Virtual Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee
Wednesday, June 17, 2020, 9:00-11:00 a.m.

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 below, or by phoning in.

Helpful hints for participating remotely are attached, and technical support during the meeting may be obtained by contacting Jason Krzyzanowski at (813) 273-3774 ext. 327 or jasonk@plancom.org.

To view presentations and participate from your computer, tablet or smartphone, go to: https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/9051263690042595597. Register in advance to receive your personalized link which can be saved to your calendar.

Dial in LISTEN-ONLY MODE: (415) 655-0052 Access Code 991-023-573

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

Comments may also be provided before the start of the meeting:
- by leaving a voice message at (813) 273-3774 ext. 369.
- by e-mailing mpo@plancom.org
- by visiting the event posted on the MPO Facebook page.

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

I. Call to Order

II. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

III. Approval of Minutes – February, March and May 27, 2020
(February and March were approved during virtual meetings)

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

V. Status Reports
A. Florida Transportation Plan & Highway Safety Plan Update (Alex Henry, FDOT)

VI. Old Business & New Business
A. Constant Contact reminder for electronic agenda (Sharon Snyder or Lisa Silva)
VII. Adjournment

VIII. Addendum

A. MPO Meeting Summary & Committee Report

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

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

Persons needing interpreter services or accommodations for a disability in order to participate in this meeting, free of charge, are encouraged to contact Joshua Barber, (813) 273-3774, ext. 313 or [barberj@plancom.org](mailto: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 Joshua Barber directamente al (813) 273-3774, ext. 313 con tres días antes, o [barberj@plancom.org](mailto:barberj@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 COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
LIVABLE ROADWAYS COMMITTEE (LRC)
MEETING OF MAY 27, 2020

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Maurino called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. The meeting was held via GoToWebinar and a quorum was present at the start of the meeting. The Pledge of Allegiance took place.

Members Present: Mariann Abrahamsen, Karen Cashon, Cal Hardie, Sara Hendricks, David Hey, Emily Hinsdale, Mark Hudson, Gus Ignas, Jason Jackman, Karen Kress, Matthew Lewis, Michael Maurino, Nicole McCleary, Sandra Piccirilli, Anna Quinones, Peter Syzonenko, and Justin Willits

Others Present: Beth Alden and Lisa Silva – MPO; Wanda West and Sharon Snyder – Planning Commission; David Aylesworth; Alex Henry – FDOT; and Dr. Yu Zhang - USF

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Official approval of the Minutes is postponed until the next in-person meeting. There were no questions or comments regarding the March minutes.

Motion: Unofficial approval of the April 15, 2020 minutes (Hey - Willits). The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Public Participation Measures of Effectiveness Report (Wanda West, MPO)

Ms. West, Community Relations Coordinator on the Public Information and Communications Team for Plan Hillsborough, presented the Public Participation Measures of Effectiveness (MOE) Report for 2018-19. Public Participation is a way to improve engagement and that engagement is essential to move from plans to action. The work the MPO does should reflect the public’s values of community plan and, in tracking the public’s participation, they know that transportation is important to our community. The MPO listened, constantly interacted, and if they haven’t learned anything over the past couple of months, we know that we’re all in this together. It takes working together. The PPP MOE is the agency’s performance as it related to public participation. It’s a tool to improve public outreach by reflecting on what they did well, what needs to be improved and it leads to the refinement of the Public Participation Plan (PPP). The agency is sure to include all constituents and are very responsive in their processes. The agency has been creative and flexible in community engagement and has learned to adapt to different situations, assuring the community has an opportunity to participate in our meetings. When possible, the MPO coordinates with other agencies to maximize exposure and avoid redundancies.

Ms. West presented the categories used to ensure the effectiveness of public participation. She reviewed the visibility and productivity through Constant Contact, plans, studies and reports,
TRIM notices to property owners, and English/Spanish flyers printed and mailed to residents for the 2018 TIP Public Hearing. She also discussed the Vision Zero promotions and new engagement and collaborations.

Ms. West highlighted the numerous opportunities for the public to participate, which included 243 public meetings/events, 154 regular MPO Committee meetings, two TIP Hearings and several highly attended events. The agency received public feedback from the CAC members Effectiveness and Time Management survey, the annual CTC evaluation, two MetroQuest surveys and the 2018 Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit evaluation. Ms. West highlighted the agency’s social media presence, public input results and online interactive map tools. She noted successes and key updates from 2016-2017 recommendations, as well as recommendations for 2020-2021.

Mr. Maurino congratulated the agency on their PPP and encouraged members to reach out to the MPO staff for them to speak to their neighborhood organization.


**B. 2020 Public Participation Plan Amendments (Wanda West, MPO)**

Ms. West explained the PPP is amended at least once every two years to capture strategic and operational changes to the outreach initiatives. The Public Participation Plan (PPP) contains the guidelines and expectations for public participation during the transportation planning activities and processes conducted by the Hillsborough County MPO, including the procedures, tools and strategies for outreach and education on transportation issues. Amendments to the PPP including cosmetic changes (new organization chart, minor edits/updates), public participation toolbox updates, flexibility for public comment, engagement in emergency situations and confirm recommendations from the MOE report.

Ms. West explained the School Transportation Working Group is now transformed into a multi-agency coordination on school transportation issues, and is now the School Board Transportation Committee, complemented by FDOT’s Community Traffic Safety Team. She presented the Plan Hillsborough organizational chart and explained that Joshua Barber has been designed the Title VI Coordinator. She presented the Select Language feature on the agency’s website, allowing for options of over 100 languages. Ms. West also explained the flexibility for public comments, especially important due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and explained how public engagement can be conducted in emergency situations.

For attendees with limited English proficiency, the following text has been added to the MPO agenda template, “MPO Staff has created a Spanish-speaking working group to translate planning jargon. Group discusses language of public information material and assures translations are understandable.” Ms. West informed the Committee that the MPO is proactively converting key documents into a compliant format, using current professionally accepted methods.

She explained the Public Participation Tool Updates are utilized, as appropriate, for constituency of each planning project, and presented the 2020 MOE Report Recommendations, which are: to increase citizen engagement in Environmental Justice areas; create short videos to better inform and increase participants; develop strategies for flexibility in meeting public plan requirements; and seek feedback on our public engagement strategies.
**Motion:** Approve the 2020 amendments to the Public Participation Plan (Ignas – Hey). The motion passed unanimously.

### V. STATUS REPORTS

#### A. Performance Evaluation of e-Scooter sharing in the City of Tampa (Dr. Yu Zhang, USF)

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

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

Dr. Zhang discussed the program evaluation methodology and data sources, such as e-Scooter sharing survey data, e-Scooter sharing operational data from Populus, accident data, and comments and feedback from the public. She presented the Evaluation Results Section 1: Evaluation Metrics, including Economic Impacts, Environmental Impacts, Equity, Health and Safety, and Level of Service. Dr. Zhang shared the public opinions on where to ride e-scooters, rules and regulations, concerns, speed limit, if the City should continue the program, if standing or seated e-scooters are preferred, the user’ s evaluation of vendors, and the preference for single or multiple vendors. Next, Dr. Zhang discussed the public feedback, including call log data analysis, comments from the call log, and comments from users and non-users on the survey.

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

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

Some of the recommendations are to invest in constructing a connected and protected bike lane network; increase in service provider’s staff to respond to complaints and collect abandoned e-Scooters in a more timely manner; adjust the number of e-Scooters based on utilization; offer seated and adaptive e-Scooters to serve disabilities; set the minimum number of e-Scooters in disadvantaged areas to improve equity; provide discounted membership plans for low income population; ban e-Scooters from busy sidewalks; set speed limits on sidewalks to 10 mph or less; provide warning signage at entrance of “No Ride Zone”; provide designated parking corrals; strengthen law enforcement; and monitoring of the safety and usage data and track performance by the City.
Discussions followed regarding if researchers are able to use the census block data showing what percentage of e-scooters were parked outside of the geofencing area, such as in the corral owned by SPIN at the northwest corner of Tampa Bay Blvd. and Armenia, to determine which neighborhoods should be added to the program (they weren’t able to analyze the disaggregated data because providers are concerned about privacy issues; however, the City is interested in offering a larger area beyond downtown).

VI. OLD BUSINESS & NEW BUSINESS

A. The next meeting is June 17, 2020. Members will be notified in a timely manner if the meeting will be in person or virtual.

B. Ms. Silva asked members to hold the date for the Hillsborough County Public Works Projects workshop on July 20, 2020 at 1:30 p.m. Some of the items to be discussed include the speed management study implementation, context classification of roadways/corridors, corridor preservation update, technical manual revisions and updates, and possibly updates to the transportation/mobility element of the Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan. She will forward more information as it becomes available. As of now, the workshop is planned to be held virtually.

Mr. Maurino thanked members for their comments and suggestions for the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), which included multi-modal school reviews and school safety audits, freight movement, trail feasibility, park safety zones, electric vehicle facilities, and right-sized parking calculator. Votes were collected from each MPO Board member at their last meeting and three of this Committee’s suggestions were moved to the top of the list (multi-modal school reviews - 8 votes and number one overall; trail feasibility and freight supply – each had 6 votes and were tied for 2nd. The need for electric charging stations and the school and park speed zones also made it to the list. Ms. Silva stated once staff has received prioritization from the MPO to move forward with the programming the UPWP, budgets will be established, and consultants will be contacted to scope out and begin implementing those needs. Per law, all projects must be tied to the UPWP. There were an overwhelming number of requests and a limited budget. The MPO appreciates everyone’s feedback and the MPO Board for recognizing many of the LRC’s requests.

Ms. Silva will post the PowerPoint presentations from today’s meeting on the Plan Hillsborough website. If you would like her to email them, please let her know.

Ms. Silva also announced the Vision Zero Leadership Summit scheduled to be held during the Policy Committee meeting on September 22nd, from 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:13 a.m.
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, Vision Zero Speed Management Action Plan
MANAGING SPEED
on Hillsborough’s
High Injury Network

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

PRESENTED BY:
Paula C. Flores, FITE
Transportation Planning Practice Leader
Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.
pflores@gpinet.com
@Paula_CFlores

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

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

Partners & Stakeholders

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

Task 1 - STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

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
WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

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

WHAT IS SPEED MANAGEMENT?

SUPPORTIVE ENFORCEMENT TECHNIQUES
- Automated Speed Enforcement
- Automated Red Light Cameras
- Targeted enforcement on high crash corridors
- Higher fines on high crash corridors
- Radar and Laser Speed Monitoring
- Aerial enforcement
**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>Gibson Dr/Bayette Rd from I-75 to Balm River Rd</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Ave from Longboat Blvd to Florida Ave</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45, 50</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Ave from Armenia Ave to 50th St</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>35, 40, 45</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mabry from Hillsborough Ave to Bearss Ave</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3-C4 (25-45)</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>C3 (25-30)</td>
<td>25-30 Max</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce B Downs from Fowler Ave to Bearss Ave</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50ft x 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 I75 to Adamo Dr</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon Rd from Hillsborough Ave to Water Ave</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-65)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M from 1275 to 22nd St</td>
<td>Freeway Urban</td>
<td>C4 (30-45)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>55, 70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th St from Sligh Ave to Busch Blvd</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C4 (30-45)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>35, 45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I275 from Howard Frankland Bridge to Busch Blvd</td>
<td>Freeway Urban</td>
<td>C4 (30-45)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</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>76th 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 Linsbaugh 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)
Communities of Concern

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

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

Example Assessment - Equity

Example Assessment - Transit Service Routes

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Cash Severity</th>
<th>RSC Crash Rate</th>
<th>Rail-Veh.</th>
<th>Schools/Mile</th>
<th>Equity/COC</th>
<th>CoV</th>
<th>Right - Contact Class</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Transit Routes</th>
<th>High Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Blvd</td>
<td>Falkenburg Rd to Dover Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibsonton Dr/Boyet Rd</td>
<td>I-75 to Balm Riverview Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td>Longboat Blvd to Florida Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Ave</td>
<td>Armenia Ave to 50th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mabry</td>
<td>Hillsborough Ave to Bearrs Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Turner</td>
<td>Gunn Hwy to Ehrlich Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Ave</td>
<td>Channelside Dr to Twiggs St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce B Downs</td>
<td>Fowler Ave to Bearrs Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th/56th St</td>
<td>MLK Blvd to Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th St</td>
<td>Fowler Ave to Fletcher Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend Road</td>
<td>US41 to I75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US301</td>
<td>I75 to Adamo Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon Rd</td>
<td>Hillsborough Ave to Water Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>I275 to 22nd St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th St</td>
<td>Sligh Ave to Busch Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I75</td>
<td>Howard Frankland Bridge to Busch Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Blvd</td>
<td>Dale Mabry to Ashley Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th St</td>
<td>Causeway Blvd to Palm River Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR579/Mango Rd</td>
<td>from MLK Blvd to US92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Ave</td>
<td>Waters Ave to Linebaugh Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TASK 4 - Next Top 30 HIN Corridors**

- Identify Next30
- Prioritize Next30

---

*Images illustrating various transportation scenarios.*
Fatal + Serious Injury Crashes
(Jan 2014-Dec 2018)

Next 30 High Injury Corridors

Bloomingdale Ave - US Hwy 301 to Lithia Pinecrest Rd
US Hwy 41 - Gulf City Rd to Riverview Dr
US Hwy 301 - 19th Ave to Bloomingdale Ave
M L King Blvd - Dale Mabry Hwy to Parson Ave
US Hwy 41 - Madison Ave to 14
Big Bend Rd - 175 to Balm Riverview Rd
Busch Blvd - Armenia Ave to 56th Street
SR 674 (Sun City Ctr Blvd) - US Hwy 41 to CR579
I-75 - SR 60 to Fletcher Ave
Hillsborough Ave - Florida Ave to Orient Rd
Waters Ave - Sheldon Road to Dale Mabry Hwy
Fowler Ave - I275 to I75
US Hwy 301 - SR 674 to Lightfoot Rd
I-75 - Big Bend Rd to US Hwy 301
SR 60 /Adamo Dr - Orient Rd to Falkenburg Rd
Causeway Blvd - 78th St to Providence Rd
Waters Ave - Dale Mabry Hwy to Nebraska Ave
Progress Blvd - Falkenburg Rd to US Hwy 301
Hillsborough Ave - Race Track Rd to Longboat Blvd
Memorial Hwy - Hillsborough Ave to Veterans Expwy
Hanley Rd - Woodbridge Blvd to Waters Ave
Dale Mabry Hwy - Interbay Blvd to Gandy Blvd
Howard Ave - Kennedy Blvd to Tampa Bay Blvd
Dale Mabry Hwy - Kennedy Blvd to Hillsborough Ave
US Hwy 92 - Falkenburg Rd to Thonotosassa Rd
Nebraska Ave - Columbus Ave to Hillsborough Ave
US Hwy 301 - Stacy Rd to County Line
Armenia Ave - Tampa Bay Blvd to Waters Ave
MacDill Ave - Kennedy Blvd to Columbus Dr
M L King Blvd - McIntosh Rd to Sammonds Rd
## Top 50 HIN Priority Recap

| Corridor and Extent | Crash Severity / Rate | Speed / CAD | Capacity / CR | Projected Speed / CR | High Volume |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------
| Bloomingdale Ave    |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| US Hwy 41           |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| US Hwy 301          |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| M L King Blvd       |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| US Hwy 41           |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| Big Bend Rd         |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| Busch Blvd          |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| SR 674 (Sun City Ctr Blvd) |       |             |               |                      |             |
| I-75                |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| Hillsborough Ave    |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| Waters Ave          |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| Fowler Ave          |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| US Hwy 301          |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| I-75                |                       |             |               |                      |             |
| SR 69 / Adamo Dr    |                       |             |               |                      |             |
**TASK 5 - Speed Management Action Plan**

- Strategies and Countermeasures
- Actions and Implementation Strategy

**Vision Zero Principles**

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

Source: Municipality of Anchorage
Vision Zero Principles

SAFE TRAVEL FOR ALL

SAFE STREETS  SAFE SPEEDS  SAFE VEHICLES  SAFE PEOPLE

Source: Vision Zero Network

Safe People

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

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

**Source:** City of Orlando – Complete Streets Policy
## 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>Intersection</th>
<th>Slow Street</th>
<th>Arterial / Corridor</th>
<th>Crash Reducing</th>
<th>Speed Reducing</th>
<th>Severity Reducing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Streets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<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>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width (10 foot standard)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Diet (repurpose space)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Treatment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</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>
<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>
<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>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulb Outs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Radius / Radius Reduction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerline Hardening</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<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>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Deceleration Lanes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Right Turn Channelization</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Parking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Urbanism – Quick Fixes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Street / Pedestrian Lighting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</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>
<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>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Speed Bars / Converging Chevrons</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</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>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Target Speed Limit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Freeway Interchanges:</strong></td>
<td></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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Context Class</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Target Speed Limit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Traffic Operations:</strong></td>
<td></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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Speed Limits (Expressways)</td>
<td>✓</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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter Signal Cycle Lengths</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal – Demand Responsive of-peak</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</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>
<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>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Context Class</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Target Speed Limit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<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><strong>Targeted Enforcement:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Section Speed Enforcement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Speed Camera Enforcement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Light Cameras</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Enforcement on High Injury Corridors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Fines on High Injury Corridors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Fines in School/Slow Speed Zones</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Campaign / PSA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Driving</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for All Users w/Emphasis on Vulnerable Motorcycle Safety</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRFB’s / Hawk Operations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Speed Enforcement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Pavement Markings/Signs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Conflict Zone Markings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Speed/Coordinated Signals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Traffic Technology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Countermeasures

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

Fatalities by Age:
- <25: 11%
- 25-35: 32%
- 35-50: 32%
- 50-65: 11%
- >65: 2%

Fatalities by Location:
- Four-Way Intersection: 62%
- Not at Intersection: 27%
- T-Intersection: 11%

Fatalities by Time of Day:
- 5-8 PM: 90%
- 9-11 PM: 5%

Contributing Factors:
- Failed to Yield Right-of-Way: 32%
- Operated MV in Careless or Negligent Manner: 10%
- Other Contributing Actions: 10%
- Ran Red Light: 8%
- Failed to Keep in Proper Lane: 8%
- Improper Turn: 6%
- Operated MV in Erratic, Reckless or Aggravated manner: 5%
- Exceeded Posted Speed: 2%

Crashes by Lighting

- Number of Crashes:
  - Dark-Lighted: 17%
  - Dark-Not Lighted: 17%
  - Dawn: 4%
  - Daylight: 12%
  - Dusk: 3%

- Serious Injuries:
  - Dark-Lighted: 12%
  - Dark-Not Lighted: 14%
  - Dawn: 6%
  - Daylight: 56%
  - Dusk: 4%

- Fatalities:
  - Dark-Lighted: 35%
  - Dark-Not Lighted: 23%
  - Dawn: 6%
  - Daylight: 22%
  - Dusk: 6%
Safe Systems Approach

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

Most Importantly, it’s proactive vs. reactive

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

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
## Top 8 HIN Corridor – Cursory Evaluation

**Countermeasure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>Bruce B Downs (Fowler to Bearss)</th>
<th>Hillsborough Ave (Englewood to Florida)</th>
<th>Dale Mabry (Hillsborough to Bearss)</th>
<th>Florida Avenue (Waters to Linebaugh)</th>
<th>Brandon Blvd (Florida to Linebaugh)</th>
<th>Fletcher Avenue (Amneda to 50th)</th>
<th>Sheldon Road (Waters to Linebaugh)</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign High Speed Exit Ramps</td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse (in lane) Rumble Strips</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Safe Continuous Bike Lanes</td>
<td>X</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>X</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>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Coordination - Target Speed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Feedback Signs - Speed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Pedestrian Interval</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Ped Beacon / HAWK</td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Speed Detection Signals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Speed Enforcement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Light Cameras</td>
<td>X</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

---

**Countermeasure Application**
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

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

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

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

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

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

Actions and Implementation Strategy - Speed Setting

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.

Actions and Implementation Strategy - Engineering & Operations

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

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)

Actions and Implementation Strategy - Engineering & Operations

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)
Action 4 - Establish Local Street Design Guidelines

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

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

Action 5 - Traffic Operations Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

### Actions and Implementation Strategy - Policy / Legislation

**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

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

Actions and Implementation Strategy - Policy / Legislation

Actions and Implementation Strategy - Plan Evaluation

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

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

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
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Annual Update

Presenter
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

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

Projects Funded in FY 2020/21 – 2024/25:

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

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

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

List of Priority Projects for Future Funding:

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

Good Repair and Resiliency, including projects such as:

1. Bridge repair & replacement
2. Road resurfacing
3. Transit vehicle replacement
4. Recovery time & economic impacts from flooding or major storm surge

Vision Zero, including safety and resilience projects evaluated by their effect on:
1. Total, fatal & bike/ped crashes [per centerline mile]

Smart Cities, including intersection, signalization, freeway incident management and ITS projects, evaluated by their impact on:
1. Travel time reliability on heavily congested arterials
2. Peak period V/C ratio

Real Choices When Not Driving, including alternatives such as transit, multi-use trails and services for the transportation disadvantaged, evaluated by:
1. Density of jobs and population in 2045 within ¼ mile of proposed transit service
2. Density of jobs and population in 2045 within ¼ mile of proposed trail/side path

Major Projects, including road and transit capacity projects for economic growth:
1. Key economic spaces (job clusters > 5,000)
2. 2045 jobs served per mile of improvement
3. 2045 delay reduced per mile of improvement

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

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

**Prepared By**
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
- Link to Draft 2020/2021 Transportation Improvement Program
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 in 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.
Virtual Meeting of the MPO Board
Tuesday, April 14th, 2020

Beth Alden reviewed the orientation with the committee members and the public.

I. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

The MPO Chairman, Commissioner Les Miller, called the meeting to order at 9:07 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.

The following members were present:

Commissioner Les Miller, Jr., Commissioner Pat Kemp, Commissioner Ken Hagan, Commissioner Mariella Smith, Commissioner Kimberly Overman, Councilman Joseph Citro, Mayor Rick Lott, Cindy Stuart, Charles Klug, Michael Maurino, Joseph Waggoner, Gina Evans, Joe Lopano, Vice-Mayor Andy Ross

Also present: Attorney Cameron Clark, Beth Alden, Allison Yeh, Bill Roberts, Lesley Miller, Lionel Fuentes, Meghan Betourney, Robert Frey, Vishaka Raman, Wanda West, Chris Vela, Demian Miller, Alexander Engleman

The following members were absent: Adam Harden, Councilman Luis Viera, Councilman Guido Maniscalco.

A quorum was met.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – TUESDAY, MARCH 3rd, 2020

Chairman Miller requested a motion to approve the March 3rd, 2020 minutes. Cindy Stuart so moved; it was seconded by Councilman Citro and adopted after unanimous roll-call of those virtually present.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were three speakers with public comments.

Chris Vela, Tampa, Florida 33605, began by emphasizing his support for the Unified Planning Work Program. He stated that the projects in it are progressive, push for logistics and safety on the roads and options on the roads, but it needs the right management, urging Toole as a qualified list option. Mr. Vela noted that Kathy Castor wrote a letter about the transportation tax, offering his feedback that we can only get the projects done locally if we have the money available for it in order to create jobs and a return on interest to build up a
stronger and more resilient economy. He mentioned the need to be competitive with three other counties who have passed a surtax and are able to compete for federal funding. Mr. Vela asked each Board member, individually, to consider the value in this letter because it is important to reduce the amount of deaths on the roadways and to give people options to connect to places they deserve to access.

Alexander Engleman, Tampa, Florida 33606, thanked the Board for their service and leadership to the community and proceeded to speak about safety options on the roadways, specifically on Bayshore Boulevard. Dr. Engleman sent in a submission on behalf of 8,500 individuals who signed a petition regarding making Bayshore Boulevard safer, that was created approximately two years ago. Dr. Engleman asked the Board to study Bayshore Boulevard, to work with the City to fund long-term redesign changes, to consider reclassifying it away from an arterial roadway, and to add Bayshore Boulevard to the planning work of the MPO.

Demian Miller, Tampa, Florida, thanked the MPO Board for allowing their group to support the MPO staff working on various projects over the last five years through the General Planning Consultant Contract, and they look forward to supporting this organization as the Board considers Action Item C on today’s agenda.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS, ONLINE COMMENTS

Bill Roberts, CAC Chair, reported on the last two meetings of the CAC. At the March 11th meeting, the CAC recommended approval of the TIP Amendment for the HART grants, which included Human Trafficking Innovations in Public Transit, Bus and Bus Facilities, as well as the CNG Duplex Compressor. The CAC also added a recommendation that HART let human trafficking survivors lead on messaging and that HART consider adding electric buses.

There were also presentations on coordinating the transportation in land use. The CAC members recognize that land use and transportation are inseparable. During the PowerPoint on the HART’s Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Study, the CAC encouraged HART to advance redevelopment of the transit lines that run every 15 minutes. There was a PowerPoint on TBARTA’s Regional Rapid Transit Study, with comments on the impact of the I-4 interchange, on the operations of a rapid transit line, the cost of service, ridership numbers, and recommendations on public participation. Finally, the CAC had a presentation on CUTRs Transportation Equity Scorecard, and the CAC members had questions on who is funding the study and where it can be accessed after the study is completed.

The second meeting, a virtual meeting of the CAC, held on April 8th, acted by consensus to recommend a transit improvement program amendment, adding three resurfacing projects, and Mr. Roberts voiced the CAC consensus recommendation. The CAC also recommended the
Unified Planning Work Program for the next two fiscal years. There was considerable discussion on the topic about the I-275 conversion study, how much it is likely to cost, FDOT's position, and how the MPO can make progress on it without taking funding away from other needed planning studies. Ultimately, the CAC felt the MPO should ask the FDOT for an opportunity to undertake the study in phases rather than in its entirety for two reasons: budget limitations and some timing limitations. The CAC also recommended the annual certification of the MPO, and those are the recommendations to the MPO.

Mr. Roberts discussed the interesting and enlightening study that CAC Member Steven Hollenkamp presented on his fiscal analysis of Plant City's growth. The CAC will further discuss this topic and would encourage the MPO Board to consider asking Mr. Hollenkamp to come and give this presentation. There were no questions for Mr. Roberts.

Wanda West, MPO staff, relayed that the committee approved and forwarded the HART Transportation Improvement Program Amendments. Other presentations made to committees included Land Use and Transportation Coordination, HART's Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Study, TBARTA's Regional Rapid Transit Project Development and Environmental Study, PD&E Advance Notification of the Whiting Street and Washington Street extensions and other project updates, research on induced traffic and induced demand, the Selmon Greenway Master Plan Update, and CUDR's Transportation Equity Scorecard. At the workshop of the Policy Committee and MPO Board on TIP priorities, status reports were provided on the 2020 surtax project's overview, and Ms. West went over them in detail, along with the committee and public questions and concerns. There were no questions.

V. ACTION ITEMS

A. Committee Appointments

HART has nominated Councilmember Gil Schisler to serve on the Transportation Disadvantaged Committee Board. Staff recommends the confirmation of the appointment.

Chairman Miller sought a motion to confirm the appointment of Councilmember Gil Schisler; Joseph Waggoner so moved; it was seconded by Vice-Mayor Andrew Ross and adopted after unanimous roll-call of those virtually present.

B. TIP Amendments for HART

Ms. Raman presented a detailed PowerPoint of the following four amendments, all for HART, two new and two updates, including the FDOT 5-year TIP: Amendment 12, a new project added, Human Trafficking Innovations in Transit Public Safety Grant; Amendment 13, a new project added, Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Grant; Amendment 14, an existing project update, HART CNG Duplex Compressor; Amendment 15, an existing project update, Surface Transportation: Bus
Ms. Overman inquired as to the HART amendments, given there's a federal and local match on a couple of the projects, if any of those projects were dependent on revenues associated with the surtax, to which Ms. Alden replied that they're generally for federal funding, so she doesn't believe so. Ms. Overman followed up, stating if they are dependent on surtax dollars for the 2020 and 2025 for Amendment 15, that needs to be addressed, and Ms. Alden responded that they don't know at this time; that when there is a match for the federal grants, it is identified to them as local funding, so they don't actually know the source from another agency.

Chairman Miller sought a motion to approve the TIP amendments for HART; Commissioner Kemp so moved; it was seconded by Commissioner Overman and adopted after unanimous roll-call of those virtually present.

C. General Planning Consultant Procurement

Meghan Betourney, Planning Commission Staff, gave a presentation on the 2020 General Planning Consultant Selection, conducted every five years, which is done to bring in GPCs’ specialized skills and best practices, an outside perspective, specialized data or software, and to make available a broad range of areas of expertise to the Board and its member governments and agencies.

GPC contracts and work orders: They are done every two years. It is a two-year contract, with the possibility of three one-year extensions, with a maximum five-year term. Work orders are generated from the MPO's Unified Planning Work Program. Work orders for specific tasks are negotiated after the general contract is signed. Hourly rates are reviewed against FDOT standards and are then included in the Board packet for approval. When looking for consultants, they must have the ability to perform four core services: Long range transportation systems planning; system/corridor planning; public outreach/participation; document production. The optional services, over 50 specialized areas ranging from data collection to multi-modal planning.

Ms. Betourney apprised the Board of the selection process, starting on January 6th through April 14th, where the nine proposed finalists were brought to the MPO Board. The 11 selection panel members were identified, and she went over the nine proposed finalists. Ms. Betourney is requesting that the Board authorizes the MPO staff to negotiate a contract with the top nine rated firms.

Commissioner Smith commented that at the County Commission, they ran into some big problems with a study from one of the listed consultants. She did not request their removal but asked that the staff thoroughly vet the studies and reports that come from the
consultants because what they ran into at the Board level was that it all came to them, and the County Commissioners and their staff were tasked with digging through and finding the flaws in a report. Commissioner Smith also cautioned and advised staff to completely vet these reports and not just pass them on just because some consultant has provided it.

Chairman Miller sought a motion to authorize the negotiation of a contract with the top nine-rated firms; Commissioner Overman so moved; it was seconded by Joseph Waggoner and adopted after unanimous roll-call of those virtually present.

VI. STATUS REPORTS

A. Unified Planning Work Program

Allison Yeh, MPO staff, commented to the Board that this is a status report, so they will not be asking for action on the Unified Work Plan until the May 13th meeting, even though the committee has received a report for approval, that they're finalizing the document partially based on the comments today. The Unified Work Plan program is a program they are required to update every two years. The biennial update is effective July 1, 2020 and goes through June 30th, 2022. The update outlines all the major tasks the MPO performs; complying with federal and state funding; coordinates federally funded planning tasks performed by the MPO, HART, and FDO; complies with federal and state rules.

Ms. Yeh discussed the 1 through 6 major planning tasks. From left to right they are: Transportation Planning Management, System and Corridor Planning, Long Range Transportation Plan and Data Collection, Transportation Improvement Plan, Public Participation, and Local and Regional Coordination and Planning. There was a PowerPoint presentation on the budget for the next two fiscal years. The first three columns, PL, STP, and FTA, are the federal funding allocation. CTD is the state funding they receive for TP planning. In the first fiscal year, there is approximately $2.8 million for all the activities that MPO does, and for the second fiscal year, approximately $2.3 million. Ms. Yeh gave a snapshot of where all the funding gets used within the six major tasks, and 90 percent of their work goes directly towards planning and public participation, and all the planning-related tasks. There was a brief overview of the major projects completed for Fiscal Years 2019 and 2020.

There are projects underway now that will continue into the next fiscal year, which are the Data Platform-Performance Monitoring and Project Evaluation; Data Portal; Equity Scorecard with CUTR; Plant City Transit Feasibility Plan; Vision Zero Corridor Studies for Unincorporated Hillsborough County; Regional LRTP. In February and March, they went to the MPO Committee and asked them to think about what projects they'd like to see in the work program and to come to a
consensus via motion about what that might be, which included the other requests, BPAC motion; LRC motion; CAC motion; TAC motion.

Ms. Yeh went over, in detail, the Jurisdiction and Agency Project Requests that includes Hillsborough County, Temple Terrace, Plant City (2019 requests) and HART. To accomplish the six tasks listed, there are critical path projects and analyses that need to be accomplished in the next two fiscal years, totaling $615,062. Along with the critical path projects, there are some potential studies that have been suggested along with the other committee and jurisdiction requests given. They did a bid cost estimate which totals $980,000.

So, the MPO staff is asking the Board to take a look at all of the studies proposed. The critical path studies have to stay, but they want the Board members to think of their top five priorities and e-mail Ms. Yeh back within a week with those top five priorities. The work program is amendable, but they are going to adopt it on May 13th, and it will be effective July 1st. So, the schedule is: The MPO Committee’s review draft UPWP – April; MPO adopts final UPWP – May 13th, 2020; new UPWP effective – July 1st, 2020.

Commissioner Overman brought forward that as they begin the discussion of potential studies that have been requested by local jurisdictions and the MPO Advisory Committees, they have to remember that these projects in the studies were originally proposed based on a general plan to implement the use of the surtax that was approved in November of 2018. She continued that it does appear that many of the projects that they're going to do the studies on, should they get an adverse decision from the Supreme Court -- and, as it stands now, they don't have a referendum until 2022, given the Board’s action last week or two weeks ago -- many of the projects can't even move forward. They are asking for critical path projects over the next two years where there may not be, in the future, any of the dollars to do these projects. So, while the critical path projects list that shows $600,000 towards studies in line with what the committees have brought forward, she'd like to know, before they even consider the potential study list, what percentage of those studies that are scheduled in the next two years are dependent on the funding plan that they have approved previously that included surtax dollars. If they get a Supreme Court ruling, they may not have it for a couple of years. So, if these studies are going to be done over the next two years and they don't even know if they have the money to pay for them, to actually implement them, why are they going to do the studies.

Commissioner Overman emphasized they have done a lot of studies where they have never funded the projects because they did not have the money locally to do it. Without the surtax, she suggested they will not have the money to do many of these plans or actual projects. She then asked: What projects on this list of the critical path, as well as the proposed path, have funding or potential funding without the surtax? Beth Alden replied that even on the critical path list, there
are some plans and studies that will take a lot longer to implement without the surtax funding, giving examples of where it is affected.

Ms. Stuart concurred with Commissioner Overman to relook at these critical paths and potential studies based on what they see happening with the surtax and also what they see happening potentially with the economy in Hillsborough County. There are a lot of people out of work right now. Even if they receive the sales tax, they are anticipating a drop in what people are going to spend money on. Ms. Stuart's question centered around the I-275 boulevard, since that's the only project listed under critical and potential that says Phase I. She asked: What is the total cost, and how many phases are there? They are talking about a study to tear down the only system that they have in place, which is an interstate system, and turning it into a boulevard. If the spending on Phase I will be $150,000, what will the total cost of the study be? Was that a staff recommendation or just a CAC recommendation? Beth Alden responded that this was a recommendation from the CAC last year that was incorporated into the Unified Planning Work Program based on a motion from the Board. Phase I of the study would help with determining what the cost would be to do all of the technical analyses that would be needed. Ms. Alden could not give, at this time, an estimate of what that would cost, but ultimately it would be at least a million dollars, probably more than that, to do the technical analyses that would be needed.

Ms. Stuart questioned spending a million dollars to do a study around something that they may not want to do or be able to do and certainly won't be able to fund at this point in time. She continued that she would save her comments on this and put them in writing for the May 13th meeting but opined that would be a potential study that she would request the Board take off the table. She asked how prudent would it be to spend that kind of money right now on something that they don’t even have a solid number of what it is going to cost to do the study on tearing down the one interstate system that runs through this community and connects two other counties. Ms. Stuart further emphasized that that is how they need to start looking at some of these studies that are on the table, based on talking about the surtax potentially not coming through in two years, and that the voters may be confused about what is going to happen with this surtax. If they don't lose in the Supreme Court, they're talking about having less funding than they've had in the past when they have a critical need in some other prominent areas in south county they need to be spending money on studies for.

Councilman Citro stated that Commissioner Overman and School Board Member Ms. Stuart asked the same questions that he had, so he had no additional questions.

Commissioner Kemp addressed the on-demand downtown transportation that she saw that keeps coming up again and again.
VII. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Beth Alden thanked everyone for their patience attending via the virtual meetings and gave a brief review of how it has progressed so far. Beth Alden went over news items: They're monitoring the possibility there will be another federal stimulus that provides additional funding for transportation. The speculation from Washington is that that might be discussed more in Congress in May and that the funding might come through some of the regular channels that they’re used to seeing for the TIP as a way of distributing the funds. All of that is still to be determined, and she will keep them posted. The next meeting is scheduled for the 13th of May. They are making provisions to attend virtually.

VIII. OLD & NEW BUSINESS

A. Status of Executive Director Annual Evaluation

Attorney Clark pointed out that he sent out evaluation forms and, to those who have not already responded, he requests that the responses be sent to him by Friday, May 1st so that he can put them together as a report for the Board to receive at its May 13th meeting.

B. Other Old or New Business

There was no old business or new business.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The MPO meeting was adjourned at 10:22 a.m.
Committee Reports

Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on April 8
Under Action items, the CAC approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:
✓ Transportation Improvement Program Amendments
✓ FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program
✓ Annual Certification of MPO Planning Process

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

Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on April 20
Under Action items, the TAC approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:
✓ Transportation Improvement Amendments
✓ FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program
✓ Annual Certification of MPO Planning Process

There were no Status Reports this month.

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on April 8
The committee heard public comments on the need for a redesign/speed study for Bayshore Blvd. and regarding modifications to 14th and 15th Streets in Ybor City as a result of the TBNext project. In Action items, the BPAC had no objections and forwarded to the MPO Board:
✓ FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program

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

Meeting of the Intelligent Transportation Systems Committee (ITS) on April 9
The ITS Committee did not vote, but had no objections and forwarded to the MPO Board:
✓ FY21 and FY22 Unified Planning Work Program

The Committee also heard status reports on the following topics:
• ITS Capability Maturity Model
• Hillsborough County Air Quality Status
• Vision Zero Speed Management Study
Meeting of the Livable Roadways Advisory Committee (LRC) on April 15

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

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

The LRC heard a status report on Air Quality Month.

Meeting of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board on April 24

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

Under Action Items TD Board approved:

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

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