lanes are good for business
The latest evidence that bike lanes are good for business

For a 2016 pilot, a stretch of Bloor Street in Toronto, from Shaw Street (above) to Avenue Road, was redesigned to remove one lane of street parking and add bike lanes to both curbs. A new study finds "no negative economic impacts" associated with the change, as many merchants feared, and even found evidence of increased business activity. (Christopher Porter / Flickr)
The latest evidence that bike lanes are good for business

A new study in Toronto supports what other cities have found: trading street parking for a bike lane doesn’t hurt the local economy, and often helps.

New bike lanes tend to draw controversy the way reflectors attract light — especially when those bike lanes replace street parking. The loudest protests usually come from ground-floor merchants, who understandably fear a loss of revenue from customers arriving by car. But in city after city, researchers have found that replacing street parking with a bike lane has no negative impact on business — and in many cases has a positive one.

The latest data point comes from Toronto. For a pilot project launched in August 2016, the city replaced street parking with a bike lane along a 1.5-mile stretch of Bloor Street, just northwest of the University of Toronto campus. The pilot removed 136 on-street parking spaces, leading retailers in the area to raise concerns.
To evaluate the business impact of the pilot, a group of researchers from U of T and the Center for Active Transportation conducted surveys of merchants and visitors before and after the bike lane’s installation. These surveys focused on four metrics: (1) spending, (2) customer counts, (3) visit frequency, and (4) vacancies.

As an extra measure, the researchers conducted surveys along a stretch of Bloor a couple miles east of the pilot site, with similar retail properties but no bike lane. This “control” area helped them gauge whether any economic changes were truly the result of the pilot itself, or merely reflected broader trends in the city.

Good news across the board: “We find all indicators point to increased economic activity on Bloor Street following the installation of the bike lane,” the researchers report in a paper set for publication in the *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Here’s a closer look at the numbers:

1. **Monthly spending rose.**

   In the pilot area, significantly more visitors to Bloor Street spent more than $100 per month there after the bike lanes were installed than before (53 percent to 44 percent). Spending also rose in the control area, so this one
metric can’t tell the whole story, but as a baseline it shows the absence of a retail doomsday.

More to the point: cyclist spending grew the most, with cyclists showing a 16 percent increase in odds of spending $100 a month on Bloor compared to visitors using other modes. In other words, the general spending increase was largely a cyclist-spending increase. There was no significant increase in cyclist spending in the control area.

2. **The number of customers rose.**

In talking to Bloor merchants, the researchers found that 55 percent served more than 100 weekday customers after the bike lane’s installation, versus 34 percent before, with food service and retail also showing statistically significant gains. The average Bloor merchant served 104 weekday customers post-bike lane (in 2017) versus 73 before (in 2015).

It wasn’t just a weekday trend. There was a significant rise in customers on Saturdays, too.

3. **The frequency of visits rose.**

In surveying visitors, the researchers found that people tended to visit Bloor...
three more days per month after the bike lane installation. The control site had no significant change in visit frequency.

There was a rise in regular visits, too. Before the pilot, 47 percent of people visited Bloor merchants 15 or more days a month. After the pilot, that number rose to 60.5 percent. Regular visit frequency also rose in the control site, though not quite as much.

Critically, visitors arriving by bike specifically to make retail or shopping trips soared, rising 12 and 14 percentage points, respectively. This increase in bike visitors came even as the share of drivers stayed the same. In other words, there was no sharp drop in the share of shoppers arriving by car, as some merchants feared.

4. Vacancies held steady.

That was true in both the pilot area and the control site.

So the picture is clear and consistent with findings from other cities: When street parking is converted into bike lanes in urban areas with commercial ground floors, economic activity as a whole remains as strong as before, and often stronger.
Caveats and causes

To be sure, it wasn’t all rosy. For example, unlike food or retail, general service establishments showed no significant weekday customer gains, and actually showed slight declines on weekends (in terms of the share of businesses seeing more than 100 customers). Such unintended consequences merit further study — and, if validated, may suggest a need for nuanced policies.

More granular data could help, particularly when it comes to generating support from wary merchants. The researchers did not have data on foot traffic, sales taxes, or credit card processing data, all of which could have painted a fuller picture. That said, the City of Toronto did review credit and debit card processing data and found spending to be up nearly 4.5 percent in the pilot area, compared with just over 2 percent in the control area.

Just why bike lanes have a neutral-to-positive impact on spending remains an open question. The strongest theory — one supported by the Bloor study — is that while cyclists lacking a car trunk might not make large purchases, they make more total purchases over a given period, since an area is now easier and safer for them to visit. (The large-purchase barrier also stands to change as more retailers shift toward on-demand delivery over in-store
merchandise.)

It’s also the case that, even when immediate street-parking spaces are eliminated for a bike lane, most cities have abundant parking options nearby. That was certainly true on Bloor; as mentioned, the share of visitors arriving by car specifically to shop did not change significantly after the bike lane’s installation, and even rose slightly, from 6 to 8 percent. Drivers did report more difficulty parking after the change, but harder to park doesn’t necessarily mean harder to shop.

And after all, harder to park is part of the point. There are many reasons beyond economics why it’s good for a city to trade street-parking for cycling, including greater safety, more public space, and less pollution. All these factors, combined with the business case, were enough to sell Toronto: In 2017, the city made the pilot changes permanent.
The latest evidence that bike lanes are good for business