Virtual Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee
Wednesday, June 10, 2020, at 9 AM

To view presentations and participate from your computer, tablet or smartphone, go to https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/7118203501021511436

You can also dial in using your phone: 1-213-929-4212
Access Code: 943-324-916

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

Live captioning will be displayed: https://2020archive.1capapp.com/event/hillsborough-cac/

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 GoToWebinar 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) 273-2200 ext. 48.

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

Public comments are welcome, and may be given at this virtual meeting by logging into the website above and clicking the “raise hand” button. Staff will unmute you when the chair recognizes you. Comments may also be phoned in during the meeting by dialing 813-273-2200 ext. 600.

IV. Members’ Interests

V. Approval of Minutes (May 20 meeting & May 27 workshop)

VI. Action Items

A. FY 20-25 Transportation Improvement Program (Sarah McKinley, MPO staff)

B. Vision Zero Speed Management Action Plan (Paula Flores, MPO consultant)

VII. Status Reports

A. SR 60/Kennedy Blvd Access Management Study (Kara Van Etten, FDOT)

B. Florida Transportation Plan & Highway Safety Plan Update (Alex Henry, FDOT)

C. Plant City Transit Plan (Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO Staff)
VIII. Unfinished & New Business

A. TBARTA CAC report (Rich Richmond, MPO CAC representative)
B. Managed Lanes Workshop in October – Adjust CAC calendar
C. Plant City Fiscal Analysis Workshop in July, date to be determined
D. Next Regular Monthly CAC meeting – August 12 at 9 AM

IX. Adjournment

X. Addendum

A. MPO Meeting Summary & Committee Report
B. Project Fact Sheet
   - US House Bill to Reauthorize Federal Transportation Spending

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 Joshua Barber, 813-273-3774 x313 or barberj@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.
HILLSBOROUGH METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Virtual Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Meeting of Wednesday, May 20th, 2020

I. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

Bill Roberts called the virtual meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. and went over the ground rules. After rollcall by Rich Clarendon, there was a quorum virtually present.

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

Members excused: Amy Espinosa, Cheryl Prida, Sky White

Others virtually present: Rich Clarendon, Beth Alden, Vishaka Raman, Allison Yeh, Wanda West, Cheryl Wilkening, Michael Rempfer, MPO staff; Chris Vela, and Debbie Guest

II. CHAIRMAN'S REQUEST

Per the MPO Bylaws, all speakers were asked to address only the presiding Chair for recognition virtually by Chat Box, to confine their remarks to the question under debate, and avoid personalities or indecorous language or behavior.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chris Vela, Ybor City 33605, relayed that, as part of the agenda, the Committee received his letter which was sent to all committees and the MPO, which outlines basically a point-by-point analysis as to the Tampa Bay NEXT Project, and that, in particular, any work to the downtown interchange would be devastating for his community in Ybor City and adjacent neighborhoods. Mr. Vela went over some history on this issue, emphasizing there was a letter sent over to Les Miller the last week in April by FDOT stating that FDOT has no money for the downtown interchange. The points were brought up because if FDOT cannot fund this project, they need to take action to discontinue the project. Also contained in the packet is an environmental impact study.
Chair Roberts responded to Mr. Vela that his letter was on the agenda for the meeting under Unfinished Business.

IV. MEMBER'S INTERESTS

Ricardo Fernandez had a question for staff regarding the status of the Boulevard Study, which he believes to be part of the discussion at the last MPO meeting and discussed during the last CAC meeting as to the funding for that project and was curious as to the outcome. He also added a footnote to Chris Vela's comments that the motion that he'll make today under Unfinished Business on the CRA action that Chris mentioned is something that was discussed in a couple of previous meetings and does include, among other things, recognition and affirmation of the CRA action to not endorse or to disapprove express toll lanes coming through the urban core, in particular through that section from Westshore to downtown. Mr. Fernandez thanked Chris Vela for showing up for public comment.

Chair Roberts reminded the committee members of the process using the GoToMeeting format and, if you wish to speak, please turn your camera on. If you are not speaking, turn your camera off.

Christina Acosta shared with the group that she provided an article to Mr. Clarendon pertaining to something called COVID Street, or Slow Street, and emphasized how bike shops are booming and there has been more biking and walking in neighborhoods, cleaner air and less traffic but, unfortunately, less space for bikers and walkers and more speeding due to less traffic. She reviewed the benefits of rebalancing streets and asked the Committee to review the article.

Ed Mierzejewski expressed a concern on the loss of revenues to locals, and certainly the federal government as well, and is concerned about what implications all of these tax revenues are going to have with respect to the CAC, specifically, as it may affect money coming to the MPO both for staff activities and then to FDOT and other agencies to carry out programs.

Chair Roberts brought forward that with the Governor's Executive Order now allowing virtual meetings for governmental entities and their committees, the Committee can actually take votes and approve motions and action items that come before them, which they were not able to do in the past couple of meetings, and he appreciates staff looking into this and giving some guidance. Chair Roberts stated that as of this meeting and through July 17th, if they meet virtually, they will be able to take a vote and will do that by roll-call, so that each member
will be individually asked to vote on any matters that require action by the committee.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

After a correction to the minutes by Ricardo Fernandez that under Members Present he needs to be listed as present, and at Section VII, Status Reports, Plant City Fiscal Analysis, the last paragraph on the page, the next to last line has the word "recourse" and it should read "resource," annual 40 percent resource gap. Ed Mierzejewski then asked that Luciano Prida be listed among the Members, not Others Present.

The Chair sought a motion to approve the April 8th, 2020 minutes; Ricardo Fernandez so moved, Camilo Soto seconded, and the motion carried unanimously with those present virtually.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

A. Public Participation Measures ofEffectiveness Report

Wanda West, MPO staff, went over the Public Participation Measures of Effectiveness Report for 2018 and 2019 and gave a brief overview, stating public participation is a way to improve engagement and that engagement is essential. It captures the public's values in planning their community, gains support and input for plans, and moves plans to action. The Public Participation Measures of Effectiveness Report is the MPO’s performance evaluation as it relates to public participation. The Public Participation Team and MPO make sure to include all constituents and are very responsive in their processes, are creative and flexible in their community engagement, and have learned how to adapt to different situations. Ms. West provided a PowerPoint of the various studies and committees with their numbers and went over the opportunities to participate. She also reviewed public feedback, surveys and input, and went over feedback with Facebook data and Twitter, stating that there were over a million web page hits on planhillsborough.org, which was a 16 percent increase from the last cycle. There were examples of plans and projects affected by public input and an online interactive map tools provided. The key updates from 2016-2017 recommendations were reviewed and recommendations for 2020-2021 to include increasing citizen engagement. The Public Participation Team and MPO are requesting to approve the Measures of Effectiveness Report.

Christine Acosta thanked Wanda and relayed that it's nice to see the results of the aggregate data of all that effort and
inquired as to the goal of cultivating relationships with nonprofits and asked if she would elaborate on that. Ms. West replied that, in reference to cultivating relationships with nonprofits, they have been out in the community, building the relationships and have established a presence. Ricardo Fernandez inquired as to It’s Time Tampa Bay surveys, in particular that portion of the surveys that addressed the various transportation scenarios that were to be considered by the public, emphasizing his concern about the one that is defined as the Beltway and Boulevard Concept.

Mr. Fernandez gave a brief rundown of how the survey was done, and stated that the particular concept that was being presented was not being presented fairly, meaning that most people that took the survey, he suspects, have absolutely no idea of what Beltway and Boulevard even meant, number one; number two, the survey itself was not professionally constituted and was not statistically valid in terms of the number of participants but did, however, render a result. That result was very negative to the Beltway and Boulevard I.D. and wound up being used as a weapon against the neighborhood in future public meetings. So, he is concerned the surveys, as they are currently being used and constituted, are receiving an outsized level of importance and are not adequately and fairly representing the true beliefs of the neighborhoods that are most affected by various transportation scenarios.

Directing Ms. West to the recommendations portion about utilizing videos to inform participants, Mr. Fernandez opined that if the survey is structured more to inform participants of each of the scenarios, at least then you have people answering a survey who have the information necessary to make informed decisions. In summary, Mr. Fernandez requested that something be done to make the surveys more scientifically appropriate, number one; and, number two, to take more steps to inform participants before they answer that survey, and if there was some way to communicate that sense to the MPO Board.

Wanda West replied they are going to use videos to educate the community more on what is in their projects and plans so they have a better understanding, and that their office is open, and staff is always available for questions. Rich Clarendon stated
that not only is it required but it is also just a good idea to go out and take a pulse of the community and population that they serve. Mr. Clarendon explained that regarding the particular survey Mr. Fernando mentioned, staff knew going in that it was not necessarily, statistically, a representative survey, and that was always made clear when they presented the results. Mr. Clarendon is glad Mr. Fernandez mentioned the short videos, that that is something they have been kicking around and, in fact, have just purchased some video equipment.

Dayna Lazarus recommended equity workshops and explained how they can measure engagement with different communities and to try to improve engagement in communities left out and get feedback on an ongoing basis. She stated that having a survey or poll after every single engagement is very important. Wanda West thanked her for the suggestions and commented the actual survey is going to be in the Public Participation Plan (PPP) discussion. She included a sample survey that can be handed out after public meetings, that it's an addition that has been added to the PPP, and that they will try to separate out how the public data is measured.

Cliff Reiss commented and shared his perspective that the group has done an excellent job with surveys and, to Dayna Lazarus's point, there's always room for improvement. His perspective, stepping back, is that it is difficult to ensure that all of the stakeholders in transportation are really represented. Public engagement and surveys are a means to get input, understand what people's concerns are, but he believes that most of the stakeholders who do answer these surveys are more concerned with current wants than the big picture of what the future needs to look like, and that it's up to the Board to make decisions taking into account everything that comes in from the public engagement strategies. He shared that the ultimate decisions need to consider not just what people want today but what the vision is of what Tampa should look like in the next 20 years, which isn't always popular. He also added that, in addition to the public, the businesses in the Greater Tampa Bay area are also stakeholders and their feedback needs to be included in everything that is gathered. Chair Roberts emphasized the need to engage the public in both phases, the long-term view, which they need to take on as a committee, and how they get to the long-term view via the short-term view.
Camilo Soto commented he still thinks there is a disconnect between the citizens’ general abilities to participate in MPO decision-making or how they can participate, and asked what strategies are being developed or proposed preliminarily to bridge that gap in terms of how citizens view their role in the MPO decision-making. Ms. West replied their plan is to work with some social services agencies, to go to their offices and perhaps set up information tables where people can find out more about what the MPO does, which is why they've mentioned the short videos to educate the public on what it is that the MPO does. Camilo Soto followed up, asking if the possibility exists for citizen participation virtually in the future. Wanda West stated that it has been discussed.

Chair Roberts emphasized that virtual and in-person meetings would go a long way towards allowing citizens to not only view the proceedings but to figure out how they can have some input. He spoke for the Committee, saying that the CAC strongly encourages that type of engagement, if it can be developed. Steven Hollenkamp echoed having surveys both long-term and short-term and explained how both are helpful in getting to the end goal.

Ricardo Fernandez inquired as to the TIP review/MPO public hearing coming up next month, whether it will be virtual or on the 26th floor of the County Center. Ms. West replied that, as of now, the plan is to hold it on the 26th floor of County Center with a lesser capacity at the meeting and to open up a floor of the building where the public can participate virtually. So, it will probably be run virtually, as well as in-person, with a smaller capacity. Ricardo Fernandez also had a question concerning the South Coast Greenway Corridor Study and asked Ms. West to expound on exactly what is going on there and which communities are in fact involved in the discussion. Ms. West stated they were just out there to get feedback from citizens and to connect the communities in the neighborhoods in that area.

Mr. Fernandez recommended that since most of those communities are in District 3, it would make sense to invite the County Commissioner to come to those meetings and be part of that public participation. Ms. West reminded everyone that they do post those meetings on their calendar, putting them in the agenda packets, et cetera, but will try to do a better job of notifying the elected officials. Rich Clarendon clarified it is standard procedure that when they hold these events out in the community, they always include in the meeting invite the Board
members. He added that virtual meetings are a real plus and something they are going to have to continue with, in some form.

David Bailey brought up geofencing, asking if they have considered it as a way to distribute surveys or when they want to promote a seminar, et cetera. Ms. West answered that they are but could not provide specifics on that. Rich Clarendon added they’ve considered it as a way of promoting the two different surveys they did and will get more information on it.

Chair Roberts sought a motion to recommend the Measures of Effectiveness Report and to send it on to the MPO; Artie Fryer so moved, Luciano Prida seconded, and the motion carried unanimously with those present virtually.

B. 2020 Public Participation Plan Amendments

Wanda West, MPO staff, stated the MPO amends the Public Participation Plan (PPP) at least every two years in order to capture any strategic or operational changes to their outreach initiatives. The following are amendments to the PPP: Cosmetic changes (new organizational chart, minor edits/updates), public participation toolbox updates, flexibility for public comment, engagement in emergency situations, confirm recommendations from the MOE report. She shared that the School Transportation Group meeting was last held December 5th, 2018; presented the New Organization Chart; the added "Select Language" feature that has over 100 languages; the added flexibility for public comment; public engagement in emergency situations; that the MPO Staff has created a Spanish-speaking working group; that per Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act to ensure electronic technology is accessible to all, they're converting key documents into compliant formatting; and went over the additions to the Public Participation Toolbox. Ms. West presented a PowerPoint on the recommendations for the MOE report the CAC just approved, and added that Dayna Lazarus mentioned a survey that has been added to Appendix C. There were no comments or questions by Staff.

Chair Roberts sought a motion to approve the 2020 amendments to the PPP; Dayna Lazarus so moved, Terrance Trott seconded, and the motion carried unanimously with those present virtually.

VII. UNFINISHED & NEW BUSINESS

A. Tampa CRA Motion re: Toll Facilities within the City

Ricardo Fernandez gave some clarity on his Tampa CRA Motion, explaining there was an action taken by the City Council sitting as the Board of the CRA back on February 13th, 2020, and the action taken is actually captured within the context of his
written motion sent out, and he basically incorporated the relevant portions of the transcript in the written motion he submitted.

Ricardo Fernandez proceeded with the motion captured in paragraph 3 of the written document: “I move that the MPO/CAC affirm and support the action of the CRA Board and communicate said support to the MPO board.” Chair Roberts so moved the motion on the floor, and Steven Hollenkamp seconded the motion.

Discussion: Christine Acosta asked Mr. Fernandez when the CRA Board voted, if the tolling of the Interstate and the CSX lines were bundled into one motion. Mr. Fernandez confirmed that is correct and explained the steps. Ms. Acosta supports the CSX lines but does not agree with the banning of tolling within the city and asked if the two could be uncoupled. Mr. Fernandez explained not with his motion, but he thinks procedurally if anybody would like to make a motion along those lines, separate and apart from what the CRA did, they may. Chair Roberts emphasized there were two parts to the motion passed by the CRA, one supporting the CSX and the second voting to recommend no tolls within the city limits on the express lane. Rick Richmond also expressed concern with the two issues at play and stated he cannot support the motion as it is worded because of the two different issues. He does support the CSX but does not support opposing tolling within city limits at this time. Hoyt Prindle discussed the confusion of the language and emphasized the term “interstate” is a very specific designation, so that doesn't mean every potential freeway in Hillsborough County won't be allowed to use tolls. Interstate is specifically 275, Interstate 75, and I-4, with an interstate highway designation. Mr. Fernandez confirmed that his interpretation is absolutely correct and explained the context of the meeting where this motion was passed. Hoyt Prindle is supportive of approving Rick's motion here from the CRA. Steven Hollenkamp asked a question for Rich Clarendon concerning possible plans of future meetings on toll roads. Rich Clarendon confirmed that the workshop on toll-managed lanes is on the agenda for today. After more discussion on the uncoupling of the two items by the CAC Committee, including Dayna Lazarus, along with comments supporting the motion, Christine Acosta modified the motion that we adopt the language of the original motion by City Council, or by the CRA Board, by Councilman Viera, and then strike for now the language that was added by Councilman Dingfelder.

Chair Roberts sought to amend Ricardo Fernandez's motion to separate the two items contained in the action of the CRA and to defer action on the toll lanes on the expressways that was modified and moved by Christine Acosta, and Rick Richmond seconded the amended motion.
Discussion: Ricardo Fernandez does not support Christine's motion but certainly accepts her ability to make it and does not know if this is an amendment or if it's a substitute motion under Robert's Rules. Mr. Fernandez asked if Christine's motion was to pass, would the original motion still come up for a vote, at which time Chair Roberts confirmed the original motion will come up for a vote as amended. Hoyt Prindle stated he could support potentially a splitting of the two into individual votes but will not vote for the amendment if they are going to just defer voting on the toll issue as presented in Mr. Fernandez's motion. Jeff Lucas has concerns on both items of the motion or amendment and feels they need to have the option of tolls as a tool to better move people around the community, that it needs to be kept on the table, and expressed a concern on mass transit due to the possible impact of the pandemic. Dayna Lazarus responded that the purpose of the Advisory Committee is to determine how that money is to be spent. Christine Acosta commented to modify the motion simply in terms of uncoupling these two motions, to make Mr. Fernandez's motion two separate motions. Luciano Prida made a comment that he does not support toll lanes, agrees that the topics are separate, fully supports utilization of the CSX lines for mass transit, and questions the timing of this motion with future vetting on this subject.

Chair Roberts stated that Ms. Acosta is withdrawing the amendment made previously and to make a new amendment that would separate or request that this Committee vote on the items separately contained in the CRA motion. Rick Richmond withdrew his second to Christine Acosta's original motion.

Chair Roberts sought a motion for the new amendment proposing separation or uncoupling the two items contained in CRA motion, modified and moved by Christine Acosta, and to vote on them separately. Rick Richmond seconded the amendment.

Discussion: Rich Clarendon made a point of order that they are talking about a whole new substitute motion, and it is not Mr. Fernandez's amendment at this point. Chair Roberts clarified this is to be a substitute motion to vote on the two portions of the CRA separately, and Rich Clarendon agreed that that's the way he interprets it. Ricardo Fernandez asked direction on Robert's Rules. As a proponent of the original motion, is it within his purview to accept or reject the proposed substitute motion? Mr. Clarendon responded that he believes that you vote on a substitute motion and it then would override the original motion. Mr. Fernandez clarified that he can literally be overridden because somebody decides to include a substitute to what he just did and he does not have to accept
Chair Roberts recited there’s a substitute motion offered that we separate the two actions taken by the CRA, the first action primarily dealing with the CSX, support of the rail line; the second piece being CRA’s recommendation against toll roads within the city limits. There was no further discussion. Ricardo Fernandez requested a roll-call on the amended motion.

Roll-call: Camilo Soto, no; Cliff Reiss, yes; Dayna Lazarus, no; Hoyt Prindle, no; Jeff Lucas, yes; Rick Richmond, yes; Steven Hollenkamp, yes; Terrence Trott, yes; Christine Acosta, yes; Artie Fryer, yes; Barbara Kennedy Gibson, yes; David Bailey, yes; Ed Mierzejewski, yes; Luciano Prida, yes; Rick Fernandez, no; Chair Roberts, yes. Chair Roberts recorded 4 against, so the substitute motion carries to allow voting on the separate two actions.

Chair Roberts sought a motion for the first action, which is reflected in the transcript of the meeting, to include the use of the CSX as a top priority in its county planning and further request that the FDOT prioritize in working with the MPO, and others, mass transit and continue robust investments in mass transit in its future plans; Ed Mierzejewski so moved, and Ricardo Fernandez seconded, and the motion carried with Jeff Lucas opposed and all others present virtually in favor.

Chair Roberts sought a second motion to support the CRA’s recommendation to oppose tolls on the interstate system within the City of Tampa; Ricardo Fernandez so moved, Dayna Lazarus seconded.

Hoyt Prindle moved to amend the motion as currently stated to support Mr. Dingfelder’s proposal, with the caveat that tolling on the 275 portion of the Westshore interchange to the west of Westshore Boulevard be permitted. Chair Roberts asked for a second on the amendment. Cliff Reiss seconded the amendment.

Discussion: Dayna Lazarus stated she does not support the motion but understands why the motion is being made. Ricardo Fernandez suggested to Mr. Prindle that he might want to make a small amendment or some small edit to his amendment to reflect that it is Section 4 of the TB NEXT Plan that would continue to be tolled, and it’s Section 5 in terms of concluding or opposing the toll lanes. Rick Richmond agreed that that is the clarity this is missing. Chair Roberts made an editorial comment that Councilman Dingfelder’s motion at the CRA was somewhat hastily and maybe poorly worded because it addresses city limits and thereby creates the problem Mr. Richmond alluded to and is hesitant to support a motion that simply deals with city limits. Hoyt Prindle clarified why he used his phrasing but is happy to change the wording to read Section 4.
Chair Roberts recited the motion for an amendment to support the CRA proposal of no toll lanes on interstates within the city limits, excluding the section of the interstate west of Westshore Boulevard.

Roll-call: **All in favor:** Rick Fernandez, aye; Ed Mierzejewski, aye; Hoyt Prindle, aye; Cliff Reiss, aye; Artie Fryer, aye; Luciano Prida, aye. **All opposed:** Christine Acosta, no; Rick Richmond, no; Steve Hollenkamp, no; Terrance Trott, no; Jeff Lucas, no; Barbara Kennedy Gibson, no; Dayna Lazarus, no; David Bailey, no; Camilo Soto, no. Having six ayes and nine nays, the motion failed.

Chair Roberts recited Mr. Prindle made a motion to exempt the area west of the Westshore Boulevard, so the main motion on the floor now is to support the action of the CRA in its opposition to tolls on the interstate within the City of Tampa and it has a second.

Roll-call: Artie Fryer, aye; Dayna Lazarus, yes; Hoyt Prindle, aye; Camilo Soto, yes; Jeff Lucas, no; Rick Richmond, no; Steven Hollenkamp, no; Terrance Trott, no; Christine Acosta, no; Barbara Kennedy Gibson, yes; Cliff Reiss, no; David Bailey, no; Ed Mierzejewski, no; Luciano Prida, yes; Rick Fernandez, yes; Chair Roberts, no. Having seven ayes and nine nays, the motion failed.

B. Letter from Chris Vela re: Proposed 14th & 15th St. Exit Ramp

Christine Acosta stated she reviewed Mr. Vela's letter and also extrapolated additional information from countless examples of the danger and health detriments that occur simply by having highway on-ramps and off-ramps.

Christine Acosta then moved that the committee recommend to the MPO we oppose the 14th and 15th Street exits as presently configured, and Ed Mierzejewski seconded the motion.

Discussion: Ricardo Fernandez provided a perspective of previous actions and told Ms. Acosta her motion is consistent with what they have brought forward to the MPO in the past. Luciano Prida gave his opinions on how he feels this would help the area from an economic prospective. Steven Hollenkamp opined that he does not feel these ramps are necessary and the traffic counts are not there for this area. Hoyt Prindle commented that, from a macro level, he is generally concerned that our metropolitan area seems to be one of the few metropolitan areas in the country that is talking about freeway expansion within the urban core. He expounded on this and stated there should be more of a focus on bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Camilo Soto added it's significant that by adding these exit streets here as a relief of the downtown interchange, it really does nothing to
abate the health, safety, and environmental hardships that the 14th and 15th Streets will potentially experience as a result of this and, to his knowledge, FDOT has not really provided any supporting study to significantly support this proposal.

David Bailey commented there is nothing going on in that area and a ramp would provide an opportunity for development in the area. Chair Roberts commented to the committee that the exits on 14th and 15th Street are part of one of the proposed fixes to improve the traffic flow through the downtown interchange. Chair Roberts phrased the motion that we’re opposing the 14th and 15th Street exits as they are presently configured and wants to be sure the Committee understands not only the words but the nuance of that, because he wants to give the DOT the opportunity to come back and make changes if they so choose. Dayna Lazarus mentioned she lives in this area, walks and bikes around this area, and feels this locale could be used for perhaps affordable housing, something better than asphalt, and as somebody who lives in the neighborhood that is what she would prefer to see.

Chair Roberts recited there is a motion by Christine Acosta, seconded by Ed Mierzejewski to oppose the present configuration of the 14th and 15th Street exits as proposed by the DOT. The motion carried with David Bailey and Luciano Prida opposed and all others present virtually in favor.

C. Plant City Fiscal Analysis (Steven Hollenkamp)

Cliff Reiss mentioned there was a thought at the last meeting that those interested in helping Steve take this further raise their hand, and so he stated he's good at financial analysis and feel free to include him in. Ed Mierzejewski asked how Mr. Hollenkamp computed expenses per acre and what is included in that, and Mr. Hollenkamp explained expenses per acre is two broad categories; it's the general fund expenses and expense number two is roads. Ed Mierzejewski then asked how he disaggregated those acre by acre, and Mr. Hollenkamp explained the life cycle cost of roads in detail and the configuration on a per acre basis and per person basis. Mr. Hollenkamp also explained the graphs to Mr. Mierzejewski and stated he would send Mr. Mierzejewski the slide that goes in between the two he's questioning. Camilo Soto asked as a result of his presentation to the City Council of Plant City, have they modified or made changes to their development code, and Mr. Hollenkamp responded to date there have been no changes but support from everybody on Plant City's Commission and the City Manager. Christine Acosta commended Mr. Hollenkamp for bringing forth this methodology. Mr. Hollenkamp closed by saying the next step is a formal workshop for those of us interested to dive a
little bit deeper into this. Chair Roberts asked Rich to see if it could be scheduled for all to participate.

D. Transportation Improvement Program public hearing postponed to June 30th at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Clarendon stated that the Transportation Improvement Program public hearing has been postponed to June 30th at 6:00 p.m., and will be held on the 26th floor, if possible, and hopefully via a virtual meeting as well. He added it may not be an in-person meeting.

E. Reminder: CAC Workshop May 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Clarendon reminded the CAC of their workshop to preview the new Transportation Improvement Program. He stated it will be virtual.

F. Managed Lanes Workshop October 14th at 9:00 a.m.

Rich Clarendon commented that, as he said earlier, the expectation is that the MPO would have a nationally-recognized expert come and give an overview and be able to answer questions from the MPO Board at that time, perhaps accompanied by a panel of other people and professionals in the toll business or locals within the State. Later that day or the next, if the CAC were willing to reschedule its October meeting, the expert would be available to make a presentation to the CAC. Ricardo Fernandez brought up that since we're going to have this workshop related to the TIP review and clearly managed toll lanes as part of the TIP somewhere, would it be possible to have an abbreviated version of managed toll lanes 101 so we could have a little bit of a universal understanding as we're digesting the TIP. Mr. Clarendon responded that he would see what he could do. Chair Roberts concurred with Mr. Fernandez's idea.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The virtual meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.
I. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Bill Roberts called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. The meeting was held via GoToWebinar. Member introductions were made.


Members excused: Nicole Rice, Vivienne Handy, Cheryl Thole, Jeff Lucas and Barbara Kennedy Gibson.

Others present: Rich Clarendon, Cheryl Wilkening, Sarah McKinley – MPO Staff, Justin Hall - FDOT

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

III. FY 21-25 Transportation Improvement Program Highlights

Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, presented the highlights of the Transportation Improvement Program for FY 2020/21 -2024/25. The document is updated annually and along with the priorities for the next year's document. The TIP is a five-year work program that list the transportation projects to be funded within the next five years and it is also the first five years of our newly adopted Long Range Transportation Plan. Within the document the MPO highlights major changes in the past year. The financial plan shows the total cost for all phases of projects and it is reviewed by USDOT when using authorized funds. Locally funded projects are included for informational purposes. The MPO develops priorities for projects and creates a wish list. The MPO has discretion over the Transportation Alternatives and Surface Transportation Program and these amount to about $15 million annually. There are a couple of state programs the MPO participates in and these are the Transportation Regional Incentives Program and the SUNTrail Program. The MPO can remove federally funded projects, but not direct how most funding is spent.

The MPO updated the priorities last June along with the work program document. The new Tentative Work Program was created by FDOT in November and December 2019 and then was approved by the Legislature and Governor to be effective July 1, 2020. We received a snapshot from FDOT early April to develop the TIP. The MPO will adopt it at the Public Hearing on June 30, 2020. Then the MPO will submit the TIP and Priorities to FDOT for Federal and State review by July 15, 2020. Included in the work program this year is FY 21 – FY 25 and funding shown in the FDOT work program is estimated $3,641 million.

Ms. McKinley showed a breakdown of work type with the use of funds from the FDOT work program and use of funds local capital improvement programs. The MPO set these priorities with for federal funds. A few of the projects are Vision Zero Corridor Studies, Columbus Bridge Replacement Study, Highland, HART Replacement Buses, Integrated Corridor Management and Walk/Bike Safety Improvements. The way the MPO manages the TIP is based on It’s Time 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan performance measures. The priority projects that have received construction funding are listed in Table 1. She provided a chart of performance targets that are required to be shown in the TIP. Some highlights of this year are some resurfacing projects, there were a couple of vision zero projects that were moved up in the priority list and a few from the smart cities program, real choices when not driving and major investments. The TIP
priorities for the next 5 years are tied to the It’s Time 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan performance measures. The MPO staff met with jurisdictions and partnering agencies in February. The jurisdictions provided updated priority letters March 15th. Then the MPO staff provided a new draft of priority projects and Transportation Alternative grant applications to FDOT by March 31 and proposed revisions to the priority list will be presented to the MPO committees in May and June. A public hearing will be held June 30th for final adoption of the TIP for FY 2021-2025 and the TIP Priorities for FY 2022 – 2026. Ms. McKinley provided the new priority requests this year by project location and limits and the TMA Leadership Group, CAC, LRC, TAC and BPAC recommendations.

Cliff Reiss commented on priority 30, Gibsonton and I-75 on the major investments and questioned if it could be pushed up as a higher priority and do something about the outdated functions at the interchange. Dayna Lazarus questioned how the funding works on the Howard Frankland project and was it part of the bridge and maintenance category? Ms. Lazarus wanted to make sure the SR 60 widening project stays out of the TIP and what is the justification for those intersections. Bill Roberts clarified Ms. Lazarus questioned regarding funding for the Howard Frankland Bridge and stated she was trying to determine if there are any local funds. Christine Acosta inquired about the intelligent intersection Dale Mabry and Gandy, the signal request at 22nd and Adamo, the Bypass Canal Trail, and a fully connected grid of the walk and bike trails. Camilo Soto commented on the Real Choices when not driving slide and wanted to know why these 4 made it into the TIP and what is the expense. Rich Clarendon added that Ms. McKinley is only providing a preview of the TIP. Table 1 projects have received construction funding and Table 2 are those projects that have not been fully funded.

Steven Hollenkamp inquired which category does road maintenance fall under and are the expenses for maintenance included. Bill Roberts commented the budget is primary capital dollars. Steven Hollenkamp commented on Melissa Zornitta’s presentation on widening roads and wanted to know if the Planning Commission is part of this plan. Ed Mierzejewski pointed out under new requests that HART requested $3.5 million to study CSX and he didn’t see in the priorities. Bill Roberts asked if the HART request is a multi-year request and what is to be studied. Terrance Trott inquired if anything is dedicated to bus stop repair and is there a list for these stops. He also agrees with Cliff Reiss on priority number 30.

Rick Fernandez would like to ask when will the full TIP will be available for review. He also inquired if the transportation funds would be available for these various projects. He questioned roundabouts that was mentioned on Vision Zero power point slide priority 5. Justin Hall commented this was an initial study so it may not necessarily be a roundabout so a PD&E will probably be done. Mr. Fernandez inquired about the $48 million in Section 6 that was mentioned on the Tampa Bay Next slide. He pointed out the CAC took a vote on the two exits to Ybor City and questioned if this is priority 28, SEIS section 6. Mr. Fernandez commented this county is moving to more transit and less road widening. The pie chart shows 80 percent is rail and inquired where is the rail. Rich Clarendon pointed out most of the rail is airport or port expenses. Lou Prida agreed with Mr. Fernandez that rail needs to be at top priority.

Christine Acosta stated the term rail needs to be corrected since it is referring to cars crossing railroad tracks in terms of investments and dollars being spent. Hoyt Prindle requested clarification to where the funding is broken down and toll revenue. Dayna Lazarus suggested using freight rails to separate the rails category and do we know specific line items for Tampa Bay Next. Bill Roberts clarified that Rick Fernandez wanted to know what allocations if any is devoted to passenger rail. Bill Roberts questioned the TBARTA van pool request. He also inquired about HARTs request for electric bus/electric bus infrastructure and automated vehicle facilities/infrastructure and would part of the funding be used to purchase electric buses. Dayna Lazarus inquired if the MPO considers things the CAC has talked about as priorities when putting together the TIP. Rich Clarendon added there may be a project the community interested in and get funded
but MPO is not an implementing agency. The MPO can only get the ball rolling. If there is something the CAC identifies as a need or a project, there is always an option to build it into a Motion to submit to the MPO. Bill Roberts stated that is why there is a members’ interest section on the CAC agenda. Christine Acosta inquired if TBARTA asked for Van Pools support from the planning organizations. There were no other questions.

IV. Managed Lanes Primer

Rich Clarendon, MPO Assistant Executive Director, gave a brief presentation on Managed Lanes. The characteristics of managed lanes where revenue is optimized are travel time reliability, becoming more common, privately operated and revenue becomes the focus. The characteristics of managed lanes where revenue is somewhere in between are travel time reliability, balance mobility and revenue, tolls not low but not high either. He showed a chart of toll managed lanes comparison in this country. He referenced the link for the FHWA publication Managed Lanes Primer and showed a graphic slide of Managed Lane Applications. Our DOT district has not committed the Managed Lanes Strategy that covers all facilities.

Rick Fernandez pointed out that the DOT is incapable of a strategy that they can present so people can come up a decision on Managed Toll Lanes. The strategy would be making lanes wider so we can create an express lane, but it is unclear what type of express lane we would use. Hoyt Prindle echoed Rick Fernandez’s comments and he would like to see more data on the economic impacts of the variable rate toll lanes. Bill Roberts commented this came up in focus in a CAC meeting where they were trying to discern the difference in the express lane, express toll lane and managed lane and if any were proposed for our interstate. He would like at the next CAC meeting for DOT or MPO Staff come to us to explain what they propose with clarity. Steven Hollenkamp suggested to take the toll money to put back in the community. Rich Clarendon said stay tuned until the October workshop.

VI. Old and New Business

A. Next Workshop: Plant City Fiscal Analysis

Mr. Clarendon said a date in possibly in July will be discussed at the June 10 CAC meeting. Ed Mierzejewski would like a write-up from Steven Hollenkamp about the financial model. Christine Acosta was concerned about the small window of time to review the TIP and requested a printed copy.

B. October Workshop: Managed Lanes

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:12 pm.

A full recording of this meeting is available upon request.
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 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
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**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

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.
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)
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
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

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

Source: USDOT, SPEED MANAGEMENT PROGRAM PLAN, MAY 2014
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
**TASK 3 - CORRIDOR PRIORITIZATION**

- Evaluate Top 20 HIN Corridors
- Develop Metrics for Prioritization
  - Severity
  - Equity
  - Focus on Pedestrian Crashes
  - Proximity to Schools
  - Ease of Implementation

---

**Example Assessment - Posted Speed & Context Class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Road Classification</th>
<th>Context Classification</th>
<th>ITE/CNU Class</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, 55</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibsonton Dr/Boyette Rd from I-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 Bearrs Ave</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3-C4 (50-45)</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 (25-30)</td>
<td>25-30 Max</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce B Downs from Fowler Ave to Bearrs 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/56th 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>16th 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>46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US301 from I76 to Adamo Dr</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</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>I4 from I275 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>58th 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>I275 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>70th 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 Linebaugh 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>

*Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach - An ITE Recommended Practice, ITE, CNU, 2010*

---

**Overall**

- 70% are 5-10MPH over National Practice
- 15% are 15-20MPH 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)
Example Assessment - Equity

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 - 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
- Brandon Blvd
- Gibsonton Dr/Boyette Rd
- Hillsborough Ave
- Fletcher Ave
- Dale Mabry
- Lynn Turner
- Meridian Ave
- Bruce B Downs
- 50th/56th St
- 15th St
- Big Bend Road
- US301
- Sheldon Rd
- 44
- 56th St
- 1275
- Kennedy Blvd
- 78th St
- CR579/Mango Rd
- Florida Ave

#### Prioritize Next30
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 I4
Big Bend Rd - I75 to Balm Riversivew 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

Corridor Classification
- Existing HIIN Corridors
- Proposed HIIN Corridors
### Top50 HIN Priority Recap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor and Extent</th>
<th>Crash Severity / Mile</th>
<th>Spacing / Mile</th>
<th>Crash Count / Count Class</th>
<th>Speed / Grade</th>
<th>Potential Speed - Count Class</th>
<th>High Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bloomingdale Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M L King Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 41</td>
<td>Medison Ave to N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend Rd</td>
<td>175 to Balm Riverview Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busch Blvd</td>
<td>Armenia Ave to 66th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 674 (Sun City Ctr Blvd)</td>
<td>US Hwy 41 to CR579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75</td>
<td>SR 60 to Fletcher Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td>Florida Ave to Orient Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters Ave</td>
<td>Sheshon Road to Dale Mabry Hwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler Ave</td>
<td>1275 to 175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 301</td>
<td>SR 674 to Lightfoot Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75</td>
<td>Big Bend Rd to US Hwy 301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 69 / Adano Dr</td>
<td>Orient Rd to Falkenburg Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor and Extent</th>
<th>Crash Severity / Mile</th>
<th>Spacing / Mile</th>
<th>Crash Count / Count Class</th>
<th>Speed / Grade</th>
<th>Potential Speed - Count Class</th>
<th>High Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causeway Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters Ave</td>
<td>Dale Mabry Hwy to NNeo Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Blvd</td>
<td>Falkenburg Rd to US Hwy 301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td>Race Track Rd to Longbo Pkwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Hwy</td>
<td>Hillsborough Ave to Veterans Expwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanley Rd</td>
<td>Woodbridge Blvd to Waters Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mabry Hwy</td>
<td>Interbay Blvd to Gandy Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Ave</td>
<td>Kennedy Blvd to Tampa Bay Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mabry Hwy</td>
<td>Kennedy Blvd to Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 82</td>
<td>Falkenburg Rd to Thonotosassa Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Ave</td>
<td>Columbus Ave to Hillborough Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 301</td>
<td>Stacy Rd to County Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia Ave</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Blvd to Waters Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDill Ave</td>
<td>Kennedy Blvd to Columbus Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M L King Blvd</td>
<td>McIntosh Rd to Sammundo Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
- 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.
- We are human and make mistakes. The roadway system should be designed to protect us.

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>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>

**Safe Streets**

*Source: City of Orlando – Complete Streets Policy*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>Urban (C4,C5,C6)</th>
<th>Suburban (C3)</th>
<th>Rural (C1-C2)</th>
<th>Arterial / Corridor</th>
<th>Crash Reducing</th>
<th>Speed Reducing</th>
<th>Severity Reducing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe Streets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicanes / Lateral Shifts</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full / Half Closure</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Diet (repurpose space)</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Traffic Circle</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Tables / Raised Intersections</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Radii / Radius Reduction</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Acceleration Lanes</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Right Turn Channelization</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Parking</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Street / Pedestrian Lighting</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert to Two-Way Streets</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Curve Delineation</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Speed Bar / Converging Chevrons</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Context Class</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aggressive Driving Crash Countermeasures (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>Urban (C4,C5,C6)</th>
<th>Suburban (C3)</th>
<th>Rural (C1-C2)</th>
<th>Arterial / Corridor</th>
<th>Crash Reducing</th>
<th>Speed Reducing</th>
<th>Severity Reducing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe Freeway Interchanges:</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign High Speed Exit Ramps</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse (in lane) Rumble Strips</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Safe Pedestrian Crossings</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Context Class</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safe Traffic Operations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>Urban (C4,C5,C6)</th>
<th>Suburban (C3)</th>
<th>Rural (C1-C2)</th>
<th>Arterial / Corridor</th>
<th>Crash Reducing</th>
<th>Speed Reducing</th>
<th>Severity Reducing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Speed Limits</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected only Left Turn Signal Phasing</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Speed Limits (Expressways)</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Pedestrian Interval</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Ped Beacon / HAWK</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Speed Detection Signals</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter Signal Cycle Lengths</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting / Pedestrian Level Lighting</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Context Class</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>
</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>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>
</tbody>
</table>

| Education Campaign / PSA:                           |           |               |                     |             |             |                  |               |               |                  |
| Aggressive Driving                                  | ✔         | ✔             | ✔                   |             |             |                  | ✔             | ✔             | ✔                 |
| Respect for All Users w/Emphasis on Vulnerable      | ✔         | ✔             | ✔                   |             |             |                  | ✔             | ✔             | ✔                 |
| Motorcycle Safety                                   | ✔         | ✔             | ✔                   |             |             |                  | ✔             | ✔             | ✔                 |
| RRFB’s / Hawk Operations                            | ✔         | ✔             | ✔                   |             |             |                  | ✔             | ✔             | ✔                 |
| Automated Speed Enforcement                         | ✔         | ✔             | ✔                   |             |             |                  | ✔             | ✔             | ✔                 |
| New Pavement Markings/Signs                          | ✔         | ✔             | ✔                   |             |             |                  | ✔             | ✔             | ✔                 |
| New Conflict Zone Markings                           | ✔         | ✔             | ✔                   |             |             |                  | ✔             | ✔             | ✔                 |
| Target Speed/Coordinated Signals                     | ✔         | ✔             | ✔                   |             |             |                  | ✔             | ✔             | ✔                 |
| New Traffic Technology                               | ✔         | ✔             | ✔                   |             |             |                  | ✔             | ✔             | ✔                 |
Countermeasures

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

Fatalities by Age
- <25: 11%
- 25-35: 11%
- 35-50: 27%
- 50-65: 32%
- >65: 16%

Fatalities by Location
- Four-Way Intersection: 32%
- Not at Intersection: 32%
- T-Intersection: 32%

Fatalities by Time of Day
- 5-9 AM: 85%
- 3-8 PM: 9%
- Non-Peak: 6%

Contributing Factors
- Failed to Yield Right-of-Way: 34%
- Operated MV in Careless or Negligent Manner: 18%
- Other Contributing Actions: 18%
- Ran Red Light: 13%
- Failed to Keep in Proper Lane: 18%
- Improper Turn: 16%
- Operated MV in Erratic, Reckless or Aggravated manner: 10%
- Exceeded Posted Speed: 10%

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: 4%</td>
<td>Dark-Lighted: 6%</td>
<td>Dark-Lighted: 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark-Not Lighted: 20%</td>
<td>Dark-Not Lighted: 30%</td>
<td>Dark-Not Lighted: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn: 72%</td>
<td>Dawn: 4%</td>
<td>Dawn: 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylight: 4%</td>
<td>Daylight: 3%</td>
<td>Daylight: 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusk: 4%</td>
<td>Dusk: 1%</td>
<td>Dusk: 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Source: Collaborative Sciences Center for Road Safety
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 (Longboat 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 (Hillsborough 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
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.
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
**Actions and Implementation Strategy - Speed Setting**

**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).

**Actions and Implementation Strategy - Speed Setting Recommendations**

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

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.

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

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.

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

**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)**

**Actions and Implementation Strategy - Engineering & Operations**

**Action 5 - Traffic Operations Recommendations**
- Where operating speeds exceeds 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 may be 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.

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.
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.

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.
Actions and Implementation Strategy - Policy / Legislation

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)

Actions and Implementation Strategy - Policy / Legislation

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
Actions and Implementation Strategy - Policy / Legislation

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

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

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
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**
SR 60 / Kennedy Blvd. Access Management Plan

**Presenter**
Kara Van Etten, FDOT GEC Project Manager

**Summary**
Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) will provide an overview of the Kennedy Boulevard project, an access management and urban corridor improvement project from Westshore Boulevard to Woodlynne Avenue (437644-1-52-01). This presentation will review median modifications and urban corridor improvements along Kennedy Blvd. Improvements include 6’ sidewalks, intersection lighting, intersection geometry, driveways, ramps and crosswalks.

Additionally, a brief overview and timeline of upcoming a new traffic signal at Rome Street, a resurfacing, restoration and rehabilitation (RRR) project along the Kennedy Blvd corridor (West Shore Blvd. to Church Street) and another to the east (Woodlynne Ave to Brevard Ave) will be provided.

These projects implement some recommendations of the [SR60/Kennedy Boulevard Multimodal Safety Review](#) approved in 2017.

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

**Prepared by**
Lisa Silva, AICP, PLA

**Attachments**
SR 60 Kennedy Blvd Access Management Project map
SR 60 (KENNEDY BLVD) FROM WEST SHORE BLVD TO WOODLYNNE AVE
MEDIAN IMPROVEMENTS
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.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Plant City Transit Study

Presenter
Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO Staff

Summary
At the request of the City of Plant City, the MPO, in collaboration with the Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART), is conducting a transit study to evaluate the feasibility of implementing transit services to Plant City in order to provide access to jobs, recreation and medical needs of the residents. Currently, there is no transit serving Plant City. In the mid-2000s, HART and Plant City operated a circulator service within downtown Plant City, but it ceased operation in 2008 due to a lack of funding. HART operated a commuter express bus service (Route 28X) from 2012. Unfortunately, this service had to be eliminated in 2017 due to low ridership.

This study will evaluate the feasibility of re-initiating a circulator service within downtown Plant City. It will also evaluate the feasibility of providing a commuter service to connect to downtown Tampa and to Lakeland in the future. The study team will also develop planning-level cost estimates for capital and operating costs for the different alternatives.

Recommended Action
None. For information only.

Prepared By
Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO Staff

Attachments
None.
ADDENDUM ITEMS
Virtual Meeting of the MPO Board
Wednesday, May 13th, 2020

I. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

The MPO Chairman, Commissioner Les Miller, called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance, and gave the invocation. The regular monthly meeting was held as a Virtual Meeting of the MPO Board.

II. ROLL CALL

The following members were present:

Commissioner Les Miller, Jr., Commissioner Pat Kemp, Commissioner Ken Hagan, Commissioner Mariella Smith, Commissioner Kimberly Overman, Councilman Guido Maniscalco, Councilman Joseph Citro, Councilman John Dingfelder, Vice-Mayor Andrew Ross, Joe Lopano, Charles Klug, Joe Waggoner, Michael Maurino, Cindy Stuart

Also present: Attorney Cameron Clark, Beth Alden, Bill Roberts, Wanda West, Allison Yeh, Johnny Wong, Vishaka Raman, Jeffrey Sims, Michele Ogilvie, Debbie Guest

The following members were absent: Mayor Rick Lott, City Commissioner Nate Kilton, Council Member Frank Chillura, Gina Evans, Adam Harden, Paul Anderson, Bob Frey, Trent Green, Steven Cona

A quorum was met. Chairman Miller welcomed Councilman John Dingfelder to the MPO Board.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – APRIL 14th, 2020

Chairman Miller requested a motion to approve the April 14th, 2020 minutes. Councilman Cindy Stuart so moved; it was seconded by Commissioner Kimberly Overman and adopted.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS & ONLINE COMMENTS

Bill Roberts, CAC Chair, gave a brief report since the CAC has not met since the last MPO meeting. There are three TIP Amendments on the agenda, and they have been reviewed and forwarded on to the MPO with CAC recommendations. CAC's next meeting is May 20th, and the next CAC scheduled workshop is May 27th to discuss the TIP funding and is still on the calendar in anticipation of the public hearing for the TIP. There were no questions.
Wanda West, MPO staff, announced the CAC has approved and forwarded the Annual Certification of the MPO Planning Process, the FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program, and Transportation Improvement Program Amendments for I-75 and I-4, which are action items on today's agenda.

Regarding the UPWP, the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating board members noted that the community health impacts, storm evacuation forecasting, and bus stop assessment studies would be most useful for the transportation disadvantaged.

Other presentations made to committees include ITS Capability Maturity Model, Hillsborough County Air Quality Status, Vision Zero Speed Management Study, and Sidewalk Stomper's activities, including advocacy, walking school buses, and future direction.

The Technical Advisory Committee held their meeting on April 20th. Under action items the TAC approved and forwarded to the MPO Board the Transportation Improvement Amendments, the FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program, and the Annual Certification of MPO Planning Process. There were no Status Reports this month.

The Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee received public comments on the need for a redesign/speed study for Bayshore Boulevard and regarding modifications to 14th and 15th Streets in Ybor City as a result of the TBNext project. The ITS Committee met and did not vote but had no objections and forwarded to the MPO Board the FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program. The Committee also heard status reports on the ITS Capability Maturity Model, Hillsborough County Air Quality Status, and the Vision Zero Speed Management Study.

The Livable Roadways Advisory Committee held their meeting on April 15th. Under action items the LRC had no objections and forwarded to the MPO Board the FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program and the Annual Certification of MPO Planning Process. The LRC heard a status report on Air Quality Month.

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 briefly discussed 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. In action items 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.
Staff received e-mails from the public and Ms. West went over their concerns, documents were provided electronically, and there were no Facebook comments.

There were no questions of Wanda West by Staff.

VI. ACTION ITEMS – All actions will be by Roll-Call Vote

A. TIP Amendments for I-75 and I-4

Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO staff, reviewed and started with the new FY 2019/2020 - 2021/2024 TIP Amendments. Amendment 16 is a new project and is for I-75 from north of U.S. 301/Progress Village Boulevard to Woodberry Road. The project is currently in design phase, and this amendment will add $1,753,888 to fiscal year 2021. Construction is anticipated in 2023. Amendment 17 is a new project and is for I-75 from north of CSX Railroad/Broadway Avenue to south of SR 582/Fowler Avenue. The project is currently in design phase, and this amendment will add $1,763,855 to fiscal year 2021. Construction is anticipated in 2023. Amendment 18 is an existing project update and is for I-4 from east of McIntosh Road to County Line Road. It is currently in design phase, and the amendment will add about $3,870,126. Construction is anticipated in 2023.

Commissioner Overman asked Ms. Raman if there's any restructuring or redesign as far as I-4 is concerned, an opportunity to create a pathway under I-4 in that design, and Ms. Raman stated this question was brought up at the CAC meeting, and she got an answer from the FDOT project manager and wrote it to CAC members that the TIP Amendment is only for the road milling and resurfacing and said she'd check on it and get back to her on the answer of a wildlife crossing.

Chairman Miller sought a motion to approve the TIP Amendments for I-75 and I-4; Joseph Waggoner so moved; it was seconded by Commissioner Overman and adopted after unanimous roll-call of those virtually present.

B. FY19 & FY20 UPWP Amendment for Funding De-obligation

Allison Yeh, MPO staff, went over how the funds for the current program will end on June 30th, 2020 and they will shift the funds that are left to the new program. Tasks 2, 3, 5, and 6 will have funds de-obligated and, in particular, Task 3, $175,000 for consultant funds, includes traffic counts being postponed until after the health emergency, managed lanes speaker, and IOC report. The total de-obligation amount is $332,703, and this complies with the FDOT standard that only 20 percent of grant funds are carried forward to the next fiscal year.

Other amended items. There were some minor expenditures that were not needed, such as funds shifted to reimburse the agency for staff hours on federally required tasks; unused FTA grant funds rolled over
into the next two-year UPWP; added language in Task 1 to clarify expenditures that ADA compliance; and TIP will be amended concurrently with UPWP de-obligation.

The Recommended Action is to approve the amendment for fiscal year 2019 and fiscal year 2020 UPWP to de-obligate planning funds and related TIP amendment.

Chairman Miller sought a motion to approve the amendment for fiscal year 2019 and fiscal year 2020 UPWP to de-obligate planning funds and related TIP amendment; Commissioner Kemp so moved; it was seconded by Joe Waggoner and adopted after unanimous roll-call of those virtually present.

C. FY 21 & FY 22 Unified Planning Work Program

Allison Yeh, MPO staff, stated the next amendment related to the previous one, and they are adopting the UPWP for FY 2021-2022. It's required every two years and is effective July 1st, 2020 through June 30th, 2022. It outlines major planning tasks, documents State and federal funding, coordinates federally funded planning tasks performed by the MPO, HART, and FDOT, and complies with federal and State rules. Ms. Yeh went over the six major planning tasks and noted that 90 percent of the funds go directly towards planning and 10 percent goes towards compliance and management activities.

There was a PowerPoint shown of the funding allocated annually for FY 2020/2021, total budget of $2,872,121, and FY 2021/2022, total budget of $2,367,660, and year one includes a carry-forward from the previous year. Also, a slide was shown going over the Critical Path Projects and Analyses, the two fiscal years, for a total cost of $615,602.

Last month a list of jurisdiction requests and committee requests, along with a list of the projects suggested to MPO Staff, were provided, and MPO Staff asked the Board members for their top five preferences. The top five are multimodal school safety reviews, storm evac/shelter-in-place scenarios, HART bus stop assessment, trail feasibility, and freight supply chain and resilience. The estimated cost for studies with two or more votes is approximately $900,000. Lastly, Ms. Yeh stated MPO Staff in April brought the draft to the committees and today are asking that the document be adopted so they can transmit it to the Department of Transportation by Friday so they can have their funding in place by July 1st.

Cindy Stuart commented that she is happy that the multimodal school safety reviews is at the top of the voting list but asked if they could potentially talk about expanding the sites and expanding the scope of this work. This work originally only included ten schools, and the data is at least two years old, maybe more. Ms. Stuart asked within the scope that they review existing schools. There were ten schools originally at the top of the list that fell as the most
hazardous, but she feels there is a need to re-review those and potentially expand the scope. We currently have 251 schools within the district, and that does not include charters, which have no busing from the district whatsoever, and there is not a lot of walking to those schools. The other issue Cindy Stuart brought up is about how kids get to schools and stated that she and Lisa Sylvan had been in conversations with both the county, the district, and MPO Staff about creating what they call “family friendly maps,” which are the ability for a parent to have a map of where their school is and alternate routes to get to that school either by bike or trail or by walking, that the school district could distribute, and gave an example.

Ms. Alden commended the comments and added that with a number of Board member votes supporting this study, there's a clear direction that the Board should focus some of their resources on, the multimodal school safety studies, certainly expand the scope to update the status of the previously reviewed schools, looking at some additional schools, and then looking at those family friendly maps that Ms. Stuart mentioned.

Chairman Miller sought a roll-call to approve the FY 2020 and FY 2022 Unified Planning Work Program, and it was adopted after unanimous roll-call of those virtually present.

D. Annual Certification of MPO Planning Process

Johnny Wong, MPO staff, explained the MPO/FDOT Joint Certification and reviewed the findings of that process. Mr. Wong stated it happens every year with FDOT. Every fourth year there is a site visit by the feds, and there is a "Report Card" on the MPO for the last year that includes notable achievements, recommended and corrective actions, compliance with fed and state rules. It is required for field and state funding eligibility. Mr. Wong walked the Board through the notable achievements. There were two recommendation comments by FDOT, both positive: MPOs (financial) risk assessment remain low and value MPOs drive to be innovative and lead conversation on safety for all modes. It was all a positive report card, and there were no corrective actions.

The requested action from the Committee is, although they can't change the findings from the certification, finding first that MPO is in compliance with fed and state laws; second, support recertification of MP; third, authorize Chair to sign the Joint Certification Statement.

Chairman Miller sought a motion to accept all three findings from the certification; Commissioner Overman so moved; it was seconded by Commissioner Smith and adopted after unanimous roll-call of those virtually present.

E. Annual Evaluation of Executive Director
Cameron Clark, MPO Attorney, presented the annual evaluation of the MPO Director. The format was the same one the Board adopted last year. There is also a second attachment that compiled all of the comments any members made into a single form to be read together, and individual forms certainly are available upon request. Attorney Clark sent two updated forms last night to incorporate comments that he received from board members earlier in the week, so they did not make the agenda deadline. The motion Attorney Clark requested was for the Board to receive the report and then the result will be transmitted to the planning commission director.

Chairman Miller sought a motion for the Board to receive the report; Commissioner Kemp so moved; it was seconded by Councilman Citro and adopted after unanimous roll-call of those virtually present.

There was a discussion on a possible pay increase for the Executive Director, which is normally done after the annual evaluation.

VII. STATUS REPORTS

A. Hillsborough Air Quality Update

Jeff Sims, EPC, gave an update on the air quality in Hillsborough County. We continue to meet the national health-based standards for the principal pollutants for the Transportation Section. During COVID-19 they have remained fully functional, and their focus today is mostly on the Air Monitoring Section. Mr. Sims presented a PowerPoint on the Effects of Common Air Pollutants and potential health and environmental effects. Looking nationally at the trends data from the EPA, it shows a significant increase in the gross domestic product and vehicle miles traveled, along with a steady growth of population; however, the long-term emissions are trending down and continue to decrease.

The EPA requires that the following six pollutants be monitored to determine compliance with federal standards: Nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and lead. The first four are particularly associated with transportation, and we are now in attainment of all six.

Mr. Sims did a quick overview of the air monitoring network. There are 11 air monitoring stations. They run continuously and take samples. There's a near-road monitoring station near I-275 to enhance the understanding of mobile source impacts. Ozone is measured at four of the sites. There was a PowerPoint presented on ozone, a secondary pollutant, and an explanation of the sources of NOX: Utilities/boilers, mobile sources, non-road mobile sources, industrial/residential/commercial fuel combustion. Ozone formation is VOC plus NOX. There was a review of the impacts of ozone nonattainment, and it would be significant for MPO and locally if we went in nonattainment. Currently, we are in attainment but close.
Mr. Sims also reviewed the factors of how to lower ozone. There was a PowerPoint on considerations for the MPO Board regarding air quality and an explanation on the EPC transportation-related initiatives. Ultimately, the message is that Hillsborough County's overall air quality is good. Florida is the most populous state to meet all the national ambient air quality standards. That being said, Mr. Sims asked that we keep promoting efforts leading to reduced emissions and the importance of air quality.

Commissioner Kemp commended Mr. Sims on his report and commented on the health effects from emissions, even with reduced traffic during COVID-19 and mentioned that one of the advantages of electric vehicles is that they don't have NOX emissions, but particulate matter is a high percentage of the pollution we receive, which comes from tires and brake dust. Commissioner Kemp also inquired as to the reduction that comes from telecommuting and opined that the MPO Board should make an effort to look at that in the future. Mr. Sims concurred with Commissioner Kemp on her statement that with electric vehicles there is the advantage of not getting any emissions from NOX and that many of the particulate emissions are also related to diesel combustion. It was also noted she's correct there is a contribution from tire dust, brake dust, and so forth, and electric vehicles would also have those same issues, although electric vehicles try to recover power by using braking to help charge their systems. Mr. Sims stated he could certainly ask the Air Monitoring Section to provide him with a quick summary of their reading at the monitor station on I-275. As to Commissioner Kemp's second issue on telecommuting, they would 100% promote it as an agency, that because of the reduced traffic on the roadways, it would correlate in a reduction of emissions. Councilman Dingfelder indicated that his question had now been answered.

Commissioner Smith also commended Mr. Sims on his presentation and asked which of the pollutants are the most dangerous for childhood asthma and other respiratory ailments, and Mr. Sims responded that he is not a health expert so he could not give a completely educated answer, but the studies show all of them can be unhealthy in high concentrated levels. With people wearing masks now, that should control most particulates that might be in the air. Obviously, lead would probably be the one he would be most concerned about, but that’s in really low levels. All of them are ones to be conscious of. The main thing is to be aware when any one of those levels are elevated. That is what they do, is to compare it to the air quality index and national standards, and they will issue an advisory when necessary.

B. Transportation Disadvantaged Services Update

Michele Ogilvie gave an update on the results of their review from 2019. This program is State funded under Chapter 427 of the Florida Statutes, and Ms. Ogilvie did an overview of the program. The Sunshine Line services include door-to-door trips, subsidized bus passes, referrals to other services as available and eligible, with
the weekly service Monday through Friday, 6:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and now Saturday service, 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., thanks to the intervention of the MPO Board. The annual cost for these services is $6.8 million. All standards have been met for safety, reliability, efficiency, being on time, low complaints, everything. The cost per trip: The standard statewide is $12.97, and the Sunshine Line is providing the cost per trip at $10.22. Satisfaction with the service continues to be 99 percent.

Ms. Ogilvie discussed other parts of the program, which include the coordination of contractors, 12 in Hillsborough County, which brings in about $12.2 million in revenue to Hillsborough County, annually, and provide over 400,000 trips, annually; and HART, a TD board member. There was also a PowerPoint on "Other News" and "Congrats to Sunshine Line."

VIII. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Beth Alden thanked the Board and shared that it has been a pleasure to work with them over the past year and does appreciate their reviews. Ms. Alden announced that the Board continues to work remotely, coordinating with Hillsborough County facilities about the upcoming reopening of the County Center Building to the public. As they continue to hold, almost without change, the public meetings of the MPO Advisory Committees and the Board through this virtual meeting format, Beth Alden noted the following changes: The first one is a postponement of the annual public hearing to adopt the Transportation Improvement Program to give more time before the deadline date for submission of the TIP and to provide opportunities for in-person feedback as well as virtual feedback.

The Board workshop on managed lanes was originally scheduled for June 19th, and the suggestion was made to postpone that to October 14th so the speakers can travel and to hold a Board workshop on managed lanes in place of the MPO Board meeting in October.

The quarterly regional meetings are still on the calendar for July 10th, starting at 9:30 a.m. at the Plant City Campus of Hillsborough Community College.

Independent Oversight Committee. The MPO Staff is providing support for the work of the Independent Oversight Committee for Transportation Sales Surtax. The Oversight Committee is required to provide an annual report and to hold a public hearing and would like to provide some in-person opportunities for folks to participate in that public hearing. That is being postponed to August. The date will be announced on the website. The annual report Beth Alden mentioned that the Oversight is required to produce has been drafted and prepared by staff, so a draft of that is available on the website now for review, and you will find a link to it in the addendum to this Board packet.
In February, as the Board discussed setting targets for improvements and safety for the upcoming year, there was a discussion about what low-cost and no-cost safety strategies can be brought forward so the Board is not waiting on funding to make progress on the safety issues. So the proposal was made to hold a leadership summit on that topic and bring in panelists to discuss things like high visibility enforcement and development review to make sure, as construction continues, that we are building communities that are as safe as they can possibly be.

Quarter 3 report is in your Board folders which have been distributed through e-mail.

Commissioner Overman thanked Beth Alden very much for her report and asked the Chair and the rest of the Board to consider accommodating virtual meetings for any meetings going forward until further notice and making arrangements for those with health challenges that would keep them out a little longer than what may be seen in the way of phase-in for back-to-work under the Governor's orders. She also emphasized that it actually supports our environmental sustainability goals by telecommuting more. Commissioner Miller inquired of Attorney Clark on the deadline of the Governor's Executive Order, and Attorney Clark stated Executive Order 20-69 allows for a Sunshine Meeting to be held without a physical quorum being present and believes it's now been tied to another executive order that has been extended to the first week of July. The Board is only able to meet virtually for as long as that executive order creates that Sunshine Law exemption. Beth Alden stated that Mayor Ross typed in the Chat Box that he believes it is July 7th. Commissioner Overman further inquired of a possible bylaw change, which is not possible under the Sunshine Law, and there was further discussion among Commissioner Miller, Attorney Clark, Councilman Dingfelder, Commissioner Smith, and Cindy Stuart, on quorum attendance to vote along with virtual appearances and maybe relocation of meetings to the Convention Center. It was noted by Beth Alden that it is a quorum of nine for the MPO Board to meet.

IX. OLD & NEW BUSINESS

There was no old business or new business.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The MPO meeting was adjourned at 10:52 a.m.
Committee Reports

Meetings of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

On May 20, under Action items, the CAC approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:

- Public Participation Measures of Effectiveness Report
- 2020 Public Participation Plan Amendments

Under Unfinished Business, the CAC voted to agree with the Tampa CRA’s motion in support for the use of CSX as a top priority; however, the CAC did not agree with the CRA’s motion opposing tolls on Interstates within the City. Following discussion of a letter from Chris Vela, the CAC also voted to oppose the proposed exit from the downtown interchange to 14th & 15th Streets.

On May 27, the CAC also held a special evening workshop on the new Transportation Improvement Program. No actions were taken, but the CAC asked a lot of good questions and discussion took place about specific projects and how they will be funded. The CAC is expected to act on the TIP at the next meeting, scheduled for June 10.

Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on May 18

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

- Comments on Regional Development Plan
- Public Participation Measures of Effectiveness Report
- 2020 Public Participation Plan Amendments

TAC heard a status report on Performance of E-Scooter Sharing in the City of Tampa

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on May 13

The BPAC heard status reports on the following topics:

- THEA Project Update and PD&E Advance Notification for Whiting St & Washington St Extensions & Selmon Expressway Ramps Reconfiguration.
- Hillsborough Air Quality Update
- Performance Evaluation of E-Scooter sharing in Tampa

Meeting of the Livable Roadways Advisory Committee (LRC) on May 27

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

- Public Participation Measures of Effectiveness Report
✓ 2020 Public Participation Plan Amendments

The LRC heard status reports on:
✓ Performance Evaluation of E-Scooter sharing in Tampa

Policy Committee on May 26

Under Action items, the Policy approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:
✓ Annual Certification of MPO Planning Process
✓ Public Participation Measures of Effectiveness Report
✓ 2020 Public Participation Plan Amendments

The Policy Committee heard status reports on:
✓ Mobility after COVID 19
✓ Hurricane Evacuation LOS
Fact Sheet

The Investing in a New Vision for the Environment and Surface Transportation in America (INVEST in America) Act is a 5-year, $494 billion investment to get our existing infrastructure working again and fund new, transformative projects that will create millions of jobs and support American manufacturing and ingenuity while reducing carbon pollution, dramatically improving safety, and spurring economic activity. It’s investing in infrastructure that is smarter, safer, and made to last.

Highways Investments: $319 Billion

- Delivers better roads and bridges faster by prioritizing fixing the broken, outdated infrastructure we already have, including 47,000 structurally deficient bridges, before building new highway capacity.
- Modernizes our infrastructure with bold new funding for addressing gridlock and the most impactful projects and bottlenecks that affect local regions and the national transportation network.
- Measures state-by-state greenhouse gas emissions, with incentives for best performers in carbon pollution reduction, and a new program to fund resilient infrastructure that can withstand the impacts of climate change.
- Dramatically increases funding for development of charging stations and other alternative fueling options for electric and zero-emissions vehicles.
- Addresses rising rates of pedestrian and bicyclist deaths by requiring States with the highest rates to set aside funding to tackle the problem, codifies and expands eligibility for safe routes to school, provides funding to develop active transportation networks, and strengthens emphasis on high risk rural roads.
- Doubles funding for technology deployment to increase innovation and creates new program to fund green materials research and to deploy green construction materials and practices to create smarter, more efficient transportation systems.

Transit Investments: $105 Billion

- Increases funding for transit agencies to add new routes and provide more reliable service, encouraging viable public transit options and fewer single-occupant cars clogging highways.
- Creates a Mobility Innovation program to permit transit agencies to collaborate on mobility on demand services.
- Strengthens Buy America provisions to boost domestic jobs in rail and bus manufacturing.
- Increases investment in zero-emission buses to reduce carbon pollution.
- Streamlines project delivery by reforming the Capital Investment Grants program so that our investments get shovels in the ground quicker and commuters see results faster.
- Provides the investments needed to address the growing backlog of transit maintenance needs, making public transit safer and more reliable.

**Passenger Vehicle and Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Investments: $10 Billion**

- Boosts funding for highway safety programs under the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, providing $5.3 billion over five years.
- Increases funding for truck and bus safety programs under the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, providing $4.6 billion over five years.

**Rail Investments: $60 Billion**

- Triples funding for Amtrak to $29 billion over five years, allowing for improvement and expansion of the Nation’s passenger rail network, including the Northeast Corridor (NEC) and the National Network, giving travelers a reliable, low-carbon option to travel both short and long distances, including to regions that lack frequent or affordable airport service.
- Invests in Amtrak stations, facilities, services, and modernization of its equipment, while continuing Amtrak’s legacy of serving long-distance, state-supported, and Northeast Corridor passengers and ensuring a skilled Amtrak workforce.
- Creates a new $19 billion program, the Passenger Rail Improvement, Modernization and Expansion (PRIME) grant program, devoted entirely to passenger rail improvements and expansion, performance optimization, and intercity passenger rail transportation expansion.
- Dramatically increases funding for the Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements (CRISI) grant program to $7 billion to fund passenger and freight rail projects. Expands program eligibilities and allows commuter rail authorities to compete for funds.
- Helps communities improve safety at rail crossings with a new $2.5 billion grade separation grant program.
- Addresses “long trains,” trains longer than 7,500 feet, as well as train crossings that are blocked more than 10 minutes, which impact local traffic and emergency response times.
- Prohibits U.S. DOT from allowing the transport of liquified natural gas by rail tank car until extensive safety analysis is performed and additional conditions are met.