The County Center and Plan Hillsborough offices are closed to the public in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Members of the public may access this meeting and participate via the GoToMeeting link above, or by phoning in and visiting the Plan Hillsborough website for the agenda packet and presentation slides. Please mute yourself upon joining the meeting. For technical support during the meeting, please contact Jason Krzyzanowski at (813) 273-3774 ext. 327.

Virtual Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee
Monday, June 29, 2020 @ 1:30 PM

To view presentations and participate your computer, table or smartphone:

https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/2304669138185338123

Register in advance to receive your personalized link, which can be saved to your calendar.


Agenda packet, presentations, and supplemental materials posted here.

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

I. Committee Soundcheck 15 minutes prior to meeting

II. Call to Order Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

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 up to one hour before the meeting:
- by leaving a voice message at (813) 273-3774 ext. 369.
- by e-mail to mpo@plancom.org

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

III. Approval of Minutes – May 18, 2020

IV. Action Items

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

B. Vision Zero Speed Management Action Plan
   (Paula Flores, MPO consultant)
V. Status Reports
   A. Florida Transportation Plan & Highway Safety Plan Update
      (Alex Henry, FDOT)
   B. Plant City Transit Plan (Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO Staff)

VI. Old Business & New Business
   A. Technical Review Workshop – July 20th, 1:30 pm

VII. Adjournment

VIII. Addendum
   A. MPO Meeting Minutes & Standing Committee Reports
   B. TBARTA’S Regional Rapid Transit Project Survey

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

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

Persons needing interpreter services or accommodations for a disability in order to participate in this meeting, free of charge, are encouraged to contact Joshua Barber, 813-273-3774 x313 or barberj@plancom.org, three business days in advance of the meeting. Also, if you are only able to speak Spanish, please call the Spanish helpline at (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

Si necesita servicios de traducción, el MPO ofrece por gratis. Para registrarse por estos servicios, por favor llame a Johnny Wong directamente al (813) 273-3774, ext. 370 tres días antes, o por correo electrónico wonq@plancom.org. 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.
The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Regular Meeting, scheduled for Monday, May 18, 2020, at 1:30 p.m., held telephonically.

The following members were present:

Jeffrey Sims, Chairman
Rachel Chase
Jay Collins
Charles Andrews for Amber Dickerson
Leland Dicus

Gina Evans
Anna Quinones for Robert Frey

Anthony Garcia
Mark Hudson for Julie Ham
Danni Jorgenson
Nicole McCleary (arrived at 2:09 p.m.)
Chris DeAnnuntis for Brian Pessaro

Jonathan Scott
Michael Williams

The following members were absent:

Michael English
Troy Tinch

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Sims called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. Ms. Sara McKinley, MPO, called the roll and noted a quorum was present.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Christopher Vela shared concerns related to the regional transit development plan, public participation, and greenhouse gas emission.
MONDAY, MAY 18, 2020

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – APRIL 20, 2020

Chairman Sims sought a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Scott moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Garcia, and carried unanimously by members present. (Member McCleary had not arrived; Members English and Tinch were absent.)

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Comments on Regional Transit Development Plan

Messrs. William Ball, representing TBARTA, and Richard Clarendon, MPO, expounded on the item. Chairman Sims asked about current TBARTA revenue sources. Ms. McCleary announced HART would not support removing the Route 275LX bus from the plan. Following remarks, Chairman Sims sought a motion to accept the draft regional transit development plan. Mr. Scott moved to approve with the two caveats listed in here; not at the expense of local transit, Hold Harmless funding for local transit agencies, pursue expanded State transit funding to support expanded regional service, seconded by Mr. Collins, and carried unanimously by members present. (Members English and Tinch were absent.)

B. Public Participation Measures of Effectiveness Report

Ms. Wanda West, MPO, delivered the report. Ms. Chase queried about environmental justice community outreach improvements and the MPO committees’ demography’s community reflection. After talks on successful public information techniques, Chairman Sims sought a motion to approve the measures of effectiveness report. Mr. Williams moved to approve, seconded by Mr.Dicus, and carried unanimously by members present. (Members English and Tinch were absent.)

C. Public Participation Plan (PPP) Update

Ms. West provided the update. Subsequent to comments on the PPP updates during the COVID-19 pandemic, Chairman Sims sought a motion to approve the 2020 amendments for the PPP. Ms. McCleary moved to approve the 2020 amendment for the PPP, seconded by Ms. Chase, and carried unanimously by members present. (Members English and Tinch were absent.)
V. STATUS REPORTS

A. Performance Evaluation of E-Scooter Sharing in Tampa

▶ Dr. Yu Zhang, University of South Florida, highlighted the report. ▶ Ms. McCleary posed questions on e-scooter trips connected to bus routes. Following dialogue, Mr. Dicus wanted to know how e-scooter injury numbers compared with walking injuries. ▶ Chairman Sims touched on various e-scooter challenges, transit/leisure uses, and first-time user rates.

VI. OLD BUSINESS AND NEW BUSINESS

▶ Ms. Gena Torres, MPO, suggested having a meeting instead of recessing in July 2020. Discussion ensued.

▶ Ms. McKinley announced the next MPO TAC meeting was on June 29, 2020.

VII. ADDENDUM

A. MPO Meeting Minutes and Standing Committee Reports


VIII. ADJOURNMENT

▶ There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:44 p.m.

READ AND APPROVED: ____________________________

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
PAT FRANK, CLERK

By: ____________________________
Deputy Clerk

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Prepared By**
Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

**Attachments**
- Link to Draft 2020/2021 Transportation Improvement Program
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Vision Zero Speed Management Action Plan

**Presenter**
Paula Flores, GPI

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

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

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

**Recommended Action**
Approve the [Vision Zero Speed Management Action Plan](#) and forward to the MPO for approval.

**Prepared By**
Gena Torres

**Attachments**
Presentation slides, [Vision Zero Speed Management Action Plan](#)
Managing Speed on Hillsborough’s High Injury Network

Hillsborough MPO
Metropolitan Planning for Transportation
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I. OVERVIEW OF THE PLAN

A. Plan Purpose and Description

The Hillsborough MPO and its partners are committed to the continued support of the Vision Zero effort to reduce fatalities and serious injuries on Hillsborough roadways. According to the statistical evaluation performed for the Safe Streets Now Vision Zero Hillsborough Action Plan,

"We have a crisis in Hillsborough County. Our streets are some of the deadliest in the country. Each day, Hillsborough County residents travel roads with the highest traffic fatality rate per capita among large counties in the United States."

The safety crisis being faced has social and economic implications for our community, our residents, and our visitors. According to the CDC, fatal crashes cost Floridians an annual $32 million in medical costs and $2.99 billion in work loss costs. FDOT estimates that each fatal crash costs society a total of $10.1 million.

There are various leading causes of road fatalities and severe injuries. Factors that contribute to severe crashes and fatalities include, but not limited to, unsafe behaviors such as speeding, aggressive driving, distracted driving/walking/biking, and impaired driving. System users must take responsibility for their actions and understand the potential impact of their behaviors on others using the same roadway system. But the proper street design can also encourage safer behavior by all users.

Per Vision Zero tenets, speed matters most. High speeds make crashes more likely and more likely to be deadly. Effective Vision Zero programs manage speed in order to reduce severe and fatal traffic injuries. Speed increases the risk of severe and fatal injuries at an alarming rate. For example, the likelihood of a pedestrian being killed at 20MPH is 5%; however, it increases to 80% at 40MPH. One of the startling statistics in Hillsborough County is that 75% of all fatal crashes occur on roads with posted speeds of +40MPH. Understanding this correlation is critical to understanding that not all crashes can be eliminated, but severe injury and fatal crashes are preventable.

Traditional safety programs have been reactive and address only hot spots where crashes occur. It is important to look at historical crash trends but also be proactive in identifying systemic improvements to prevent future crashes even in locations where there is no crash history. This is often referred to as taking a systems approach to road safety instead of just addressing the hot spots. It should be noted that efforts to influence individual behavior (educating one user at a time) primarily with education and enforcement campaigns have fallen short. Addressing speed requires changing organizational practices and reforming policies. Existing practices, such as designing roads for inappropriately high speeds and setting speed limits too high, often prioritize moving more cars over the safety of all road users (driver, pedestrian, bicyclist, or transit user).

The USDOT has provided significant resources to develop a Speed Management Program Plan. Basic plan attributes include:

- Data-driven – crash, roadway, user, land use 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
B. Safety Goals of the Plan

Current guidance on managing speed indicates the purpose is to improve public health and safety by reducing speeding-related crashes and the resulting injuries and fatalities. However, it is one of Vision Zero tenets that managing speed reduces all types of crash types that result in fatalities and severe injuries, not just speed-related crashes.

The effort is comprehensive in its approach to look to reduce all fatality and severe injury crashes, not just speeding related crashes. The plan identifies specific actions to be taken by the various jurisdictional agencies in Hillsborough County to effectively address managing speed and reducing the crash risk on the identified Top20 and Next30 High Injury Network corridors and ways to institutionalize a safe systems approach to safety and design of streets and roads. To accomplish the actions identified, a coordinated effort is needed to address the fundamental engineering, enforcement, education, and communication challenges being faced.

The plan goal is simple:

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

The plan desired outcomes are comprehensive. Outcomes include improving the safety experience, increase awareness, institutionalize good practices, identify supportive polices, programs and infrastructure and obtain the cooperation and support needed to succeed.

**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.
C. Stakeholder Engagement
The success of any speed management program or plan is enhanced by coordination and cooperation among the various agencies, engineering, enforcement, health and educational disciplines. A thoughtful list of stakeholders was developed, and invitations issued to be part of this fundamental journey to learn how to change the safety culture in Hillsborough County.

The Stakeholder Group met three times throughout the plan development process including at the kick-off stage, upon preliminary safety findings and when the preliminary recommendations were developed.

The first meeting centered on plan goals and desired outcomes, identification of collaborative roles, responsibility and data needs. In addition, preliminary prioritization metrics and potential safety countermeasures currently in use and others to considered.

The second meeting focused on review of the detailed safety evaluation of the Top20 HIN networks and conversation around current efforts on some of the corridors and what are the next list of corridors each jurisdictional agency can start to address. This led to the Next30 HIN corridor identification process.

The third meeting presented the preliminary countermeasure tool kits on Safe People, Safe Streets, Safe Interchanges, Safe Operations, Targeted Enforcement, Education and Public Service Announcements. In addition, the Implementation Plan Actions on these same areas of focus plus policy and legislative considerations were reviewed.

The Stakeholder Group, especially some of the agencies, engaged in several teleconferences to coordinate on current safety projects and corridors, to provide supplemental data and information related to the formation of the plan. The Stakeholder Group also provided feedback on the final plan. The meeting presentations and notes are provided in the appendix.

D. Why Speed Matters
As vehicle speeds increase, two outcomes also increase: the likelihood of crashing and the severity of injuries resulting from the crash.

Partners & Stakeholders
- Hillsborough County MPO
- Hillsborough County
- Hillsborough County School District
- City of Tampa
- City of Temple Terrace
- Plant City
- Law Enforcement
- Florida Department of Transportation
- Hillsborough Area Regional Transit
- Tampa Hillsborough Expressway Authority
- Florida Health Department
Higher speeds increase both reaction time and braking distance required to come to a complete stop. If a crash occurs that involves a vulnerable user, the speed differential between the two opposing bodies are more likely to result in severe injuries and even death. Safety increases when speed differential is minimized. For example, freeways are safer because motorists move at similar speeds, access is limited, less friction, and transitions to slower speed roads are handled via ramps to surface streets (where slower users on foot and bicycle are kept on a different network). Low-speed streets (due to low volumes or congestion) can be similarly safe because all users, from motorists to bicyclist to walkers, are traveling at similar speeds. A crash between a vehicle driven at a low speed and a fixed object will typically result in minimal damage because of the lower speed impact.

Another major contributor to the dangers of speeding is peripheral vision. As motorist speed increases, the cone of vision narrows so that the motorist can focus on items farther away. When stationary, the cone of vision approaches 180 degrees. When moving, the cone of vision decreases with increasing speeds. Given the limits of the vision cone, it is unrealistic to expect motorists to be able to be aware of all their surroundings when traveling at higher speeds. Design objectives that prioritize lower speeds for motorists on streets where pedestrians and bicyclists are present may enhance visibility.

Motorist make decisions on how fast to drive based partially on posted speed limit signs and partially based on physical cues in the environment (trees, parked cars, etc.). If higher speeds feel natural and instinctive, people are likely to drive at those speeds, due to the intuitive nature of such designs.

Currently policy allows speed limits to be adjusted based on operating speed, gathered by observing actual speeds and selecting the 85th percentile. The road’s design speed is based on 100th percentile speeds and is higher than the posted speed. There is no

---

1 ITE “Implementing Context Sensitive Design on Multimodal Thoroughfares” A Practitioner’s Handbook, 2017
evidence that the 85th percentile speed corresponds to a speed with low crash rates. In fact, a 2017 National Traffic Safety Board study concluded that using the 85th percentile speed setting method has led to unintended consequences of higher operating speed and an undesirable cycle of speed escalation and reduced safety. The 85th percentile speed setting methodology is not the only method. The USDOT has the USLIMITS2 method that considers road, traffic, crash data, access, density and pedestrian and bicycle activity. The USLIMITS2 more directly resembles Median or 50th percentile speed setting limit. Another method of setting speed limit is the Safe Systems Approach which relates to the premise of setting Target Speeds.

Using street design as a language for communicating desired operating speed means designing toward a designated target speed, or the speed at which the community desires motorists to travel. In fact, AASHTO recommends target speed be used on urban arterial streets of 20-45 MPH.

Operating speeds on roadways are successfully managed when design speed, target speed, speed limits and inferred speed converge. This means not just the speed limits but also the design of the roadways must convey the same travel speed, the target speed.

Vision Zero Cities across the US have embraced the importance of managing speed and have taken a proactive approach to reduce posted speeds to the ideal 20-25MPH across neighborhoods and citywide to minimize the risk of crashes leading to fatal and serious injuries.

\(^2\) National Transportation Safety Board “Reducing Speeding-Related Crashes Involving Passenger Vehicles: Safety Study NTSB/SS-17/01” 2017

### SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION RESULTS

**Seattle**
- 40% in crashes
- 30% in injury crashes

**NYC**
- 14% in crashes
- 49% in pedestrian crashes
- 42% in bicyclist crashes

**Mexico City**
- 18% in crashes

**Boston**
- 30% in speeds over 35 MPH

**Other Cities**
- Washington, DC
- Portland, OR
- Cambridge, MA
- Albuquerque, NM
- Nashville, TN
- Minneapolis
- St. Paul
- Boulder, CO

![Seattle Speed Limit Sign](image)
II. SPEEDING-RELATED SAFETY CHALLENGES

A. Problem Identification

In nations around the world speeding is a major driver of fatal crashes. In 2018 in the US alone, 9,378 lives were lost in speeding-related crashes. Speeding endangers everyone on the road. We all know the frustrations of modern life and juggling a busy schedule, but speed limits are put in place to protect all road users.

For more than two decades, speeding has been involved in approximately one-third of all vehicle fatalities. Speed also affects your safety even when you are driving at the speed limit but too fast for road conditions, such as during bad weather, when a road is under repair, or in an area at night that isn’t well lit.

Speeding endangers not only the life of the speeder, but all the people on the road around them, including law enforcement officers. It is a problem we all need to help solve. But it is not just about the number of crashes identified as a result of speeding but much greater than that, it’s about aggressive driver behavior.

Speeding is more than just breaking the law. The consequences are:

- Greater potential for loss of vehicle control.
- Reduced effectiveness of occupant protection equipment.
- Increased stopping sight distance after the driver perceives a danger.
- Increased degree of crash severity leading to more severe injuries.
- Economic implications of a speed-related crash; and
- Increased fuel consumption / cost.

According the NHTSA, several factors have contributed to an overall rise in aggressive driving:

- Traffic – traffic congestion is one of the most frequently mentioned contributing factors to aggressive driving.
- Running late – some people drive aggressively because they have too much to do and are running late to work, school, their next meeting or appointment.
- Anonymity – a motor vehicle insulates the driver from the world. A driver can develop a sense of detachment from their surroundings.
- Disregard for Others and for the Law – Most motorists rarely drive aggressively, and some never do. For others, episodes of aggressive driving are frequent, and for a small proportion it is their usual driving behavior.

In the US, 83% of speeding-related fatalities occurred on roads other than freeways that is arterials, collectors, and local roads. On urban roads, speeding is particularly dangerous due to the prevalence of vulnerable pedestrians and cyclists. Effectively managing speeds on urban arterials poses unique challenges. Under the banner of Vision Zero, many US cities are increasingly focusing on speed management to improve traffic safety.

B. Hillsborough County Challenges

In 2017, Hillsborough MPO Vision Zero Action Plan was completed documenting the state of safety conditions and necessary actions to be taken to address traffic safety in Hillsborough County. The plan identified startling statistics in relationship to having the highest traffic fatality rate per capita of all large counties in the country. Identifying that on average, at least one-person walking, and one-
person biking are involved in a crash every day, resulting in serious injury or death. Some of the Hillsborough crash statistics that emerged included:

- For every fatal crash, there are eight incapacitating injury crashes.
- A third of our roads account for ¾ of the county’s severe crashes.
- Aggressive driving accounted for 33 percent of all fatal crashes, and 42 percent of vehicle crashes on our roads.
- Electronic distraction was cited as a factor in 19 percent of severe vehicle crashes.
- Intoxication is a factor in 23 percent of all fatal crashes and is a factor in 19 percent of fatal pedestrian crashes.
- Dark, unlit roads were a factor in 39 percent of fatal and incapacitating injury crashes.
- 75 percent of fatal crashes occur on roads with posted speeds of 40+MPH

Engineers, planners, law enforcement officials and educators have launched programs and projects across the county to provide safe, comfortable travel conditions for residents and visitors. The action plan built on the many state and local agency safety programs, projects and initiatives underway. Vision Zero Hillsborough provides an umbrella under which these efforts are organized, connected and promoted.

While great strides have been made to create safe streets and change the culture around how we design and use our roads, there is still work to do.

C. High Injury Network - Update
The Vision Zero Action Plan identified the Top20 deadliest corridors in Hillsborough County based on the most severe crashes per mile. These corridors form the initial High Injury Network in Hillsborough County. The plan dived into notable common elements of these corridors including characteristics involving vulnerable users, aggressive driving and lighting conditions. Considering the Top20 High Injury Network (HIN) corridors are the deadliest corridors in the county, it makes sense to develop the Speed Management Action Plan around these priority corridors.

The first step taken was to obtain the latest information from the FDOT – Crash Data Management System for the HIN corridors over a five-year period, January 2014 through December 2018. The data was downloaded and scrubbed for: correct location, proximity to corridor limits, correct street name. In addition, crashes on crossing corridors that are grade separated were eliminated. The scrubbing resulted in a reduction of 7-10% of the total crash records.

In summary, there were several changes in the total crashes on the Top20 HIN corridors since the original Vision Zero Action Plan. These changes are expected as crashes will change from year to year.

- Total crashes have increased by +13% since the original Vision Zero Action Plan
- Fatalities have decreased by -4%
- Serious Injuries have decreased by -30%
- Motorcycle crashes decreased by -10%
- Pedestrian crashes increased by +10%, however,
- Pedestrian fatality crashes increased by +41%
- Pedestrian serious injuries reduced by -22%
- Bicycle crashes reduced by -5%
- Bicycle fatality/serious injuries reduced by -20-30%, respectively.

While fluctuations have occurred in this new 5-year period, pedestrian crashes have resulted in a disproportionally higher fatality rate. The following graphic shows the trends for the fatal crashes for the Top20 HIN corridors.
SPEED MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN

**HIN Crash Statistics (2014-2018)**

- **< 35 Years Old**: 67%
- **92%**: Speed limit 40+ km/h
- **59%**: Non-Intersections
- **71%**: Aggressive Driving/Speeding
  - Erratic, Reckless, Aggravated maneuvers, ran off road, exceeded speed limit, ran red light, careless or negligent

**Fatal Crash Characteristics**

- **53%**: Occurred on “Dark-Lighted” streets
- **83%**: Non-Peak Hours
- **59%**: 4 or more travel lanes

- **43%**: Cars
- **24%**: SUV
- **14%**: Motorcycles
Of the total Fatal crashes, 83% occurred during non-peak commute hours. During peak commute hours, these corridors may be operating at congested levels and travel speeds may be controlled. During non-peak hours, these corridors have less traffic, still the same number of travel lanes that can lead to higher opportunity for aggressive driving behaviors.

Of the total Fatal crashes, 71% of the contributing factors involved some type of aggressive driving or speeding relation action such as erratic reckless, aggravated maneuvers, ran off the road, exceeded speed limit, ran red light, careless or negligence behavior. This is where this plan differs from strictly focusing only on the “speeding” crashes.

Of the total Fatal crashes, 67% of the people involved were younger than 35 years of age. Not only are our younger residents involved, but they are also dying. Aggressive driving campaigns should be targeted at this younger demographic.

Of the total Fatal crashes, 59% occurred at mid-block locations on the network. Normally the exposure rates for fatal crashes are at the intersections where the number of conflict points are greatest; however, the trends in these corridors indicate differently. The mid-block locations need to be carefully be evaluated to address potential deficiencies for all users.

Of the total Fatal crashes, 59% occurred on corridors with four or more travel lanes. That is expected as the higher the number of lanes, the higher the speeds, the higher exposure for a crash.

Of the total Fatal crashes, 53% during evening hours on corridors identified as being lighted. This fact is suspect considering the limited lighting available in most Hillsborough County corridors. Each Corridor needs to be carefully evaluated and validated to identify if lighting or no lighting is a factor including at mid-block locations.

D. High Injury Network – Prioritization
Considering the significant number of crashes and especially life altering fatal and serious injury crashes in Hillsborough County, one of the primary outcomes of this plan is to identify a way to prioritize top injury corridors so attention and fiscal investment can be allocated by the respective jurisdictional agencies.

During one of the stakeholder meetings, breakout group conversations lead to a series of prioritization factors to be evaluated based on knowledge of the Top20 HIN corridors, the communities they serve. The feedback received on prioritization was summarized based on the most mentioned in the breakout group conversations and is shown below.

The prioritization factors are extensive. Based on readily available data various prioritization factors were evaluated for relevance to the Top20 HIN corridors. Crash history and pedestrian/bicycle crash data is readily available and the crash occurrence per mile was calculated and used. These are the first primary factors. The other factors required further evaluation and identification. The next sections expand on them and how and why they were incorporated.
Stakeholder Feedback

Prioritization Factors:

- 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)

(Ranked by order of most mentioned in breakout groups)
E. Posted Speed versus Context Classification

As previously mentioned, the posted speed, design speed and target speed of corridor, combined with the geometric design of a corridor can have significant implications on safety. Vehicle speed also has a major impact on a street’s ability to attract non-motorized users, as walking or bicycling next to high-speed motorists is not comfortable for most people. However, we must keep in mind that 1/3 of residents in the US do not drive and rely on non-motorized ways to move, to access services, education, jobs and health care.

It is therefore important that in more urbanized areas where higher levels of non-motorized users are expected that safe facilities are available. The FDOT context classification system was used as a basis of this assessment which broadly identifies the various built environments existing in Florida. The use of context classifications is used to determine criteria for roadway design elements (normally driven by corridor function and posted speed) to be consistent with national best practices and direction.

National best practices were consulted to validate if the FDOT context classification speed ranges are appropriate in the Top20 HIN corridors. The Institute of Transportation Engineers and Center for New Urbanism publication published in 2010 called Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach – An ITE Recommended Practice was used for comparison.

With no actual travel speed information made available for the Top20 HIN corridors, an evaluation was conducted to compare the posted speed to national best practices according to the general context classifications that each of the corridors traverse. The Context Classifications for each corridor were estimated based on visual assessment of land use patterns, density and various other factors. Updates to the Context Classification of any area, neighborhood or region should be updated to reflect rapidly changing conditions in a growth region.

The table below shows the Top20 HIN corridors with their respective road classification, the estimated Context Classification, Posted Speed and the resulting Conflict Range between how the posted speed limit on these corridors and what national best practices recommend.

Overall, 70% of the Top20 HIN corridors have posted speed limits that are 5-10MPH over national practice. An additional 15% of the corridors have posted speed limits that are 15-20MPH over national practice for their context. It is critically important to note that the abnormally high posted speed limits in all the highest injury corridors, are enabling higher exposure that can result in significant fatal and serious injuries for all users (motor vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists).

It should be noted that it is well known that travel speeds are normally at least 5-10MPH above posted speed limits; hence, the severity of the disconnect in the findings is greater. Considering Speed Limit/design speed is one of the highest-ranking factors for determining design parameters for a given street, it is important to clearly address how are setting speed limits being determined on streets and corridors and how to update the FDOT Context Classification speed ranges. The design parameters that are greatly affected by a roadways speed limit/design speed include: lane width, acceleration/deceleration lanes, left turn lanes, sight distance, sign placement, traffic signal operations, provision of bicycle facilities, super elevation and so many other geometric characteristics. Starting with the wrong posted/design speed has consequential impacts on the safety of its users.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Road Classification</th>
<th>Context Classification</th>
<th>ITE/CNU Class Speed Range*</th>
<th>Posted Speed (MPH)</th>
<th>Conflict Range (MPH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Brandon Blvd from Falkenburg Rd to Dover Rd</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-55)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45,50,55</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gibsonton Dr/Boyette Rd from I-75 to Balm Riverview Rd</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-55)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hillsborough Ave from Longboat Blvd to Florida Ave</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-55)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45,50</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Fletcher Ave from Armenia Ave to 50th St</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-55)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>35,40,45</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Dale Mabry from Hillsborough Ave to Bearss Ave</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3-C4 (30-45)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Lynn Turner from Gunn Hwy to Ehrlich Rd</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-55)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Meridian Ave from Channelside Dr to Twiggs St</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C6 (25-30)</td>
<td>25-30 Max</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Bruce B Downs from Fowler Ave to Bearss Ave</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-55)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 50th/56th St from MLK Blvd to Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-55)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 15th 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>11 Big Bend Road from US41 to I75</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-55)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 US301 from I75 to Adamo Dr</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-55)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sheldon Rd from Hillsborough Ave to Water Ave</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C3 (35-55)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 I4 from I275 to 22nd St</td>
<td>Freeway</td>
<td>Urban (50-70)</td>
<td>50-70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 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>16 I275 from Howard Frankland Bridge to Busch Blvd</td>
<td>Freeway</td>
<td>Urban (50-70)</td>
<td>50-70</td>
<td>55,60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 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>18 78th St from Causeway Blvd to Palm River Rd</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C4 (30-45)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 CR579/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>20 Florida Ave from Waters Ave to Linebaugh Ave</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>C4 (30-45)</td>
<td>25-35 Max</td>
<td>40,45</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Mobility Equity

Transportation affects the every-day life activities of every-day life. Transportation’s ability to provide effective, timely and safety access to our residents disproportionally affects the most vulnerable. Considering one third of the US population (kids, elderly, poor, disadvantaged) does not drive and are heavily reliant on public transportation, and mostly rely on walking and bicycle to get to their destinations. Transportation is a key player that helps lift someone out of poverty. Transportation is how we get to the doctor, to our job and our family and friends. Transportation is a hot button issue in Hillsborough County and ranked 29th out of 30 of the biggest metro areas in the US for transportation.

As part of the prioritization process, equitable access to jobs, education, services and health care must be a priority. As such, the Hillsborough County Communities of Concern (COC) were factored into this corridor safety prioritization. Communities of Concern measure more than one standard deviation above the county’s median in tow or more characteristics such as low income, disability, youth, elderly, limited English proficiency, minorities and carless households. The Top20 HIN corridors were overlaid on the COC map, the estimated distance of the corridor frontage for each COC category was tabulated. A point system for each COC category on the corridor was assigned, with the higher number of deviations getting higher points including extreme poverty. The higher the points assigned indicates a higher probability of vulnerable users present and hence a higher exposure for fatal and serious injuries should crashes occur on the corridor. To summarize, a Risk Performance Level was developed that indicates the higher the deviations, the higher the point, the higher the risk.
G. Transit Service Routes and Exposure
Like Mobility Equity, the importance of access to public transportation is critical. Considering the Top20 HIN corridors are predominantly high-level arterials serving regional travel and access to services, having public transit routes is normal but also can introduce safety concerns if the proper support infrastructure to get users to and from transit stops are not readily available. There is a distinct difference in providing transit service versus the proper support infrastructures such as sidewalks, crossings, bike lanes to and from the transit stops. It is felt that if a transit corridor exists on a corridor, the exposure rate for fatal and serious injuries increase.

The Top20HIN corridors were overlaid on the Hillsborough Area Regional Transit system map to identify how many service routes traverse the corridor, how many routes cross the corridor, identify if transfer centers and park and ride lots exists, and identify how many key destinations (grocery, health care, schools, etc.) exist with transit access.

A point system was assigned to each of these categories and a risk Performance Level was developed that indicated the higher the services provided, the higher the points assigned because of the higher probability of pedestrian and bicycle and increasing exposure rates.

H. Top20 High Injury Network Prioritization
The evaluation process for the Top20 HIN corridors was completed and includes prioritization factors such as:
- Crash Severity per Mile
- Pedestrian / Bicycles Crash Rate per Mile
- Number of Schools per Mile
- Equity – COC Coverage
- Posted Speed-Context Class Conflict
- Transit Route Exposure
- High Traffic Volumes

Each of the factors were then aggregated and a total weighted average score developed for each corridor. Each of the corridors where also ranked in order of priority. The higher the weighted average score the higher the priority. A High, Median and Low priority ranking for each of the corridors was established. The next table shows the final Top20 HIN corridor and their priority.

I. Next30 High Injury Network Corridors and Prioritization
As some of the jurisdictional agencies have initiated assessments and projects on the Top20 HIN corridors. There was a need expressed to identify the Next30 HIN corridors. Similar to how the Top20 HIN corridors were identified on a crash severity per mile factor, the next 30 HIN corridors were determined.

Each of the Next30 HIN corridors were also preliminarily prioritized on a more limited set of prioritization factors. The next graphic displays the corridors and limits followed by the prioritization table.

Why Measure Exposure?
Exposure to collisions is one of the most significant predictors in crash frequency. It is commonly measured by how many pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists pass through a given intersection. Without knowing this information, we may conclude that certain well-used facilities are higher risk than they really are, and vice-versa.
### Corridor and Extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 20 - Priority Matrix</th>
<th>Crash Severity / Mile</th>
<th>Ped/Bike Crash Rate / Mile</th>
<th>Safety/Congestion Coverage</th>
<th>Posted Speed - Context Class</th>
<th>Conflict Plans</th>
<th>Transit Routes</th>
<th>High Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibsonton Dr/Boyette Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mabry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Ave</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th/56th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78th St</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next30 High Injury Corridors

- Bloomingdale Ave - US Hwy 301 to Lithia Pinecrest Rd
- US Hwy 41 - Gulf City Rd to Riverview Dr
- US Hwy 301 - 19th Ave to Bloomingdale Ave
- M L King Blvd - Dale Mabry Hwy to Parson Ave
- US Hwy 41 - Madison Ave to I4
- Big Bend Rd - I75 to Balm 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 - Falkenberg Rd to US Hwy 301
- Hillsborough Ave - Race Track Rd to Longboat Blvd
- Memorial Hwy - Hillsborough Ave to Veterans Expwy
- Hanley Rd - Woodbridge Blvd to Waters Ave
- Dale Mabry Hwy - Interbay Blvd to Gandy Blvd
- Howard Ave - Kennedy Blvd to Tampa Bay Blvd
- Dale Mabry Hwy - Kennedy Blvd to Hillsborough Ave
- US Hwy 92 - Falkenburg Rd to Thonotosassa Rd
- Nebraska Ave - Columbus Ave to Hillsborough Ave
- US Hwy 301 - Stacy Rd to County Line
- Armenia Ave - Tampa Bay Blvd to Waters Ave
- MacDill Ave - Kennedy Blvd to Columbus Dr
- M L King Blvd - McIntosh Rd to Sammonds Rd

**Corridor Classification**

- Existing HIN Corridors
- Proposed HIN Corridors
### Speed Management Action Plan

#### Next 30 - High Injury Corridors Priority Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor and Extent</th>
<th>Crash Severity / Mile</th>
<th>Schools / Mile</th>
<th>Equity GQC Coverage</th>
<th>Posted Speed - Context Class</th>
<th>High Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bloomingdale Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M L King Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busch Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 674 (Sun City Ctr Blvd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 60 / Adamo Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causeway Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Hwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanley Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mabry Hwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Mabry Hwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Florida Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDill Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mc Williams Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority Scoring**
- **High**
- **Medium**
- **Low**

**Performance Level**
- **High**
- **Medium**
- **Low**
III. ACTION ITEMS, STRATEGIES AND COUNTERMEASURES

Managing dangerous travel speeds is not just an effective strategy but is a critical tenet of Vision Zero. Given the vulnerability of the human body, it is the force of a crash related to speed and weight that most determines the severity. Someone walking who is hit by a car moving at 20 MPH has a 80% chance of survival, while that person only has closer to a 20% change of survival if hit by a car moving at 40 MPH.

- 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.

According to the Vision Zero Network, there are three major ways to do this:

First, designing self-enforcing roadways that physically encourage safe speeds through traffic calming and geometric design (examples include narrower travel lanes, roundabouts, and speed humps). The physical design of a roadway is the first and most impactful way to encourage speeds at safe levels.

Second, setting and communicating safe speed limits. In a complicated, multimodal environment, this means setting default speed limits at levels where severe injuries are unlikely when a car collides with a pedestrian, ideally 20 MPH or less. This may require change to some of the most established traffic engineering practices, such as setting speed limits at the 85th percentile of a car movements, as well as legislative action. The time is long overdue to change outdated, detrimental policies such as this.

And Third, enforce safe speed limits. Automated speed enforcement is a well-tested and proven strategy to encourage safe speeds. Cities such as Washington D.D., Chicago, NYC and many others across the world have effectively discourage speeding via the use of safety cameras. A particularly timely benefit is that this technology can lessen the degree of police officer discretion required in making traffic stops, important at a time when concerns about equitable law enforcement is at a particularly high and troubling level.

There are important considerations in utilizing automated speed enforcement technology, most around privacy and equity (for instance,
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fines present a disproportionate impact on low-income populations). These are valid concerns and can and should be addressed in any safety camera program, but the value of automated enforcement in protecting lives is high enough that it should be integrated into Vision Zero strategies.

Simply put, communities will not significantly advance Vision Zero goals if they do not directly and assertively manage speed on their roads. Vision Zero work that ignores speed management is merely playing in the margins of effectiveness.

The following tables of Speed Management tools have been developed based on national best practices. The tool kit is divided into the following categories for each access. The tool kits also describe where the tools may be appropriate by Area and Location Type:

- Safe People Walking or Bicycling
- Safe Streets
- Safe Freeway Interchanges
- Safe Traffic Operations
- Targeted Enforcement
- Education Campaign / Public Service Announcements

Details on these tools, their effectiveness and crash reduction effectiveness can be found via:

- Federal Highway Administration / US Department of Transportation
- Institute of Transportation Engineers
- National Association of City Transportation Officials
- Various Vision Zero Cities
## Safe People Walking or Bicycling – Tool Kit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>Area Type</th>
<th>Location Type</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban (C4,C5,C6)</td>
<td>Suburban (C3)</td>
<td>Rural (C1-C2)</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe People Walking or Bicycling:</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised Pedestrian Crossing</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks (8 foot min standard)</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Block Pedestrian Crossing/Short Blocks</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted Intersections / Crosswalks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Intersections</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes (separated)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes (protected)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Trees / Landscaping</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Curb Ramps</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zone Temporary Facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Shared / Slow Streets</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Target Speed Limit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Safe Streets – Tool Kit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>Area Type</th>
<th>Location Type</th>
<th>Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Streets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicanes / Lateral Shifts</td>
<td>Urban (C4,C5,C6)</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban (C3)</td>
<td>Slow Street</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (C1-C2)</td>
<td>Arterial / Corridor</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crash Reducing</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Reducing</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Severity Reducing</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full / Half Closure</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width (10 foot standard)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Diet (repurpose space)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Treatment</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Traffic Circle</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Tables/Raised Intersections</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulb Outs</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Radii / Radius Reduction</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerline Hardening</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Acceleration Lanes</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Deceleration Lanes</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Right Turn Channelization</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Parking</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Urbanism-Quick Fixes</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Street / Pedestrian Lighting</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert to Two-Way Streets</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Curve Delineation</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Speed Bars/ Converging Chevrons</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Context Class</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Target Speed Limit</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safe Freeways and Traffic Operations – Tool Kit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>Area Type</th>
<th>Location Type</th>
<th>Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban (C4,C5,C6)</td>
<td>Suburban (C3)</td>
<td>Rural (C1-C2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Freeway Interchanges:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Acceleration Lanes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign High Speed Exit Ramps</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign High Speed On-Ramps</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse(in lane) Rumble Strips</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Safe Continuous Bike Lanes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Safe Pedestrian Crossings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Context Class</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate Target Speed Limit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Safe Traffic Operations:            |           |               |                  |             |             |                     |                 |                 |                   |
| Lower Speed Limits                  | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Add New Signals / Improve Connectivity | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Protected-only Left Turn Signal Phasing | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Signal Coordination-Target Speed    | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Variable Speed Limits (Expressways) | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Driver Feedback Signs - Speed       | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Leading Pedestrian Interval         | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon   | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Hybrid Ped Beacon / HAWK            | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Rest in Red Signal Operation        | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Advanced Speed Detection Signals    | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Shorter Signal Cycle Lengths        | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Traffic Signal- Demand Responsive off-peak | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Street Lighting / Pedestrian Level Lighting | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Update Pedestrian Countdown Timers  | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Re-evaluate Context Class           | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
| Re-evaluate Target Speed Limit      | ✓         | ✓             |                  | ✓           | ✓           | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                 |
## Enforcement and Education – Tool Kit

<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>Intersection</td>
<td>Crash Reducing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban (C3)</td>
<td>Slow Street</td>
<td>Speed Reducing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (C1-C2)</td>
<td>Arterial / Corridor</td>
<td>Severity Reducing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targetted 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</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Safety</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRFB’s / Hawk Operations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Speed Enforcement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Pavement Markings/Signs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Conflict Zone Markings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Speed/Coordinated Signals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Traffic Technology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. ACTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

This study one and only goal is to improve public health and safety by reducing road fatalities and serious injuries. The desired outcomes agreed to include:

- **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.

The actions and strategies developed to meet these desired outcomes have been categorized into five areas. These areas represent Speed Setting, Engineering & Operations, Education & Enforcement, Policy & Legislation, and finally, Plan Evaluation. Each action is also prioritized as a short, mid or long-term item.
SPEED SETTING ACTIONS

Action 1 – Regional Context Classification (Short Term)

✓ 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

Action 2 – Immediately Evaluate All Projects (Short Term)

✓ 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).
✓ New Development and access plans.

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: (Mid Term)

✓ 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 limit of:
  • 20MPH on any street within a residential district
  • 25-35MPH on all other streets
✓ Provide guidance that address liability and tort barriers
ENGINEERING & OPERATIONS ACTIONS

Action 1 - Develop preliminary treatment plans for Top50 High Injury Network corridors. (Short Term)

✓ Establish standard scope for all evaluations to ensure consistency.
✓ Obtain travel speed for Top50 High Injury Network corridors.
✓ Identify feasible countermeasures from the Speed Management resource table.
✓ Identify immediate quick fix (Tactical Urbanism) recommendations.
✓ Identify longer term recommendations, program and fund.

Action 2 – Strengthen Design Manual / Design Standards for roadway construction, operations and maintenance. (Short Term)

✓ Reflect the speed management concepts and countermeasures identified.
✓ Add more flexibility for multimodal design needs.
✓ Discourage overdesigning for future motor vehicle capacity where such design would encourage higher operating speeds.

✓ Include design guidance that is more protective of vulnerable users where variable speeds (transition areas) and where land use destinations suggest current or latent demand for walking and bicycling.

Action 3 – Incorporate design flexibility to reflect state of the art / national best practices. (Short Term)

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

Action 4 – Establish Local Street Design Guidelines (Mid Term)

✓ 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.
Action 5 – Traffic Operations Recommendations (Mid Term)

✓ 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 may be approved under statute.
✓ Use signal timing to manage traffic flow for compliance with target speeds.
✓ Use radar feedback signs and messaging to help public understand that the speed limit is the upper limit.

Action 6 – Professional Development and Training (Mid Term)

✓ 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 (Mid Term)

✓ 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. (Long Term)

✓ 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
EDUCATION & ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

Action 1 – Educate the Public and Elected Officials (Short Term)

- 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 (Short Term)

- 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.

Action 3 – Draw on local resources and partners to develop community-based public awareness and education. (Short Term)

- 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 (Short Term)

- 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.
Action 5 - Establish safeguards against inequitable enforcement practices. (Short Term)

✓ 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 (Short Term)

✓ 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.
POLICY & LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

Action 1 – Support Changes to Laws and Regulations as necessary to ensure people are protected to the greatest extent possible. (Short Term)

✓ 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 (Short Term)

✓ 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: (Mid Term)

✓ 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 project planning process.
✓ Conduct road safety audits of all new, pending and maintenance and operations projects.

Action 4 – Review and update Land Use Policies - ensure walkable, safe, and healthy communities. (Mid Term)

✓ 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

Action 5 – Review and Initiate Traffic Safety Legislation Measures (Mid Term)

✓ 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
PLAN EVALUATION ACTIONS

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
Appendix – Supporting Materials
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.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Plant City Transit Study

Presenter
Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO Staff

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

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

Recommended Action
None. For information only.

Prepared By
Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO Staff

Attachments
None.
Monday, July 20, 2020, 1:30 PM
Technical Review Workshop [need a more descriptive name?]

Virtual Meeting

Agenda

1:30 PM Welcome, Introductions, Workshop Objective (Leland Dicus)

1:35 PM Brief overview: [5 minutes each]
   - Comprehensive Plan Update Process (Katrina Corcoran)
   - Corridor Preservation Plan Update (Richard Ranck)
   - Bicycle Facility Selection Toolkit (Wade Reynolds)
   - Speed Management Action Plan Highlights (Gena Torres)

2:00 PM Context Classification Designations [Matt Lewis or Angelo Beluccia?]

2:30 PM Transportation Technical Manual Update [Matt Lewis or Angelo Beluccia?]

3:00 PM Round robin/Breakout?

3:30 PM Next steps & Adjourn
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 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. Raman asked the MPO Board to approve all four amendments, 12 through 15.

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.