Virtual Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee
Wednesday, April 8, 2020, at 9 AM

To view presentations and participate from your computer, tablet or smartphone, go to https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/402947589

You can also dial in using your phone: (646) 749-3112
Access Code: 402-947-589

Please mute yourself after joining the conference call to minimize background noise.

New to GoToMeeting? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts: https://global.gotomeeting.com/install/402947589

The County Center and Plan Hillsborough offices are closed to the public in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Members of the public may access this meeting and participate via the GoToMeeting link above, or by phoning in and visiting the Plan Hillsborough website for the agenda packet and presentation slides. Please mute yourself upon joining the meeting. For technical support during the meeting, please contact Michael Rempfer at (813) 273-3774 ext. 348.

I. Call to Order & Introductions

II. Chairman’s Request: per the MPO Bylaws, all speakers are asked to address only the presiding Chair for recognition; confine their remarks to the question under debate; and avoid personalities or indecorous language or behavior.

III. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please 9:05

IV. Members’ Interests 9:10

V. Approval of Minutes 9:20

VI. Action Items

A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendments (Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO staff) 9:25

B. FY 2021 & 2022 Unified Planning Work Program (Allison Yeh, MPO staff) 9:45

C. Annual certification of MPO planning process (Rich Clarendon, MPO Asst. Dir.) 10:45

VII. Status Reports

A. Plant City Fiscal Analysis (Steven Hollenkamp, CAC member) 11:00

B. Tampa Community Redevelopment Agency motion (Rick Fernandez, CAC member) 11:20

VIII. Old Business & New Business

IX. Adjournment

X. Addendum
A. MPO Meeting Summary & Committee Report

B. May 1 & 2, Grow Community Gardens Flyer

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

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

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

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

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

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.
MPO Board and Committee Members:

Below are some helpful hints to guide your remote participation in the upcoming meeting (the MPO is requesting that everyone participate remotely to minimize risk of transmitting COVID-19):

**Hints for Meeting Participants Attending Remotely:**

- You can call by telephone or follow the link provided and attend using the Go To Meeting service (link and telephone number provided below).
- If you use the telephone, you’ll need to follow along with a copy of the meeting agenda and materials sent via e-mail or made available on the PlanHillsborough website ([www.planhillsborough.org](http://www.planhillsborough.org)).
- If you use the Go To Meeting service, you will be able to view the agenda and presentation materials as they are discussed during the meeting on your screen.
- If signing onto GoToMeeting on a computer, smart phone or tablet please do not enable the video/camera function. (DO enable the microphone but keep it muted unless you are speaking).

**Getting Set-up:**

- Much like you would arrive at our offices early for a meeting, please log-in or phone in 10 to 15 minutes before the meeting start time. This will give us a chance to assist participants that are having trouble. Feel free to call us, e-mail us or text one of us if you need assistance.
- If you use your computer and telephone, please mute the sound and microphone for one of the devices to avoid feedback.
- When you are in the GoToMeeting environment, at the top of the screen is a drop down that says "Hide everyone". Enabling this will make the agenda and materials on the screen larger. You can also enlarge the screen size by moving your cursor to the right side of the screen and clicking the "+" button.

**When the meeting begins:**

- Please wait to announce your attendance until the roll is called.
- There will be an opportunity for members of the public to provide comments. Please announce yourself and adhere to the standard time limits when the Chair asks for public comments.
- During the meeting, please wait until the Chair asks for comments or questions from board members.
• When you provide comment or ask a question, please signal that you want to speak by announcing your name (this is Commissioner Smith), wait to be acknowledged and then speak.
• If an item generates multiple comments or questions, we will initiate the chat feature which allows participants to let us know they have a question or comment. The chat feature will only be activated if conversation gets busy and difficult to manage. Like lifting up your table tent, you will need to type your name into the chat box (click on the chat bubble in the upper right corner of your screen) to signal to the Chair that you’d like to speak. Be sure to send the chat message to everyone and not just the chair as it will become a part of the official record of the meeting.
I. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Bill Roberts called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

Members present: Bill Roberts, Ricardo Fernandez, Nicole Rice, Hoyt Prindle, III, Steven Hollencamp, David Bailey, Rick Richmond, Barbara Kennedy Gibson, Terrance Trott, Camilo Soto, Dayna Lazarus, Jeff Lucas, Edward Mierzejewski, Evangeline Linkous, Artie Fryer, Vivienne Handy, Christine Acosta, and David Bailey

Members excused: Sky White, Cheryl Thole, Cliff Reiss, Luciano Prida, and Amy Espinosa

Others present: Michele Ogilvie, Beth Alden, Joseph Price, Chris Cochran, Connie Rose, Melissa Zornitta, Justin Willits, Brian Pessaro, Scott Pringle, Tia Boyd, and Debbie Guest

II. Chairman’s Request: Per the MPO Bylaws, all speakers are asked to address only the presiding Chair for recognition; confine their remarks to the question under debate, and avoid personalities or indecorous language or behavior.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Connie Rose, with HART/ Human Trafficking Awareness and Public Transportation Grant, which is about creating human trafficking awareness and public safety initiative within Hillsborough County. Ms. Rose spoke about the rolling out of a new poster campaign which they initiated back in 2013, and it’s called “Get Help, Get Out, Paint the Town Blue” and gave the history of the collaboration with HART and the Junior League of Tampa in redefining “refuge” to create an initiative called “I am not for sale, I am priceless” over the years. She focused on survivors and was asking to bring in survivors for the current campaign, reasoning that the most powerful voice is a voice that has lived it. She recited a quote: "Anyone can get on a bus and take a ride. The bad guys can coerce someone into talking with them and find the next victim." Ms. Rose asked the Board to support the initiative for campaign dollars.

There was a question from Dayna Lazarus asking the name of the organization and if Ms. Rose is working on the campaign or has been asked to work on the campaign. Ms. Rose responded that the name of the organization is Victims to Survivors U.S., and she has not been asked to work on the campaign. Hoyt Prindle asked if there is a website for the organization, and Ms. Rose stated it’s in the process of being built but that they can find them everywhere. Chair Roberts asked Ms. Rose to provide her contact information to Michele.

IV. MEMBER’S INTERESTS

Steven Hollenkamp announced he’s working on a fiscal analysis for Plant City, and each member in their packet was given printed color slides. He asked that during the New Business section of today’s meeting he would like to propose a motion to support him doing the presentation at a future meeting. It would be about 15 minutes long, and he will keep the presentation about transportation, the best he can. Christine Acosta asked if he’s proposing to present this for each city, to which Mr. Hollenkamp responded no, but that he’d be happy to help anyone who would want to do this analysis in their area. Dayna Lazarus inquired if he’d go over his methodology in the presentation, to which Mr. Hollenkamp answered, “No,” basically emphasizing the long time frame and trying to focus on the simple and high level.

Ricardo Fernandez spoke about an article in the packet called "ODOT's Climate Lie: An idle theory of greenhouse gas emissions," summarizing that at public forums you’re hearing talk that cars at idle are somehow more polluting than cars that are moving through a traffic corridor and that that is justification for widening roads. The article addresses the inaccuracy of that statement. Mr. Fernandez requested that a presentation be made to the Board before they are
went over them briefly associated with HART for the current transportation Program, TIP. There was a PowerPoint presentation before this committee prior to the TIP hearing in June, maybe prior to the month they asked to have a presentation on toll policy by no means is a done deal. The bill, as it stands now, would just require that there be a traffic study by a professional engineer before they get the most recent and bring it to a future agenda.

Chair Roberts asked Michele to make a note to bring that to an agenda before they meet.

Ricardo Fernandez passed out a partial transcript of a Tampa City Council meeting, sitting as the CRA Board on February 13th of this year, where he made a motion that we support the action of the CRA Board in opposing express toll lanes through the City of Tampa on the Expressway. Luis Viera also made a motion about supporting CSX and supporting transit initiatives, from the City Council’s perspective at least, sending a resolution to the MPO letting them know the City was on board. Mr. Fernandez intends to make a motion on this during New Business, asking that the Board support the actions of the CRA and add that recommendation to the MPO.

Hoyt Prindle brought forward two things: One, he pointed out an article in the packet from the Washington Post about tolls on Interstate 66 in Northern Virginia, in the D.C. area. He had touched on this briefly during the last meeting but wanted to provide a little more detail, summarizing in order for the express toll lanes to truly function from an economic perspective, supply and demand, they have to be free-flowing; and, two, he touched on Addendum C regarding traffic and pedestrian safety, dealing with beacons, and said that there's a bill in the Florida legislature that would require the beacons to be changed from yellow to red. Red is not approved federally, so there could be a loss of federal funding. The bill also states that regarding all roads at 35 miles or higher, the beacon would be removed if not switched to a red flashing beacon. Chair Roberts tagged on letting the Board know the MPO did vote to endorse the letter going to the legislature opposing the imposition of the red flashing beacons as opposed to yellow.

Camilo Soto had a comment for public interest, bringing to the attention that tomorrow is the “Bike to Downtown in Tampa” event. Christine Acosta let the Board know she's one of the ride leaders for this event and gave a rundown of meet-ups and the agenda. She also questioned if the Board saw the mind-blowing roadway speed study results and wants to make sure they are up-to-date with it, to which Chair Roberts stated they have some information on it and will look to see that they get the most recent and bring it to a future agenda.

Beth Alden brought forward an update on the rapid flashing beacon bill, that Representative Toledo did file an amendment. The bill, as it stands now, would just require that there be a traffic study by a professional engineer before installing rapid flashing beacons, basically kind of buying time, and there was a concern from governments all over the state about the removal of these beacons which have a tremendous track record of safety. She also mentioned that the toll policy by no means is a done deal here and announced a workshop that will bring in speakers who will give a presentation on tolls and wanted to put that out there for the Board to be aware that this is an ongoing dialogue. Ricardo Fernandez asked if the workshop scheduled is before the TIP hearing. Beth Alden stated it is currently scheduled for the 19th of June and the fact that this happens after the TIP hearing is not going to affect their ability to be part of the toll-setting process. Chair Roberts thanked Ms. Alden and reminded the committee members that last month they asked to have a presentation on tolls, variable tolls, and express lanes. They’re counting on having that presentation before this committee prior to the TIP hearing in June, maybe prior to the TIP workshop in May.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

After a correction to the minutes by Ricardo Fernandez that under Member's Interests, "sitting for the CRA support the vote" should read "sitting as the CRA board support the vote," the Chair sought a motion to approve the February 19th, 2020 minutes. Ricardo Fernandez so moved, and the motion carried unanimously. Chair Roberts and Ricardo Fernandez both commended the staff on the detailed minutes.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

A. HART Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

Joseph Price, Hillsborough MPO, reviewed the proposed amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program, TIP. There was a PowerPoint presentation of the proposed amendments. There are four amendments associated with HART for the current transportation improvement program, Amendments 12 through 15, and Mr. Price went over them briefly. Amendment 12, a new project added, Human Trafficking Innovations In Transit Public Safety
Grant Project; Amendment 13, another new project added to the work program to the TIP, Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Grant Project; Amendment 14, an existing project update, HART Compressed National Gas Duplex Compressor Project; and Amendment 15, a project currently in the TIP, Surface Transportation: Bus Replacements. All are HART projects. There was a brief explanation of each project and their costs.

Camilo Soto noticed on the human trafficking item in the TIP, in the top right-hand corner, it says "For our partners." He asked for an explanation of how the process goes. He questioned if they do get this grant money, how will they reach out to organizations in an effort to implement and focus this money that they do get, and will there be an opportunity to work with organizations like Victims and Survivors and other local organizations. Chris Cochran, Director of Service Development at HART, answered Mr. Soto's questions, stating this grant came through their Marketing and Communications Department and that absolutely this will be a community-wide effort that will involve partnerships. He is unsure of the plan right now, but the intention is to begin partnering with community stakeholders throughout the County, and he gave some examples. Mr. Soto followed up with would it be safe to presume or even assume that maybe a request for proposals will be put out in the public so that organizations have an opportunity to collaborate and that way there is some local outreach. Mr. Cochran did not have that level of detail but will ask the Chief of Communications to come update the Board on how that goes. Chair Roberts then asked if this funding is intended primarily for HART and HART employees or is it a community-wide effort, to which Mr. Cochran responded it's definitely a community-wide public awareness campaign. Nicole Rice asked if they would be coordinating with the Hillsborough County Sheriff's and TPD, and Mr. Cochran assured her they would be major stakeholders in something like this.

Ricardo Fernandez went over the newly-formed Human Trafficking Task Force Commission and suggested there be some sort of coordination between HART and the commission on this. Mr. Cochran opined that was a good suggestion and will definitely take that back with him, although he didn't want to speak on behalf of the Chief of Communications. Mr. Fernandez questioned who Mr. Cochran had made reference to as someone at HART who was developing the plan, and Mr. Cochran stated it's Jacqueline Haldow. Mr. Fernandez asked if somebody was interested in being considered as a trainer or being otherwise involved in this program, would it be appropriate for that individual to reach out to Jacqueline now, to which Mr. Cochran said it would.

Dayna Lazarus stated she prepared something related to CNG buses and emphasized her desire to have survivors and people on the front lines involved in the messaging and part of the program and her reasons for this. Also, Dayna Lazarus did research on electric buses because, according to the 2018 IPCC Special Report, they only have until 2030 to cut our emissions by 45 percent as an earth. She discussed electric buses and how she wants to keep them on the radar with HART's constraints. Also, she found that HART makes a fantastic candidate for these electric buses that run on batteries because Tampa is flat in elevation, which is good for the batteries. As well, we seldom have freezing cold weather here, which is also a drain on battery life. She then presented a research sheet.

Nicole Rice questioned approving Amendment 12 without all of the facts, including not knowing the partners; and if the money is allocated, how the money is going to be utilized by HART. She asked to make a motion on this action item to approve the other three amendments pending more information in regards to the partners on Amendment 12. Chair Roberts answered that this is a TIP amendment that is the result of an application for a grant that HART applied for and received and suspects the grant application has much more detail than has been heard today. Mr. Cochran replied there's certainly a scope within the application that they are held to. It would be difficult to assign any conditions to the funding that is not directly associated with the scopes of intention of the funding for which FTA grants them and cannot go outside of the scopes. It is a public awareness campaign, and there's no problem having Ms. Haldow come back and do a more detailed presentation the next month. Chair Roberts welcomed that as an alternative to amending the motion to TIP and asked that the Board see the grant application to get more information about the detail and then visit it at the next meeting.

Mr. Soto asked if the Board doesn't vote on Amendment 12 today, would there be a timing issue because grants are time-sensitive. Mr. Cochran answered yes, without it being in there, they can't get that funding from FTA, and asked the Board to consider recommending getting the funding, with the understanding they're coming back to give a better understanding of what the intention of the scope of the program is, but the scope is what it is. Chair Roberts reminded the committee that their actions are a recommendation to the MPO Board only.

Ricardo Fernandez is inclined to make a motion to support this, but it would be imperative there be some recommendation out of this group that survivors be included as part of the training team and have a voice in the
development of the program. He asked, “Would there be anything about a motion of that sort, as you sit there today, that would derail what it is you are trying to accomplish today?” Mr. Cochran again stated he would be inclined to say no, that he cannot imagine that they would be against having survivors included in developing a public awareness campaign. He doesn't know who would be better to speak. Chair Roberts again welcomed a presentation from someone from HART at a subsequent meeting.

Dayna Lazarus asked that since they are a recommending body, maybe they could vote to approve it with an amendment as a recommendation that HART explicitly will let survivors lead on the messaging and work with survivors, and that they continue to look at electric buses as an option over CNG buses.

Mr. Roberts sought a motion to approve the TIP with the two additional comments as part of the recommendation. Hoyt Prindle so moved, it was seconded by Van Linkous, and the motion carried unanimously.

VII. STATUS REPORTS

A. Land Use & Transportation Coordination

Melissa Zornitta, Planning Commission Executive Director, presented growth trends and projections, some recent BOCC policy direction, Wimauma and RB-2 land use studies, and gave a brief detail, first talking about growth and population and how the infrastructure is not keeping up with the growth. She presented slides prepared for the County, looking at the urban service area, where the County is focusing on growth and focusing on things like water and sewer service. The projected growth for 2045 is just over 2 million people, which is from the Bureau of Economic Business Research projection, and the plans should accommodate at least ten years' worth of growth. The projections are used to understand where and how the community might grow, to plan for infrastructure, a long-range transportation plan, a school facilities plan, facility plans for things like fire stations, and look to see if the trends are taking them in line with each community's vision. Ms. Zornitta then went through in more detail the slides on the projected trends.

Ms. Zornitta shared that what they have put forward and what is the basis of the 2045 long-range transportation plan is a different employment and population projection and allocation than where the trend would take us; how they're differing from the trend is they'd have transit that would cause transit-oriented development and explained the detail in each projected area, including breakdowns of the population growth by jurisdiction and employment growth, utilizing the slides. Ms. Zornitta emphasized what's been exciting over the last few months is the Board of County Commissioners is talking about this information, talking about how they don't care for that trend scenario, and then some of the ideas about how to change their comprehensive plan to take it in a different direction to try to keep that trend from just occurring. That is the policy synthesis, that they have had a series of maybe five workshops with them where, over the course of that, they presented different ideas, they have embraced that and put together this direction. Then she proceeded to give highlights on a couple of the major areas and encouraged the Board to review the materials.

A question was asked by Hoyt Prindle as to what discussion has there been about getting rid of parking minimums, especially in urban areas like the downtown core with commercial and residential developments, to which Ms. Zornitta replied that from the comprehensive plan standpoint, that is something certainly that would be encouraged to be considered to help create that more urban form in the City in particular. Her understanding is that it's on the City's radar as something that needs to be looked at. Nicole Rice inquired about one of the slides Ms. Zornitta introduced where the Wimauma downtown redevelopment has to be inside potentially what Ms. Zornitta is actually showing as the focus area, to which Ms. Zornitta replied the Wimauma Study is looking at what is outlined in the Wimauma area and then the RB-2 study is looking at all of the tan areas, so the two studies are very proximate to each other in southeast Hillsborough County.

Nicole Rice clarified that she's confused by which area is the proposed site for redevelopment of downtown Wimauma, and it was pointed out this is what is identified generally in Wimauma as their existing downtown and where they would like to see that focus, showing that is inside the urban service area, but their community plan covers this area outside the service area.

Steven Hollenkamp praised the presentation and proceeded to comment that right now we have all of this growth and all of these people who are going to move here. He stated, “The question is, how do we respond?” Mr. Hollenkamp
then gave a brief history since World War II on population growth and roads, stating that while she presented a lot of really great benefits to this kind of new way of approaching handling growth, could they also include financial implications, explaining that every city and county in America is insolvent, so adding homes to the outskirts of town barely pays for itself. And even if it does, growth on the inside pays for itself and then some, to which Ms. Zornitta responded the County has hired a consultant to create a fiscal impact model to look at and test some of the different patterns of growth and how they perform financially to the County's bottom line. The results of that work are not yet complete. Steven Hollenkamp made some suggestions to bring forward. Ms. Zornitta appreciated the feedback.

Edward Mierzejewski added a comment and a question that unfortunately there’s been a raft of articles about millennials moving out to the suburbs and asked if Ms. Zornitta could refresh him on what the current status is of the mobility transportation impact fees. Ms. Zornitta replied that as to the mobility fee for the unincorporated county, they are in the process of having hearings to look at updating that. They have had a study done about how that should be updated, how the fees should apply to some of these areas where there is growth being permitted at lower levels outside of the urban service area. Mr. Mierzejewski followed up stating one of the great advantages of the whole mobility fee concept instead of transportation impact fees was that you could incorporate transit investments and transit capital investments in the mobility phase, and that could do a lot to somewhat counter the move to the suburbs, just a thought. Ms. Zornitta replied that the hard part is they have a lot of transportation deficits. Mobility fees can’t be applied to the deficit. They have to be applied to the impact the new development is creating. We need funding to help with the deficits to balance that equation.

Vivienne Handy made several comments, including that it’s great to see movement toward what we have been doing and detailed those patched areas of RB-2 outside the urban service area they tried to have included in a moratorium because they’re outside of the service area, but the Board did not agree to that and the community saw that as a mistake. She further talked about negative impacts in the RB-2 category for the Balm area, and one of the reasons for the moratorium is because of the misinterpretation of the Wimauma Community Plan, that before you allow that housing to go in, you need to have jobs. They need to have jobs so it’s not just increasing commuter traffic through the downtown area, endangering a community that is very, very heavy on carless households.

Camilo Soto had a question on amending the development code to allow easier development of accessory dwelling units in single-family/residentially zoned neighborhoods to alleviate the affordable housing issue. Ms. Zornitta responded that from the comprehensive plan standpoint, the County and City encourage use of accessory dwelling units, that much of the County’s standard land development code for single-family zoning will permit that. There are size restrictions and some other issues. There’s also been some discussions within the City of Tampa about some of the restrictions on how the accessory dwelling units have to be owner-occupied in some capacity.

Christine Acosta expressed a desire for more in-depth information in the future on these expansive topics, to which Chair Roberts agreed it was very appropriate. In a question to Ms. Zornitta on density and a boulevard concept, Ms. Zornitta replied they have been looking at how to do some additional public education on the issue of density. The issue she hit on, separating this from automatically being related to cars and as something they can sincerely consider. Beth has been looking at the boulevard concept, and they very much would like to partner in terms of looking at it from a land use perspective.

Nicole Rice commented, when speaking about mother-in-law suites and accessory buildings in the City of Tampa, that it’s more complicated than you would think. If you have an accessory building in the City of Tampa or the overlay district, you are required to get a Special Use Variance for your property. She went on to state that there’s a lot of loose language right now in land use when it comes to accessory dwellings/buildings, and she has found that not everyone is on the same page across the board and that it really affects and impacts putting density in communities where you could actually be using a property for more people to be on. Ms. Zornitta agreed that it’s not easy to do right now and that a potentially easier solution would be the ability to make the rules such that they have the flexibility to allow people to do this. Nicole Rice asked if there’s a conversation about making this easier as there’s a lot of language used right now in land use for changes or a variance to a property that is open to interpretation of the law, to which Ms. Zornitta replied that these issues are more of a City of Tampa issue than of the unincorporated areas of the County. The City has hired a number of land use attorneys with the goal of look at updating the Land Development Code for the City of Tampa.
Chair Roberts stated that transportation is tied directly to density and density is tied directly to land use and zoning. If anyone has concerns like Ms. Rice does, to try and participate in those zoning activities because they are inside the City of Tampa and controlled by the City.

Vivienne Handy also asked if there are these proposed amendments to the comp plan, to which Ms. Zornitta responded they are a little bit broader than what the policy language is, this is more like the goal than the objective, and this is giving us our marching orders to go bring back amendments to the comprehensive plan. Ms. Handy followed up by stating the comprehensive plan is broader, discussing how we would implement it, and how do we make them enforceable. Ms. Zornitta stated it kind of bounces from broad to more specific in certain areas, giving an example, and stating they have to get them into the documents to make them enforceable. It was noted that if the Board wanted to express support, ultimately the Board of County Commissioners is where it would go. Mr. Roberts emphasized it would be appropriate for the Board to make recommendations from this committee because land use changes have a direct impact on transportation in the County.

Evangeline Linkous commented that the two areas they hadn't discussed are that this is also a leap forward for affordability for the region and a greenhouse gas reduction piece.

Dayna Lazarus asked when the Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan is being updated and is there a date for that, to which Ms. Zornitta responded that they are working on it right now and bringing forward that first component in the April cycle of plan amendments and having it go to hearings with the BOCC in the summer and adopted before October. One Water is the first piece, but they're working on it with County staff right now and went over the proposed 12-month work program.

B. Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Study

Justin Willits, with HART Service Development Department, gave a Tampa Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Study update, going over parking requirements and the need for private capital to build parking. He spoke about needing the Land Development Code to be updated to recognize the existing service. He gave a quick update that the overall purpose was to identify a corridor using a combination of Florida, Nebraska and/or Fowler Avenues to connect downtown Tampa to USF, to improve safety and operating conditions for transit, improve connectivity for the east/west routes that cross the corridor, and improve access to bicyclists, pedestrians, and scooters to get to their services. Accessing transit is one of the biggest barriers for people who don't ride, who are attempting to ride, or for people who ride and continue to ride. A lot of the injuries that are seen on the bicycle/pedestrian network are accessing their services. The identified transit needs are to expand transit options for new and existing riders and, again, connect USF and downtown with a premium service option that is not so dependent on traffic flow to keep the service on time. They're subject to congestion just as much as everyone else on all of the routes, other than the streetcar, and even that sometimes can be clogged up by traffic. The timeline is a little bit dated now, and they're getting ready for recommended alternative public workshops where they will lock in the alignment they have chosen, then get into Phase II and decide whether or not they're going for a federal project or not. There are a lot of different efforts going on in this corridor, the Heights Mobility Study, the Tampa Street Car Extension Downtown, the Regional Rapid Transit Study, the Fowler Avenue Multimodal Corridor Study, the Intermodal Centers for University and Downtown, and also U.S. 41 improvements. DOT study has a few station areas they're looking at that coordinate with the Regional Transit Study.

Mr. Willits talked about how they initially started with 17 different alternatives of where they could leave downtown on the one-way pairs of Florida Avenue and Tampa Street and then cross over to Nebraska. Screening out early, they came up with three that scored the highest. The key issues to be addressed are the land uses at the north end of Florida Avenue and at the intersection with Fowler Avenue, the ability to provide a dedicated lane under I-275 east, and the efficiency of connectivity with potential University area Intermodal Centers. The agendas for committee meetings were announced.

Edward Mierzewski asked about preferred or dedicated lanes on Fowler, to which Mr. Willits responded the preferred is a median guideway. They have concepts that don't touch the outside curb but basically take the bike lanes that are very underutilized and shift them onto side paths, shift the general traffic out, and then to reconstruct the median with a two-way guideway. Mr. Mierzewski then followed up asking if the major stops would be at existing cross streets. Mr. Willits stated this is an improvement for pedestrians crossing Fowler, whether or not they're getting
to transit. Instead of crossing maybe 140 feet at once to get across the corridor, you'd be crossing half of that and then you would be at the station platform. Mr. Mierzewski also asked about mid-block stations and was told probably not because they want really good station spacing to keep the running times up, but there would be more opportunities for pedestrian-only crossings away from the stations.

Camilo Soto had a question on the BRT project, particularly in downtown where it proposes the elimination of the bike lanes and what is proposed to offset the elimination, to which Mr. Willits replied that north of downtown they're proposing building off the Heights Mobility Study as far as some greenways that run parallel to the corridors that they're looking at, assuming reconstruction of one side of the curb, so they can widen the sidewalk on one side which would kind of become a de facto side path, a multi-use path. In downtown, it's a little bit different. They're probably looking at Franklin Street to be more of a true bike boulevard, splitting the two of them, and then of course they have some other parallel corridors. Riverwalk is a good alternate path. Dayna Lazarus commented that she likes the idea of the median for the BRT lane on Fowler and all the improvements. Rick Richmond brought up a concern of not putting bicyclists on shared pedestrian paths. Mr. Willits also stated there may be ways to do a shared bus and bike lane for the people who like to ride fast. Scooters aren't allowed on the Riverwalk but bikes are.

Hoyt Prindle asked, outside of this project, what discussion has there been, and has there been any advancement on utilizing those dedicated lanes in other areas where it's not necessarily a BRT corridor but where the right-of-way traffic counts might permit that one of the lanes becomes dedicated for bus or for taxi use to speed up the travel times of buses. Mr. Willits responded that away from the corridor they have been workshopping some ideas with the City about a bus line pilot. They have plenty of ideas, but right now they're trying to move certain ones forward that may impact this project. It's really more of an issue that there are not many places they can minimally impact traffic and take a lane. Florida and Tampa Streets are a very rare example of where you don't have the volumes to support the three lanes that exist and went over two of his personal favorites that came out of the recommendation.

Steven Hollenkamp, after commenting on ADUs, asked the question: What is the timing of this bus if everything goes according to plan? Mr. Willits said it depends on if they make it a federal project or not. On the federal timeline, they're trying to line up the streetcar and BRT in kind of a one-two punch, so they're looking at '23, '24, maybe '25, depending on how those line up. Mr. Hollenkamp followed up with: What are the target headways that you're looking for? Mr. Willits replied they're planning for 15, 10, or 12 at the peaks.

Evangelina Linkous asked: What visions are you aware of for how the Temple Terrace community can tap into enhanced transit services and how Temple Terrace residents can get more involved and advocate for that? Mr. Willits responded they're doing a short-term operations plan, a short-term expansion plan for the surtax revenue. They basically asked the consultant to break up the County into about 15 subareas, and they are going to do targeted outreach into the subareas early in the project. The later recommendation and alternatives will zoom out a little bit to four or five more generalized, major regions, and that Temple Terrace is actually going to be a stand-alone, because they have drafted it to where Plant City will have its own subarea, so they'll have specific workshops for those areas that will talk about what the needs are, both the riding and nonriding public, and also how the needs generally in transportation relate to those specific areas. He thinks that would be the best place to point them. There were more questions and discussion on the operational component and if there's a funding competitiveness, which is just how they'd spend that bucket and if it's a viable project; ADUs, the pairing of land use and routes in place was commented on again.

C. Regional Rapid Transit Project Development & Environmental Study

Brian Pessaro presented a PowerPoint presentation. Scott Pringle, a consultant, is also present. The purpose of the Regional Rapid Transit is to provide all-day modern mobility. It provides quick, safe, reliable, frequent, and regional rapid service. The timeline of the study is a two-year study, which started in May of 2019, and he went over milestones one and two. In the fall they hit the first milestone. The plans are going to wrap up the study around the Summer of 2021, and they'll submit the project to FTA and ask for a project evaluation. Mr. Pessaro went over the station area locations and showed a map of a route overlay. The three projects support one another and lead to ridership. He also went into the five alternatives, including the no-build option as a sixth: Alternative 1: TSM, in terms of alignment, the same as the no-build but investment in the stations, and not eligible for the capital investment program; Alternative 2: An alternative that came out of the Regional Transit Feasibility Plan; Alternative 3: A slight variation on 2; Alternative 4: Swap out the Howard Frankland Bridge segment; instead of it being in the express lanes across the bridge,
it would have its own dedicated lane; Alternative 5: Looking at what it would cost to build a 100 percent dedicated lane. Mr. Pessaro went over the next schedule.

Camilo Soto asked a question: On Alternative 5, it's called 100 percent dedicated. In Alternatives 5, 4, and 3, a use right here in downtown that requires mixed traffic for the bus system to utilize, it's commingled with traffic. How are you able to say that it is 100 percent dedicated when that little bit there is part of the system? Mr. Pringle replied for the purpose of the slide, they're rounding it, but they're almost at 99 percent. Camilo Soto commented on his concerns with commingling in that geographic area and asked about a design and setback. He asked if there was a cost analysis to utilize the downtown area to make this connection here, to which Mr. Pringle responded that a couple of things are involved, but they needed to have access to the true core of downtown for the service to be productive.

Edward Mierzejewski asked what frequency of service is anticipated, and they're shooting for a 10-minute frequency. Edward Mierzejewski's concern is if you have a dedicated freeway lane, if you look at the experience across the country, you have people driving on an interstate with a lane that is empty 99 percent of the time, and the political outrages of that are liable to be really strong. Mr. Pringle responded that one of the things they probably haven't done enough to discuss is the secondary benefit of having that space available; the 275LX could use that same lane, the 100X, the 300X, and PSA could use that same lane. The 10 minutes would be this project only, but it could also benefit the local transit services that it is moving through.

Hoyt Prindle asked several questions, to which Mr. Pringle responded. One question: Is there an estimated passenger count? The response was that the early estimates they looked at during the planning phase, they are looking at approximately 10,000 riders per day across the 40-mile corridor. Mr. Prindle asked if that's based on similar routes somewhere else; the response, they are using the Federal Transit Administration Simplified Transit Stops Model. It is a requirement if you are interested in seeking federal funds. Their model does have a number of variables derived from other case studies across the country. Hoyt Prindle then inquired into if the cost of this project, the BRT, without the dedicated freeway lanes was cheaper than rail, but his recollection is to have the dedicated freeway lanes, especially in areas where the freeway might need to have reconstruction, was more than dedicated rail, and is that accurate, to which Mr. Pringle replied that that is inaccurate. Hoyt Prindle then asked: Does it require a significant freeway reconstruction with the dedicated lanes? Mr. Pringle replied that they're looking for the rare opportunity to flex highway dollars to the benefit of transit, and they can't do that without a highway project. That is why they are looking to be included into the TBNext program. Mr. Prindle commented that this being cheaper is dependent upon TBNext funds, and Mr. Pringle stated it's not very often in this country where a transit project can dip into federal highway dollars which is larger than what's available in transit. Hoyt Prindle asked: If you don't go with the dedicated freeway lane route, how are you going to control the headways, the transit, between stops? What is the contingency plan to make sure the headways are pretty consistent? Mr. Pringle replied that without dedicated lanes, that becomes an issue and they'd have to deploy more fleet vehicles to make sure they match that headway. Hoyt Prindle wrapped up inquiring if there's been any discussion about making these lanes hot lanes, to which Mr. Pringle responded no. Hoyt Prindle wondered what's the amount of money being spent on parking garages, and Mr. Pringle replied they're trying to figure out what it is.

Steven Hollenkamp expressed that with funding a project like this that is going to cost a great deal of money, what are the thoughts on buying land for the rail system the way it was done in the 1800s, which isn’t used anymore. Mr. Pringle responded it is more a modern approach to looking at it the way the three Ps partner. Dayna Lazarus spoke on the times of the meetings that are not accessible to regular people and would they be willing to do virtual public meetings, to which they responded it's a challenge but they're working on it.

D. Transportation Equity Score Card

Tia Boyd, USF Center For Research, spoke on the Transportation Equity Score Card, a tool for project screening and prioritization, and presented a PowerPoint on the background of the project, that it builds on previous research on equity in the MPO process, project evaluation from an equity perspective, integrates equity into project screening and prioritization. Using the findings from these projects and other projects they have worked on, they found there were a few inconsistencies and quite a bit of variation in the ways MPOs evaluate equity in their transportation plan processes. The purpose of this tool is to help facilitate the ways that MPOs or other organizations may look at equity during their
prioritization or other projects during the evaluation process. Some examples of the uses for the tool are: Moving projects from the needs list to the cost-affordable list, selecting projects for programming in the TIP, selecting projects as a part of a specific agency plan, program or initiative, and then also selecting projects that best advance an equity plan or program. Ms. Boyd went over the six categories that they found were more frequently used and most effective in providing a way to look at equity: Access to opportunity, health and environment, safety and emergency evacuation, affordability, mobility, and burdens. She explained each category with three factors. She went over the score system, does the project improve or expand bicycle/pedestrian facilities, does the project accomplish one of the following, and they are conducting several beta tests working through the project.

Dayna Lazarus asked: Who funded this study? Ms. Boyd replied that it’s funded by CTEDD. Ms. Lazarus followed up with: Where is the tool going to be housed? Is it going to have its own website? Ms. Boyd replied that as of now, they have not discussed it having its own website, and it’s available on the CTEDD website.

Camilo Soto asked if there’s any intent to commodify the tool or is it going to be free for agencies? Ms. Boyd said it will be publicly available for any agency that would like to access it.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS & NEW BUSINESS

A. TBARTA CAC Report – No new news.

New Business - Steven Hollenkamp proposed a motion that he do a presentation for the Board on the fiscal analysis for Plant City at some point at a future meeting. Edward Mierzejewski questioned: What is the fiscal analysis of? Steven Hollenkamp replied that it’s the fiscal analysis of Plant City, of the revenues, the expenses, the road expenses, and then if you look at the slides, it breaks down the profits. If you think of Plant City as a company, it breaks down the profits by property type, and you get to see where we win in Plant City, where we maybe lose. It has received some proposals on how to do the math on new developments. Camilo Soto commented: “Your presentation for Plant City is done, but your intent is to provide a framework for someone else who may want to pick it up countywide or the City of Tampa or maybe another local government,” to which Mr. Hollenkamp agreed that is the intent of the presentation.

Chair Roberts sought a motion for Steven Hollenkamp to do a presentation to the Board on the fiscal analysis for Plant City at some point at a future meeting. Steven Hollenkamp so moved, Ricardo Fernandez seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously.

Old Business - Ricardo Fernandez brought up an old business matter having to do with the CRA’s action in February and passed out a transcript of the past MPO meeting. Being cognizant of the time, he suggested to hold it off until next month. Chair Roberts offered a suggestion that Michele be asked to have someone from FDOT here when this issue comes up so that the Board can really understand what the toll lanes, especially variable toll lanes, on the interstate means. Chair Roberts doesn’t think that is really clear for the committee and said they’ll do that at the next meeting, and they don’t need a motion to move it up on the agenda.

B. Next Meeting - April 8th, at 9:00 a.m. Item E., SR-60/Kennedy Boulevard Access Management Study was deferred to the next meeting.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 12:08 p.m.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

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

**Presenter**
Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO Staff

**Summary**
The following items are amendments to the Fiscal Year FY2019/20 – 2023/24 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

**Amendment 16 - 443630-1 I-75 from N of US 301/ Progress Blvd to Woodberry Rd.** This amendment proposes to rehabilitate the rigid pavement and repave the ramps on I-75/ SR 93A from S of Progress Blvd (MP 19.015) till N of Woodberry Road (MP 24.185). The project is currently in design phase. This amendment will add $1,753,888 (FY2021).

**Amendment 17 – 443630-2 I-75 from N of From N OF CSX R/R/Broadway Ave to S of SR 582/Fowler Ave.** This amendment proposes to rehabilitate the rigid pavement and repave the ramps on I-75/ SR 93A from N of CSX R/R/Broadway Ave (MP 25.227) to S of SR 582/Fowler Ave (MP 30.244). This project is currently in the design phase. This amendment will add $1,763,855 (FY2021).

**Amendment 18 – 445380-1 I-4 repaving from E of McIntosh Rd to County Line Rd.** This amendment will add $3,870,126 and will be used for repaving the interstate, ramps and frontage roads between McIntosh Rd and County Line Rd in eastern Hillsborough County. This project is currently in design phase.

**Recommended Action**
Approve the above amendments to the FY2019/20 TIP.

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

**Attachments**
- Factsheets for the TIP Amendments 16,17 and 18.
- Comparative Reports for the TIP Amendments 16,17 and 18.
## FDOT 5 Year TIP
### Hillsborough County, District 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Related Project</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Extra Description</th>
<th>LRTP</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>443630 1</td>
<td>I-75 FROM N OF US 301/ PROGRESS BLVD TO WOODBERRY RD</td>
<td>443630</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>RIGID PAVEMENT RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>This project will repair or replace the concrete pavement of the Interstate 75 roadway and ramps between Progress Blvd. and Woodberry Road</td>
<td>Minimize congestion, p.163</td>
<td>Amended</td>
<td>5/13/2020</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preliminary Engineering - Managed by FDOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2020</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>&gt;2024</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added ACNP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,753,888</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,753,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,753,888</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,753,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 443630 1 Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,753,888</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,753,888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Description:
- The Florida Department of Transportation, District Seven, proposes to rehabilitate the rigid pavement on I-75/SR 93A from US 301 to CSX R/R / Broadway Ave. Rehabilitate the rigid pavement on the following ramps: SB on ramp from ramp #324 (10075322), NB off ramp to Lee Roy Selmon Expressway (10075325), NB off ramp to ramp #323 (10075315), SB on ramp from Lee Roy Selmon Expressway (10075326), SB off ramp to ramp #324 (10075330), SB off ramp to ramp #324 (10075332), NB on ramp from ramp #323 (10075329).

Project Location:
The project will begin along I-75/SR 93A at south of Progress Blvd. (MP 19.015) and will end north of Woodberry Road (MP 24.185).

Project Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Cost Estimate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$1,753,888 (FY 2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$19.79 Million **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that cost estimates may change as the project progresses.
**Cost estimate includes funding for Construction, Engineering, and Inspection.
### FDOT

#### 5 Year TIP

**Hillsborough County, District 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status: Amended</th>
<th>Amendment Date: 5/13/2020</th>
<th>Amendment Number: 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item Number:</strong></td>
<td>443630 2</td>
<td>Description: I-75 FROM N OF CSX R/R/BROADWAY AVE TO S. OF SR 582/FOWLER AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Project:</td>
<td>443630</td>
<td>Extra Description: This project will repair or replace the concrete pavement of the Interstate 75 roadway and ramps between Broadway Avenue and Fowler Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Length:</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Type of Work: RIGID PAVEMENT RECONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LRTP:</strong> Minimize congestion, p.163</td>
<td><strong>SIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING - Managed by FDOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2020</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>&gt;2024</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Added</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACNP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,763,855</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,763,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,763,855</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,763,855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 443630 2 Totals:** $0 $0 $1,763,855 $0 $0 $0 $0 $1,763,855
I-75 (SR 93A)
From N. of CSX R/R/Broadway Ave to S. of SR 582/Fowler Ave
Financial Project ID 443630-2-32-01

Project Description:
- The Florida Department of Transportation, District Seven, proposes to rehabilitate the rigid pavement on I-75/SR 93A from north of CSX R/R/Broadway Ave to south of SR 582/Fowler Ave. Rehabilitate the rigid pavement on the following ramp: I-4 SB on ramp (one lane from Bridge #424 to merge at I-75 (10075342).

Project Location:
The project will begin along I-75/SR 93A at north of CSX R/R/Broadway Ave. (MP 25.227) and will end south of SR 582/Fowler Ave (MP 30.244).

Project Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Cost Estimate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$1,763,855 (FY 2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$15.38 Million **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that cost estimates may change as the project progresses.
**Cost estimate includes funding for Construction, Engineering, and Inspection.
## FDOT
### 5 Year TIP
#### Hillsborough County, District 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Amended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Date:</td>
<td>5/13/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Number:</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item Number:** 445380 1  
**Description:** I-4 REPAVING FROM E OF MCINTOSH RD TO COUNTY LINE ROAD  
**Extra Description:** This project will repave the interstate, ramps and frontage roads between McIntosh Rd (Exit 14) and County Line Road (Exit 25) in eastern Hillsborough County  
**LRTP:** System Preservation, p. 161

**Type of Work:** RESURFACING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2020</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>&gt;2024</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added ACNP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,870,126</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,870,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,870,126</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,870,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 445380 1 Totals:** $0 | $0 | $3,870,126 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $3,870,126
I-4 repaving from east of McIntosh Rd to County Line Road 445380-1-52-01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact Information**

**Design Manager**  
Charlie Xie  
813-975-6287  
Charlie.xie@dot.state.fl.us

**Media Contact**  
Kris Carson  
813-975-6060  
Kristen.carson@dot.state.fl.us

**About**

This project will repave the interstate, ramps and frontage roads between McIntosh Rd (Exit 14) and County Line Road (Exit 25) in eastern Hillsborough County.

The project is currently being designed. Construction is anticipated to begin in the fall of 2023.
Agenda Item
FY21 & 22 Unified Planning Work Program

Presenter
Allison Yeh, MPO Staff

Summary
The MPO’s transportation planning functions are supported primarily by federal and state grants. These functions must be identified in advance for two fiscal years and encompass the federally funded surface transportation planning efforts to be undertaken by FDOT, HART, local jurisdictions, and other agencies. These activities, products and budgeted funds are documented in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The new UPWP for fiscal years 2020/21 and 2021/22 will be effective July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2022.

In February, staff solicited planning project suggestions from partner agencies and MPO committees for consideration in the new UPWP. A draft FY21-FY22 UPWP was then submitted to FDOT on March 13th for a 30-day review period. FDOT comments will be addressed in the final draft when they are available.

There are no major changes to the structure of the new FY21 - FY22 UPWP except some expected annual adjustments to budget calculations including the reimbursement rate for indirect expenses. Also, the planning budgets for Task 1-6 and the budget summary tables have been consolidated into one section. The final draft UPWP is being presented for approval to MPO Committees in April and to the MPO Board on May 13th, 2020.

The currently adopted UPWP for FY19-FY20 and draft FY21-22 UPWP are available on the MPO website: http://www.planhillsborough.org/unified-planning-work-program/

Recommended Action
Approve the FY21-22 UPWP document

Prepared By
Allison Yeh, AICP, LEED GA

Attachments
Link to Draft FY21-22 UPWP Document
**Agenda Item**
MPO/FDOT Joint Certification

**Presenter**
Rich Clarendon, MPO staff

**Summary**

The Metropolitan Planning Organization is established and funded by federal and state laws and rules. Many federal and state requirements apply. The federal government evaluates our compliance every four years, and a public meeting is held at that time. The last such meeting was held in 2017.

In between these major review events, the MPO’s planning process must be certified as following federal and state rules through a cooperative review conducted by the FDOT District 7 office and the MPO. This concludes with a Joint MPO/FDOT Certification statement and summary of notable achievements, recommendations and corrective actions.

Staff will review notable achievements from the past year.

**Recommended Action**

Support re-certification of the MPO and authorization for the MPO Chairman to sign a Joint Certification Statement.

**Prepared By**
Rich Clarendon, AICP

**Attachments**

Joint MPO/FDOT Certification Summary & Statement
The annual Joint FDOT/MPO Certification for January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019, review was conducted on March 4, 2020, as required by federal guidelines to assess the MPO’s compliance with the federal transportation planning process and applicable state laws. The Hillsborough County MPO was found to be in compliance with federal and state guidelines for metropolitan transportation planning.

The following is a summary of the Department’s findings:

Notable Achievements

- The Resilient Tampa Bay Transportation Pilot Project funded by FHWA will be used for federal guidance documents from the Office of Planning, Environment & Realty. In addition, this effort along with the 2014 FHWA Hillsborough Vulnerability Assessment, have been designated as a noteworthy 2020 project by the MPOAC and in the FDOT Resilience Quick Guide. The studies have been presented in a various FHWA Peer Exchanges, TRB and the FHWA Transportation Resilience conferences.

- In updating the Long-Range Transportation Plan to 2045, the MPO created an online survey to collect input on the County’s highest priority transportation projects. From June through July 2019, the MPO extensively promoted the survey through presentations to community organizations, homeowners’ associations, chambers of commerce, business groups, civic and environmental organizations, plus targeted advertising on social media, and displays at community events. The MPO made special efforts to solicit participation from Communities of Concern and hard-to-reach constituents, even conducting “ride-alongs” to survey bus riders on selected routes. The result was that more than 5,200 people participated in the survey, and compared to the last LRTP, 40% more Hispanic and 70% more African American people participated.

- In November 2019, the MPO co-sponsored the Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit (GCSSS) and Safe Routes to School National Conference. Over 425 active transportation and public health advocates from across the country gathered for valuable networking and sharing of best practices.

- The FHWA Florida Division is highlighting the MPO’s work in establishing safety performance targets as a best practice.
The MPO received a $50,000 Healthiest Cities and Counties Challenge grant from the AETNA Foundation, American Public Health Association and National Association of Counties for the Garden Steps initiative to expand access to fresh, healthy food in Tampa’s food deserts through education, agriculture and walk/bike connections.

**Recommended Actions**

- It is FDOT’s recommendation that Hillsborough MPO Risk Assessment remains in the low category
- FDOT values Hillsborough MPO’s drive to be innovative and lead the conversation on safety for all modes of transportation

**Corrective Actions**

- None
Pursuant to the requirements of 23 U.S.C. 134(k)(5) and 23 CFR 450.334(a), the Department and the MPO have performed a review of the certification status of the metropolitan transportation planning process for the Hillsborough County MPO with respect to the requirements of:

2. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2000d-1) and 49 C.F.R. Part 21;
3. 49 U.S.C. 5332 prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment or business opportunity;
4. Section 1101(b) of the FAST Act and 49 C.F.R. Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in USDOT funded projects;
5. 23 C.F.R. Part 230 regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts;
6. The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.) and the regulations found in 49 C.F.R. Parts 27, 37, and 38;
7. The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6101) prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;
8. Section 324 of 23 U.S.C. regarding the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of gender; and

Included in this certification package is a summary of noteworthy achievements by the MPO, attachments associated with these achievements, and (if applicable) a list of any recommendations and/or corrective actions. The contents of this Joint Certification Package have been reviewed by the MPO and accurately reflect the results of the joint certification review meeting held on March 23, 2020.

Based on a joint review and evaluation, the Florida Department of Transportation and the Hillsborough County MPO recommend that the Metropolitan Planning Process for the Hillsborough County MPO be certified.

Name: District Secretary (or designee)
Title: Name: Lesley "Les" Miller, Jr.
Title: MPO Chairman (or designee)
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Plant City Fiscal Analysis

Presenter
Steven Hollenkamp, CAC member

Summary
Mr. Hollenkamp requested an opportunity to make this presentation to the Citizens Advisory Committee.

Revenues come in the form of property taxes, sales taxes gas taxes etc. Cities have money going out and we call that the expenses. Expenses come in the form of services like police and fire protection, and infrastructure maintenance for our roads, sidewalks, pipes for our water, pipes for our sewage, and pipes for our storm drainage. When you take the revenues and subtract out the service costs and infrastructure costs, you get the annual profit. In every city and county in America, pretty much without exception, there’s not enough money coming in to cover everything.

The attached slides show what types of parcels and what types of developments pay more than they consume, and which types consume more than they provide. We will look at some changes Plant City as well as changes that some County Commissioners are considering. It involves doing the math on new developments on the outskirts of town. There are many ways that counties like Sarasota County, Volusia, and Collier County have proposed to do the math on new developments requiring expanding the county service coverage area in a method that’s called Fiscal Neutrality.

Recommended Action
None; for information only.

Prepared By
Rich Clarendon, AICP

Attachments
Presentation
#DoTheMath
A Fiscal Analysis on Plant City’s Growth Strategy and Transportation Policies

Steven Hollenkamp

Street Pavement Management

A Worst First Approach vs. A Best First Approach

We need to start brushing our teeth
Plant City Profit Per Acre by Property Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Profit/Acre</th>
<th>Total Profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>$6,521</td>
<td>$841,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Acreage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 - 0.25</td>
<td>$11,679</td>
<td>$247,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.26 - 0.50</td>
<td>$2,862</td>
<td>$177,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51 - 1.0</td>
<td>$1,793</td>
<td>$203,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 - 5.0</td>
<td>$685</td>
<td>$345,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01+</td>
<td>($1,219)</td>
<td>($2,239,372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes Acreage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02 - 0.2</td>
<td>$2,745</td>
<td>$1,909,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21 - 0.3</td>
<td>$910</td>
<td>$426,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.33 - 0.4</td>
<td>$56</td>
<td>$21,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.5</td>
<td>($415)</td>
<td>($102,185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51 - 0.75</td>
<td>($1,107)</td>
<td>($264,301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.76 - 1.0</td>
<td>($2,568)</td>
<td>($1,298,827)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01+</td>
<td>($3,274)</td>
<td>($2,300,793)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium</td>
<td>$802</td>
<td>$48,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex/Triplex/Quadplex</td>
<td>$3,638</td>
<td>$253,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>$16,045</td>
<td>$337,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Acreage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02 - 0.2</td>
<td>$2,745</td>
<td>$1,909,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21 - 0.3</td>
<td>$910</td>
<td>$426,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.33 - 0.4</td>
<td>$56</td>
<td>$21,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.5</td>
<td>($415)</td>
<td>($102,185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51 - 0.75</td>
<td>($1,107)</td>
<td>($264,301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.76 - 1.0</td>
<td>($2,568)</td>
<td>($1,298,827)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01+</td>
<td>($3,274)</td>
<td>($2,300,793)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>($3,274)</td>
<td>($2,300,793)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plant City Undeveloped Acreage
ADDENDUM ITEMS
MPO Board Meeting of Tuesday, March 3rd, 2020

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

The MPO Chairman, Commissioner Les Miller, called the meeting to order at 9:04 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, Commissioner Mariella Smith, Commissioner Kimberly Overman, Councilman Citro, Councilman Luis Viera, Councilman Guido Maniscalco, Mayor Rick Lott, Cindy Stuart, Charles Klug, Michael Maurino, Joseph Waggoner

Also present: Attorney Clark and Beth Alden

The following members were absent: Mayor Mel Jurado, Adam Harden, Joe Lopano.

A quorum was met.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 12th, 2020

Chairman Miller requested a motion to approve the February 12th, 2020 minutes. Commissioner Maniscalco so moved; it was seconded by Commissioner Overman and adopted.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were three speakers with public comments.

Chris Vela, Tampa, Florida 33605, stated he's upset about the approval of the sound walls, and that in October of 2019 the board also approved the operational improvements which he mentioned badly hurt his community. The concern is the anticipation of more cars coming off the 14th and 15th Street exits, including the future anticipation of the interstate being widened and additional sound walls put up in urban neighborhoods, more dense areas. Mr. Vela went on to read a quote from the Socioeconomic Impacts, "TBX is unlikely to affect children or older adults or the disabled, once it opens, if they do not use the interstate," stating right off the bat it's a discriminatory use of a federal facility. Mr. Vela opined how his community is impacted by these improvements, giving examples, and stated that local trips could be resolved with walkability, by pet plans, as well as with transit. Mr. Vela spoke to the Business Guild in Ybor City, which is against these exits, just like the YCDC is and just like the neighborhood association is. The Colombia Restaurant, he stated, remembered some opposition against the exits back in the 1980s. Mr. Vela asked the Board to oppose the 14th and 15th Streets on this plan.

Jim Davidson brought to the Board's attention that the LRTP has been submitted to the federal government, and the diagram shows the cost feasibility program was
all done in present-day costs when handed into the State, which has to be done in expenditure dollars, and the public saw this diagram. He urged the Board to read the 2045 LRTP Cost Feasibility Technical Memorandum. Mr. Davidson went over the inconsistencies in calculations, stated he read the Compliance document, and urged the Board to consult their lawyer because of mistakes.

Sharon Calvert also spoke on the 2045 LRTP. The MPO coincidentally changed their format and there are inconsistencies, the numbers don't match, and there's missing information. On November 5th, 2019, two appendices, one of which is the major investment costs, were blank. Ms. Calvert stated that she informed the Board that day and it would be corrected. On February 20th, 2020, it was still blank, but has since been updated. The information provided in 2040, a table for the Cost Feasibility project, is nowhere to be found in the 2045 document, and the key piece is there's missing information the public did not have at the time of the public hearing. The document has been changed numerous times, and there's no version control from the public perspective. Speaking on the Fixed Guideway Transit Projects, when looking at the costs, comparing to the 2040 plan, she cannot make heads or tails of where the numbers came from.

COMMITTEE REPORTS, ONLINE COMMENTS

Bill Roberts, CAC Chair, presented an update on the CAC meeting in February of 2020. He reported the CAC voted to approve Terrance Trott for the At Large seat on the CAC, representing the African-American community, and they also welcomed two new members at that meeting -- Jeff Lucas and Christine Acosta. The CAC approved the Garden Steps Action Plan; the Transportation Improvement Program Amendment to the I-75 northbound ramp from US 301 with recommendations. They asked that the signal timing be evaluated during and following the improvements at 301; secondly, they identified changes to minimize the spillback during the evening rush hour from southbound 301 traffic turning onto eastbound Bloomingdale, which blocks that intersection; and, finally, the CAC approved the Resilient Tampa Bay: Transportation Pilot Project. Other actions: The CAC heard a presentation and received research papers on induced travel demand; heard a report on the Streetcar Modernization and Extension Study being conducted by the City of Tampa; heard a presentation on the Tampa Interstate Study/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearings, with much discussion regarding the motion made by the Community Redevelopment Agency in support of prioritizing transit and opposing tolls on the interstate within the City of Tampa. The CAC debated a motion to oppose new variable express tolls within the City limits, mirroring the action of the City of Tampa's CRA. That motion failed by a vote of 6 to 8, with many questions about express lanes, tolled or otherwise, which the CAC expects to have a presentation on in the future to clarify language and what some of its intent is. The CAC, regarding the next Unified Planning Work Program, passed a motion asking the MPO to coordinate between the cities and county to adopt a uniform standard for buffered bike lanes.

Wanda West, MPO staff, relayed the other committees approved three items for action on the agenda: Technical Advisory Committee, making a slight modification to one of the items; the Resilient Tampa Bay: Transportation Pilot Project to accept the report and request implementing entities strongly consider mitigation strategies; and the Transportation Disadvantage Coordinating Board approved the annual evaluation of the community transportation coordinator. Other presentations made to the committee included Induced Demand, Transit Major Project Next Steps, HART - BRT Arterial Study, Tampa Streetcar Modernization and Extension Study, Vision Zero Speed Management Study update, update on Bicycle Friendly Business Program, the Tampa Interstate Study Supplemental Environmental
Impact Study, MPO's Unified Planning Work Program, Call for Projects. Regarding the UPWP Committee's request for consideration to add the following studies:

Online comments: Gary Rector sent an e-mail expressing concerns about FDOT's February 27th public hearing on the Tampa Interstate Study Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Protection of the Hillsborough River, and both MPO and FDOT staff have responded. A records request was received from Sharon Calvert for the major investment projects and assessment and cost feasible plan supplemental tables from LRTP. Requested documents were provided, and a similar request was received from Mr. Jim Davidson. There was correspondence between County Administrator staff and Plan Hillsborough staff regarding use of the conference room on 26th floor. Mike Lamarca wrote regarding the FDOT maintenance workers in the Ruskin/Apollo Beach area who did not utilize laws regarding bicyclist safety, and FDOT thanked him and will follow up with staff.

No Facebook comments were received.

Chairman Miller sought a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Maniscalco so moved; it was seconded by Commissioner Kemp and adopted.

ACTION ITEMS

A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment

Vishaka Raman, MPO staff, gave a brief summary that this amendment has been brought by the FDOT to add a new project to the current TIP for interchange improvement at U.S. 301 and I-75. It calls for the design and construction of roadway improvements and mainly adds an outside lane to the I-75 outbound ramp, from northbound U.S. 301 to northbound I-75. Other improvements include new concrete pavement, rehabilitation of existing pavement, signage, marking, and lighting, et cetera, and goes with other roadway improvements from north of Lake St. Charles Boulevard to north of Progress Boulevard. From the comparative report, as a new project, it's adding roughly $5 million in advanced construction funds to this project. This project has already gone through the CAC and LTAC, so he requested approval of the amendment.

Chairman Miller sought a motion to approve the amendment. Commissioner Waggoner so moved; it was seconded by Commissioner Kemp, followed by a discussion from Commissioner Smith on the question by the CAC, stating they would like to see a signal timing study added. Ms. Raman relayed that it was added to the recommendations for the study, along with identifying the changes during and after the construction from southbound U.S. 301 to eastbound Bloomingdale because it blocks traffic.

A standing motion moved by Mr. Waggoner, seconded by Ms. Kemp, with a roll call vote and adopted.

B. Garden Steps Action Plan

Michele Ogilvie, MPO staff, gave a brief overview that Garden Steps is a project for which MPO was awarded First Runner-Up in the APHA/Aetna Foundation Healthiest Cities competition, for work in establishing community gardens in areas identified as food deserts and evaluating and improving transportation around
conditions surrounding garden sites, thanks to their partners. They're looking at trends in which obesity has grown in the United States, and they discovered that health is 50 percent of public policy. They affirmed that transportation affects health in the areas of safety, walking, bicycling, and air quality, of which they had numerous conversations about in the last year, including connectivity to destinations so that they can build wealth and health and equity.

What they had missed in this project that they discovered was that food access and the food desert label became part of their daily speech and they created a county health atlas that helped to identify health, environment, transportation, food environment, all layered over the City of Tampa, which was the study area. As a result of all the successes of Garden Steps, they were named First Place winners and were awarded $50,000 and, evidence based and moving forward, Ms. Ogilvie requested that they use the $50,000 to complete new gardens for health and food access, for the purpose of community education, safe and health active transportation, and public policy.

Their request to the Board is to support the Garden Steps Action Plan in your packet, as they have the support indicated from City of Tampa. It was also stated they'll be working at the 22nd Street and Osborne corridor for the next three years and would like to recreate this garden and move forward. Commissioner Kemp and Commissioner Overman congratulated Ms. Ogilvie on the good work and inquired if they're working with County Extension, and they are. Chairman Miller also asked if they're putting one in East Tampa at Middleton High School. He was assured that they were.

Chairman Miller sought a motion to approve the support for the Garden Steps Action Plan. Commissioner Maniscalco so moved; it was seconded by Commissioner Kemp and adopted.

C. Resilient Tampa Bay: Transportation Pilot Program

Allison Yeh, MPO Staff, described that Resilient Tampa Bay is a project that started a little over a year ago when they started the Long-Range Transportation update, and it's an effort between the three, MPOs, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, and DOT. Ms. Yeh gave a brief description that the LRTP was mandated to look at resiliency and flooding strategies for this project. She described what went into the LRTP – a.) State of good repair and resilience; b.) Vision zero; c.) Smart cities; d.) Real choices when not driving; e.) Major projects, and this plan had stakeholder participation.

Karen Kiselewski, Technical Consultant, further explained the report has three components to it. It’s a vulnerability assessment, has an adaptation toolbox in it, and it has cost information and some return on investment in it, and that all three of those kind of wrap up into identifying potential projects moving forward. She also quickly touched on the three components, showing diagrams of the potential impacts/changes. Ms. Kiselewski, as well, mentioned the Cost of Doing Nothing report.

The recommended action is the Board accept the Resilient Tampa Bay: Transportation Pilot Project Report and request that implementing entities strongly consider mitigation strategies for the highly critical, highly vulnerable road segments when doing maintenance or other work on those roads.

Chairman Miller sought a motion to approve the Resilient Tampa Bay: Transportation Pilot Project Report and request that implementing entities strongly consider mitigation strategies for the highly critical, highly
vulnerable road segments when doing maintenance or other work on those roads Garden Steps Action Plan.

Commissioner Kemp so moved; it was seconded by Councilman Citro and adopted.

Discussion went forward by Commissioner Kemp, exclaiming this is a very compelling presentation. She asked about infrastructure issues with the Cat 3 plus sea level rise, and are we addressing that in the projects that are underway now? Her concern is that FDOT said they are now looking at the Howard Frankland Bridge, with a 1.5 foot sea level rise in the plans, but it appears that by 2045 they will be needing 4 feet.

Mr. Gwynn responded that if they raised the Howard Frankland Bridge 8 feet, you wouldn’t be able to get on it and that it would be higher than everything else. Currently, they're looking at the sea level rise, having to balance their options with the surrounding and abutting properties.

Commissioner Overman asked if by approving this report and sending it on for transmittal, does it set specs in order to avoid the additional cost, since we are planning for 2045. She stated they should have these specs in their plan design and questioned if they are required to be added to the design standards in order to mitigate this kind of resilience, because not only is it the economic cost of not doing it now, it is the volume of traffic that would be impeded. Her question was: By approving this report and putting it through, do we adopt or should we or can we adopt the design standards to address this mitigation?

Ms. Yeh responded this is a planning level study, so when you get to, for example, the PD&E phase, there will be additional engineering required to do the design and she thinks they can adopt the concepts and the basic cost estimates. When it goes up to the Federal Highway Administration level, it's going as a final draft. They're going to massage it into a national guidebook, together with all of the other collective pilot projects. Ms. Yeh wanted to note that when they were working with the Department of Transportation, they understood there was quite an extensive study done for Highway 275.

Karen Kiselewski reiterated this was a planning level study, so the tools and strategies in here are at a planning level. She thinks the big takeaway is it helps identify those facilities that are vulnerable to be able to do more detailed studies going forward. So as local governments or DOT do maintenance projects on the facilities, they will look at it more closely in terms of vulnerability, as well, and consider additional strategies based on some of the suggestions in the report. They have found elsewhere if there’s not money set aside to do enhancements for resilience, they sometimes don’t occur. This is a way of trying to start that conversation. Ms. Overman exclaimed that that’s her point, and if they’re estimating the cost of building projects for 2045 now, these standards to address resiliency need to be included in the planning and the design so they can estimate what the costs are going to be at that time. That is why she asked the question and wants to know if they're even close to including this kind of resilience planning in their estimates for LRTP. Assuming that someone would put them there last-minute, which probably would not happen, she would like to make sure that whatever they, as an MPO need to do, that they reiterate planning for the resiliency that is discovered and studied now in the cost estimates needs to be included in the plan. Ms. Yeh stated stormwater and resurfacing costs are incorporated into one of the performance measures already. To answer Commissioner Overman's question, yes, at the planning level, but for the design level, they may have to defer to individual projects and the engineering because of tweaks, but that these are probably estimated lower since they're preliminary estimates, which is Commissioner Overman's concern.
Chairman Miller sought a motion to approve the report. Commissioner Kemp so moved; it was seconded by Councilman Citro and adopted.

STATUS REPORTS

A. Cost of Doing Nothing Report

Randy Deshazo, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, gave an overview on how climate is changing the economy, how it has a cumulative effect over time, and that there are considerable risks to our national economy. Since there's not quite as many studies that relate to Florida or certainly to the Tampa Bay area, what the Council has done in recent years is to try to address the gap. The study done a few years ago looked at an increase of the sea level rise of 2.95 feet by 2060. They looked only at the sea level rise and only focused on impacts to property, both inundated residential properties and inundated commercial properties, to get a sense of what property value loss would be and how many coastal jobs would be lost as a result of sea level rise. This was a GIS-focused kind of study. Essentially, their findings were somewhere north of $10 billion in property damage as a result of inundation by 2060 and a cumulative loss of $160 billion from the economy. That is for the four-county area of Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco, and Pinellas.

Mr. Deshazo further explained what they're going to be doing this coming year is updating that Sea Level Rise Study with funds provided by USEPA to help not only consider what the impacts of the sea level rise are but considerably look at impacts of heat and how that influences our economy and the entire Florida economy, as well. With that, they're taking the recommendation from the Tampa Bay Climate Science Advisory Panel to update their sea level rise projections, that they're no longer looking at under 3 feet of sea level rise by 2060 but about 3.5 feet by that period, because what they're seeing is that the sea level rise appears to be more aggressive than what they thought it was four or five years ago, and presented more detail on the impacts of the cost of hotter days, heat impacts on coastal regions, with a consideration of the synthesis of a wide range of scientific research. The economic model was provided, and they'll continue to use this model throughout the study. The mortality rates of heat exposure and heat mortality impacts was charted and explained. It was noted that science does make assumptions, and this must be kept in mind. He relayed a brief overview on the Next Steps.

B. Plan Hillsborough Annual Report

Melissa Zornitta, Planning Commission, gave a brief presentation on the Plan Hillsborough Annual Report, reporting that the strategic plan the MPO was a part of creating a year and a half ago supports all three boards the agency works for -- the MPO, the Planning Commission, and Hillsborough River Board -- and went over the strategic plan background. The highlights of Linking Land Use and Transportation: Plant City mixed use gateway; proactive planning efforts; incorporating market insight into planning; FSU Department of Urban Planning shared mobility project. She further explained in terms of technology and innovation, their major focus in this area is trying to bring their website up to compliance with the Americans for Disabilities Act. They also have a Transportation Improvement Project Viewer on their website to look at the specific projects in the TIP. Citizen Engagement included community presentations around the It's Time Hillsborough, as well as around Vision Zero.
They've been very active in the 2020 Census Complete Count Committee and participated in a summer camp held in Tampa Heights, as well as Palm River. In terms of planning partnerships, they saw a benefit partnering with the radio stations who helped get the word out about that survey, and they continue to participate in programs like MAPS and FLiP. They also, for the first time, participated in the Civilian Career Day. Enabling Transportation Choices' major focus was completing the LRTP. In addition, they did the Low Speed Electric Vehicle Study and Garden Steps. Opportunities for Regional Collaboration include the Resilient Tampa Bay: Transportation Pilot Program, but a big success was hosting the Safe Routes to Schools National Conference and doing that in conjunction with Gulf Coast Safe Street Summit. Lastly, she went over the Internal Agency Enhancements in terms of focusing on succession planning, that they've had a number of retirements in-house, so they also are focusing a lot on cross-team collaboration to make sure the projects are looked at by all teams in the agency.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Beth Alden gave the Executive Director's Report. Regarding our next steps in looking at climate change, we are partnering with Hillsborough County and the Environmental Protection Commission on a grant application, hoping to use a portion of the Volkswagen Settlement Funds for electrical vehicle charging stations in HC, with a possible focus on evacuation routes.

Following up on the board discussion last month about how to make progress regarding safety on roadways, we've started putting together a concept for a leadership summit in the August/September time frame to talk about policies that don't necessarily cost a lot of money but that they can go ahead and get started with right now. That would require partnering with the Sheriff's Office and maybe with healthcare providers, getting data and drawing to our community members' attention to what steps they need to take to create safer streets.

Also following up on last month's discussion, Peter Hsu mentioned an upcoming event to celebrate the Fletcher Avenue Complete Streets Project, which will be Monday, the 16th of March, at 9:00 a.m., on Fletcher Avenue. They're to meet in the parking lot of the McDonald's near 22nd Street. One other follow-up item from last month's safety discussion involved the bill in the legislature that would remove the ability to use rapid flashing beacons to draw attention to pedestrian crosswalks. Ms. Alden was pleased to report that as a result of their letter and other outreach that happened through local communities, progress of that bill seems to have slowed in the Senate.

There are a couple of other bills they are monitoring that also affect their work, that include a bill that would extend the funding for the Transportation Disadvantaged Program that the Sunshine Line uses; a bill to focus some funding on cross-county trips. That bill is making progress, has passed the House, and has been referred to the Senate. They talked about changes in their regional planning with TBARTA, refocusing on transit only. There's a bill that would separate the MPO's Chairs Coordinating Committee from TBARTA; it's going to a full-floor vote in both the Senate and the House.

The TMA Leadership Group Meeting is coming up Friday, hosted in Pasco County, and the address is up on the website. Also, they're traveling with HART for a tour of the Sun Rail in Orlando on Thursday. If you need transportation, please let
Ms. Alden know. They're providing a van for board members and need to leave County Center at approximately 7:00 in morning.

Finally, Commissioner Miller was invited to draw a couple of names from the Smiley Face cup for two Lightning tickets for two citizens that came out to march in the Martin Luther King Day Parade as a part of the Zero Vision Coalition.

Commissioner Overman mentioned a concern that recently, when looking at their comprehensive plan for Hillsborough County and other planning that they do, she discovered that the fee structure calculation, cost structure calculation, assumed a Level of Service D as standard operating procedure, and that this is problematic if their priority is safety. And if C is what they get safety with, then they have a disconnect in their policy. She asked for an understanding of when they adopted the Level of Service D as their planning tool in their comprehensive plan and how it impacts their long-range goals of safety and design, because if they're designing for dangerous roads or a level of service that is not delivering what they need, she'd be very interested in finding out how they fix that problem.

OLD & NEW BUSINESS

Cindy Stuart proclaimed her concern with some planning that is happening or not happening both at the MPO level and at the Commission level that is starting to put the brakes on some of the projects that she is involved with. She started with the Balm Road Project. Currently, they have a school opening on Balm Road in August of 2020 that is on a two-lane road with one lane in and one lane out for the school. It's going to max out at capacity, at 3,000 students, on opening day. It's a middle school and high school combined for the first three years because they don't have the money to build the middle school. Ms. Stuart learned a few weeks ago that instead of having other funding sources to fix and repair and improve this road so the residents of this community aren't stuck in front of the high school for hours trying to get in and out of their community, comparing it to Fish Hawk, the request has been made to do a PD&E study from this agency which will take no less than three years to complete and then start improvements, which is a huge issue. She's anticipates getting suddenly slapped with major complaints from the community because of the similar traffic issues with Fish Hawk. She stated they're prohibited from doing traffic improvements or road improvements unless it's on their property. She wants to bring that out into the open as this body meets and as the Commission begins to meet and have these conversations. She continued that they're looking at the purchase of two schools and the roadblocks with that. Ms. Stuart said they have 38 schools, minimum, to build in the next 15 years, and that's at the utilization of 150 percent. That is minimum, with no plan in place for how they move to correct the issues that they have and continue to supply the community with the needs and things our residents deserve. She relayed that two weeks ago they had a rezoning hearing for three schools, and it was a nightmare. She can't build schools fast enough to fill the need, and South County is a problem. She asked the Chair if there is something that can be brought back to this Board to have a different conversation, and she doesn't know if perhaps a committee needs to be formed. She turned to the executive director to ask, "Where do I go now at this point since we have had the conversation at the surface level as elected officials and the decisions being made between the two buildings are not consistent with what the community needs?"
Beth Alden responded that transportation is one piece of the larger puzzle. As a first step, they do have a board workshop scheduled on the 24th of March. The Balm Road project is on their priority list. Ms. Alden stated that federal funding may be five or six years out for the first phase, which would be a PD&E phase, and that is a long way out, going through their process. Ms. Stuart responded that does not work, that she doesn't believe a five-year plan, with a two-lane road, with 3,000 students entering and exiting, works. Ms. Alden relayed there's a meeting on the 24th that would be an opportunity for a dialog with all the implementing agencies about what their community needs are and how to address those needs. Commissioner Kemp mentioned she's glad to have Ms. Stuart raise the point. This is one reason why she's been strong on raising impact fees that have not been raised since 2006 that is holding up the building of schools. They voted to create a two-mile safety zone around schools and spoke about the safety issues that have been occurring. Mayor Lott questioned the ranking of this issue, doesn't this have to be resolved by August, and how do we not fix this between now and August. Cindy Stuart stated that's not the goal. The goal of this agency is to do a PD&E study. That is the plan, and the best plan would be to correct the situation by August. Ms. Alden relayed it cannot be done with federal funds, and Cindy Stuart suggested what she'd like to do is set meetings with commissioners, because she's looking at an agenda item right now that specifically says, The Interlocal Agreement For Public School Facility Planning, Siting and School Consistency has been submitted. The County has responded to the consistency request with additional information and a more in-depth transportation study. This is for her to purchase property to build an elementary and middle school on Bishop Road, which none of that is required. But the on-site approval, which has to come to the commission, is being held up because additional traffic studies and transportation studies are being requested. She's not going to be able to stay on her timeline to build those schools, which ultimately is going to come back on everyone because the houses are there, the kids are there, the building is happening, and they presently can't keep up with it, and now it's going to be delayed. So, she'll schedule individual meetings with commissioners so she can share with the Board what is happening maybe behind the scenes that they are not aware of that staff is handling. Balm Road is one example. When that school opens, it is going to be a traffic nightmare. It's going to very quickly become another Fish Hawk.

Chairman Miller asked if there aren't two additional schools they are looking at on Bishop Road, and Cindy Stuart responded, yes, a $4 million purchase of property only. Chairman Miller said that Bishop Road is a very substandard road and stated there's been some conversations between her superintendent and their staff concerning that property and looking at possible property swaps because of the fact that building a school on Bishop Road will produce major, major traffic jams. Cindy Stuart assured the issue they're having is the price they can afford to purchase, which goes back to impact fees. Most of the roads in that part of the community are substandard and do not meet the level of transportation consistency that you are requiring or asking for. So, they are being handcuffed to do siting because of that problem and she doesn't see a plan in place for how they can move beyond that. She again related she had schedule some meetings with Chairman Miller so they can bring the right people into the room, like the Planning and Growth Department, and they can bring someone also, but she needs 38 schools in that part of the county in 15 years. Mayor Lott questioned if it's South County and Cindy Stuart confirmed South County. Chairman Miller said to make her phone call.
Commissioner Kemp asked Ms. Alden about her legislature report, something that is actually moving in terms of the State paying on maybe a more permanent basis for transit in between jurisdictions, in between counties? Ms. Alden reiterated this is support for the Transportation Disadvantaged Program, the Sunshine Line.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 10:32 a.m.
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