Virtual Meeting of the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Wednesday, June 17, 2020, 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

The County Center and Plan Hillsborough offices are closed to the public in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Helpful hints for participating remotely are attached, and technical support during the meeting may be obtained by contacting Chris English at (813) 273-3774 ext. 380.

To view presentations and participate from your computer, tablet or smartphone, go to: https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/4526830516348593166

Live captioning: https://2020archive.1capapp.com/event/hillsborough

Dial in LISTEN-ONLY MODE: (415) 655-0060 Access Code 281-776-822

Agenda packet, presentations, and supplemental materials posted here.

Public comments are welcome and may be given in person at this teleconference meeting, by logging into the website above and clicking the “raise hand” button.

Comments may also be provided before the start of the meeting:

- by leaving a voice message at (813) 273-3774 ext. 389.
- by e-mail to mpo@plancom.org
- by visiting the event posted on the MPO Facebook page.

Written comments will be read into the record, if brief, and provided in full to the Committee members.

I. Call to Order

II. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

III. Approval of Minutes – May 13, 2020

IV. Action Items

A. FY21-25 TIP (Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff)
B. Vision Zero Speed Management Action Plan (Paula Flores, GPI)

V. Status Reports

A. Florida Transportation Plan & Highway Safety Plan Update (Alex Henry, FDOT)
B. Induced Transportation Demand (Alvaro Gabaldon, MPO Staff)

VI. Old Business & New Business

A. July Recess Discussion
B. Fall Tri-County BPAC Discussion
C. Tampa Velodrome Idea

VII. Adjournment

VIII. Addendum
A. MPO Meeting Summary & Committee Report

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, ext. 370 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 correo electronico. También, si sólo se puede hablar en español, por favor llame a la línea de ayuda en español al (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

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

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

Mr. Forbes called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m. The meeting was held via GoToWebinar and a quorum was present.

Members present: Katrina Corcoran, Lynda Crescentini, Peter Davitt, Jonathan Forbes, Rafael Hernandez, Jason Jackman, John Marsh, Faye Miller, Allison Nguyen, Diana Ramirez, Richard Ranck, Jaime Rubscha, Bill Sapper, Jim Shirk, Holly Simmons, Sally Thompson, Wanda Vinson and Alain Watson

Others present: Wade Reynolds, Beth Alden, Gena Torres and Lisa Silva – MPO; Lynn Merenda, Chris English, Joshua Barber and Sharon Snyder - Planning Commission; Alex Henry– Florida Department Transportation (FDOT); Monica Martin – Hillsborough County; Anna Quinones – THEA; Karen Kress – Tampa Downtown Partnership; Diana Lee – Hillsborough County Environmental Protection Commission; YuYu Zhang – USF; Mike Lamarca

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Mike Lamarca expressed his concerns with the lack of bicycle lane maintenance in Hillsborough County. He currently has seven open requests with the County but has received a response regarding only one of them. The County employee acknowledged the 2’ of overgrowth in the bike lane but said the County isn’t going to do anything about it. He is very concerned about this response and shared a picture of a bike lane on Big Bend Road, just west of Balm/Riverview, in Riverview. Mr. Reynolds stated roadways with paved shoulders are classified as a bicycle facility, so it is incorrect to say this isn’t a bicycle facility. Ms. Ramirez stated the Department of Transportation’s handbook states if it is within one mile of a buffered area, it is a bicycle lane. She will check this area.

Since she wasn’t able to attend, Mr. Reynolds read a letter from Christine Acosta (Pedal Power Promotions) at her request:

“Good evening BPAC Members and Chair, I am Christine Acosta, 2402 W. Morrison Ave., Tampa. Please accept my apologies for not being able to speak with you personally.

For the last several months we’ve all watched as the world changed due to the Coronavirus Pandemic.

Through our lens of walking and biking advocates, we observed bike shops being in high demand, selling out of inventory in some cases, and serving our community with courage and stamina not unlike our healthcare heroes.

We’ve observed a silver lining of more walking and biking throughout neighborhoods, cleaner air, and less traffic.

Unfortunately, we’ve also observed insufficient space for people to walk and bike while maintaining social distance, AND increased speeding due to less traffic.”
Over 150 cities have been rebalancing streets to add more safe space for walking and biking. Before COVID 19 we would refer to these “SLOW STREETS” as Neighborhood Greenways or Bike Boulevards. They are NOT full street closures; they are streets that prioritize pedestrians and cyclists with signage, pinch points, and reduced speeds. They are being deployed all over the nation and world to the tune of hundreds of miles every day. According to a recent ITE webinar, cities that have incorporated their plans into Emergency Teams will submit for FEMA reimbursement.

These many cities, some of whom we compete with for talent, workforce, and company relocations, (like Seattle, Denver, Austin, and Baltimore) are using this unprecedented once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to change their cities for the better…right now, right away. Not all the miles will last in perpetuity, but many will.

Tampa’s Lift Up Local is an excellent means of providing more space for restaurants to regain their economic footing, but each closed street is deliberately not-bike friendly, and in fact, bike lanes are blocked within Hyde Park Village. To date, Tampa and Hillsborough have not added any space or safety features, despite all children being at home, and our community having more people wanting and needing to bike than ever before.

I ask you to read the article Wade will share, which is the latest of many on the subject, and elevate your individual and united BPAC voices to urge city, county, and state transportation departments to implement SLOW STREETS (also called COVID Streets) as soon as possible.

Thank you.”

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Official approval of the Minutes is postponed until the next in-person meeting.

Ms. Thompson asked for the minutes to be edited to reflect to clarify the status of the temporary stoplight poles along Bayshore Blvd. at the time of the April BPAC meeting.

The Committee approved the minutes subject to the clarification of the Bayshore stoplights.

IV. MEMBERS’ INTERESTS

Peter Davitt – Spoke regarding concerns over bicycle lane maintenance along 40th Street, at the “S” curve, below Columbus and above 7th. Lane delineators don’t allow bicycle lanes to be swept and the lanes are full of debris on both sides of the road. The lanes need to be manually cleaned or the delineators need to be removed so the street cleaner can access them.

Holly Simmons – Asked if there is any follow up from the City of Tampa City Council meeting on April 30th? Mr. Reynolds stated City Staff was asked to come to the next City Council meeting in early June with recommendations for what to do regarding traffic along Bayshore Blvd. Temporary poles for the signals at Rome and Euclid are in place. The Mayor has also been asked to consider occasionally shutting down northbound lanes to allow for pedestrians and cyclists use; however, the plan for emergency vehicle access is still being developed.

V. ACTION ITEMS
VI. STATUS REPORTS

A. THEA Project Update and PD&E Advance Notification for Whiting St & Washington St Extensions & Selmon Expressway Ramps Reconfiguration (Anna Quinones, THEA Representative)

Ms. Quinones presented THEA’s five-year work program which includes over a half billion dollars of transportation and community improvement projects, as well as several project development and environmental studies that may result in more projects. The projects are: Selmon Extension, South Selmon Safety Project, South Selmon PD&E, Whiting Street PD&E and Morrison Gateway Project. These five projects accommodate the growth, plans and implement solutions for the projected growth, all the while continuing to provide safe, reliable and cost – effective transportation solutions that connect communities and reinvest revenues back into our transportation system.

She reviewed the Selmon Extension project by the numbers and the South Selmon Safety Project, which will enhance driver safety by constructing a concrete barrier wall in the median of the Expressway.

The South Selmon PD&E study evaluation area is from Himes Avenue to Whiting Street in downtown Tampa. The primary purpose of the study is to evaluate the needs, costs and effects of construction improvements that will increase capacity on the South Selmon Expressway. The study will also identify solutions to the frequent congestion and entry and exit points along the Selmon Expressway. In addition, it will evaluate strategies to eliminate conflict points and reduce crashes. They will also evaluate the need for noise walls. Ms. Quinones reviewed the schedule for this project and the upcoming outreach schedule.

The Whiting Street PD&E addresses the extension of Whiting Street, a commitment from THEA to the City of Tampa related to the Selmon Expressway Reversible Express Lanes (REL) project. Once ConAgra vacates the property in the Channel District, the CSX rail lines currently serving the flour mill will be removed to allow for the realignment and extension of Whiting Street and Washington Street. The Whiting Street PD&E will be conducted in close coordination with the South Selmon PD&E and the Selmon East PD&E. The purpose of this project is to improve safety, accessibility and circulation along the Selmon Expressway and throughout Downtown and the Channel District. The extensions will provide capacity improvements while complementing the City’s street grid network. Ms. Quinones reviewed the schedule for this PD&E, noting THEA is currently in the data collection and analysis phase.

Ms. Quinones provided updates on two other projects, not included in the PowerPoint presentation. THEA recently kicked off the Selmon East PD&E, which looks at capacity operations improvements from downtown to I-75, which includes adding ramps to the REL. They also began the Nebraska Avenue PD&E which was supposed to go before the March Board meeting that was postponed. This study will look at operational improvements from Twiggs to Cass Street and will be completed in cooperation with the City of Tampa and the FDOT District 7. This project includes a design build to add another turn lane from the REL onto Twiggs, between Meridian to Nebraska, and the study will look at improving the traffic flow and operations.
The Morrison Gateway project is an underpass improvement brought to THEA by the neighborhood association. It is scheduled to be finished by the end of the week and will be maintained by the neighborhood association.

Ms. Quinones provided an update on the enhancements on the Selmon Greenway Masterplan Update. An enhancement at Florida and Jefferson, along Brorein, is currently in the design phase and construction is programmed for FY22. A pocket park in the triangular lot on Jefferson is planned as part of the Whiting ramp project. Remaining enhancements along the Greenway are planned for FY22. The Adamo section enhancements are to be determined based on area plans and development.

Discussions followed regarding a possible modification to the challenging bike path where Adamo becomes Channelside underneath the Selmon Expressway (To keep the Greenway in the Right-of-Way it had to go under the Expressway; however, a possible redesign is being discussed); the possibility of having the trail cross over Channelside closer to the intersection (It has previously been deemed unsafe because of the intersection set up and possible conflicts with the trolley, but the redesign is being discussed); and how the modifications will affect the traffic flow on Meridian, especially reducing the speed of vehicles exiting the Reversible Express Lanes (Ms. Quinones doesn’t know all the details, but it is being looked at carefully. She will bring these concerns to her supervisors for their input.).

B. Air Quality month (Alain Watson, Environmental Protection Commission {EPC})

Mr. Watson provided the Air Quality Update. The EPC is compliant with all national health-based standards for the principal transportation pollutants (ozone, nitrogen dioxide and fine particulates). He explained the air management division, the effects of common air pollutants and the air monitoring for public health protection and research.

Mr. Watson reviewed the near-road site data from the Munro Street collection site. He discussed the significant difference in the data collected in March 2019 compared to March 2020, due to the huge reduction in vehicles on the roadway because of the shelter in place. He also reviewed ozone precursor pollutants. Transportation is the largest contributor of NOX.

Mr. Watson discussed the impacts of ozone nonattainment; however, Hillsborough County is currently in attainment. He reviewed the County’s ozone design value and explained why we see higher ozone levels in the Tampa Bay area. He highlighted the MPO considerations regarding air quality, which are reducing congestion, reducing vehicle idling, promoting alternative transportation options, encouraging public transit, promoting alternative/cleaner fuel options and supporting electric vehicle charging infrastructure. He reviewed the EPC’s Transportation-related initiatives, including alternative vehicle fleet, two public charging stations on-site, public outreach, Tampa Bay Clean Cities Coalition, staff route optimization, sustainability office and air quality advisories.

Mr. Watson reviewed the air quality summaries from 2001 - 2019. He shared an announcement released on March 5th which stated the DEP announces Florida has the cleanest air on record and meets all ambient air quality standards, making Florida the most populist state in the Union in compliance with all of the standards.

Discussions followed regarding if the slides will be added to the BPAC section of the Plan Hillsborough website (yes, Mr. Reynolds will add them); if there have been updated readings at the Munro Street collection site since April 1st (yes, instruments operate and update
and if telecommuting is on the list of MPO considerations regarding air quality (The list didn't specifically state telecommuting by it is a strategy that can be applied).

C. Performance Evaluation of e-Scooter Sharing in Tampa (YuYu Zhang, USF)

Dr. Zhang presented the Performance Evaluation of e-Scooter Sharing in the City of Tampa. and acknowledged Committee member, Jason Jackman, and two of her students for their participation with this evaluation. Ms. Zhang reviewed the Scooter program, how the program was evaluated, where the data was collected, and the evaluation results, which include metric development, the public opinions on key questions and feedback suggestions. She also reviewed major findings and recommendations.

The City of Tampa’s scooter program began in late May 2019 and data was collected from May 28, 2019 to March 9, 2020. There are currently four service providers in the City: Lime, Spin, Bird and Jump. There have been 982,468 total trips and daily trips average 3,423. Dr. Zhang presented the daily trip counts by month and by day of the week, as well as the hourly trip counts and the utilization ratio.

Dr. Zhang discussed the program evaluation methodology and data sources, such as e-Scooter sharing survey data, e-Scooter sharing operational data from Populus, accident data, and comments and feedback from the public. She presented the Evaluation Results Section 1: Evaluation Metrics, including Economic Impacts, Environmental Impacts, Equity, Health and Safety, and Level of Service. Dr. Zhang shared the Public Opinions on Where to ride e-Scooters, Rules and Regulations, Concerns, Speed Limit, if the City should Continue the Program, if Standing or Seated e-Scooters are preferred, the User's Evaluation of Vendors, and the preference for Single or Multiple Vendors. Next, Dr. Zhang discussed the Public Feedback, including Call Log Data Analysis, Comments from the Call Log, and Comments from Users and Non-Users on the survey.

Dr. Zhang displayed pictures showing abuse of the program, some of which are improper e-Scooter parking, unsafe riding behaviors and e-Scooter vandalism. She also shared suggestions and feedback from the Tampa-Hillsborough Alliance for Persons with Disabilities and National Federation of Blind-Tampa Chapter.

Major findings include e-Scooter sharing improves people’s mobility in downtown areas, though equity is an issue; safety concerns are the most complaints from the public; geo-fencing needs to be improved; the opinion that e-Scooters are more suitable for riding in the bicycle lanes; vendor performance is similar; and the utilization ratio has been decreasing since the program debut.

Some of the recommendations are to invest in constructing a connected and protected bike lane network; increase in service provider’s staff to respond to complaints and collect abandoned e-Scooters in a more timely manner; adjust the number of e-Scooters based on utilization; offer seated and adaptive e-Scooters to serve disabilities; set the minimum number of e-Scooters in disadvantaged areas to improve equity; provide discounted membership plans for low income population; ban e-Scooters from busy sidewalks; set speed limits on sidewalks to 10 mph or less; provide warning signage at entrance of “No Ride Zone”; provide designated parking corrals; strengthen law enforcement; and monitoring of the safety and usage data and track performance by the City.
Discussions followed regarding how the City of Tampa’s utilization compares to other cities of the same size (the City of Tampa is close, but a little below similar sized cities).

Mr. Reynolds will contact the City of Tampa for a copy of the evaluation to be shared with the Committee.

VII. OLD AND NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Shirk brought up the rise of bike/pedestrian crashes. Mr. Reynolds referred to the Vision Zero newsletter attached to the agenda and stated he is currently crunching numbers for the City of Tampa. Mr. Forbes would like to see an overlay showing the high traffic areas which have been targeted for improvement with the All for Transportation monies. Mr. Reynolds feels that can be done, along with who has jurisdiction for the corridors. He will bring this back to the Committee. Ms. Nguyen would also like to see the race and ethnicity for those involved in those crashes included on the overlay. Mr. Reynolds stated he can include the areas of concern on the overlay.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:22 p.m.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Annual Update

Presenter
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

Summary
Staff has prepared a draft of the Transportation Improvement Program document for the fiscal year period of 2020/21 – 2024/25. The TIP document includes projects programmed by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) based on priorities that were to be adopted by the MPO on June 11, 2019. These priorities were based on the adopted 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan. There are several considerations in approving this document, which will be discussed step by step.

Projects Funded in FY 2020/21 – 2024/25:
The TIP document shows funding amount and source, fiscal year, and project location and phase for projects funded with state and federal dollars in Hillsborough County during the next five fiscal years. The TIP document will be effective October 1, 2020–September 30, 2021 and funding in the first year cannot be changed without a TIP amendment, years two-four can be adjusted through future TIP adoptions. The TIP is coordinated and consistent with FDOT's Work Program.

Over the past year, FDOT has added funding to its Work Program for a number of projects that were on the MPO Board’s list of priority projects. With this update, the Hillsborough TIP document will now include those funded projects.

The TIP also lists significant transportation projects drawn from the capital improvement programs of local governments and agencies. These are shown for public information and coordination.

List of Priority Projects for Future Funding:
This item also seeks approval to update the MPO Priorities for FY2022-2026, shown in Tables 1 & 2, and was last updated June 2019. The priorities are grouped based on the programs within the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and then ranked based on objective criteria in each program. This update adds new projects to the priority list, based on coordination with the local governments and transportation agencies. The projects that have been funded but not yet built can be found in Table 1, where they will continue to be listed until completion. The projects for which funding is needed can be found in Table 2 of the TIP document, which is a separate attachment produced in 11 x 17 format.

Good Repair and Resiliency, including projects such as:
1. Bridge repair & replacement
2. Road resurfacing
3. Transit vehicle replacement
4. Recovery time & economic impacts from flooding or major storm surge

Vision Zero, including safety and resilience projects evaluated by their effect on:

1. Total, fatal & bike/ped crashes [per centerline mile]

Smart Cities, including intersection, signalization, freeway incident management and ITS projects, evaluated by their impact on:

1. Travel time reliability on heavily congested arterials
2. Peak period V/C ratio

Real Choices When Not Driving, including alternatives such as transit, multi-use trails and services for the transportation disadvantaged, evaluated by:

1. Density of jobs and population in 2045 within ¼ mile of proposed transit service
2. Density of jobs and population in 2045 within ¼ mile of proposed trail/side path

Major Projects, including road and transit capacity projects for economic growth:

1. Key economic spaces (job clusters > 5,000)
2. 2045 jobs served per mile of improvement
3. 2045 delay reduced per mile of improvement

The TIP must be submitted to the Florida Department of Transportation by July 15, 2020. The current schedule calls for a public hearing and adoption of the TIP at the MPO meeting on June 30, 2020.

**Recommended Action**

Recommend approval of the TIP for FY2020/21 – 2024/25.

**Prepared By**

Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

**Attachments**

- Link to Draft 2020/2021 Transportation Improvement Program
Agenda Item
Vision Zero Speed Management Action Plan

Presenter
Paula Flores, GPI

Summary
With the concerning numbers of people hurt and killed on roadways in Hillsborough County, several approaches will be needed to see a reduction in injuries and deaths. Through Vision Zero, there is an acknowledgement that speed plays a significant role in avoiding a crash altogether or at least surviving one. One of the strategies outlined in the MPO’s Vision Zero Action Plan specifically calls for looking at setting target speeds suitable to the surrounding context of land uses.

The MPO Board sponsored a study of speed management and safety, focusing on severe crash corridors in Hillsborough County. Stakeholder meetings have been held to help guide how to select and treat roads where excessive speed was a factor in the crash history. A presentation will be given on the methodology used to prioritize the high injury network corridors, share recommended countermeasures, and explain the need for speed management to systematically reduce serious injuries caused by crashes.

The attached presentation thoroughly represents the details of the draft Speed Management Action Plan. The full document was not available in time for the mailout but will be sent under separate cover prior to the meeting.

Recommended Action
Approve the Vision Zero Speed Management Action Plan and forward to the MPO for approval.

Prepared By
Gena Torres

Attachments
Presentation slides.
MANAGING SPEED on Hillsborough’s High Injury Network

Presented by:
Paula C. Flores, FITE
Transportation Planning Practice Leader
Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.
pflores@spinet.com
@Paula_CFlores

GOAL
• Improve public health and safety by reducing road fatalities and serious injuries.

DESIRED OUTCOMES
• Improved safety experience for all road users - pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.
• Increase awareness of the dangers of speeding.
• Institutionalize good practices in road design, traffic operations, engagement, enforcement and safety.
• Identify supportive policies, programs and infrastructure improvements to meet safety goal.
• Obtain cooperation and support of stakeholders.
SPEED MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN - Study Scope

• Task 1 - Stakeholder Involvement
• Task 2 - Speed Management Practices
• Task 3 - Corridor Prioritization
• Task 4 – Next30 High Injury Corridors
• Task 5 - Speed Management Action Plan

Partners & Stakeholders

- Hillsborough County MPO
- Hillsborough County
- Hillsborough County School District
- City of Tampa
- City of Temple Terrace
- Plant City
- Law Enforcement
- FDOT
- HART
- THEA
- Florida Health Department

Engagement Rules

- Be engaged
- Be respectful of others
- Be creative, innovative
- Be positive
- Be a problem solver
- Be a motivator for change
- Be a Safety Warrior!

... people are dying, and we can make a difference!
Stakeholder Meetings

May 24, 2019
October 2019
April 2020

Prioritization Factors:

(Ranked by order of most mentioned in breakout groups)

- Posted speed vs. context Class
- Regional equity (low income, Commissioner districts)
- Crash history
- Proximity to schools
- Ped/bike injuries
- Absence of lighting
- Ped/Bike level of stress
- Planned projects in Work Program / CIP
- Low hanging fruit - ease of implementation
- Transit service route
- Geometric features (volumes, lanes, intersection spacing)
Stakeholder Feedback

Potential Countermeasures:

• Wider use of Red-Light Cameras – do studies; change how we speak about them, and apply revenue for safety improvements
• Enforcement - Consider photo enforcement, share example case studies; manual vs automated enforcement assessment; need legislation.
• Outreach & Education – at schools; more resources to E’s; build community partnerships; support from local elected officials
• Crosswalks - Elevated crosswalks; increase density in urban areas
• Tactical Urbanism – more pilot projects; use bollards/quick curb
• Traffic Signals - Coordination for target speed; increase density of # of signals; smart technology for vehicle detection;
• Speed Limit Signs – enhance visibility with panels and bright sticks
• Land use patterns – mixed and higher density
• More roundabouts
• More on-street parking
• Lane eliminations

TASK 2 - SPEED MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

- Existing Speed Management Practices
- Industry Best Practices
  - Statewide & National
SPEED MANAGEMENT PLAN ATTRIBUTES:

- Data-driven - crash, roadway, user, landuse data
- Applying road design, traffic operations, & safety measures
- Setting “appropriate/rational/desirable/safe” speed limits
- Institutionalize good practices
- Supportive enforcement efforts
- Effective outreach & public engagement
- Cooperation by traffic safety stakeholders

Design - Speed Management Countermeasures

- Road Diet
- Speed Humps / Tables
- Roundabouts
- Raised / Refuge islands
- On-Street Parking
- Street Trees
- Narrow Lane widths
- Horizontal/Vertical Curvature
- Short Blocks/ Midblock Crossings
- Pavement markings and Signs
- Leading Pedestrian Intervals
- No Right On Red
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

Intelligent Transportation Systems

- Driver feedback signs
- Install signals to maintain an orderly progression
- Time signals for target speed
- Rest in Red signals
- Excessive speeds trigger red signal indication
- Variable speed limits

WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

SUPPORTIVE ENFORCEMENT TECHNIQUES

- Automated Speed Enforcement
- Automated Red Light Cameras
- Targeted enforcement on high crash corridors
- Higher fines on high crash corridors
- Radar and Laser Speed Monitoring
- Aerial enforcement
Evaluate Top 20 HIN Corridors
Develop Metrics for Prioritization
- Severity
- Equity
- Focus on Pedestrian Crashes
- Proximity to Schools
- Ease of Implementation

PROTECT #EVERYSCHOOL WITH SPEED SAFETY CAMERAS

Education
Engineering
Enforcement
Equity
Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Road Classification</th>
<th>Context Classification</th>
<th>ITE/CNU Class Speed Range*</th>
<th>Posted Speed (MPH)</th>
<th>Conflict Range (MPH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Blvd from Falkenburg Rd to Dover Rd</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45, 50, 65</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibsborn Dr/Boyette Rd from 1-75 to Balm Riverview Rd</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Ave from Longboat Blvd to Florida Ave</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45, 50</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Ave from Armenia Ave to 50th St</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>35, 40, 45</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mabry from Hillsborough Ave to Bearss Ave</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3-C4 (50-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Turner from Gunn Hwy to Ehrlich Rd</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Ave from Channelside Dr to Twiggs St</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C6 (55-70)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce B Downs from Fowler Ave to Bearss Ave</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th St from MLK Blvd to Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th St from Fowler Ave to Fletcher Ave</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>C4 (30-45)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend Road from US41 to I75</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US301 from I75 to Adamos Dr</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon Rd from Hillsborough Ave to Water Ave</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 from 1275 to 22nd St</td>
<td>Freeway</td>
<td>Urban (50-70)</td>
<td>50-70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th St from Sligh Ave to Busch Blvd</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C4 (30-45)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>35, 45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275 from Howard Frankland Bridge to Busch Blvd</td>
<td>Freeway</td>
<td>Urban (50-70)</td>
<td>50-70</td>
<td>55, 60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Blvd from Dale Mabry to Ashley Dr</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C4 (30-45)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>40, 45</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78th St from Causeway Blvd to Palm River Rd</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C4 (30-45)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR875/Mango Rd from MLK Blvd to US92</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C4 (30-45)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Ave from Waters Ave to Linobauh Ave</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C4 (30-45)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>40, 45</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall
- 70% are 5-10 MPH over National Practice
- 15% are 15-20 MPH over National Practice

Prioritization Factors

- Posted speed vs. context Class
- Regional equity (low income, Commissioner districts)
- Crash history
- Proximity to schools
- Ped/bike injuries
- Transit service route
- Geometric features (volumes, lanes, intersection spacing)
Communities of Concern

Which measure more than one standard deviation above the county’s median in two or more characteristics: low income, disability, youth, elderly, limited English proficiency, minorities and carless households.

• Overlaid HIN corridors
• Estimated distance of frontage of each COC category on the corridor
• Assigned a point system for each COC category on the corridor
• Developed a Risk Performance Level - the higher the deviations, the higher the points, the higher the risk.

Example Assessment - Equity

Example Assessment - Transit Service Routes

• Overlaid HIN corridors
• Identified how many service routes traverse the corridor
• Identified how many routes cross the corridor
• Identified if a transfer center or park and ride lot exists
• Identified what key destinations (grocery, health care, schools, etc.) exist with transit access
• Assigned a point system for each category
• Developed a Risk Performance Level - the higher the services provided, the higher the risk, the higher the points.
### TASK 4 - Next Top 30 HIN Corridors

- Identify Next30
- Prioritize Next30

#### Top 20 - Priority Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Crash Severity/Missed Opportunity</th>
<th>Ped-Bike Crash</th>
<th>Rail-Veh.</th>
<th>Equity Categorical</th>
<th>Contact Class Conflict</th>
<th>Transit Routes</th>
<th>High Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Blvd</td>
<td>Falkenburg Rd to Dover Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibsonton Dr/Boyette Rd</td>
<td>I-75 to Balm Riverview Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td>Longboat Blvd to Florida Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Ave</td>
<td>Armenia Ave to 50th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mabry</td>
<td>Hillsborough Ave to Bearns Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Turner</td>
<td>Gunn Hwy to Ehrlich Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Ave</td>
<td>Channelside Dr to Twiggs St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce B Downs</td>
<td>Fowler Ave to Bearns Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th/56th St</td>
<td>MLK Blvd to Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th St</td>
<td>Fowler Ave to Fletcher Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend Road</td>
<td>US41 to I75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US301</td>
<td>I75 to Adamo Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon Rd</td>
<td>Hillsborough Ave to Water Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>I275 to 22nd St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th St</td>
<td>Sligh Ave to Busch Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I275</td>
<td>Howard Frankland Bridge to Busch Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Blvd</td>
<td>Dale Mabry to Ashley Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78th St</td>
<td>Causeway Blvd to Palm River Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR579/Mango Rd</td>
<td>from MLK Blvd to US92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Ave</td>
<td>Waters Ave to Linebaugh Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fatal + Serious Injury Crashes
(Jan 2014-Dec 2018)

Next 30 High Injury Corridors

Bloomingdale Ave - US Hwy 301 to Lithia Pinecrest Rd
US Hwy 41 - Gulf City Rd to Riverview Dr
US Hwy 301 - 19th Ave to Bloomingdale Ave
M L King Blvd - Dale Mabry Hwy to Parson Ave
US Hwy 41 - Madison Ave to 14
Big Bend Rd - I75 to Balm Riverview Rd
Busch Blvd - Armenia Ave to 56th Street
SR 674 (Sun City Ctr Blvd) - US Hwy 41 to CR579
I-75 - SR 60 to Fletcher Ave
Hillsborough Ave - Florida Ave to Orient Rd
Waters Ave - Sheldon Road to Dale Mabry Hwy
Fowler Ave - I275 to I75
US Hwy 301 - SR 674 to Lightfoot Rd
I-75 - Big Bend Rd to US Hwy 301
SR 60 /Adamo Dr - Orient Rd to Falkenburg Rd
Causeway Blvd - 78th St to Providence Rd
Waters Ave - Dale Mabry Hwy to Nebraska Ave
Progress Blvd - Falkenburg Rd to US Hwy 301
Hillsborough Ave - Race Track Rd to Longboat Blvd
Memorial Hwy - Hillsborough Ave to Veterans Expwy
Hanley Rd - Woodbridge Blvd to Waters Ave
Dale Mabry Hwy - Interbay Blvd to Gandy Blvd
Howard Ave - Kennedy Blvd to Tampa Bay Blvd
Dale Mabry Hwy - Kennedy Blvd to Hillsborough Ave
US Hwy 92 - Falkenburg Rd to Thonotosassa Rd
Nebraska Ave - Columbus Ave to Hillsborough Ave
US Hwy 301 - Stacy Rd to County Line
Armenia Ave - Tampa Bay Blvd to Waters Ave
MacDill Ave - Kennedy Blvd to Columbus Dr
M L King Blvd - McIntosh Rd to Sammonds Rd
## Top50 HIN Priority Recap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor and Extent</th>
<th>Crash Severity / Rate</th>
<th>Speed Mph</th>
<th>Capacity / Lane</th>
<th>Paved Speed - Capacity Ratio</th>
<th>High Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bloomingdale Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 69 / Adamo Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor and Extent</td>
<td>Crash Severity / Rate</td>
<td>Speed Mph</td>
<td>Capacity / Lane</td>
<td>Paved Speed - Capacity Ratio</td>
<td>High Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causeway Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Hwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanley Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mabry Hwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mabry Hwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDill Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M L King Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority Scoring

- **High**
- **Medium**
- **Low**

**Performance Level**

- **High**
- **Medium**
- **Low**
TASK 5 - Speed Management Action Plan

- Strategies and Countermeasures
- Actions and Implementation Strategy

Vision Zero Principles

- Human life and health are priorities in our community.
- Traffic deaths and severe injuries are preventable.
- We are human and make mistakes. The roadway system should be designed to protect us.
- Speed is a critical factor in crash severity. The most effective approach is to systematically prioritize safety over speed.
- Responsibility is shared between system designers and road users.

Source: Municipality of Anchorage
Vision Zero Principles

SAFE TRAVEL FOR ALL

SAFE STREETS  SAFE SPEEDS  SAFE VEHICLES  SAFE PEOPLE

Source: Vision Zero Network

Safe People

Source: City of Tampa- Crosswalks to Classrooms
# Aggressive Driving Crash Countermeasures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>Area Type</th>
<th>Location Type</th>
<th>Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban (C4,C5,C6)</td>
<td>Suburban (C3)</td>
<td>Rural (C1-C2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe People Walking or Bicycling:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing - High Visibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks Required on both sides</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks (8 foot min standard)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Separation (from travel lanes)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Block Pedestrian Crossing/Short Blocks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge Islands (raised/painted)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted Intersections / Crosswalks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Intersections</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes (separated)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes (protected)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Trees / Landscaping</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Curb Ramps</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Radius of Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zone Temporary Facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Shared / Slow Streets</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Context Class</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Target Speed Limit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Orlando – Complete Streets Policy

---

## Safe Streets

---

Source: City of Orlando – Complete Streets Policy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>Area Type</th>
<th>Location Type</th>
<th>Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C4,C5,C6)</td>
<td>(C3)</td>
<td>(C1-C2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Streets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicanes / Lateral Shifts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full / Half Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width (10 foot standard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Diet (re-purpose space)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Traffic Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width (10 foot standard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Diet (re-purpose space)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Freeway Interchanges:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Acceleration Lanes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign High Speed Exit Ramps</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign High Speed On-Ramps</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse Rumble Strips</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Safe Continuous Bike Lanes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Safe Pedestrian Crossings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Context Class</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Target Speed Limit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Traffic Operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Speed Limits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add New Signals / Improve Connectivity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected only Left Turn Signal Phasing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Coordination Target Speed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Speed Limits (Expressways)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Feedback Signs - Speed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Pedestrian Interval</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Ped Beacon / HAWK</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest in Red Signal Operation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Speed Detection Signals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter Signal Cycle Lengths</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal - Demand Responsive off-peak</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting / Pedestrian Level Lighting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Pedestrian Countdown Timers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Context Class</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Target Speed Limit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Safe Speeds

### Aggressive Driving Crash Countermeasures (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>Area Type</th>
<th>Location Type</th>
<th>Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban (C4,C5,C6)</td>
<td>Suburban (C3)</td>
<td>Rural (C1-C2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Enforcement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Section Speed Enforcement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Speed Camera Enforcement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Light Cameras</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Enforcement on High Injury Corridors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Fines on High Injury Corridors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Fines in School/Slow Speed Zones</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Campaign / PSA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Driving</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for All Users w/Emphasis on Vulnerable</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Safety</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRFB’s / Hawk Operations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Speed Enforcement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Pavement Markings/Signs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Conflict Zone Markings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Speed/Coordinated Signals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Traffic Technology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Countermeasures

Application to Top8 HIN Corridors
Top 8 HIN Corridor - Fatal Crash Characteristics

Fatalities by Age

Fatalities by Location

Fatalities by Time of Day

Contributing Factors

Failed to Yield Right-of-Way
Operated MV in Careless or Negligent Manner
Other Contributing Actions
Ran Red Light
Failed to Keep in Proper Lane
Improper Turn
Operated MV in Erratic, Reckless or Aggravated manner
Exceeded Posted Speed

Top 8 HIN Corridor Characteristics

Crashes by Lighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Crashes</th>
<th>Serious Injuries</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dark-Lighted</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark-Not Lighted</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusk</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Dark-Lighted      | 17%              | 4%         |
| Dark-Not Lighted  | 12%              | 4%         |
| Daylight          | 56%              | 30%        |
| Dusk              | 2%               | 4%         |
Safe Systems Approach

- Holistic view of the road system
- Interactions among roads and roadsides, travel speeds, vehicles and road users
- Inclusive approach for all users
  - Drivers, motorcyclists, passengers, pedestrians, cyclist, and commercial/heavy vehicles
- Speeds must be managed
- Humans are not exposed to impact forces beyond their physical tolerance

Most Importantly, it’s proactive vs. reactive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>Bruce B Downs (Fowler to Bearss)</th>
<th>Hillsborough Ave (Longboat to Florida)</th>
<th>Dale Mabry (Falkenburg to Bearss)</th>
<th>Florida Avenue (Waters to Linebaugh)</th>
<th>Brandon Blvd (Falkenburg to Down)</th>
<th>Fletcher Avenue (Amerlia to 50th)</th>
<th>Sheldon Road (Hillsborough to Waters)</th>
<th>Kennedy Blvd (Dale Mabry to Ashley)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe People Walking or Bicycling:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing - High Visibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks Required on both sides</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks (8 foot min standard)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Separation (from travel lanes)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Block Pedestrian Crossing/Short Blocks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge Islands (raised/painted)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes (separated)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes (protected)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Trees / Landscaping</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Radius of Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Target Speed Limit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Streets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width (10 foot standard)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Diet (repurpose space)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Treatment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulb Outs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Radii / Radius Reduction (+Driveways)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerline Hardening</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Acceleration Lanes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Deceleration Lanes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Right Turn Channelization</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Urbanism-Quick Fixes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples

W Hillsborough Ave @ Town N Country Blvd

Major Corridor w/ 45-50 MPH posted speed
- No high visibility crossings
- Only three pedestrian crossings
- Large turning radii
- High speed right turn lane

Dale Mabry Highway @ Floyd Road

Major Corridor w/ 45 MPH posted speed
- Two Bus stop locations
- No crossings
- Large turning radii
- High speed right turn lanes

Examples

W Hillsborough Ave @ Dale Mabry Highway

Major Corridor w/ 45-50 MPH posted speed
- Circuitous pedestrian crossings
- Bicycle multi-threat conflict zones
- High speed acceleration/deceleration lanes

Dale Mabry Highway @ Lambright St

Major Corridor w/ 45 MPH posted speed
- High Visibility Crossings 150’ across
- No refuge islands
- Large turning radii
- No centerline hardening
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>Bruce B Downs (Fowler to Bearss)</th>
<th>Hillsborough Ave (Waters to Florida)</th>
<th>Dale Mabry (Hillsborough to Bearss)</th>
<th>Florida Avenue (Waters to Linebaugh)</th>
<th>Brandon Blvd (Falkenburg to Dover)</th>
<th>Fletcher Avenue (Armenia to 50th)</th>
<th>Sheldon Road (Waters to Waters)</th>
<th>Kennedy Blvd (Dale Mabry to Ashley)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe Freeway Interchanges:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Acceleration Lanes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign High Speed Exit Ramps</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign High Speed On-Ramps</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse (in lane) Rumble Strips</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Safe Continuous Bike Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Safe Pedestrian Crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Traffic Operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Speed Limits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add New Signals / Improve Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Coordination - Target Speed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Feedback Signs - Speed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Pedestrian Interval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Ped Beacon / HAWK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest in Red Signal Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Speed Detection Signals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal - Demand Responsive Off-Peak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Pedestrian Countdown Timers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Speed Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Light Cameras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targeted Enforcement and Education applicable to ALL HIN Corridors

Further information/data necessary
Actions and Implementation Strategy

GOAL
• Improve public health and safety by reducing road fatalities and serious injuries.

Study Objectives

DESIRED OUTCOMES
• Improved safety experience for all road users - pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.
• Increase awareness of the dangers of speeding.
• Institutionalize good practices in road design, traffic operations, engagement, enforcement and safety.
• Identify supportive policies, programs and infrastructure improvements to meet safety goal.
• Obtain cooperation and support of stakeholders.
Safe Speeds

Actions and Implementation Strategy - Speed Setting

Action 1 - Regional Context Classification
✓ Develop and publish Context Class for every street in the county per ITE/ULI speed range guidance
✓ Update FDOT Context Class speeds per ITE/ULI best practices
✓ Identify corridors with egregious speed limits related to context class
✓ Develop process to address and prioritize modifications
✓ Review and update regularly per local growth and development plans

Short Term (1-2 Years)
Mid Term (3-5 years)
Long Term (5+ years)
Action 2 - Immediately Evaluate All Projects

- Per new Context Classifications, evaluate all ongoing projects at State, County and City Levels
- All projects include: new roads, reconstruction projects, resurfacing projects, operations projects (ITS, signal progression).

Action 3 - Initiate a HC safety task force to engage on speed limit setting, improve consistency of outcomes, and restore credibility of speed limits. Outcomes:

- Improve the methodology for determining operating speed per national best practices.
- Adopt a Safe Systems Approach - Target Speed
- Discourage the use of the 85th percentile method to set speed limits in urban, suburban and rural town centers.
- Encourage agencies to establish a max speed limits of:
  • 20MPH on any street within a residential district
  • 25-35MPH on all other streets
- Provide guidance that address liability and tort barriers
Actions and Implementation Strategy - Speed Setting

- Any actions of concern?
- Any additional strategies or actions?
- Are the time frames reasonable?
- Responsible parties?

Actions and Implementation Strategy - Engineering & Operations

Action 1 - Develop preliminary treatment plans for Top50 High Injury Network corridors.
- Establish standard scope for all evaluations to ensure consistency.
- Obtain travel speed for Top50 High Injury Network corridors.
- Identify feasible countermeasures from the Speed Management resource table.
- Identify immediate quick fix (Tactical Urbanism) recommendations.
- Identify longer term recommendations, program and fund.
Action 2 - Strengthen Design Manual / Design Standards for roadway construction, operations and maintenance.

✓ Reflect the speed management concepts and countermeasures identified.
✓ Add more flexibility for multimodal design needs.
✓ Discourage overdesigning for future motor vehicle capacity where such design would encourage higher operating speeds.
✓ Include design guidance that is more protective of vulnerable users where variable speeds (transition areas) and where land use destinations suggest current or latent demand for walking and bicycling.

Action 3 - Incorporate design flexibility to reflect state of the art / national best practices.

✓ Agencies should be encouraged to adopt and require national best practices on safety, vision zero and speed management (ITE, NACTO, Vision Zero Network, etc.)
✓ Update FDOT Street Design Standards - Replace “warrant” requirements with “guidelines” per FHWA principals. Especially in justification for pedestrian crossings and signals in high pedestrian areas, and school zones.
Action 4 - Establish Local Street Design Guidelines

☑ Encourage local agencies City and County to establish context sensitive design guidelines.
☑ Ensure prioritization of transportation modes for vulnerable users. People first design approach.
☑ Ensure close coordination and refinement of land use / zoning / development regulations.
☑ Encourage adoption of local agency ordinances/policies that would require developers to meet safety and speed management in new street design.

Short Term (1-2 Years)
Mid Term (3-5 years)
Long Term (5+ years)

Action 5 - Traffic Operations Recommendations

☑ Where operating speeds exceed the context classification ranges, identify and install the appropriate traffic control countermeasures.
☑ Expand the use of automated traffic safety cameras in school zones, at traffic signals, and other locations that maybe approved under statute.
☑ Use signal timing to manage traffic flow for compliance with target speeds.
☑ Use radar feedback signs and messaging to help public understand that the speed limit is the upper limit.

Short Term (1-2 Years)
Mid Term (3-5 years)
Long Term (5+ years)
Actions and Implementation Strategy - Engineering & Operations

Action 6 - Professional Development and Training
✓ Provide educational opportunities for professionals, public officials on speed management principles, importance of vehicle speed and injury severity.
✓ Provide training on relationship between 85th percentile operating speed and the effect of increasing speed limits on fatal and serious injury crashes, versus less severe crashes.
✓ Provide training on speed management and land use/zoning/development decisions.
✓ Provide educational opportunities on how to determine which streets need traffic calming techniques.

Action 7 - Fund Improvements to Achieve Speed Management Goals
✓ Inventory current and future sources of funding for safety and speed management.
✓ Reprioritize funding for safety and speed management projects.
✓ Encourage competitive grant programs (safety programs, SRTS and Ped/Bicycle Safety Programs) to make speed management practices eligible for funding and add speed management consideration in selection criteria.
✓ Identify and pursue opportunities to incorporate speed management treatments with other projects.
Action 8 - Collaborate with law enforcement, firefighting and other emergency response professionals to generate support for Safety and Speed Management goals and implementation.

- Potential issues may include:
  - Enforcement preference for multiple lanes so they have a lane to work in;
  - Grid verses cul-de-sac issues;
  - Lane width;
  - On-Street parking value as friction for speed management

Any actions of concern?
Any additional strategies or actions?
Are the time frames reasonable?
Responsible parties?
Actions and Implementation Strategy - Education and Enforcement

Action 1 - Educate the Public and Elected Officials
✓ Encourage public health and traffic safety partners to educate the public and elected officials about the importance of speed management and injury minimization.
✓ Create a one-page injury minimization and speed management that is easy to read and understand for decision makers (one for city and one for county).
✓ Apply principles of multicultural communication means to prepare and share traffic safety educational materials.
✓ Educate drivers by using advertising, updates to school curriculum and driver’s education programs.

Action 2 - Develop Education Messages
✓ Encourage proper road use behavior by all road users
✓ Explain how and why injury minimization speed limit methodology is used to inform of the purpose and goals of the speed management approach.
✓ Obtain public understanding and support to prevent / reduce road rage and support positive traffic safety culture in communities.
✓ Inform the general public about the importance of using appropriate lower speed limits to save lives and achieve Vision Zero goals.
**Actions and Implementation Strategy - Education and Enforcement**

**Action 3 - Draw on local resources and partners to develop community-based public awareness and education.**
- Ensure that speed limits, including statutory maximums, are well-communicated to drivers.
- Improve and increase communications about the safety reasons for effective policies and strategies.
- Increase publicity and visibility of enforcement to enhance deterrent effects.
- Target education and outreach when speed limit or street design changes occur.

**Actions and Implementation Strategy - Education and Enforcement**

**Action 4 - Encourage Elected officials to adopt Speed Management Policy**
- Replicate steps used to encourage adoption of Complete Streets Policies, in a way that will inform the community and get support from elected officials.
- Create a one-page concise page that shows how injury minimization efforts support Complete Streets principles for staff and elected officials to use in response to public concerns.
- Encourage the integration of speed management into Complete Streets policies.
Actions and Implementation Strategy - Education and Enforcement

**Action 5 - Establish safeguards against inequitable enforcement practices.**

- Before undertaking enforcement emphasis campaigns, provide training on equity issues for law enforcement and encourage work with cultural ambassadors in diverse communities.
- Primarily issuing warnings and educational materials rather than citations, early on in new programs.
- Ensure all outreach materials are bilingual, at a minimum.
- Establishing metrics to continuously evaluate equity within program activities.

**Action 6 - Enforcement Recommendations**

- Encourage enforcement efforts to address the top 10% of aggressive driver behaviors on HIN network corridors.
- Expand the use of automated speed enforcement in school zones.
- Encourage better posted and impact speed documentation in crash data reports.
- Design escalating enforcement campaigns
- Designate “speed awareness zones” with higher fines for aggressive driving violations,
- Issue notifications to drivers and encouraging resident-involved speed reduction efforts.
Any actions of concern?
Any additional strategies or actions?
Are the time frames reasonable?
Responsible parties?

Action 1 - Support Changes to Laws and Regulations as necessary to ensure people are protected to the greatest extent possible.
✓ Encourage the change in guidance authorizing agencies to reevaluate speed limits.
✓ Discourage the use of the 85th percentile speed setting in urban, suburban and rural town centers.
✓ Develop and adopt a Speed Management Policy.
✓ Integrate speed management goals in Complete Streets policies.
✓ Encourage the use of automated traffic safety cameras for speed management in HIN corridors and school zones.
Actions and Implementation Strategy - Policy / Legislation

**Action 2 - Set a firm Vision Zero crash reduction Goal**
- Establish parameters to establish a 50% reduction in fatal and serious injury crashes by 2030.
- Prioritize repurposing existing corridors for all users.
- Prioritize safety projects in LRTP and UWP to achieve crash reduction goal.
- Redefine funding objectives to fund safety projects to achieve Vision Zero safety goals.

Actions and Implementation Strategy - Policy / Legislation

**Action 3 - Develop an inter-agency speed and safety review process to assess land use and transportation plans, designs, and implemented projects. That will:**
- Leverage parallel programs and initiatives where there are shared objectives and priorities.
- Coordinate land use and transportation plans in setting speed limits and street design characteristics.
- Set or revise speed limits early in the new project planning process.
- Conduct road safety audits of all new, pending and maintenance and operations projects.
Action 4 - Review and update Land Use Policies - ensure walkable, safe, and healthy communities.

- Ensure mixed-use development patterns
- Ensure grid street system to improve connectivity
- Ensure multi-modal infrastructure is required of all developments
- Maximize the number of entry points to subdivisions
- Ensure self enforcing street design
- Integrate neighborhood schools with safe access

- Short Term (1-2 Years)
- Mid Term (3-5 years)
- Long Term (5+ years)

Action 5 - Review and Initiate Traffic Safety Legislation Measures

- Pull on local partnerships and elected political officials to formulate a plan of action to address current and future traffic safety legislative needs, including but not limited to:
  - The need to update statutory speed setting legislation
  - State authority to utilize Automated Speed Enforcement
  - Initiate the need for a state Motorcycle Helmet Law
  - Identify other critical safety legislation needs

- Short Term (1-2 Years)
- Mid Term (3-5 years)
- Long Term (5+ years)
Any actions of concern?  
Any additional strategies or actions?  
Are the time frames reasonable?  
Responsible parties?

### Actions and Implementation Strategy - Policy / Legislation

**Action 1** - Develop evaluation metrics and timeframes for plan updates.

- Establish quarterly updates of the Speed Management Action Plan.
- Establish post-project evaluation measures with qualitative and quantitative approaches, including:
  - Quantitative measures: speed reduction, crash reduction, serious injury/fatality reduction, and impact on travel time.
  - Qualitative measures: user observations, surveys

### Actions and Implementation Strategy - Plan Evaluation

- Short Term (1-2 Years)
- Mid Term (3-5 years)
- Long Term (5+ years)
Actions and Implementation Strategy - Plan Evaluation

- Any actions of concern?
- Any additional strategies or actions?
- Are the time frames reasonable?
- Responsible parties?

NEXT STEP

- Finalize Draft Plan
- Presentation to MPO Committees
- Incorporate Feedback
- Finalize Speed Management Action Plan
THANK YOU!

Paula C. Flores, FITE
Transportation Planning Practice Leader
Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.
pflores@gpinet.com
@Paula_CFlores
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Florida Transportation Plan and Highway Safety Plan Update

**Presenter**
Alex Henry, FDOT District 7

**Summary**
The Florida Department of Transportation is updating the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP), which is the statewide long-range transportation plan for all of Florida. The FTP defines the future transportation vision and identifies goals, objectives, and strategies to accomplish that vision. Steering committees have been meeting to develop the draft update which will then be shared at regional meetings later this year. FDOT wants your feedback on key topics to help inform the update of the FTP and has developed the following surveys which you can participate now:

- Technology: [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PQ8MXVS](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PQ8MXVS)
- Resiliency: [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/7BXXNR7](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/7BXXNR7)
- State and Interregional trends: [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/H5PRX35](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/H5PRX35)
- State and local trends: [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JYNFB3K](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JYNFB3K)

The Highway Safety Plan will also be updated in collaboration with Florida’s traffic safety partners. It is aligned with and builds on the adopted FTP, the State’s long-range transportation plan. Both the FTP and the SHSP share the vision of a fatality-free roadway system to protect Florida’s 20 million residents and more than 105 million annual visitors.

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

**Prepared By**
Gena Torres, MPO Staff.

**Attachments**
None.
Induced Demand Briefing

Presenter
Alvaro Gabaldon, USF MPO Fellow

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

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

Recommended Action
None – informational briefing

Prepared By
Alvaro Gabaldon, USF MPO Fellow

Attachments
Presentation Slides
Induced Demand
A LITERATURE REVIEW

Understanding Induced Demand

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

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

Induced Demand is an Economic Term

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply:</th>
<th>refers to the amount of a “good” available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand:</td>
<td>refers to how many people want a “good”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price:</td>
<td>refers to the cost required to consume a “good”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supply and Demand Seek Equilibrium

- Supply, Demand, and Price exist in an equilibrium.
  - Quantity Supplied = Quantity Demanded

- A shift in one variable causes a reaction in the others.

Supply & Demand Applied to Roads

- Supply = Road capacity
- Demand = People that want to use the road (VMT)
- Price = The cost incurred by using the road

https://www.britannica.com/topic/supply-and-demand
What Happens When You Increase Supply?

Induced travel occurs when latent demand becomes real demand.

**FIGURE 2**  Supply and demand relationships for induced travel ($C = \text{initial cost}; S = \text{initial supply/capacity}; S' = \text{new supply/capacity}; V = \text{initial VMT}; V' = \text{new VMT}$).

*Generated Traffic and Induced Travel Implications for Transport Planning* 18 March 2019

https://www.vtpi.org/gentraf.pdf
What Does the Research Say?

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

Studies found elasticities of >1 across results.

Elasticity is a measure of the relationship between an independent and dependent variable.
What does the Research say?: Cervero

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

Published in APA Journal, 2003

Found “short term” congestion relief provided by capacity to reduce over the “long term”

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

What does the Research say?: Cervero

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

Proposed idea of “Induced Growth”

- Changes in land use development patterns around highway corridors that experienced increased capacity.
- More-dispersed, low density, auto dependent patterns emerged.
- Warned of the feedback loop that increased vehicle traffic results in investment in increasing vehicle capacity.
Published in 2011, *The American Economic Review*

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

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

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

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

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

What does the Research say?: Beaudoin & Lawell

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Research Limitations

- Researchers have controlled for statistical bias in inconsistent ways.
- Diversity of methodologies makes comparing studies difficult.
- Most researchers do not isolate specific sources of the additional VMT they observed, the exception being Duston and Turner (2008).
- Studies mostly focus on new roadway construction or road widenings.
- There is lack of information on the impact of HOV, toll, or auxiliary lanes or the impact of Transportation Demand Management strategies.
- Researchers highlight the difficulty of controlling for disruptive technologies, consumer preferences, and trends.
Some Patterns Have Emerged.

Key Takeaways

Induced vehicle travel effects occur and are measurable.
Key Takeaways

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

Key Takeaways

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

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

This can be referred to as "Induced Growth."

Key Takeaways

Cost is a primary influencer of travel behavior.
Committee Reports

Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on April 8
Under Action items, the CAC approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ Transportation Improvement Program Amendments
✓ FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program
✓ Annual Certification of MPO Planning Process

Committee members had questions about the cost of the I-4 resurfacing project, and FDOT responded that the segment has over 11 miles of the interstate highway and 16 miles of ramps and frontage roads. The CAC also heard a status report on Plant City Fiscal Analysis.

Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on April 20
Under Action items, the TAC approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ Transportation Improvement Amendments
✓ FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program
✓ Annual Certification of MPO Planning Process

There were no Status Reports this month.

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on April 8
The committee heard public comments on the need for a redesign/speed study for Bayshore Blvd. and regarding modifications to 14th and 15th Streets in Ybor City as a result of the TBNext project. In Action items, the BPAC had no objections and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program

The BPAC heard a status report on Sidewalk Stompers’ activities including advocacy, walking school buses, and future direction.

Meeting of the Intelligent Transportation Systems Committee (ITS) on April 9
The ITS Committee did not vote, but had no objections and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program

The Committee also heard status reports on the following topics:

• ITS Capability Maturity Model
• Hillsborough County Air Quality Status
• Vision Zero Speed Management Study
Meeting of the Livable Roadways Advisory Committee (LRC) on April 15

Under Action items, the LRC had no objections and forwarded to the MPO Board:

✓ FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program
✓ Annual Certification of MPO Planning Process

The LRC heard a status report on Air Quality Month.

Meeting of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board on April 24

The TDCB held their annual workshop and heard an update on the Tri-County Regional Needs for cross-county trips. A summary report on the cross-county trips provided through the Advantage Ride Pilot Program was also given. Board members discussed briefly the pilot program and its implications for future cross-county trip services. The Board also learned that the Advantage Rides Pilot Program and the Sunshine Line’s weekend trips have been provided through the Commission for Transportation Disadvantaged’s M-CORES funding.

Under Action Items TD Board approved:

✓ FY 20-21 Sunshine Line Service Rates
✓ FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program - Board members noted that the Community Health Impacts, Storm Evacuation Forecasting and Bus Stop Assessment studies would be the most useful for the Transportation Disadvantaged.

A presentation on the USC Section 5310 New Freedom Program reported that $2.4 million was available regionally this year. Hillsborough County agencies are receiving around $1.3 million of these funds to continue providing enhanced mobility for seniors and persons with disabilities.