Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee
Wednesday, February 26, 2020, 9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.
County Center, 18th Floor, Plan Hillsborough Room

I. Call to Order

II. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

III. Approval of Minutes – January 22, 2020

IV. Action Items

A. Garden Steps Action Plan (Michele Ogilvie, MPO)

B. Resilient Tampa Bay: Transportation Pilot Project (Allison Yeh, MPO)

V. Status Reports

A. Induced Traffic (Alvaro Gabaldon, MPO Intern)

B. Tampa Arterial Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Study (Justin Willits, HART)

C. Painted Intersections/Crosswalks to Classrooms with Rampello Field Trip
   (Danni Jorgenson, City of Tampa)

VI. Old Business & New Business

A. FY21 & FY22 UPWP Call for Projects (Allison Yeh, MPO)

VII. Adjournment

VIII. Addendum

A. MPO Meeting Summary & Committee Report

B. Public Hearing Flyer-Tampa Interstate Study Supplemental Environmental
   Impact Statement (SEIS)

C. Project Fact Sheet for I-275 from MLK and Bearss

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

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

Persons needing interpreter services or accommodations for a disability in order to
participate in this meeting, free of charge, are encouraged to contact Johnny Wong,
813-273-3774 x370 or wong@plancom.org, three business days in advance of the
meeting. Also, if you are only able to speak Spanish, please call the Spanish helpline
at (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.
Si necesita servicios de traducción, el MPO ofrece por gratis. Para registrarse por estos servicios, por favor llame a Johnny Wong directamente al (813) 273-3774, ext. 370 con tres días antes, o wongji@plancom.org de correo electrónico. También, si sólo se puede hablar en español, por favor llame a la línea de ayuda en español al (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

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

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.
I. **CALL TO ORDER**

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

**Members Present:** Melissa Collazo, Catherine Coyle, Cal Hardie, Sara Hendricks, David Hey, Emily Hinsdale, Gus Ignas, Jason Jackman, Arizona Jenkins, Larry Josephson, Karen Kress, Matt Lewis, Michael Maurino, Roger Menendez, Anna Quinones, and Justin Willits

**Others Present:** Beth Alden, Michele Ogilvie, Allison Yeh, Lisa Silva, Johnny Wong, and Wade Reynolds – MPO; Mariann Abrahamsen and Sharon Snyder – Planning Commission; Tia Boyd and Yaye Keita – CUTR; Alex Henry – FDOT; Antonio Serbia – George F. Young, Inc.; Christine Acosta – Pedal Power Promotions

II. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no public comments.

III. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion: Approval of the December 18, 2019 minutes (*Ignas - Collazo*). The motion passed unanimously.

IV. **ACTION ITEMS**

A. **Election of Officers (Lisa Silva, MPO)**

Ms. Silva stated the MPO appointed Michael Maurino as Chair of the LRC Committee during their December 2019 Board meeting. The Vice Chair is currently David Hey and the Officer-at-Large is Cathy Coyle. Both agreed to continue serving in their current roles. Ms. Collazo nominated David Hey to continue serving as Vice Chair and Cathy Coyle to continue as Officer-at-Large.

**Motion:** To elect a Vice Chair and Officer-at-Large (*Collazo – Menendez*). The motion passed unanimously.

B. **2019 Attendance Review and Declaration of Vacant Seats (Lisa Silva, MPO)**

Ms. Silva reminded members the Bylaws state she needs to contact members regarding their attendance when they have three or more unexcused absences; however, this Committee doesn’t have any serious offenders. There are currently vacancies on the Committee and one is for the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA). Neale Stralow accepted a new position with a MPO consultant so he can no longer serve and Lea DefTosto has a weekly conflict, so she also needs to step down. Ms. Coyle asked if members can let their architect related contacts know of the vacancy and Ms. Silva replied yes, as long as they are acknowledged by the ASLA.
Mr. Maurino commended the Committee on their good attendance.

C. Environmentally Sensitive Noise Walls White Paper (Michele Ogilvie, MPO)

Ms. Ogilvie presented the Environmentally Sensitive Noise Walls White Paper. She provided the background and discussed the issues, the effects on public health, the mitigation, and other opportunities.

Discussions followed regarding if Ms. Ogilvie has a favorite type of noise wall (yes, trees); if the example shown is a planted wall (Ms. Ogilvie replied yes and Mr. Hardie stated it is a planted wall along the Florida Turnpike); if the handout provided by Ms. Silva is part of this presentation, which agency will pay for the electricity (Electricity isn't required along noise walls. Ms. Silva explained she brought the handout from SmogStop back from the Transportation Research Board conference just as a reference since she knew noise walls is an agenda item.); if a trellis/living wall is viable to have on the ramps of an interstate or are they for a free-standing structure to help reduce smog and noise (They work on interstates. Vines covered the concrete walls on I-4 back in the early 1990s); and in reviewing the Public Health map, a member was surprised at the difference in the amount of traffic between I-4/I-275 and the Selmon/Veterans Expressway and does the landscaping along the two Expressways really help that much (Ms. Ogilvie replied they have not looked at the mitigating factors but the literature tells them the landscaping does help. Ms. Coyle added there is a large amount of residential next to I-4 and I-275 and is mainly at grade. The Selmon and Veterans are both mostly elevated. Ms. Collazo commented there is a lot of bumper to bumper congestion along I-4 and I-275 and Mr. Menendez included the fact that the more cars that are queued up, the worse the air quality.).

Mr. Maurino likes the noise wall working group concept and suggesting adding the recommendation to form the working group to the motion.

Discussions continued regarding if the SEIS is for more roadways than interstates (no, but FDOT asked the MPO to be broad and not specific to one interstate); the reason noise walls are used on interstates is because they are continuous since breaks along the noise walls don’t work; what happens if there is opposition to the noise walls (there will be a public hearing before any construction of the walls); there has been opposition to noise walls before for various reasons; for bushes or trees to work as a noise wall, there must be at least 100’ of dense vegetation; building the wall doesn’t handle the population part and adding vegetation doesn’t handle the noise part; staggered trees and berm work best as a natural wall; and clarification that the Public Health map in the presentation shows chronic disease.

Motion: Approve the report and support transmittal of the finalized white paper to potential implementing agencies, with strong encouragement to form the noise wall working group (Kress – Hey). The motion passed unanimously.

By making the motion, members of the Committee agreed to volunteer with the working group. Ms. Silva and Mr. Maurino will keep the members updated.

D. 2020 Safety Performance Targets (Johnny Wong, MPO)

Dr. Wong presented the 2020 Safety Performance Targets. He discussed what has occurred since the 2019 safety target adoption, the performance management measures for the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and the process and schedule for safety target setting.
Dr. Wong stated the MPO’s methodology for generating projected performance and targets has been nominated by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to be a best practice and will be shared with other MPOs around the State to teach them how to collect data and do analysis for predictions. He presented how the MPO forecasted future performance for the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and how to forecast a 35% reduction in crashes by 2045. The MPO is projecting a 0.93% reduction for CY20 because no surtax funding was invested in safety improvements in CY19.

After spotlighting two safety projects, Dr. Wong presented the seven targets for 2020.

Discussions followed regarding the request to receive the electronic version of this presentation (Ms. Silva will send out to the Committee); the increase in deaths offsets the decrease in serious injuries; most graphs are showing upward trends and is it possible to see these trends through 2045 (This was a conclusion reached by the 2045 LRTP needs analysis. Based on projected population increase and an increase in motor vehicle miles traveled (MVMT) the MPO believes crashes will increase over time based on these two factors. However, when the surtax funds are released and safety treatments can be applied, they will overcome the anticipated increases from population and MVMT, but they will be able to chip away at the baseline. Safety treatments are a benefit that are sorely needed); are the projections through 2045 available (yes, they are part of the LRTP available online and Dr. Wong will send them via email); Hillsborough County is the 3rd most dangerous city in the nation to not drive in; if the non-motorized injuries and fatality numbers include scooters (no, only bicycle and pedestrian. The MPO asked FDOT to include scooters and other non-motorized vehicles in their reports, but it will take time to formalize); if the cost reduction benefits numbers recognize an increase in enforcement (yes, they looked at an increase in enforcement and reduction in speed limits in the LRTP assessment); the concern about vehicles driving on sidewalks along Nuccio Parkway (the analysis doesn’t look at individual roads); Mr. Hardie stated he’ll be working on a Green Spine Cycle Track project along Nuccio Parkway, along 12th and 13th, scheduled for July and he’ll look at these issues; what happens if the target isn’t met (the Department of Transportation receives repercussions and is mandated to budget more revenue towards safety); the opinion that it’s not an accomplishment to reduce deaths by one (While the reduction of one is not significant, the targets are about overcoming the anticipated increase in population and MVMT); if this will be presented to the BOCC (Dr. Wong has not be requested to present to the BOCC); when presented next, there needs to be more talk about people rather than percentages, especially as it related to the implementation of the sales tax and whether or not the implementation of the sales tax will save people’s lives.

Motion: Based on the adopted methodology, recommend approval of 2020 Safety Targets (Ignas – Menendez). The motion passed unanimously.

V. STATUS REPORT

A. Robert’s Rules of Order, the handbook of procedures for creating and acting on motions (Lisa Silva, MPO)

Ms. Silva gave a brief refresher of Robert’s Rules of Order and the parliamentary procedures.

B. Transportation Equity Scorecard (Tia Boyd, CUTR)

Ms. Boyd presented the Transportation Equity Scorecard project. She discussed the project background and gave examples for uses for the tool. She explained the equity tool categories, the Communities of Concern (COC) scoring system, beta testing and data sources. Ms. Boyd also gave an example of a beta test of the 34th Street North Project.
Discussions ensued regarding if the COCs will eventually be tied into the Environmental Justice format (yes, they were granted a project to develop a transportation equity tool kit); the opinion that Communities of Concern is easier to understand than Environmental Justice; if widening the roadway on 34th Street to four lanes would improve the access score (possibly; however burdens are also taken into consideration); are the adverse impacts qualitative (yes); and if so, who makes the decision (the reviewing agency but public involvement is very important).

C. FY21 & FY22 Unified Planning Work Program Call for Projects (Allison Yeh, MPO)

Ms. Yeh presented the FY21 & FY22 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Call for Projects. This is the required biennial update and is effective July 1, 2020-June 30, 2022. The UPWP documents the federal and state funding for the MPO, FDOT, HART and the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD), outlines the major planning tasks and complies with federal and state rules. She reviewed the major planning tasks and reviewed some of the Committee, jurisdiction and agency requests for FY19-20 that have been completed. Ms. Yeh also discussed the UPWP Development Schedule.

Chair Maurino asked Ms. Yeh to return to next month’s meeting to discuss what projects the Committee would like to see and to give them time to compile a list of appropriate projects. Members were asked to please send ideas to Ms. Silva. Ms. Silva will compile a list to include in the February agenda packets; however, she reminded members this is a request for studies to be conducted, not projects. Chair Maurino requested 45-60 minutes be allotted at the February meeting to discuss the UPWP; Ms. Silva will schedule as much time as possible. Ms. Yeh stated the draft will be presented at Committee meetings in April, prior to being presented to the MPO Board.

VI. OLD BUSINESS & NEW BUSINESS

The next meeting is February 25, 2020 and the Committee is scheduled to go on a walking field trip to see the first “Crosswalk to Classrooms” in Tampa at Rampello School.

The Broward County Safe Street Summit is February 5th and 6th in Fort Lauderdale. Some of the Committee members are attending.

Ms. Silva asked members to let her know of any other urban technical demonstration projects they would like to see.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:39 a.m.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Garden Steps Action Plan

Presenter
Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff

Summary
The Aetna Foundation, the American Public Health Association (APHA) and the National Association of Counties (NACo) launched the Healthiest Cities & Counties Challenge (the Challenge) in 2016. The purpose of the Challenge is to support cities and counties to build multi-sectoral collaborations and develop evidence-based strategies promoting health, equity and social interaction. Garden Steps was selected as one (1) of 50 cities and counties from across the country to compete for a grand prize recognizing achievements in improving community health. In 2019, the Challenge named The Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) was selected as a first runner up in the Healthiest Cities and Counties Challenge with an award of $50,000.

The MPO was supported greatly by the Coalition of Community Gardens, City of Tampa Economic Development Department, City of Tampa Transportation Department, City of Tampa Parks Department, Florida Department of Health, Hillsborough, Hillsborough Area Regional Transit (HART) and residents of City of Tampa.

Garden Steps created the Hillsborough Health Atlas, a web based public tool to help communities evaluate the interconnectivity of Health, Environment, Transportation, Food access and Emergency Preparedness. The Atlas shows high rates of Diabetes, Obesity, Asthma, lack of leisure time activity and poor physical and mental health in food deserts. The Atlas also provides transportation data such as sidewalk coverage, bus routes and crashes of bicyclists and pedestrians; neighborhood socioeconomic data can also be displayed and overlaid with information on heat indexes and other risk factors.

The Garden Steps Action Plan is based on the community values, data and Goals identified through the Healthiest Cities and Counties Challenge.

Recommended Action
Support the Garden Steps Action Plan

Prepared By
Michele Ogilvie, MPO staff

Attachments
DRAFT Garden Steps Plan
**GARDEN STEPS ACTION PLAN: 2020 - 2023**

**INTRODUCTION**

The Aetna Foundation, the American Public Health Association (APHA) and the National Association of Counties (NACo) launched the Healthiest Cities & Counties Challenge (the Challenge) in 2016. The purpose of the Challenge is to support U.S. cities and counties in their efforts to build multi-sectoral collaborations and develop evidence-based strategies promoting health, equity and social interaction. **Garden Steps** was selected as one of 50 proposals from across the country to compete for a grand prize recognizing achievements in improving community health. In 2019, the Challenge named Garden Steps as a first runner up in the Healthiest Cities and Counties Challenge with an award of $50,000.

**BACKGROUND**

Garden Steps Initiative seeks to create community gardens with easy pedestrian and bicycle access in identified food deserts. The goal is to improve health equity and population health by increasing easy access to fresh fruits and vegetables. Garden Steps is accomplishing this goal:

- To encourage the sustainability and formation of Community Garden, the Garden Steps team sponsored the first annual Grow Community Gardens – Tampa Bay Conference with 120 attendees participating.
- Garden Steps installed 2 Pop up Gardens with the strong capacity of community volunteers.
- Working with the City of Tampa Transportation Department, a Pedestrian Wayfinding pilot project to a Community Garden was completed.

- Addressing population health, Garden Steps has hosted two Vegetable Cooking & Tasting Sessions for seniors who are learning to manage Diabetes. A new partnership with Senior Connections offered an opportunity to assist in the support of better outcomes in the health and wellness of older adults.
- Garden Steps has collected data on food deserts, chronic health conditions, transportation facilities and related indicators creating the Hillsborough County Health Atlas, a public tool which currently features over 65 health indicators.
- The Garden Steps Health Initiative proposed a model approach to improving health equity through presentations at events such as the Community Indicators Consortium 2017 Impact Summit, the Florida Brownfields Conference and the 2018 National Conference on Equitable Development.
• A Health in All Policies resolution demonstrating the relationship between the MPO’s regional, short- and long-term transportation plans with the Department of Health’s priorities in addressing health equity has been created.

• Garden Steps has used annual community events such as the Neighborhoods Conference and Clean Air Fair to encourage and educate on the benefits of community gardens.

• Partnering with our transit partner, Garden Steps created an education poster on the value of community gardening that is on display at all transfer stations and at stops along our bus transit way.

• Garden Steps has established a web page sharing information on how to begin a garden at: http://www.planhillsborough.org/gardens/.

• Attended 15 neighborhood and community group meetings to consult and collaborate.

PARTNERS

The MPO was supported greatly by the Coalition of Community Gardens, City of Tampa Economic Development Department, City of Tampa Transportation Department, City of Tampa Parks Department, Florida Department of Health, Hillsborough, Hillsborough Area Regional Transit (HART), residents of city of Tampa.

VALUES

The values that reflect the principles of Garden Steps are:

1. **Health Equity**: GARDEN STEPS is committed to the reduction of health disparities; particularly those populations who do not have safe and equal access to nutritional food; including all residents with all levels of ability, from all backgrounds.

2. **Sustainability**: GARDEN STEPS is committed to a lasting impact.

3. **Education**: GARDEN STEPS is committed to educating people on how they can support, encourage and engage in healthy behavior.

4. **Community Engagement**: GARDEN STEPS recognizes that community engagement is empowering and increases the likelihood of cooperation, ownership and success.

5. **Data Driven**: GARDEN STEPS is committed to using data collection and analysis to guide decision making and improve health outcomes.
A. Early on, the Steering Committee for Garden Steps asked that we understand what the health of our community is. This led to the creation of the Hillsborough Health Atlas, a web based public tool to help communities evaluate the interconnectivity of Health, Environment, Transportation, Food Access, and Emergency Preparedness. We have learned that many residents in food deserts face high rates of Diabetes, Obesity, Asthma, lack of leisure time activity and poor physical and mental health. The Atlas also provides inclusive transportation data such as sidewalk coverage, bus routes and crashes of bicyclists and pedestrians; neighborhood socioeconomic data can also be displayed and overlaid with information on heat index and other risk factors.

B. Working with community partner Senior Connections, Garden Steps provided cooking demonstrations and taste-tests of fresh vegetables at 2 senior centers where 35 participants are learning Diabetes Self-Management. The Project Manager shared the participants comments-"Beets can be tasty prepared as we were shown. Cauliflower also." "Helpful to learn the manner that vegetables were prepared." We were encouraged by the Project Manager’s comment to us as well: “Continue to share your love of gardening and growing fresh vegetables in our community. You are making a difference!”

GOALS

Goal 1: Expand access to Community Gardens in an identified Food Desert

- Design, build, and maintain new gardens
- Build New Partnerships (Network to End Hunger, Office of Sustainability, IFAS, Hillsborough County)

**Responsible Partner(s): Coalition of Community Gardens, City of Tampa, MPO**

Goal 2: Engage and Educate

- Preparing and holding educational and outreach events to include veggie tasting and cooking opportunities
- Develop and engage programming for seniors, teens and children

**Responsible Partner(s): Coalition of Community Gardens, City of Tampa and Middleton High School**

Goal 3: Update Data

- Continue to update the Health Atlas
- Expand the Health Atlas to include all of Hillsborough County
Responsible Partner(s): Plan Hillsborough

Goal 4: Support People Focused Infrastructure
- Support the development of the Green ARTery trail system
- Continue to coordinate and partner with HART

Responsible Partner(s): MPO and City of Tampa

BUDGET FOR THREE YEAR PILOT PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>$50,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1: Create 2 New Gardens for the intention of addressing food desert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2: Create Community Education Veggie tasting Community Programming for children, teens and seniors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3: Create Front Yard Veggie Gardens for the intention of addressing food desert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4: Continue Health Atlas update</td>
<td>Plan Hillsborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5: Human transportation Infrastructure for the intention of safe access and healthy activity</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6: Create Record of accomplishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1: Continue to Maintain gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2: Continue Community Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3: Continue Front Yard Veggie Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4: Continue Health Atlas update</td>
<td>Plan Hillsborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5: Human transportation Infrastructure for the intention of safe access and healthy activity</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6: Record accomplishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1: Continue to maintain gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2: Continue Community Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3: Continue Front Yard Veggie Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4: Continue Health Atlas update</td>
<td>Plan Hillsborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5: Human transportation Infrastructure for the intention of safe access and healthy activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 6: Complete recording of accomplishments and report back to Aetna

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ONE TIME CONTRIBUTION TO COALITION OF COMMUNITY GARDENS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY MESSAGE:**
The interconnectedness of transportation's impact on economic development is huge. It is anticipated that the future successful economy is one that leverages active, safe transportation systems to attract and retain a skillful labor force. The Community Garden can connect generations, neighbors and families; reduce transportation costs for food; provide a space and tool for people to share work and build new social and economic capital.
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**Agenda Item**
Resilient Tampa Bay Transportation Pilot Project

**Presenters**
Karen Kiselewski, Cambridge Systematics Inc.
Allison Yeh, MPO Staff

**Summary**
The Tampa Bay region is an important state hub for the tourism, higher education, commercial shipping, medical services, business/financial services, defense/national security, and agricultural sectors. The region is also one of the most vulnerable areas in the country, experiencing frequent storm events and persistent flooding. While it has not been directly impacted by a major hurricane in nearly 100 years, the region has experienced a series of close calls, most recently during the 2017 hurricane season. Due to climate change, the region faces additional threats from sea level rise and increasing frequency of severe inland flooding from heavy precipitation events.

As the Tampa Bay region continues to face these climate challenges, understanding individual asset and overall system vulnerability to key climate hazards will allow state and local agencies to integrate appropriate measure and strategies into their planning process, project development, asset management, and day-to-day operation. New federal requirements state that future Long Rang Transportation Plan (LRTP) updates must address "improving the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reducing or mitigating the stormwater impacts of surface transportation ..."

To assist in meeting the new federal mandate as well as inform the LRTP updates, the Resilient Tampa Bay Transportation pilot project, which includes the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization, Forward Pinellas, Pasco MPO, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, and the Florida Department of Transportation District 7, conducted a climate vulnerability study utilizing a FHWA Resilience and Durability to Extreme Weather grant.

The study assessed the potential climate vulnerability and risks on transportation network due to storm surge, flooding, and sea level rise; screened and prioritized critical transportation facilities; identified adaptation strategies and candidate projects; compared potential economic impact and adaptation costs, and provide
recommendations for inclusion of resiliency strategies in the decision making process of transportation planning.

The study focused on roadway infrastructure in Hillsborough, Pinellas, and Pasco counties. The Tampa Bay regional travel demand model served as the base. An indicator-based desk review approach was used in the quantitative analysis part of the study, stakeholder input was obtained and incorporated regarding important (critical) roads. It should be noted that the study is a scenario-based evaluation and should not be viewed as a prediction of occurrence.

The report identifies recommendations for incorporating adaptation strategies into the LRTPs for all three MPOs. For Hillsborough County, staff recommends prioritizing transportation mitigation investments with facilities that area highly vulnerable to weather stressors and critical to the community. The full draft report is available at http://www.planhillsborough.org/resilient-tampa-bay-transportation/

This project is part of the FHWA’s Office of Planning, Environment, & Realty (HEP) research program on Resilience and Durability to Extreme Weather https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/pilots/index.cfm

**Recommended Action**
Approve Report

**Prepared By**
Allison Yeh, AICP, LEED GA

**Attachment**
Informational Flyer
Strengthening the Resilience of Our Regional Transportation Network

The Tampa Bay region is an important state economic hub and is also one of the most vulnerable areas in the country to extreme weather events. Many roads and bridges in the Tampa Bay region are susceptible to flooding because they are in areas of low elevation, cross flood zones, and run near to the coast.

However, with advanced planning and innovative engineering, there are many steps we can take to enhance the resilience of our roads and support the safety and prosperity of our communities.

What's the Concern?

Weather patterns and climate projections indicate that flood risks are increasing:

- **Storm Surge**
  - Mexico Beach, Pier, FL, recorded a 14-foot storm surge during Hurricane Michael in 2018.

- **Sea Level Rise**
  - Since 1946, the Tampa Bay area has seen over 7 inches of sea level rise, and that rate is expected to increase.

- **Inland Flooding**
  - Flooding has increased in the Southeast. For example, four major inland flood events occurred in 2014 – 2016 alone, causing billions of dollars in damages and loss of life.

The Tampa Bay Area Has:

- 1,000+ miles of shoreline
- Nearly 3 million residents
- 58% of population in flood zones

Within the Three Counties, It Is Projected That:

- 9 inches of rain over 24 hours would potentially impact 12% of roads
- A category 3 hurricane with high sea level rise would potentially impact 28% of roads

Over 14 Days of Network Disruption:

- Economic losses are more than the cost of high priority road upgrades.

FDOT · Forward Pinellas · Hillsborough MPO · Pasco County MPO
Federal Highway Administration · Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council
Why Transportation?

Roads are critical to the safety and prosperity of our community, and we need to prepare our region to be resilient in the face of various climate hazards.

- Flooded roads create challenges, including for getting to work, school, businesses, and other routine activities, which can mean lost income, lost time, and other hardships.
- Impassable roads can restrict access to emergency services and evacuation routes, which place lives in danger.
- Damaged transportation infrastructure, such as washed out roads, create longer-term disruptions and increase repair and overall maintenance costs.

How to Create a Resilient Transportation Network

Example methods:

- Create barriers such as wetlands and sea walls to protect against storm surge
- Elevate roads above flood levels
- Improve drainage to help roads shed water more quickly
- Strengthen infrastructure to increase durability, such as hardening shoulders and improving bases of roads to resist erosion

Plan procedures and allocate resources to make recovery faster

Resilient Tampa Bay Transportation Pilot

The pilot is a joint initiative between the Hillsborough, Pinellas, and Pasco Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, and the Florida Department of Transportation District 7. With public input, the project has used federal funding to:

- Review scenarios that are likely to impact the region’s transportation network over the next 25+ years
- Identify areas at highest risk of flooding
- Recommend steps to enhance resilience and durability of our roadways
- Determine costs and benefits to assist regional decision making

Learn more about the Resilient Tampa Bay Transportation Pilot and its recommendations:

www.resilienttampabay.org
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**Agenda Item**
Induced Demand Briefing

**Presenter**
Alvaro Gabaldon, USF MPO Fellow

**Summary**
Induced Demand is an economic term referring to the increase of demand for a good as a result of an increase of supply for that good. This term is popularly applied to transportation in discussions around the effects of widening roads or increasing road capacity. There are many challenges to empirically observe and isolate this phenomenon’s presence in transportation. The papers reviewed in this briefing are among the seminal studies on this topic and can provide context to a term that has become somewhat misappropriated in its application to transportation and discussions around congestion relief.

A key takeaway is that transportation can be thought of as a market where travelers predominantly make cost-based decisions. This requires an understanding of the total cost of traveling which implicates land use, housing, and employment, among other factors, that can drive demand for certain transportation within a certain area.

**Recommended Action**
None – informational briefing

**Prepared By**
Alvaro Gabaldon, USF MPO Fellow

**Attachments**
Presentation Slides
Induced Demand
A LITERATURE REVIEW

Understanding Induced Demand

- Economic context
- Overview of frequently cited academic studies
- Key Takeaways
What is Induced Demand?

- Induced Demand is a phrase used frequently in conversations about widening roads.
- It refers to the application of the theory of Supply and Demand to transportation.
- More broadly, it is an economics term referring to the change of demand within a market after supply changes.

Induced Demand is an Economic Term

- Assumes transportation acts like a “market” governed by supply, demand, and price.

  - **Supply:** refers to the amount of a “good” available
  - **Demand:** refers to how many people want a “good”
  - **Price:** refers to the cost required to consume a “good”
Supply and Demand Seek Equilibrium

- Supply, Demand, and Price exist in an equilibrium.
  - Quantity Supplied = Quantity Demanded
- A shift in one variable causes a reaction in the others.

[Link to Britannica topic on supply and demand]

Supply & Demand Applied to Roads

- Supply = Road capacity
- Demand = People that want to use the road (VMT)
- Price = The cost incurred by using the road
Induced travel occurs when latent demand becomes real demand.
What Does the Research Say?

- Researchers attempt to understand how shifts in capacity (supply) affect road usage (demand).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Location (study type)</th>
<th>Study Years</th>
<th>Change in VMT/Change in Lane-Miles</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duranton and Turner</td>
<td>United States (MBA)</td>
<td>1983-2003</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervero</td>
<td>California (freeway corridors)</td>
<td>1980-1994</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervero and Hansen</td>
<td>California (urban counties)</td>
<td>1976-1997</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noland</td>
<td>United States (states—all roadway types)</td>
<td>1984-1996</td>
<td>0.30 to 0.60</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noland and Cowan</td>
<td>United States (metro areas—freeways and arterials)</td>
<td>1982-1996</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen and Huang</td>
<td>California (metro areas—state-owned highways)</td>
<td>1973-1990</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Elasticity is a measure of the relationship between an independent and dependent variable.

What does the Research say?

- Studies found elasticities of >1 across results.
What does the Research say?: Cervero

“Road Expansion, Urban Growth, and Induced Travel: a Path Analysis”

- Published in APA Journal, 2003
- Found “short term” congestion relief provided by capacity to reduce over the “long term”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Location (study type)</th>
<th>Study Years</th>
<th>Change in VMT/Change in Lane-Mile</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cervero (J)</td>
<td>California (freeway corridors)</td>
<td>1980-1994</td>
<td>0.10/0.39</td>
<td>Short term/Long term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Proposed idea of “Induced Growth”
  - Changes in land use development patterns around highway corridors that experienced increased capacity.
  - More-dispersed, low density, auto dependent patterns emerged.
  - Warned of the feedback loop that increased vehicle traffic results in investment in increasing vehicle capacity.
What does the Research say?: Duranton & Turner


TABLE 1 Impact of Capacity Expansion on VMT (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Location (study type)</th>
<th>Study Years</th>
<th>Change in VMT/Change in Lane-Miles</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duranton and Turner (1)</td>
<td>United States (MSAs)</td>
<td>1983-2003</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Published in 2011, The American Economic Review

Studied the effect of increased road supply on VMT within every Metropolitan Statistical Area in the United States from 1983 to 2003.

Found no relationship between transit supply and VKT within study areas.

Identified the potential sources of increased driving as:

- Increased household driving: 11%-46%
- Increased commercial driving: 18%-28%
- Migration: 5%-15%
- Diversion of traffic from other routes: 0%-10%
What does the Research say?: Beaudoin & Lawell

“The Effects of Public Transit Supply on the Demand for Auto Travel”

- Published in Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 2018
- Tested Duranton & Turner’s conclusion that transit did not relieve congestion

- Observed different effects over time.
  - Short run (0-4 years): The Substitution Effect
  - Medium run (5 years): Induced Travel Effect
  - Long run (>6 years): Induced Travel and “Induced Growth”
What does the Research say?: Beaudoin & Lawell

“The Effects of Public Transit Supply on the Demand for Auto Travel”

- Short run (0-4 years): The Substitution Effect
  - Congestion is relieved as drivers replace car trips with transit.
  - Averaged 10% increase in transit supply results in a 0.7% reduction in auto travel.

What does the Research say?: Beaudoin & Lawell

“The Effects of Public Transit Supply on the Demand for Auto Travel”

- Medium run (5 years): Induced Travel Effect
  - Road capacity that was initially relieved is filled once again.
What does the Research say?: Beaudoin & Lawell

“The Effects of Public Transit Supply on the Demand for Auto Travel”

- Long run (greater than 6 years): Induced Travel and “Induced Growth”
  - On average, 10% increase in transit capacity is associated with a 0.4% increase in auto travel.
  - Like roads, transit investment increases an area’s accessibility which can increase its desirability.

Research Limitations

- Researchers have controlled for statistical bias in inconsistent ways.
- Diversity of methodologies makes comparing studies difficult.
- Most researchers do not isolate specific sources of the additional VMT they observed, the exception being Duranton and Turner (2008).
- Studies mostly focus on new roadway construction or road widenings.
- There is little to no information on the impact of HOV, toll, or auxiliary lanes or the impact of Transportation Demand Management strategies.
- Researchers highlight the difficulty of controlling for disruptive technologies, consumer preferences, and trends.
Some Patterns Have Emerged.

Key Takeaways

Induced vehicle travel effects occur and are measurable.
Key Takeaways

Increasing road capacity relieves congestion in the short term but will diminish overtime.

Key Takeaways

Transportation connectivity and land use development decisions have impact on each other.
Key Takeaways

Economic development, population growth, and trips are attracted to accessible areas.

This can be referred to as "Induced Growth."

Key Takeaways

Cost is a primary influencer of travel behavior.
Agenda Item
Tampa Arterial Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Study

Presenter
HART Representative

Summary
In mid-2019, HART kicked off the Tampa Arterial BRT Study to look at opportunities to implement BRT between USF and Downtown, including revisiting previously proposed routes.

Two of HART’s busiest and most popular local bus routes are Route 1, located on Florida Avenue, and the MetroRapid on Nebraska Avenue. These routes, along with other local routes that connect Downtown Tampa and the USF Tampa Campus, are the focus of HART’s Tampa Arterial BRT Study.

The study’s primary goal is to identify a corridor, using some combination of Florida, Nebraska, and/or Fowler Avenues, to connect Downtown Tampa to the USF Tampa Campus. This corridor will be able to provide a dedicated transit lane for a majority (at least 50%) of its length to ensure reliable bus travel times. The study focuses on how the proposed new bus service can best meet the needs of existing bus riders, as well as those who may not have chosen to use this form of transportation before.

Recommended Action
None; for information

Prepared By
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

Attachments
Tampa Arterial BRT Study Factsheet
4-Minute Video of December Public Workshop
Tampa Arterial BRT Study

Two of HART’s busiest and most popular local bus routes are Route 1 located on Florida Avenue and the MetroRapid on Nebraska Avenue. These routes, along with other local routes in this area that connect Downtown Tampa and the USF Tampa Campus, are the focus of HART’s Tampa Arterial Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Study.

The study’s primary goal is to identify a corridor, using some combination of Florida, Nebraska, and/or Fowler avenues, to connect Downtown Tampa to the USF Tampa Campus. This corridor will be able to provide a dedicated transit lane for a majority (at least 50%) of its length to ensure reliable bus travel times. The study will focus on how the proposed new bus service can best meet the needs of existing bus riders, as well as those who may not have chosen to use this form of transportation before.

This study has three main objectives:

1. Improve safety and transit operating conditions for bus routes on Florida, Nebraska and/or Fowler avenues between USF and Downtown Tampa.

2. Improve connectivity for east-west routes that cross the USF to Downtown Tampa corridor.

3. Improve local transit access on Florida, Nebraska and/or Florida avenues for communities between USF and Downtown Tampa, including bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and signalized crossing improvements, throughout the area for eventual connection to potential premium transit alignments.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Painted Intersections Guide and Crosswalks to Classroom field trip

**Presenter**
Danni Jorgenson, PE, City of Tampa staff

**Summary**
The City of Tampa understands that residents are concerned about the livability of their local residential neighborhood streets with the most common complaints reported to the Police Department and Traffic Engineering relating to speeding vehicles and cut through excessive traffic volumes. With increases in traffic volumes, roadway constraints, frustrated commuters often resort to using local roads to bypass congested collector roads or intersections. Usually in a hurry to get to work or home, commuters may ignore residential speed limits. The result is a reduction in the livability of our residential neighborhoods and perceived unsafe conditions. The purpose of the Painted Intersection Guide is to present residents with a unique or novel process to pursue relief from some residential traffic concerns and is approved by City of Tampa Transportation and Stormwater Services Department. Wanting to do everything possible to improve upon the safety and livability of residential neighborhood streets, the City of Tampa has developed a Paint the Intersection Policy that may allow residents to build neighborhood community, increased communication between neighbors, lower crime rates, raised livability, unique neighborhood identifier and public art in your neighborhood.

After today’s meeting Livable Roadways Committee (LRC) members will get “schooled” about the City of Tampa’s Painted Intersections and Crosswalks program. After, we walk the two blocks from County Center to Rampello’s K-8 Downtown Partnership Magnet School to experience Mayor Castor’s first painted Crosswalk to Classroom project and see the bright colors that help drivers pay attention to pedestrians, bicyclists, and children crossing to school. In November 2019, Mayor Castor unveiled her Crosswalks to Classrooms initiative by showcasing a colorfully painted crosswalk at Rampello and reaffirmed Tampa’s commitment to Vision Zero during the National Safe Routes to School Conference.

We invite everyone to join us at the completion of MPO’s Livable Roadways Committee meeting for an enjoyable and informative field trip to Rampello. In
addition to Ms. Jorgenson, we will hear from the consultant team that sponsored the crosswalk and Rampello PTA parents whose children helped paint the crosswalk.

**Recommended Action**
None; for information

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

**Attachments**
None
OLD BUSINESS - UPWP ideas submitted after the January 2020 LRC meeting

Hi Lisa:  Here is an idea to consider for the Hillsborough MPO UPWP.  Has there been any prior work done relating to managing parking supply?  As an example, please see the King County **Right Size Parking Calculator** at https://rightsizeparking.org/about.php.  Especially now with the development of the Regional Transit Development Plan and the updates of the TDPs of the local transit agencies, as these plans are implemented, they will need supportive land development patterns.  A study to develop a “Hillsborough County Right Size Parking Calculator” would provide the impetus for local government, business, and community dialogue on this usually contentious topic to develop a case why we need constrained parking supply and how this could be done in a coordinated way.

Thanks,
Sara

While I have heard City Council bring up re-looking at the parking standards, I do not know of a specific project to do this right now.

Melissa E. Zornitta, AICP
Planning Commission Executive Director

Good afternoon Lisa, Allison, and Gina,

I wanted to float an idea by you before bringing it before LRC. Maybe this is better as a study and not an application.

Each park in Hillsborough and the cities would have a designated **Park Speed Zone**. The zone would be the frontage of the park on the road, or within 500 feet in each direction of each park entrance, whichever is the greater distance. Unless there is 30-feet between the road and the active uses of the park, or guard rails, or a line of trees, this zone would have a speed limit of at least 10 mph below the road’s posted speed limit or 25mph, whichever is faster, to avoid a speed trap effect on major roads. The Park Speed Zone would be enforced from that park’s open and close.

The example I have attached is [“Senior Zone” on Waters Ave](#). Karen Kress mentioned this to me. I had forgotten they existed. This could be a model for a Park Speed Zone. The length is about 1/3 mile. The beginning and ends are marked by specific signs and roadway paint. In the middle of the zone is a full traffic signal. (I personally think this stretch of Waters is too wide.)
To use Waters as an example of an application, I did Countryway Park with 500 feet on each side of the entrance. For parks like Lettuce Lake Park, or Al Lopez Park, the wooded areas against the road would not be in the speed zone, but the entrance would include part of that frontage. For linear parks or ballfields where the field fence is the barrier (since the field is the active use), the zone would extend beyond the 500-foot zone, including wrapping around a park placed on a corner.

I think children are the most vulnerable road users. If the roads can protect them, they will be safe for everyone. That’s why I think after school crossings, park crossings need to be the next step in terms of a pedestrian improvements that have a good return on investment. Maybe this could be a step towards safer streets across the county.

Thank you for all that you do and continue to do.

Best,

Michael Maurino, CNU-A
Director of Transportation and Planning
Westshore Alliance
Office: 813.289.5488
maurino@westshorealliance.org
www.westshorealliance.org

Hi Michael,

I agree with you that senior zones would be a good model to use. I think the first Senior Zone in the U.S. (need to double check with Michele) is actually on Fletcher Avenue across from USF where the John Knox retirement home is. I was also thinking that maybe a broader category could be considered which allows for the ability to design areas beyond parks. Below is an example from Chicago where they designated a children’s safety zone. Something like this might overlap with school zones, but it could also cover areas that are not officially designated parks where many families happen to gather. Just a thought… Also, would your proposed motion study the process and viability (political and cost) of designating park speed zones or form of safety zones rather than investigate which areas may need them the most? I’m guessing those priority areas maybe somewhat evident from our existing Vision Zero data.

The Children's Safety Zone Program protects children and other pedestrians by reminding motorists to slow down and obey speed laws – especially in school and park zones. Safety zones are designated as a 1/8th of a mile boundary around any Chicago parks or schools.

Hope this helps. Thanks!

Allison G. Yeh, AICP, LEED GA

MPO Executive Planner • Sustainability Coordinator

Lisa/Sarah – I’d like to suggest this as an UPWP project. Something like “best practices for EV charging”. I’m very curious whether public charging infrastructure is needed or if handling it privately is the better path.

For instance, the City of Columbus added on-street EV charging to a row of metered parking. Then are most places charging to charge? I am developing a list of all the public and private EV charging downtown FYI.

Can you LMK if this will be considered please?

Karen Kress
Safety Zone proposal for Hillsborough MPO  
Michael Maurino  
January 30, 2020

- The Hillsborough MPO funds a study to identify and prioritize the installation of Safety Zones, including additional sidewalks/sidewalks/trails, and crosswalks around the following locations.
  o Within 1/8th of a mile on each road bordering public schools, private schools, preschools, daycares, libraries and other locations where children gather (enforced school opening/sunrise to school closure/sunset on school days, with exemptions for after school sports);
  o Within 1/8th of a mile on each road bordering and/or the entrance to state, municipal, and private parks and recreation centers (enforced based on the park or recreation center hours of operation up to 24 hours daily);
  o Within 1/8th of a mile around senior centers, assisted living communities and facilities as requested by the property owner (enforced sunrise to sunset daily);
  o Prioritization is ranked by MPO standards and sorted by the roadway owner. For example, a school on a County road is not ranked against a school on a City road, unless the municipality or School District asks for the project to be included in MPO funding where the overall score takes priority.
  o All future locations that warrant a Safety Zone must install a Safety Zone to the MPO’s standards. The cost of design and installation must be incurred by the property owner, without exemptions.
  o To be applied enacted by Hillsborough County, and the Cities of Tampa, Plant City and Temple Terrace. MPO staff would work with the staff of each municipality on prioritization.

- The study should answer the following questions.
  o How can a public or private entity apply to install a Safety Zone before priority rank order if it meets locational standards?
  o How can a public or private entity apply if they do not fall into one of the established locations?
  o Can the cost for the zone installation be assumed by a private entity and installed to the municipality’s standard by a private contractor hired by the funder? (Example: Private foundation raises funds and hires a contractor for a public school zone expansion on a public road.)
  o What is the appropriate speed for each location based on class of road, and zone user (driver, pedestrian, student, etc.)?
  o What elements should be used to indicate each Safety Zone? (Flashing beacon on speed limit sign, pedestrian activated flashing beacons, signs with the type of pedestrians to be expected, markings on street and street art, reflectors and rumble strips, etc.)
  o What is the penalty for violations within each Safety Zone, and how should those penalties be reallocated?
  o How to study the effectiveness of each Safety Zone? Who does the study? Should road design and lighting be part of the Safety Zone improvements?
MPO Board Meeting of Tuesday, December 3, 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 on the 26th Floor Conference Rooms A & B.

The following members were present:

Commissioner Les Miller, Commissioner Pat Kemp, Commissioner Ken Hagan, Charles Klug, Councilman Guido Maniscalco, Mayor Rick Lott, Mayor Mel Jurado, David Mechanik, Michael Maurino, Commissioner Kimberly Overman, Janet Scherberger, Commissioner Mariella Smith and Joe Waggoner.

The following members were absent: Councilman Joseph Citro and Councilman Luis Viera

A quorum was met.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – November 5, 2019

Chairman Miller sought a motion to approve the November 5, 2019 minutes. Councilman Maniscalco so moved; it was seconded by Commissioner Overman and adopted.

Commissioner Miller welcomed aboard new member Michael Maurino. Michael Maurino introduced himself as the Planning Commission appointee to the MPO and he is the City of Tampa appointee to the Planning Commission. He is the Director of Transportation and Planning for the Westshore Alliance and also serves on the Port Tampa Civic Association neighborhood board.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: FLORIDA COMMISSION FOR THE TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED

Michele Ogilvie, MPO Staff, stated that each year the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged recognizes individuals and organizations within the community that have exhibited exceptional service, personal excellence and dedication towards serving persons who are transportation disadvantaged. This year, the Hillsborough MPO was recognized as the Designated Official Planning Agency that went beyond the scope of its work to implement coordinated transportation. Highlighted in this award is the MPO’s practice of connecting the work of the TD board with the MPO board and the MPO’s other committees. The Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged staff could not attend the celebration today but sent a message. Also this year, Ms. Gloria Mills, the vice chair of the TD board, was recognized for her 23 years of service to this organization. And in addition, a Hillsborough County Sunshine Line director received the driver of the year award for the State of Florida, so Scott Clark is present to celebrate with us.

Beth Alden invited the guests up to take a photo with the board.
PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

COMMITTEE REPORTS, ONLINE COMMENTS

Gena Torres, MPO Staff, gave a brief report on the action items of the other committees. The CAC met at the Expressway Authority and visited the traffic management center; many thanks to THEA for rolling out the red carpet and to City of Tampa Traffic engineer Brandon Campbell for a great overview; committee members were thoroughly engaged. Following the tour, the CAC reviewed and recommended approval of the amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program and Unified Planning Work Program, one of today's Action Items; these reflect Federal Transit Administration actual grant funding amounts, as well as an allocation from the Board of County Commissioners for safety feasibility studies on eight high-crash corridors in the county; the amendments were also supported by the TAC and BPAC. All committees approved the 2020 calendar of meetings, which is on today's Consent Agenda. HART briefed the CAC and your other committees on their Flamingo fare and One Bus Away app. The CAC and TAC will meet jointly for their next meeting on December 16th at 1:30PM in this same room. The Transportation Management Area Leadership Group held a lengthy discussion at their last meeting on regional priorities; the summary is in your packet; a motion passed unanimously to support HART as it begins to negotiate with CSX for joint use or purchase of rail lines from Downtown to USF for passenger service, and support for the 41-mile TBARTA Regional Rapid Transit, as a priorities on the TMA regional priority list.

We received no Facebook posts and 4 emails. Roc King congratulated Beth and staff for the hard work leading to the adoption of the 2045 LRTP. Secretary Gwynn responded to a woman who lost a family member to a traffic crash; he also clarified the reason behind the bi-weekly fatality reports. On behalf of FHWA, Richard Retting with Sam Schwartz thanked our team for hosting the Safety Performance Target Workshop. Lena Young Green thanked us for being powerful partners with the Tampa Heights Junior Civic Association and bringing folks from the FHWA Peer Exchange for Vision Zero MPO's to view the intersection mural and take a tour of the community.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Committee Appointments

B. 2020 MPO Board & Committees Meeting Calendar

Commissioner Miller requested a motion to approve the consent agenda. Commissioner Overman noticed after reviewing the calendar that there is an MPO meeting on November 4 which is the same day as the BOCC meeting, and there may be a conflict with the June public hearing. Ms. Alden stated we are working from a draft so we may not have the final meeting calendar from the BOCC, but we'll coordinate and adjust.

A motion was made by Commissioner Kemp and was seconded by Councilman Maniscalco. It was approved unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS

A. 2020 MPO Board Officers & Committee Representatives
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Cameron Clark, MPO Attorney, listed the officer positions and committee appointments. He asked for nominations for MPO Chair. Commissioner Smith nominated Commissioner Kemp. Mr. Waggoner nominated Commissioner Miller. There were no other nominations. In order of nominations, Mr. Clark asked for a show of hands for Commissioner Kemp. There were five votes out of thirteen members present. He asked for a show of hands for Commissioner Miller. There were eight votes out of thirteen members present. Commissioner Miller was elected chair. Mr. Clark asked for nominations for vice chair. Commissioner Smith nominated Commissioner Kemp. There were no other nominations, therefore Commissioner Kemp will serve as vice chair.

Next is the MPO Policy Committee, which is a five-member committee with two alternates. Presently, the members are Commissioner Kemp, Commissioner Smith, Councilman Maniscalco, School Board member Cindy Stuart, THEA Director Joe Waggoner, and the alternates are Port Director Paul Anderson and Commissioner Overman. He asked if they would like to continue membership or if there were any changes. Mr. Clark confirmed that current membership is maintained. TMA Leadership Group members currently are Commissioner Overman, Commissioner Kemp, Councilman Viera and alternates are Paul Anderson and Joe Lopano. No changes were desired, so they maintained current membership. Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board (TDCB) current chair is Councilman Viera. Ms. Alden conveyed that Councilman Viera was not present due to illness but he expressed interest to continue as TDCB chair. Livable Roadways Committee Chair was Mr. Green, who is no longer the Planning Commission’s representative on the MPO board, so this will require a new appointment. With Mr. Maurino’s consent, Commissioner Miller appointed Michael Maurino. Finally, the representative on the Florida MPO Advisory Council, per the by-laws, is the MPO Chair; the person currently serving as the alternate is Mr. Anderson. There were no changes.

B. Roll-Call Vote for UPWP and TIP Amendments Approved by Committees

Vishaka Raman, MPO staff, presented an amendment to the FY 2019-20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). This is a two-year work program effective July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2020. It outlines major planning tasks, complies with federal and state rules, documents federal and state funding and coordinates federally funded planning tasks performed by the MPO, HART and FDOT. The amendment also appears in the FY 2019-20 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP is an annual work program effective October 1, 2019 to September 30, 2020 that identifies, prioritizes and allocates anticipated local, state and federal funding to transportation projects by phase and year, over the next five years. The amendment adjusts the FY20 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant budget and contract to match the actual grant award; and adds $500,000 in County funds to Task 2 of the UPWP to perform safety retrofit feasibility studies on eight high-crash corridors identified in the Vision Zero Action Plan.

Mr. Mechanik moved for approval and was seconded by Mr. Maurino. Upon roll-call vote, the motion was approved thirteen to zero.

C. Process for Updating TIP Priorities and Letter to Local Agencies

Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, presented an overview of the TIP priority-setting process and the development of the TIP. The TIP can be confusing because there are always three, and sometimes four, transportation improvement programs that are in existence or being developed. In June, we adopt a new TIP, but the TIP from the previous year is still in effect through September 30th. The new TIP goes into effect October 1. It includes five years of funding, and priorities for what to fund next. Simultaneously, the TIP to be adopted next June is also being developed, and the MPO staff is working on updating the priority list for projects to be funded in the following year’s TIP. Ms. McKinley briefly explained how the projects on the priority list get funded. FDOT administers many categories of funding, as described in the FDOT Office of Policy Planning Revenue Forecast for MPO 2045 Plans.
There was discussion about whether the local government/agency’s governing board would need to take action prior to the transmittal of priority requests to the MPO; and also if the Policy Committee and MPO board should hold a workshop to discuss the priority requests that are received from local governments/agencies. There was a question if there should be a stand-alone list of MPO priorities for FDOT SIS, FDOT Other Arterials and FL New Starts funding, to highlight the importance of the major capacity projects that are typically funded through these programs.

Commissioner Miller asked whether Ms. McKinley is stating that the MPO will approve the priorities before they are given to the jurisdictions. Commissioner Overman had questions about the process of the priority-setting. Commissioner Smith clarified, we are here to approve the letter that states they will ensure the projects brought to the TIP meeting will go through the local government’s legislative body or staff. Commissioner Miller does not think we should be intruding on the local government, asking the cities’ staff, legislative body or even the mayor to do it. Mayor Jurado commended the joint workshop with the jurisdictions. Mayor Jurado is a firm supporter of home rule. Cameron Clark clarified that the MPO staff does not mandate how the member agencies submit projects. Mr. Waggoner clarified the bullet points and agreed this was a good process. Mayor Lott stated his staff is already following this process and this is not a policy change. Commissioner Kemp appreciated the clarification of the process. Commissioner Overman stated these are only discussion questions and this is a process that will provide value before we end up in a public hearing. She recommends a pre-TIP workshop to discuss the projects and what is important to them. Mr. Klug proposed the wording of the letter be changed, to “suggest” not mandate. Mayor Lott agreed there should be a lot more discussion from the board before the TIP priority approval process, so there are no surprises at the hearing. Councilman Maniscalco pointed out they are becoming more efficient. Mr. Waggoner stated that the order of the bullets is the order in which they prepare things for a group discussion, and it should be the whole board not just the policy committee holding a workshop on the proposed priorities. Commissioner Overman asked if she should make a motion to propose a workshop. Ms. Alden confirmed there is a workshop proposed on the 2020 calendar for March 24, 2020.

Commissioner Miller sought a motion to approve the letter. Commissioner Kemp moved to approve the letter with the Mr. Klug’s wording change, “to suggest” that the projects be submitted instead of “to ask” that the projects be submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Smith.

Mr. Maurino questioned if the letter only goes to the Cities; it does not, it is to be sent to all the governments and agencies which request TIP priorities. Ms. Scherberger does not support the letter because they are asking for another layer of discussion and decision-making at the local governments/agencies.

Mr. Waggoner suggested to change the wording of “legislative body” to “governing body.”

Commissioner Miller sought an Amendment to the Motion to change the wording from “legislative body” to “governing body”. Mr. Waggoner so moved, seconded by Commissioner Overman. The Amendment to the Motion was unanimously adopted.

Commissioner Miller returned to the original motion, now as amended. The motion carried twelve to one. Ms. Scherberger opposed the motion.

STATUS REPORT

A. Managed Lanes: Five Case Studies

Anna Quinones, THEA, introduced Rick Gobeille who works for Stantec and will be giving the overview regarding Managed Lanes. Ms. Quinones suggested to have a workshop on managed lanes since this will be a short overview. Mr. Gobeille explained managed lanes are designed to promote mobility and access and to be used as a pricing tool. The goal of a managed lane can be to maximize mobility, to optimize
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revenue, or somewhere in between. The characteristics of mobility maximization are travel time reliability, publicly operated, and mobility is the primary goal; whereas lanes with the goal of revenue optimization are usually privately operated and revenue focused yet do improve travel time reliability. Somewhere in between these two goals, you have managed lanes with a balance of mobility and revenue and reasonable tolls.

Commissioner Overman recognizes that managed lanes do have value in some circumstances but would like to know where in our process can we find the best modality for the expressway, and if it is the managed lane process. Mr. Waggoner responded it is typically in the PD&E process. FDOT District Secretary Gwynn stated the FDOT policy is no longer to require that all new expressway lanes be tolled; instead, FDOT will put the appropriate lanes in the appropriate environment. Commissioner Kemp commented that it would be valuable to hear case studies. Mr. Waggoner expressed there are great opportunities with managed lanes and a workshop would be beneficial. Commissioner Smith expressed that not everyone can afford to pay the toll for managed lanes, and there is not necessarily much of a difference in speed. Secretary Gwynn clarified FDOT would not build a managed lane unless it was beneficial. There was agreement to schedule a longer workshop on the topic of managed lanes, to learn more.

B. MPO Chairs’ Coordinating Committee (CCC) Interlocal Agreement: Updates

Beth Alden, MPO Director, stated this agreement is between six MPO’s in West Central Florida for regional transportation planning and coordination. The proposal is to make two major changes to the agreement. The first one is to incorporate the Tri-county Tampa Bay TMA Leadership Group under the auspices of the six MPO’s, so this formalizes the status of the TMA Leadership Group and makes it a part of the overall regional transportation planning and coordination agreement. The other major change has to do with the MPOs’ relationship with TBARTA. The legislature has changed the role and geographic area of TBARTA. TBARTA has narrowed in its geographic area, and now focuses only on public transit, so the proposal is that we come back to this agreement among the six MPO’s to take the lead on multimodal transportation planning in West Central Florida, and re-establish that role. Any expenses for the CCC will be shared among the MPOs, and approved by the MPO Boards in their Unified Planning Work Programs. The proposed changes to the agreement will be brought to the CCC for review at its December 13 meeting, and after that, will be brought back to this board for approval. There were no questions or comments from the board members to be brought to the December 13th CCC meeting.

C. Safe Routes National Conference Highlights

Lisa Silva, MPO Staff, presented the highlights for the Safe Routes National Conference. The MPO hosted the three-day conference that was nearly sold out with 425 attendees. There were 184 proposals for 26 sessions and 4 were from our MPO. There were 110 Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit attendees, for the regional summit that occurred directly after the national conference. In addition, the MPO hosted the State Safety Engineers Meeting on November 12, a FHWA Safety Target Setting Workshop November 13-14, the 2019 Vision Zero Walk of Silence on November 15, and the FHWA National Vision Zero MPOs Peer Exchange November 20-21.

Commissioner Overman commented on the slide from Jeff Speck that asks, why are we building schools on major arterials? Ms. Overman stated until our local jurisdictions incorporate in our land use specifications that building local schools on major arterials is bad idea due to safety of our children this problem will never change.

Executive Director’s Report

A. Independent Oversight Committee (IOC)
On November 21st the IOC for the transportation sales tax did certify that all of the project plans for the local governments’ use of sales tax funding in the upcoming calendar year are in compliance with applicable law. Therefore once the supreme court makes their decision we can get going, without any further delay, with the much-needed transportation improvements.

B. I-275 North Alternatives Study Next Steps

This is the feasibility study that was included in the MPO Unified Planning Work Program this past year to look at the feasibility and concept of the Boulevard north of Downtown Tampa in the I-275 corridor. There is a snag in the scope from the current consultant, with the cost of the study being more than we have in our budget this fiscal year. We would potentially like to talk to other consultants that do this type of work. Ms. Alden proposed that the MPO postpone the I-275 North Alternatives Study into the next fiscal year to give the opportunity to speak to other consultants. There was no objection.

C. Process for 2020 Procurement of MPO General Planning Consultants

The MPO’s General Planning Consultant contracts generally last for five years. The MPO typically goes through a procurement process immediately after adopting our Long Range Transportation Plan. An advertisement will be run in January, and there will be a multi-agency interview panel for the consultant selection. This team will make a recommendation back to the board in May. In the summer, staff will negotiate the contracts for approval by the board in August.

D. Vision Zero Quarterly Report

The Vision Zero Quarterly Report is in the agenda packet for review.

OLD & NEW BUSINESS

There was no old or new business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.
Committee Reports

Joint Meeting of the Citizens & Technical Advisory Committees on December 16

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

- Tampa Hillsborough Greenways and Trails Plan Update

Members supported trails serving bicyclists and walkers in Wimauma and were concerned with how people were going to be able to safely access the trail on the new Gandy Bridge.

They also heard status reports on:

- Agency Project Plans for 2020 for Transportation Surtax: CAC members wanted to know how intelligent transportation management systems proposed by different jurisdictions and agencies were being coordinated. Also, concern was expressed about the safety and lighting at transit stops. Members were interested in the next steps for the IOC and project plans submitted by local governments. Discussion ensued about the close coordination on projects of mutual interest between the County and City.

- Fletcher Avenue Complete Street, Before & After: members complimented the County for a successful project with a high return on investment. They were impressed especially with LED lighting to see pedestrians when crossing the road. Members had lots of questions:
  - Would more such before and after studies be conducted?
  - Were drivers getting accustomed to the flashing beacons installed and yielding for pedestrians at mid-block crossings?
  - Would protected bike lanes be better and perhaps encourage use instead of riding on the sidewalk by cyclists?

- Government in the Sunshine State and Public Records Refresher: members discussed what constitutes topics that a committee might take action on in the future; what members can post on social media; and how discussions can take place between members.

- Robert's Rule of Order

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on December 11

The BPAC heard status reports on:

- Agency Project Plans for 2020 for Transportation Surtax
- Fletcher Avenue Complete Street – Before & After
- Government in the Sunshine State and Public Records Refresher
- Robert's Rules of Order, the handbook of procedure for creating and action on motions
Meeting of the Livable Roadways Advisory Committee (LRC) on December 18

The LRC approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ Tampa-Hillsborough Greenways and Trail Plan Update

The LRC heard status reports on:

- Smart Cities Alliance
- Fletcher Avenue Complete Street Before & After
- Overview of Agency Project Plans for 2020 for Transportation Surtax
- Government in the Sunshine State and Public Records Refresher

Meeting of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board (TDCB), Dec. 13

The TDCB elected its officers for 2020, reelecting Gloria Mills as Vice Chair and Craig Forsell as Member At Large.

Transportation Disadvantaged Legislative Awareness Day will be held on February 11, 2020 in Tallahassee. This is an opportunity to show support for the Transportation Disadvantaged Program. The TDCB’s annual Legislative Message is included in the MPO Board’s packet today.

The Board approved continued coordination contracts with Quality of Life Inc., McClain and Northside. The Board learned that one major challenge for these contractors is that Medicaid does not uniformly provide trips for medical services.

The Board also learned that the Sunshine Line’s new Saturday service is up to 40 trips each weekend.

Meeting of the MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee (CCC) on December 13

At their biannual meeting, the CCC approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ Regional Transportation Priorities Update
✓ 2020 TBARTA MPOs CCC Fifth Restated Interlocal Agreement for Regional Transportation Planning and Coordination in West Central Florida
✓ 2020 CCC Interlocal Agreement and Operating Procedures

The CCC heard status reports on:

- Florida Transportation Plan
- Regional Transit Development Plan
- Tampa Bay TMA Leadership Group Update
Dear Property Owner and/or Interested Citizen:

You are invited to attend and participate in the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District Seven public hearing regarding the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study for I-275 (SR 93) from the Howard Frankland Bridge to north of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (SR 574) and i-4 (SR 460) from I-275 (SR 93) to east of 50th Street (US 41) in Hillsborough County, Florida. This project is known as the Tampa Interstate Study (TIS) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS).

The TIS SEIS is being developed to evaluate a range of improvements for the I-275 corridor, including environmental, social, economic, cultural, and environmental effects of the proposed project. The hearing will cover TIS Segments 1A, 2A, 2B, 3A, and 3B (also referred to as Tampa Bay Next Sections 4, 5, and 6) as displayed on the map below. As a result of the comprehensive planning process, the FDOT has determined that the I-275 corridor connects these two areas.

FDOT has determined that the project is needed and is consistent with the state’s transportation plan. The project will improve safety and mobility for all users of the corridor, which includes drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists. It will also provide opportunities for economic development and support local communities.

FDOT encourages you to attend the public hearing, as your input is important in shaping the project. The hearing will allow you the opportunity to ask questions and have concerns addressed.

The hearing will begin at 6:00 p.m. and will provide the opportunity for oral public comments. A court reporter will be available to receive comments in a one-on-one setting before and after the formal portion of the hearing. You may submit written comments at the hearing, mail your written comments to the address pre-printed on the back of the enclosed comment form (also provided online at www.tampainterstatestudy.com), or on the project website. All comments must be postmarked or emailed by Thursday, March 12, 2020 to become part of the official public hearing record.

The hearing will be conducted in English and Spanish. Spanish interpretation services can be provided. If you require translation service (free of charge) should contact Alex Henry, Public Involvement Coordinator, at (813) 975-6405 or alex.henry@dot.state.fl.us.

For more information on this study, please visit the project website at www.tampainterstatestudy.com.

Sincerely,

FDOT welcomes and appreciates everyone’s participation. If you have questions about the project or the hearing, please contact Alice Price, AICP, PD&E Project Manager, at (813) 975-0452 or D7-TIS@dot.state.fl.us. You may also visit the project website at www.tampainterstatestudy.com.

Kirk Bolgen, P.E.
Environmental Management Engineer
Study Purpose

A PD&E Study is a comprehensive evaluation of social, cultural, economic, and environmental effects associated with proposed transportation improvements. The objective of this PD&E Study is to assist the FDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in deciding the type, location, and conceptual design of the proposed improvements for the Westshore Area Interchange, the Downtown Tampa Interchange, and the I-275 from Howard Frankland Bridge. The study satisfies all applicable requirements, including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), for this project to qualify for federal-aid funding of subsequent development phases (right of way, design, and construction).

The purpose of the Tampa Interstate Study (TIS) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) is to upgrade the safety and efficiency of the existing I-275 and I-4 corridors that service the Tampa Bay region while maintaining access to the surrounding community. The project also intends to provide congestion relief that improves accessibility, travel times, system linkages, and multimodal connections, while supporting regional economic development goals and enhancing the quality of life for residents and visitors.

Project History

The Tampa Bay region interstate system was originally constructed in the early 1960s. In 1983, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

In 1983, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

In 1983, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

In 1987, FDOT began Phase I of the TIS Master Plan Report. The purpose of the Phase I study was to produce a Master Plan to identify alternatives and make recommendations regarding the preferred type and location of multi-lane improvements, potential HOV facilities, transit facilities, traffic management techniques, and traffic surveillance and control systems. FDOT published the TIS Master Plan Report, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approved the Plan in 1989.

Following completion of the TIS Master Plan Report, FHWA, in cooperation with FDOT, began the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in 1991 and the supporting documentation necessary for state and federal approvals and subsequent funding of the TIS Master Plan Report concepts. The EIS evaluated impacts associated with various alternatives, addressed agency and citizen concerns, and identified ways to minimize impacts.

FHWA approved the TIS Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in November 1996, issued the Record of Decision (ROD) in 1997, and an amended ROD in June 1999. The 1997 and the 1999 RODs are the documents that have governed the development of all improvements to I-275 and I-4 and provide a roadway system that includes general use lanes, separated express lanes in each direction, as well as a future transit corridor. The intent of the FHWA and FDOT has been to construct the 1996 TIS FEIS Long-Term Preferred Alternative as funding becomes available. Since issuance of the 1997 ROD and the amended 1999 ROD, FDOT has taken several major steps to advance the project to full implementation. The TIS has been re-evaluated several times to advance various elements of the project, many of which have been completed, including portions of TIS Segments 1A, 2A, 3A, 3B, and 3C (see map).

In 2012, with the release of the Florida Transportation Vision for the 21st Century, FDOT initiated a master plan study which included the TIS limits to determine the feasibility of dynamically tolling the express lanes on the interstate system as the 1996 TIS FEIS did not consider tolling. The purpose of the Phase I study was to produce a Master Plan to identify alternatives and make recommendations regarding the preferred type and location of multi-lane improvements, potential HOV facilities, transit facilities, traffic management techniques, and traffic surveillance and control systems. FDOT published the TIS Master Plan Report, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approved the Plan in 1989.

In 2013, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

In 2013, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

In 2013, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

In 2013, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

In 2013, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

In 2013, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

In 2013, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

Right-Of-Way Procedure

When a transportation project proposes the acquisition of private property, you may have questions and concerns. To better educate and inform you about the right-of-way acquisition process and your rights, the FDOT has created real estate acquisition and relocation informational brochures. These brochures and other education materials will be available during the public hearing. Copies of the brochures are available on our website at: https://www.fdot.gov/rightofway/documents.shtm. We would like to hear your concerns and answer your questions. We also encourage you to speak with the FDOT Right-of-Way Representative at your convenience either at the hearing or at 800-226-7220.

Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix compares the potential social, economic, cultural, and environmental effects of the No Further Action Alternative and the Locally Preferred Alternative.

Project Phase

FDOT Tentative Five-Year Work Program (FY 2020/2021 - FY 2024/2025)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>No Further Action</th>
<th>Locally Preferred Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Construction</td>
<td>Not Currently Funded</td>
<td>Not Currently Funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding

FDOT Tentative Five-Year Work Program (FY 2020/2021 - FY 2024/2025)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>No Further Action</th>
<th>Locally Preferred Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Construction</td>
<td>Not Currently Funded</td>
<td>Not Currently Funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project History

The Tampa Bay region interstate system was originally constructed in the early 1960s. In 1983, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

In 1983, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

In 1983, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

In 1983, FDOT began to identify potential improvements to the Tampa Interstate System, which was originally constructed in the early 1960s. These improvements included potential short-term safety solutions, design changes, and long-term high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) related improvements to accommodate growing traffic volumes and address congestion. The 1983 study considered all transportation needs within the study area, including concurrent highway, rail, and transit improvements.

Right-Of-Way Procedure

When a transportation project proposes the acquisition of private property, you may have questions and concerns. To better educate and inform you about the right-of-way acquisition process and your rights, the FDOT has created real estate acquisition and relocation informational brochures. These brochures and other education materials will be available during the public hearing. Copies of the brochures are available on our website at: https://www.fdot.gov/rightofway/documents.shtm. We would like to hear your concerns and answer your questions. We also encourage you to speak with the FDOT Right-of-Way Representative at your convenience either at the hearing or at 800-226-7220.

Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix compares the potential social, economic, cultural, and environmental effects of the No Further Action Alternative and the Locally Preferred Alternative.

Right-Of-Way Procedure

When a transportation project proposes the acquisition of private property, you may have questions and concerns. To better educate and inform you about the right-of-way acquisition process and your rights, the FDOT has created real estate acquisition and relocation informational brochures. These brochures and other education materials will be available during the public hearing. Copies of the brochures are available on our website at: https://www.fdot.gov/rightofway/documents.shtm. We would like to hear your concerns and answer your questions. We also encourage you to speak with the FDOT Right-of-Way Representative at your convenience either at the hearing or at 800-226-7220.
Alternatives

Since the TIS SEIS kicked off, FDOT engaged with numerous neighborhoods, coordinated with local agencies, participated in community events, and held Community Working Groups within and outside of the SEIS study area. FDOT also hosted public workshops in October 2017 and May 2019 and had a Public Involvement Office in Ybor City. These outreach activities have presented opportunities for the public to learn more about the project and provide feedback on proposed alternatives and design options. Following the evaluation of potential effects of proposed alternatives and input from the community and stakeholders, a Locally Preferred Alternative has been identified and recommended to the FHWA for approval. The No Further Action Alternative will continue to remain a viable alternative throughout the PD&E Study process. Descriptions of these alternatives are provided below.

No Further Action Alternative

The No Further Action Alternative is defined as the existing transportation system plus the improvements approved in the 1997 and 1999 RODs. These improvements include the construction of the general use lanes (outer roadways) and associated ramps within the I-275/SR 60 Interchange (Westshore Area Interchange) in TIS Segment 1A, which were approved under the 1997 ROD. Within the TIS SEIS study area, all other improvements approved in the 1997 and 1999 RODs have already been built.

Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)

The LPA includes the following specific proposed improvements.

**TIS Segments 1A and 2A** – The full reconstruction of the Westshore Area Interchange would include three general purpose lanes and two new tolled express lanes in each direction, connecting the Howard Frankland Bridge and Westshore area to Downtown Tampa along I-275. The tolled express lanes would be constructed to the inside of the roadway. A transit corridor in the median would be preserved to accommodate future transit.

The tolled express lanes would also provide direct connections from I-275 to the Veterans Expressway, Independence Parkway, Courtney Campbell Causeway, Tampa International Airport via the I-275/SR 60 Interchange, Reo Street, and Himes Avenue. Himes Avenue would be an express lanes interchange with direct express lane ramps constructed to the south side, providing drivers from northbound I-275 access to Himes Avenue and drivers on Himes Avenue access to southbound I-275.

Local street improvements to enhance mobility would include the reconnection of Reo Street, Occident Street, and Trask Street under I-275 providing additional north-south connectivity. A new on-ramp from Reo Street to southbound I-275 would provide direct express lane access. A diverging diamond interchange at Reo Street will provide new connections between Kennedy Boulevard and Cypress Street.

**TIS Segments 2B and 3A** – Improvements to TIS Segment 2B include tolled express lanes that are a continuation from the Westshore area (TIS Segments 1A and 2A). Tolled express lanes would extend to Ashley Drive/Tampa Street via direct connect ramps, providing drivers direct access from northbound I-275 to Downtown Tampa via Ashley Drive only and to southbound I-275 from Downtown Tampa via Tampa Street and Ashley Drive. Improvements in this segment would also enhance safety and traffic operations within the I-275/I-4 interchange by addressing the existing bottlenecks that occur. Improvements do not include tolled express lanes. In addition, access to Floribraska Avenue would be maintained. No interstate access at North Boulevard is proposed.
Additional details are below:

- **Southbound I-275 to Eastbound I-4** – The southbound I-275 to eastbound I-4 improvements would include widening the existing one lane flyover ramp to two lanes. Access to the local community would be provided via the existing exit ramp to Floribraska Avenue and a relocated ramp to 14th/15th Streets from 21st/22nd Streets, for both northbound and southbound traffic on I-275. This new exit location would allow drivers access from I-275 meaning they will not need to merge onto I-4 to exit to Ybor City and East Tampa. Access to 21st/22nd Streets will be maintained from the relocated 14th/15th Street exits via E13th Avenue (frontage road), which will be widened to two lanes towards the inside.

- **Westbound I-4 to Northbound I-275** – The westbound I-4 to northbound I-275 improvements would include widening the existing one lane exit to northbound I-275 to two lanes. Additional merge lanes on northbound I-275 would be provided and the existing one lane exit ramp to Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Boulevard would be widened to two lanes.

- **Westbound I-4 to Southbound I-275** – The westbound I-4 to southbound I-275 improvements would include widening the southbound I-275 ramp from two lanes to three lanes through the interchange. The three lanes would join the two lanes from southbound I-275 to provide five lanes for traffic to combine onto southbound I-275 before merging back to the existing four lanes at Jefferson Street. The exit to downtown would be relocated to improve the spacing of decision points between the split between northbound and southbound I-275 and the exit to downtown. Shoulders would be widened on southbound I-275 between Palm Avenue and Jefferson Street to improve safety.

**TIS Segment 3B** – There are no improvements proposed within TIS Segment 3B as part of the LPA.
Comments may be provided the following ways: mail comments to the address on the back of this form, complete the form at one of the hearing sessions and place in the “Comments” box, email comments to D7-TIS@dot.state.fl.us, or visit the website at www.tampainterstatestudy.com.

Comments must be submitted or postmarked by March 12, 2020 to become part of the official public hearing record.

Name (Print): ____________________________________________

Address: _______________________________________________

City, State, Zip: __________________________________________

Email: __________________________________________________

☐ Please add me to the study notification list.

Public Hearing Session 1
Tuesday, February 25, 2020
Hillsborough Community College
Dale Mabry Campus
Student Services Building
4001 W Tampa Bay Boulevard
Tampa, FL 33614

Public Hearing Session 2
Thursday, February 27, 2020
Port Tampa Bay Cruise Terminal #6
1331 McKay Street
Tampa, FL 33602

Note: This is a public record. Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, or family status.

Comuníquese con nosotros: Nos importa mucho la opinión del público sobre el proyecto. Si tiene preguntas o comentarios, o simplemente desea más información, por favor comuníquese con nosotros. Nuestro representante en español es: Manuel Flores (813) 975-4248 o manuel.flores@dot.state.fl.us.
The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) concluded the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Studies on I-275 from I-4 to north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (SR 574) and from north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard to north of Bearss Avenue (SR 678/CR 582). Both projects are in Hillsborough County, Florida.

The PD&E studies evaluated potential social, cultural, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed transportation improvement. FDOT worked with federal, state, and local agencies to determine the effects the projects may have on the natural and human environment. This analysis, with public input, determined the location and future design of the proposed improvements.

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for these projects are being, or have been, carried out by FDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. §327 and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated December 14, 2016 and executed by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and FDOT.

On October 22, 2019, FDOT granted Location and Design Concept Acceptance (LDCA) for the Type II Categorical Exclusion for I-275 from north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard to north of Bearss Avenue. The proposed improvements add one general purpose lane in each direction and provide transit accommodations on the inside shoulders, and operational improvements at the Hillsborough Avenue interchange. The Bearss Avenue interchange bridge will be replaced and entrance and exit ramps improved.

On October 8, 2019, FDOT approved the environmental document for operational improvements on I-275 from I-4 to north of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Boulevard in which one dedicated auxiliary lane will be added in each direction.

Contact Information
If you wish to discuss any issues related to the completed environmental phase of this project, please contact:

Ashley Henzel, P.E.
Senior Project Manager | FDOT District Seven
11201 N. McKinley Drive, MS 7-500 | (813) 975-6433
ashley.henzel@dot.state.fl.us

For issues related to final design of this project, please contact:

Mary Lou Godfrey, P.E.
Senior Project Manager | FDOT District Seven
11201 N. McKinley Drive, MS 7-500 | (813) 975-6621
marylou.godfrey@dot.state.fl.us

For all other issues related to this project, please contact:

Kris Carson
Public Information Officer | FDOT District Seven
11201 N. McKinley Drive, MS 7-500 | (800) 226-7220
kristen.carson@dot.state.fl.us

En Español
Si usted tiene preguntas o comentarios o si simplemente desea mas información sobre este Proyecto, favor de ponerse en contacto con el señor Manuel Flores, al teléfono (813) 975-4248 o correo electrónico manuel.flores@dot.state.fl.us.

Non-Discrimination
Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who need special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation service (free of charge), please contact Alex Henry, Public Involvement Coordinator by phone (813) 975-6405 or (800) 226-7220, or by email alex.henry@dot.state.fl.us.

Right of Way Acquisition Procedure
When a transportation project proposes acquiring private property, you may have questions and concerns. To better inform you about the right of way acquisition process and your rights, FDOT created real estate acquisition and relocation informational brochures. These brochures and other education materials will be available during the public hearing. Copies of the brochures are available on our website: www.dot.state.fl.us/rightofway/Documents.shtm. We would like to hear your concerns and answer your questions. We encourage you to speak with the FDOT Project Manager or a Right of Way Representative at your convenience, by calling 1-800-226-7220.
Public Involvement

A public hearing was held Tuesday, March 26, 2019, at Seminole Heights United Methodist Church, 6111 N Central Avenue, Tampa, FL 33604. The hearing informed and allowed residents, business owners, tenants, and those interested to comment and express views concerning the location, conceptual design, and social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed project. The hearing included an open house at 5:30pm and a formal portion beginning at approximately 6:30pm. In total, 239 members of the public signed in.

Planned Improvements

The Preferred Build Alternative consists of adding one 12-foot general purpose lane in each direction on I-275 for a total of four 12-foot general purpose lanes in each direction. Improvements also include a 15-foot inside shoulder to accommodate transit, a 12-foot outside shoulder, and a 2-foot concrete barrier separating each direction of travel. The mainline I-275 improvements would be constructed within the existing right of way. Approximately 3.4 acres of right of way will be required for stormwater management facilities near the Bearss Avenue interchange.

Selected Alternative

Following the public hearing, the Preferred Build Alternative was selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) based on a determination that the No Build Alternative did not meet the purpose and need of the project to increase capacity and relieve congestion along the corridor. Adding roadway capacity will reduce future traffic congestion and improve traffic operations and safety along I-275.

The remainder of this newsletter describes the improvements for north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard to north of Bearss Avenue (shown in teal in the map above).

For more information about the projects go to: active.fdotd7studies.com/i275/mlk-to-bearss