Virtual Workshop of the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Wednesday, November 18, 2020, 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

The County Center and Plan Hillsborough offices are closed to the public in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Members of the public may access this meeting and participate via the GoToWebinar link below, or by phoning in.

Technical support during the meeting may be obtained by contacting Chris English at (813) 273-3774 ext. 380.

To view presentations and participate from your computer, tablet or smartphone, go to: https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/4282868680779624976

Dial in LISTEN-ONLY MODE: (415) 655-0052 Access Code 458-902-754

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

Comments may also be provided before the start of the meeting by e-mail to reynoldsw@plancom.org

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

I. Call to Order

II. Members’ Interests

III. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

IV. Approval of Minutes – October 14, 2020

V. Discussion Items
   A. Plant City Transit Plan (Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO)
   B. 2021 Meeting Calendar (Wade Reynolds, MPO)
   C. Vision Zero Corridor Studies (Wade Reynolds and Lisa Silva, MPO)

VI. Status Reports
   A. MPO Non-discrimination Plan (Joshua Barber, MPO)
   B. Florida Bicycle Association Legislative Update (Becky Afonso, FBA)

VII. Old Business & New Business

VIII. Adjournment

IX. Addendum
   A. MPO Meeting Summary & Committee Report
The full agenda packet is available on the MPO’s website, www.planhillsborough.org, or by calling (813) 272-5940.

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

Persons needing interpreter services or accommodations for a disability in order to participate in this meeting, free of charge, are encouraged to contact Joshua Barber, (813) 273-3774, ext. 313 or barberj@plancom.org, three business days in advance of the meeting. If you are only able to speak Spanish, please call the Spanish helpline at (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

Si necesita servicios de traducción, el MPO ofrece por gratis. Para registrarse por estos servicios, por favor llame a Joshua Barber directamente al (813) 273-3774, ext. 313 con tres días antes, o barberj@plancom.org de cerro electronico. También, si sólo se puede hablar en español, por favor llame a la línea de ayuda en español al (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, materials attached are for research and educational purposes, and are distributed without profit to MPO Board members, MPO staff, or related committees or subcommittees the MPO supports. The MPO has no affiliation whatsoever with the originator of attached articles nor is the MPO endorsed or sponsored by the originator. Persons wishing to use copyrighted material for purposes of their own that go beyond ‘fair use’ must first obtain permission from the copyright owner. The MPO cannot ensure 508 accessibility for items produced by other agencies or organizations.

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.
Call to Order

Chair Forbes called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. The meeting was held via GoToWebinar and a quorum was present.


Others present: Wade Reynolds, Beth Alden, Johnny Wong, Vishaka Shiva Raman, Dayna Lazarus and Fatima Elkott – MPO; Chris English, Wanda West and Sharon Snyder - Planning Commission; Alex Henry and Kenneth Spitz - Florida Department Transportation; Terry Bower; Sean Bell and Ron Henry

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Member’s Interests

Ms. Rubscha discussed the Palma Ceia business district meeting last week that reinvigorated the issue surrounding the Bay to Bay area, from MacDill to Himes. The community input session began last week, and they will continue to put out more information asking for community involvement. Mr. Reynolds sent out an email last week with the link for more information.

Approval of Minutes

Motion: Approval of the September 9, 2020 Minutes (Shirk). The motion passed unanimously.

Status Reports

All Love Rideout Introduction (Dayna Lazarus, MPO)

Ms. Lazarus introduced Sean Bell Sr. and Ron Henry Sr., founders of All Love Rideout. They started this bicycle movement while Ron was recovering from a health issue and he and his wife were on Facebook Live while out for a ride. His friends were messaging him asking when the next ride was to show their love and support for his recovery. They came up with a date and over 100 people joined. Now it is held once a month with 300 riders. After showing a video, Ms. Lazarus asked Mr. Bell and Mr. Henry a few questions. Ms. Lazarus asked, “What is All Love Rideout”. Mr. Henry replied it is a movement that was started after his surgery, inviting those who want to ride, and they welcome all to ride with them. It is safe and held monthly. It is for health awareness. Mr. Bell added they encourage people to ride their bicycles and have a seven-day challenge on their Facebook page. They have a vehicle that follows behind in case there are any issues. Riders feel there is safety in numbers, too. Ms. Lazarus asked, “What is their vision for the future for All Love Rideout?” Mr. Henry would like to see everyone come out, more than the 300 participating now, so they can give back to the community. He would really like to see the kids participating instead of playing video games. Ms. Lazarus asked, “How can people get involved and what are
some of their needs as an organization?” Mr. Bell said they need bicycle lights. Currently, they arrange riders so those with lights are in the front and scattered throughout. The lights help cars see the bicyclists. He also encourages bicyclists to ride with traffic and to obey the traffic signals. Mr. Henry also mentioned they have a need for bottled water donations.

Ms. Lazarus encouraged members to visit their Facebook page “All Love Rideout 2020”. A pink bicycle will be raffled off at the next ride for Breast Cancer Awareness and they are making a donation to the Sisters Network, Inc. of Tampa. For more information or to make a donation, please reach out to Dayna Lazarus (lazarusd@plancom.org).

Mr. Shirk stated Planet Bike is a major manufacturer of bicycle accessories and they have a bicycle light donation program. Mr. Shirk knows some of the people there and will provide contact information to Ms. Lazarus.

Mr. Forbes expressed his concern about the safety of the riders and encouraged riding in the safest way possible. He appreciates the initiative and the efforts of Mr. Bell and Mr. Henry.

B. Review last year’s legislative positions and suggest new ones (Wade Reynolds, MPO)

Mr. Reynolds reviewed last year’s legislative positions, including correspondence to Senator Rouson, Representative Fine and Senator Galvano (included as part of the agenda packet), and asked if members have new suggestions.

Mr. Shirk asked if anyone knows the status of the move over law which is similar to the law for moving over for emergency vehicles on the side of the road? Will motorists be required to move over a full lane, slow down to at least 20 mph under the posted speed limit or just allow at least 3 feet clearance? Ms. Alden commented the MPO Board hasn’t weighed in but can if the Committee wishes. Mr. Benson stated he recently spoke with Becky Alfonso and she is developing some language that combines that as well as recommended adjustments and clarification that needs to be incorporated into State Law, in terms of general definitions and terminology, as bicycle and pedestrian laws are unclear in some Florida Statutes. Mr. Forbes asked if this discussion refers to the third bullet on the letter to Senator Rouson, urging Legislature to take all possible steps to reduce Florida’s high traffic death rate? Ms. Alden feels that is a reasonable place for it. She also stated the MPO also needs to revisit what they are saying about the regulation of motorized scooters as there have been some changes since the letter was written in February 2019. Ms. Alden offered to contact Ms. Alfonso for an update.

Mr. Shirk also asked if anyone else saw the article about the use of accelerometers on scooters to detect when they are being used on sidewalks to stop them? Someone has figured out a way to deactivate scooters using artificial intelligence (AI). Mr. Reynolds stated scooters are still legal to use on sidewalks in the State of Florida, but if they weren’t, that would be a good way to use AI to shut it down.

Mr. Reynolds read that the UK updated their move over law recently to require motorists move over 2 meters, which is approximately 6 feet. He feels 6’ is better especially when there is no shoulder or the bicyclist isn’t on a multi-lane road.

C. BPAC Tampa Activities Update (Stephen Benson and Karla Price, City of Tampa)

Mr. Benson and Ms. Price presented an update on the City of Tampa’s walk bike programs and activities. The presentation includes Transforming Tampa’s Tomorrow (T3) which is Mayor
Castor’s plan, ongoing planning efforts they would like the Committee to participate in, Vision Zero, speed management, placemaking and tactical urbanism, transportation and corridor projects, trails and greenways, innovative tools and pilot projects that relate to smart mobility, micro-mobility and technology.

Mr. Benson shared that at the beginning of her term, Mayor Castor formed an advisory team for transforming Tampa. Some of their recommendations are to transform the transit system, reimagine trails and greenways for mobility, embrace Vision Zero, smart mobility and urban parking and expand community engagement efforts. The City of Tampa's mobility plan develops a framework for the next 30 years of their transportation system and includes five pillars: mobility for all, economic opportunity, vision for sustainability and resiliency, equity and safety (MOVES). One of the first on-going tasks is to create a Vision Zero plan, visioning and listening phase, and potential land use and growth management component.

Ms. Price announced the City of Tampa Parks and Recreation Department is developing a Master Plan, which will be a comprehensive look at their facilities and everything they do with recommendations on how they can do it better. This includes special events and recreation programming at all Parks facilities. Last fall, they hosted eight public meetings around the City. They gathered written and videotaped public comments to share with their consultant, AECOM. The full Master Plan process kicks off this month. The City will be holding more public and stakeholder meetings in the Spring with the completion of the Master Plan in 2022. One of the elements in the Master Plan is connectivity, looking at how people get to the City’s facilities and how they can improve upon the bicyclists, pedestrians and those using alternative modes of transportation opportunities for people within the City.

Mr. Benson reviewed the Vision Zero recommendations: Adopt Vision Zero as citywide priority; join Vision Zero networks and create action plan; update land development code to reflect Vision Zero principles; create Vision Zero role within City government: focusing on engineering solutions, such as fill sidewalk gaps, add more pedestrian crossings and expand complete street citywide; focus on priority corridors, including State and County roads; and make it easier to activate City streets as public spaces. He shared a map and list of the Vision Zero corridors which will be focused on within the City. Mr. Benson reviewed the Citywide Speed Limit Reduction Program goal of all arterial and collector roads having a maximum speed limit of 35 MPH. He shared images of placemaking, which was essential during the pandemic, an Art in the Roadway project and the Crosswalks to Classrooms projects.

Another strategy the City has expanded the use of is the All-Way Stop Control, which is relatively low cost, easy to implement and can reduce crashes by nearly 70%; however, there is already a six month backlog of request for field review and study. Mr. Benson shared some examples of improvements the City has recently made along Hyde Park and the Hampton Terrace raised intersection. Over the course of 20 years, the City has implemented road diets on 20 streets.

Ms. Price discussed the Greenways and Trails Master Plan. In 1995, a group of citizens, volunteer consultants and City of Tampa staff met on a Saturday to plan a trail along the Hillsborough River corridor. This was the City’s first attempt at incorporating trails into our community. From that document, the City was able to get a grant from the National Parks Service, who assisted them with preparing a Master Plan for the Community. It was adopted by City Council in November 2000. Since that time, this document been the basis for everything the City does for greenways and trails. The document identified six greenway areas and in each of those areas, the City developed detailed plans. She showed an example of the South Tampa area plan.
Ms. Price stated they try to get these plans updated as much as they can and these plans are what guide their efforts. When the City initially started this, they looked at greenways versus just trails. They try to identify parcels of property. At one point, they identify property that followed the whole north edge of MacDill AFB, from Hillsborough Bay to Old Tampa Bay, and they had grants from the Office of Greenways and Trails and the State of Florida to purchase a lot of those properties. However, because the economy was doing so well at that time, the City was not able to pay the same price for these properties that private developers could so unfortunately they weren’t able to make a lot of the green linkages that they would have like to have had. They were able to keep some of the connectivity, but they do have a few missing links they are working on. At some point they will be able to have a trail that goes from bay to bay.

Since that time, they have been using the old Master Plan, but one of the things the Mayor’s Advisory Committee on transportation did was to come up with some new recommendations on how to incorporate these trails into the rest of the multimodal system. The first recommendation was to integrate the planning and implementation function for City trails and greenways into the City’s Transportation and Stormwater Services Departments. There are so many new things that Transportation is doing, that having it under one umbrella will help with the uniformity of the connectivity. When greenways and trails was started in 2000, Transportation wasn’t on board with the whole idea for this connectivity, so it’s nice to have off-road trails integrated with on-road and it is deemed important. The Transportation Department embraces incorporating them into the overall plan.

Other recommended action items are: to update the maps with what the Transportation Department is currently doing and what their future goals are; the planning of greenways and trails is performed with an eye to providing a viable transportation option, not simply a recreational function, and is consistent with the guiding principles of the Citywide Mobility Plan; and developing performance goals for the trails and greenways planning and implementation.

Mr. Benson and Ms. Price highlighted some of the recently completed projects and signature trail projects as well as future trail projects like the trail marker installation and miscellaneous trail improvements, MacDill 48 Park trail connection, Interbay Trailhead and 2020 BUILD grant for $24 million.

Mr. Benson also discussed the installation of approximately 40 rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFB) with plans for more than 100 additional locations, prioritized in proximity to schools and parks. They are also taking a step back and looking at the City as a “Lab” with signal initiatives, street lighting and the technology platform, Waycare. He also discussed pilot projects and tactical urbanism, such as buffered bike lanes with flexible delineators, to discourage vehicle encroachment. The City is also purchasing a mini-street sweeper to maintain the protected bike lanes throughout the City.

Mr. Benson shared the City’s capital projects website (www.tampagov.net/tss-transportation/info/projects) that is kept up-to-date. Projects include corridors (Complete Streets), intersection improvements, neighborhood resurfacing, trails & greenways, capital maintenance and special projects. He shared samples of some of the projects that are wrapping up or are scheduled for construction in 2021 (Floribraska Avenue, East Columbus Drive, North 34th Street, Brorein Street bridge, Tampa Street, and County Road resurfacing on Armenia Avenue and Columbus Drive). Mr. Benson updated on the two segments of the Green ARTery Perimeter Trail that are in production. The design for Segment E, near Lowry Park, is near completion and construction is scheduled for 2021. Design for Segment D runs on Park Circle and will begin in 2021 with construction to be determined. He gave an update on the Green Spine. Everything for Phase 1, from the River east to Nebraska, has been completed and everything west of the River
is currently under construction of some sort. The large Cypress Street outfall project will be incorporating the remaining elements of the Green Spine so it will go all the way to Howard. Then the last sections, east of Nebraska along Nuccio Parkway, are all that remain to be built. They have been funded by FDOT and are in the tentative work project. Four miles in 15 years, but they have come a long way. Mr. Benson thanked the MPO for all of their support in helping the City get the FDOT grants to get this project done.

Mr. Shirk was amazed at how fast the work was completed along 34th Street. Mr. Benson said getting the work completed faster is a silver lining to the pandemic. Mr. Forbes appreciates the mini-sweeper.

Discussions ensued regarding the project limits for the Armenia rsurfacing project (Kennedy to Columbus); and the negativity associated with the term road diet (Mr. Benson agrees and said the City is trying to not use it going forward).

D. Overview of ClearGuide Data and Analytics Platform (Johnny Wong, MPO)

Dr. Wong provided an update of the ClearGuide Data and Analytics Platform. This is a project the MPO has been managing for about four years. For three of the four years, it was a vision that hadn’t come to fruition. In November 2019, the MPO was able to launch a shared analytics and data platform and they’re hoping this can represent a new way of how transportation planning and operations management gets done. The MPO is hoping that this platform can become the centralized repository for all mobility data across the County.

In 2016, Hillsborough MPO was selected to participate in a FHWA data business plan pilot study with the focus being on data business plans. The Feds were interested in knowing how agencies, especially MPOs, are acquiring, using and managing transportation data. The study focused mainly on aspects of data governance because that was the Feds interest, so they asked questions such as "How is data being collected?", "How are changes being documented?", "Who's responsible for data quality?", and "How is access being regulated?".

Dr. Wong shared the goals of the Data Business Plan (DBP) and the most interesting were what datasets are being collected, what datasets are not being collected and what are we working towards. To answer what datasets are and aren’t being collected, the MPO used a data and gap assessment which revealed about 50 sets of mobility data collected in Hillsborough County. Our County is operating at the higher end of the spectrum. Another interesting finding was, even back in 2016, the County was operating at the cutting edge as we had agencies collecting connected vehicle data, autonomous vehicle data, location-based services and we were one of the first MPOs to participate in the Waze data exchange. There are a lot of agencies within the County doing amazing things with data analysis. The third interesting finding was the uneven landscape of data within the County and we suffer from a huge problem of data inequity. There are a few, well-funded programs in the County with mature data programs. We’re able to invest in building new tools and acquiring new datasets whereas some that don’t have those resources really suffer and good planning is contingent upon us being able to produce good datasets and share them with our partners for that consistency. We don’t want a wealth of information with just a few agencies, we want to be able to share. That is a message that Dr. Wong is trying to push, and other agencies are on board.

Dr. Wong and the Hillsborough MPO are managing the data and analytic portal, in strong coordination with their partners in the County, City and FDOT District 7. The portal has been operational for approximately ten months, but even in that short amount of time, they have
received a lot of value from it. They feel this is the next wave of planning as it allows them to work smarter, not harder, and it’s producing insights and analytics that are reducing the amount of effort it takes to do quality checks.

The platform is a website that all the agencies have access to. It displays a map of the County along with weather data and real time traffic data across the entire network. They can analyze historical data to track trends over time. This is helpful for planning and operations. ClearGuide is an Iteris product, one of the leaders in this industry. The Hear data, which is provided to us for free by their central office, is produced in real time, but can be bend in very short intervals for operational purposes. People in traffic management center can customize the data to fit their needs for planning. They recently added crash data and Waze incidents. This is becoming a one-stop shop for all to see speed, delay, congestion, crashes and incidents. Dr. Wong showed a sample of the map with the data displayed.

One of the first use cases this tool was used for was studying route performance. When doing a planning study, most of the time the focus is on corridors. Instead of just looking at a 2 - 3 mile section of a corridor, they wanted to see what a typical commute would look like. The MPO wanted to explore the tool’s capabilities so they identified 15 key economic spaces from their travel demand model, and put together a 15 x 15 matrix to represent origin to destination, then calculated speed, delay, travel time, reliability, buffer index, etc., to see which of the 225 commuter routes was the most miserable. They thought the Top 20 Most Miserable Commutes would be a fun take on the Top 20 Vision Zero Corridors – this was done in house and the results will not be shared – but this is an example of the type of analysis ClearGuide allows the MPO to produce. In the future, after some refinements, this information could appear in the LRTP, because cross County commutes typically rely on the interstate system before moving on to arterials to arrive at the final destination. This was just an example of the type of analysis that can be done for the future Plan.

This tool can also be used as a supplement to traditional corridor-level Level of Service (LOS) analysis. The MPO is working with the County to update their comprehensive plan and the mobility element contains LOS analysis, but what is known about the County’s network is LOS doesn’t tell them a whole lot because most of the roads are performing poorly. The MPO is looking at reliability or travel time index as alternatives to LOS so they can target improvements to roads that will be most affected by new development.

ClearGuide is also a helpful public engagement tool because it provides an engagement opportunity and transparency. While handouts during a meeting are helpful, being able to answers questions and producing the analysis on the spot makes it more engaging and easier to participate in a conversation.

Our partners are getting a lot of use from ClearGuide. The City recently used it to work on signal retiming. Dr. Wong explained the process and evaluation for retiming the signals in downtown Tampa.

The next steps for data and analytics platform are building dashboards on the website, continue data exploration for transit, O-D and micro-mobility options, predictive analytics, open source, and expansion to other services.

The MPO has provided training to most of the agency partners already. Dr. Wong is happy to train others. Please email him at wongj@plancom.org, if interested. Mr. Reynolds shared his thoughts on how helpful this tool is, too.
There were no questions for Dr. Wong.

**Fowler Avenue Multi-modal Study (Ken Spitz and Alex Henry, FDOT)**

Mr. Spitz presented the Fowler Avenue Multimodal Feasibility Study, formerly known as the University Area Multimodal Feasibility Study. The study includes Fowler Avenue from I-75 to I-275. The key corridor needs are: safety (improved pedestrian facilities, more crossing opportunities and use of LPVs; upgraded lighting; reduced cyclist exposure to higher speed vehicles; lower vehicle travel speeds in segments with more pedestrian and cyclist activity), transit flexibility (accommodate planned HART BRT and potential transit services) and intersection efficiency (3M square feet mixed use and 3000 new residences already approved equals increased future volumes; and use ‘innovative intersection design” where feasible). The actions were divided into three timeframes: short-term (within 5 years) for minor construction actions without ROW needs, complete required planning/environmental approval process for medium-term actions, and acquire ROW for medium-term actions; medium-term (within 10 years) for minor construction activities that require ROW and/or change property access, complete required planning/environmental approval process for long-term actions, and acquire ROW for long-term actions; and long-term (10 or more years) for major construction activities that require ROW.

Mr. Spitz reviewed the short-term actions for FY2022-2024, which include intersection improvements, leading pedestrian intervals and complete intersection crosswalks.

Mr. Henry discussed the quick safety improvements that can be made along the Fowler Avenue corridor. They reviewed the corridor’s crash data and conducted bicycle and pedestrian counts. One thing that really caught their attention was the largest concentrations of crossings and crashes were at signalized intersections. Making geometric improvements to some of the signalized intersections could be done relatively quickly and didn’t require a lot of additional traffic analysis. These improvements are funded for this fiscal year and construction should begin in Spring 2021. He presented existing conditions and improvements being made at the Fowler at Nebraska Avenue intersection (tightening up the right turn angle to shorten the pedestrian crossing distance, increases driver’s visibility and lowers turning speeds); Fowler at 15th Street (similar improvements); and Fowler at 22nd Street (similar improvements and extending median noses into intersection for pedestrian refuge). He explained the Urban Smart Channel Concept, a channelized right-turn lane designed for pedestrians compared to the conventional design, which allows for slower vehicle speed and good visibility of pedestrians. The first intersection FDOT will implement this concept at is Fowler at Bruce B. Downs Blvd. The most significant changes will be at Fowler and 56th Street. In addition to adding the Urban Smart Channel concept, they are shrinking the footprint of the intersection and reducing the distance pedestrians will need to cross. Other improvements along the corridor include leading pedestrian intervals being evaluated at all signals, LED lighting upgrades at eight signals completed this Fall, and LED corridor lighting upgrades programmed for construction in FY24.

Mr. Spitz reviewed the proposed implementation schedule. He presented pictures of the three Fowler Avenue conceptual designs which will be analyzed in the PD&E study (others may be developed). The conceptual designs are: BAT Lane (business access and transit lane allowing non-transit right turns {minor to major construction/medium-term action}); Frontage Lane (access lane separated from main roadway with curbside Bus Only Lane {minor to major construction/medium-term action}); and Median Transitway (BRT lanes or LRT guideway and stations in center separated from roadway {major construction/long-term action}). Transit stations located near the intersections for all designs. He also shared Hart’s arterial BRT concept for a median guideway.
In the chat, Ms. Crescentini asked Mr. Spitz or Mr. Henry to please coordinate with HART on the Nebraska project as there may be some bus bay issues.

There were no questions.

**Tampa Multimodal Network Safety & Improvements**

The City received a $24 million BUILD (Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development) grant which the City is matching with a $6 million grant for a total of $30 million in safety and improvement projects. The focus will be on building new and improving existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure mostly in the area to the west of the River, but also establishing connections to the Riverwalk on the east side as well. The criteria for the grant included sustainability & resiliency.

Ms. Price gave a quick overview of the proposed projects, which have to be completed in seven years.

A discussion followed regarding if anything is going to be done with the traffic at Armature Works area and what are the plans for some type of control in the area (Mr. Benson stated the cut through traffic issue at Ross as been added to the queue for adding four-way stop controls. The list is about six months long but this location may be completed sooner).

**VI. Old and New Business**

**A. BPAC Calendar Adjustment for 2021**

The May/June meetings may need to be a week later than normal to allow more time to get the TIP finalized before it is presented to the Committee. He will bring the entire calendar back for approval, but just wanted to make members aware.

**B. Maintenance Issues discussion**

There are no updates on the Harney Road maintenance issues. Mr. Reynolds stated he is putting together information to bring to the Committee. He received some great information from the City of Tampa and is working on the same with the County and FDOT so they can compare with other cities what they are doing, so we can be more proactive. He was pleased to see the small street sweeper and other items in Mr. Benson’s presentation.

**C. Virtual and Hybrid Meeting discussion**

The Emergency order runs out at the end of this month. The Board and Committees will have to go back to having an in-person quorum. The BPAC isn’t required by State or Federal law and has the option to continue to meet virtually, in-person or a hybrid of the two. If the Committee wants to have an in-person option Mr. Reynolds is happy to run the meeting from the Plan Hillsborough Room. If the Committee choses to continue with virtual meetings, they can note objections and comments on action items but there will still be the formal action issue although action isn’t required under State or Federal law, so it’s a gray area.

Mr. Forbes asked for members thoughts and concerns. Although not mandated by law, conceivably the Committee could meet in person in November. Mr. Reynolds understands this is
a difficult issue and feels we’ve had good turnouts to the virtual meetings. As we get towards major action items such as the TIP, there will need to be in-person meetings. Mr. Forbes asked about accommodations being made for room size. Mr. Reynolds stated we would still use the Plan Hillsborough room which adjusted occupancy size is 12 people, which isn’t an in-person quorum. In the chat, Ms. Nguyen stated she prefers virtual and Ms. Vison prefers in-person. Mr. Forbes likes the hybrid, but will attend virtually, and Mr. Shirk will attend in person.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:33 p.m.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Plant City Transit Study

**Presenter**
Vishaka Shiva Raman or Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff

**Summary**
The Hillsborough 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 to provide access to jobs, recreation and medical needs of the residents. Plant City was served by a local circulator called Strawberry Connector (from 2001 to 2008) and an express route called Route 28X operated by HART (from 2010 to 2017). Currently, there is no transit serving Plant City.

This study focuses on evaluating the feasibility of re-initiating a circulator service within downtown Plant City. It also evaluates the feasibility of providing a commuter service to connect to downtown Tampa and to Lakeland in the future. Through a series of public outreach including two stakeholder focus group meetings and a virtual public open house, staff has developed three alternatives for a local commuter service and five alternatives for an express route to connect Tampa to Plant City. The planning-level cost estimates for capital and operating costs for the different alternatives have also been evaluated and compared to help Plant City and HART determine the most feasible option for the future.

**Recommended Action**
Support the results of the study and recommend to the Board for approval.

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

**Attachments**
- Study website
- Presentation
PLANT CITY TRANSIT STUDY
Project Update

MPO Committees
November 2020
PLANT CITY TRANSIT STUDY
STUDY OVERVIEW
Background

Currently over 40,000 residents in Plant City

Plant City one of the fastest growing areas of Hillsborough County (by percent)*

Major corridors Park Rd, S Collins St, Alexander St, Reynolds St, Baker St.

*2045 MPO Population and Job Growth update
Study Purpose & Outcomes

Explore
Explore options for transit in Plant City:
• Transit circulator to serve transit needs within Plant City
• Express route connecting Plant City to Tampa and potentially Lakeland

Evaluate
Evaluate alternative routes and service based on:
• Costs
• Potential ridership
• And other performance measures

Identify
Identify areas to serve in the future to meet projected growth

Recommend
Recommend final set of proposed transit alternatives
# Plant City Transit Master Plan

## Tentative Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEPT</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Demand/Market Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Focus Group Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning-Level Cost Estimates and Potential Funding Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Public Open House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Alternatives Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/City Commission Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Study Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Community Engagement**
- **Project Deliverable**
PLANT CITY TRANSIT STUDY
PREVIOUS TRANSIT SERVICE
Previous Transit Service

**Strawberry Connector**
- Four routes operated by HART from 2001-2005, Plant City from 2005-2008
- Highest annual ridership: 47,543 (FY 2006/2007)

**28X East County Express**
- Two round trips (morning/afternoon) and later one trip a day (morning/afternoon); operated between 2010 to 2017
- Peak average annual ridership in 2012: 14,363 annual riders (17.3 riders per trip)
PLANT CITY TRANSIT STUDY
COMMUTING CHARACTERISTICS
Commute Patterns & Zero Car Households

- 84% of workers drive alone
- Mean travel time to work is 23.6 minutes
- 18% of residents travel less than 10 minutes to work
- 1.5% of households in Plant City have no vehicle
- Coincides with Communities of Concern map by Hillsborough MPO
# Sunshine Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Destinations</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant City Adult Day Care</td>
<td>Day Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse for the Blind</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davita Dialysis</td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Florida Baptist Hospital</td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmart Super Center</td>
<td>Grocery/Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winn Dixie</td>
<td>Grocery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clements Church &amp; Food Pantry</td>
<td>Church/Food Pantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save-A-Lot</td>
<td>Grocery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Map of Sunshine Line with Study Area and Top Destinations/Origins]
PLANT CITY TRANSIT STUDY
OUTREACH EFFORTS
Outreach Efforts

Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting I – Feb 2020

Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting II – May 2020
  ° Survey distributed to stakeholders and public following the focus group meeting

Virtual Public Meeting – Open House Format
  • Flyers distributed at various location in Plant City
  • Live Presentation on August 26 for public
  • Workshop was live for 3 weeks from Aug 24 to Sep 13
Transit Alternative Goals

1. Implement useful and reliable service for people who need it most (Communities of Concern & persons with disabilities)

2. Use transit to incentivize development downtown

3. Connect Plant City to Tampa and Lakeland/Polk County with transit
PLANT CITY TRANSIT STUDY
CIRCULATOR ALTERNATIVES
Assumptions

$600K capital cost for each new bus
Paratransit costs are an additional 12% of operating costs
Operates from 6 am to 10 pm
7 days/week

Note: All costs are planning-level cost estimates. Any route will require more in-depth analysis by HART staff for more detailed cost estimates.
PLANT CITY TRANSIT STUDY
Circulator Alternatives

Two options evaluated:

Option A
- 1 bus every 60 minutes
- Connects Strawberry Festival Grounds on the west through Downtown to Walmart along Redman Parkway on the south

Option B
- 2 routes operated by 2 buses
- Splits Option A into 2 routes and covers more area
## Circulator Route Cost Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B, Routes 1 &amp; 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Operating Cost</strong></td>
<td>$600 - $650K</td>
<td>$1.12M-$1.22M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paratransit Cost</strong></td>
<td>$72K-78K</td>
<td>$136K-146K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of vehicles</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>30 min (route 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 min (route 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Time (round trip)</strong></td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>25 min (route 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 min (route 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to other routes</strong></td>
<td>Limited stop alternatives</td>
<td>Limited stop alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of people within ½ mile</strong></td>
<td>10,056</td>
<td>18,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of jobs within ½ mile</strong></td>
<td>4,942</td>
<td>7,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% in poverty within ½ mile</strong></td>
<td>18.74%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% minority within ½ mile</strong></td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% seniors within ½ mile</strong></td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% households w/no vehicles within ½ mile</strong></td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option C: On-Demand Service

On-demand, point-to-point service

Case Study - Downtowner

- Approx. $1.6M per year to operate 6 vehicles in an area the size of downtown Tampa
- Metrics specific to downtown Tampa
  - Funded through a grant with 50% local match
  - 14,010 passengers per month
  - $5.09 cost per passenger (paid by HART)
  - Avg wait time: 15 min
PLANT CITY TRANSIT STUDY
LIMITED STOP ALTERNATIVES
Assumptions

$600K capital cost for each new bus
Each route would require 2 buses
Operates Monday – Friday
  ◦ 6:00 am to 8:00 pm
Sat/Sun
  ◦ 10:00 am to 8:00 pm

Note: All costs are planning-level cost estimates. Any route will require more in-depth analysis by HART staff for more detailed cost estimates.
## Tampa - Plant City
### Limited Stop Route Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>28X</th>
<th>I-4</th>
<th>MLK</th>
<th>Rt. 38 Ext</th>
<th>I-4 + MLK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Operating Cost</strong></td>
<td>$950K-1.25M</td>
<td>$950K-1.25M</td>
<td>$900-950K</td>
<td>$950K-1M</td>
<td>$950K - $1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per Day</strong></td>
<td>Weekday: $3K</td>
<td>Weekdays: $2,800</td>
<td>Weekdays: $2,700</td>
<td>Weekdays: $3K</td>
<td>Weekdays: $3K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat/Sun: $2,228</td>
<td>Sat/Sun: $2,800</td>
<td>Sat/Sun: $2K</td>
<td>Sat/Sun: $2,250</td>
<td>Sat/Sun: $2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Time (one-way)</strong></td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>50 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance Traveled; 2 veh (round trip)</strong></td>
<td>53.6 miles</td>
<td>49.67 miles</td>
<td>46.3 miles</td>
<td>37.7 miles</td>
<td>52.18 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfers to get to Downtown Tampa</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of people within ½ mile</strong></td>
<td>44,596</td>
<td>15,509</td>
<td>19,848</td>
<td>6,644</td>
<td>20,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of jobs within ½ mile</strong></td>
<td>104,602</td>
<td>77,783</td>
<td>70,672</td>
<td>11,685</td>
<td>77,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% in poverty within ½ mile</strong></td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% minority within ½ mile</strong></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% seniors within ½ mile</strong></td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% no vehicles within ½ mile</strong></td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plant City - Amazon - Lakeland
### Plant City - Amazon - Lakeland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Operating Cost</td>
<td>$460K - $510K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Day</td>
<td>Weekday: $1,400 Sat/Sun: $1K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time (one way)</td>
<td>25 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Traveled; 1 veh (round trip)</td>
<td>24.84 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to other routes</td>
<td>Circulators, limited stop routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of people within ½ mile</td>
<td>4,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of jobs within ½ mile</td>
<td>8,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in poverty within ½ mile</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% minority within ½ mile</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% seniors within ½ mile</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% no vehicles within ½ mile</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All costs are planning-level cost estimates. Any route will require more in-depth analysis by HART staff for more detailed cost estimates.
Lessons Learnt

Opens opportunities for jobs, tourism and economic growth

Providing reliable service and coverage are challenges, public perception about transit

All the commuters drove to work and majority saw transit as a desirable option, prefer transit plaza

Need easy Access to transit stops, comfortable facilities and shorter waiting times, service frequency

Current development pattern could support transit, but need more density to support frequent transit service, policy decisions

Most frequent trips within Plant City for shopping along Redman Plaza, medical appointments, area around the hospital and to work

For Express route, most desired destination Tampa Downtown, followed by Tampa International Airport, Brandon and USF area. Lakeland is a desired destination
THANK YOU

Comments and Questions
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
2021 Meeting Calendar

Presenter
Committee Liaison

Summary
Staff has prepared a calendar of meetings for 2021. We ask that each MPO advisory committee review and approve its meeting dates. Upon approval by the MPO Board, this calendar will be published and posted online to provide the public with ample notice of meeting schedules.

Recommended Action
Review and approve the 2021 MPO and Committees Meeting Calendar

Prepared By
Johnny Wong, PhD

Attachments
MPO Meeting Calendar
## 2021 SCHEDULE OF MONTHLY MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MPO 10:00 AM</th>
<th>POLICY 8:30 AM</th>
<th>TAC 1:30 PM</th>
<th>CAC 9:00 AM</th>
<th>BPAC 5:30 PM</th>
<th>LRC 9:00 AM</th>
<th>ITS 1:30 PM</th>
<th>TDCB 9:30 AM</th>
<th>TMA 9:30 AM</th>
<th>CCC 11 AM</th>
<th>CCC DIRECTORS 1:30 PM</th>
<th>IOC 6:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Pasco</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Hearing (a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>14 Workshop</td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 Pasco</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Joint Mtg. 15 (c) @ 12P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 Hillsborough</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acronyms

- **BPAC**: Bicycle - Pedestrian Advisory Committee of the MPO Board
- **CAC**: Citizens Advisory Committee of the MPO Board
- **CCC**: TBARTA MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee
- **ITS**: Intelligent Transportation Systems Committee of the MPO Board
- **MPO**: Metropolitan Planning Organization Board
- **POLICY**: Policy Committee of the MPO Board
- **TAC**: Technical Advisory Committee of the MPO Board
- **TDCB**: Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board
- **LRC**: Livable Roadways Committee of the MPO Board
- **TMA**: Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group
- **IOC**: Independent Oversight Committee

### Meeting Locations

- (a) BOCC Chambers, County Center, 601 East Kennedy Blvd., 2nd Floor
- (b) Plan Hillsborough Committee Room, County Center, 601 East Kennedy Blvd., 18th Floor
- (c) 26th Floor, Rooms A&B, County Center Building, 601 E. Kennedy Blvd.
- (d) Call (813) 282-8200 or [www.tbarta.com](http://www.tbarta.com) for meeting location - TBARTA Office, 4350 W. Cypress St. #700, Tampa
- (e) Planning Commission Boardroom, County Center, 601 East Kennedy Blvd., 18th Floor

Revised: 10-29-20
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Agenda Item
Hillsborough County Vision Zero Corridor Studies Draft Recommendations

Presenter
Wade Reynolds and Lisa Silva, MPO Staff

Summary
The Hillsborough MPO adopted its Vision Zero Action Plan in 2017. The data-driven Action Plan identified 20 High Injury Network (HIN) corridors with the greatest number of fatalities and serious injuries per mile. This study focuses on eight that are the responsibility of Hillsborough County. Using strategies from “Paint Saves Lives” as a guide, the goal is to recommend short-term, immediately implementable countermeasures to reduce serious injuries and fatalities. The project is co-managed by staff of the Hillsborough County Engineering and Operations Department and the Metropolitan Planning Organization.

A presentation of draft recommendations and public outreach results from the communities surrounding these HIN corridors:

- 78th Street (Causeway Blvd to Palm River Rd)
- Gibsonton Drive (I-75 to Balm Riverview Road)
- 15th Street (Fowler Avenue to Fletcher Avenue)
- CR579 /Mango Rd (MLK Boulevard to US 92)
- Sheldon Road (Hillsborough Ave to Waters Ave)
- Lynn Turner (Gunn Highway to Ehrlich Road)
- W. Fletcher Ave (Armenia Ave to Nebraska Ave)
- Bruce B. Downs (Fowler Ave to Bearss Ave)

Please visit the project page to review the reports for any of the corridors.

Recommended Action
Approval of recommendations.

Prepared By
Gena Torres

Attachments
Draft Reports
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**Agenda Item**
Nondiscrimination Plan Update

**Presenter**
Joshua Barber, MPO Staff

**Summary**
Under federal law, the MPO is required to prepare a Title VI of the Civil Rights Act & Nondiscrimination Plan every 3 years to ensure nondiscrimination in the provision and execution of MPO activities. The Hillsborough MPO Title VI & Nondiscrimination Plan was adopted by the MPO Board in 2018, and an updated Title VI & Nondiscrimination Plan will need to be adopted in 2021.

This update will be guided by the Resolution on Racial Discrimination adopted by the MPO in August, which states that as “racial discrimination has been evident in transportation planning, transportation planning is one of those systems that must change.” This update will therefore include an examination of how planning has contributed to racial inequities in our area. This update also presents an opportunity to expand the Nondiscrimination Plan to address the work of the Hillsborough City-County Planning Commission. This proactive step would better ensure nondiscrimination in the provision and execution of land use and community planning activities, in coordination with transportation, and further the advancement of equitable processes and outcomes.

At this meeting staff will provide a presentation on the steps to be taken to collaboratively review, update, and expand the Title VI and Nondiscrimination Plan to better achieve equitable outcomes and processes throughout The Hillsborough MPO’s and City-County Planning Commission’s work.

**Recommended Action**
None – for information and discussion

**Prepared By**
Joshua Barber

**Attachments**
Presentation slides
2021 Nondiscrimination Plan

October 2020
Project Background

- Hillsborough MPO *Title VI and Nondiscrimination Plan* adopted by MPO on March 2018
  - Required by Federal Law
  - Must be updated every 3 years; next update due in 2021

- Nondiscrimination Plan covers:
  - Identifying underserved communities and where they are located
  - How we engage those communities in our work
  - How we evaluate the equity outcomes of our plans
  - How we integrated Title VI/Nondiscrimination in our primary program areas
  - Title VI complaint process, procedures, and staff liaison
  - Recommendations

- 2021 Plan will be expanded to include The Hillsborough City-County Planning Commission
What groups are covered?

Federal law requires agencies receiving federal funds to ensure nondiscrimination in the provision of agency activities. We should and must ensure nondiscrimination the basis of:

- **race, ethnicity, color, or national origin** including African-American, Latinx, Asian, and Native American
- **income**, including low-income populations
- **ability**, including those with physical and mental disabilities
- **sex, gender, and sexual orientation** including women and the LGBTQ population
- **age**, including youth and older adults
- **limited English proficiency (LEP)**
- **religion**
Context: Past Policies, Neighborhood Makeup, and Disparate Outcomes

1940s HOLC Map


Low Income Households (2018)
- **Home Ownership** - White (73.3%) versus Black (40.8%) = 32.5% gap

- **Air Quality** - Hillsborough County's adult asthma rate of 9.2% ranks the highest among large counties in Florida. 1/5th of us live within 300m of high-volume roadway, and the proportion is 13% higher if you’re a COC resident.

- **Transportation Safety** - If you are in a COC, you are 20% more likely to be in a severe crash.

- **Neighborhood Safety** - 1 in 5 parents with household income less than $25,000 report feeling unsafe in their neighborhood compared to less than 1 in 10 parents with household incomes of $50,000 or over.

How can we influence policy to have more equitable outcomes in the future?
Goals of an Agencywide Nondiscrimination Plan

• Meet Federal and State Requirements for Title VI, Environmental Justice, and Nondiscrimination

• Institutionalize Equity as a priority throughout the Hillsborough Metropolitan Organization, Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission and Hillsborough River Board

• Update, improve, and expand data tracking and performance measurement of equity conditions and outcomes.

• Improve community engagement and empowerment processes, strategies, and data tracking.

• Improve community representation throughout the agency.
Scope of Work

• Task 1. Define Equity
• Task 2. History of Inequities from Planning Policy in our Community
• Task 3. Identify Communities of Concern
• Task 4. Review Existing Equity Work
• Task 5. Community Engagement
• Task 6. Recommendations
• Task 7. Writing the 2021 Nondiscrimination Plan
Task 1 – Defining Equity

• Major Components of Equity
  • **Distribution** – of benefits and burdens
  • **Recognition** – of historical and current inequity, and systems that uphold those inequities
  • **Interaction** – quality of interpersonal interactions and relationships
  • **Care and Repair** – Maintenance and upkeep of public spaces
  • **Procedure** – how decisions are made, who makes them, who is involved
Task 2 – History of Inequity in Planning in Hillsborough County

• Establishment of Hillsborough County
• Early Public Housing
• Early Zoning Codes and Comprehensive Plans
• HOLC
• Urban Renewal
• Highway Construction
• Segregated Neighborhoods
Task 4 – Evaluation of Existing Work

• Planning Commission
  • Comprehensive Plans
  • Special Area Studies
  • Public Engagement

• MPO
  • LRTP
  • TIP
  • Complete Streets, Vision Zero
  • Resiliency, Health, TD
  • Public Engagement
  • Other Program Areas
Timeline and Outside Assistance

Timeline:

• Community Engagement: February and March 2021
• Drafting Recommendations: March - July 2021
• Plan Adoption: ~August 2021

Predominantly conducted by in-house staff with assistance from:

• Charles Brown, Ph.D. – Equitable Cities, LLC
• Danielle Jackson – TELL Public Relations
Questions and Comments

Joshua Barber, MPO Staff – Barberj@plancom.org
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**Agenda Item**
Florida Bicycle Association Legislative Update

**Presenter**
Becky Afonso, Florida Bicycle Association

**Summary**
Becky Afonso, Executive Director of the Florida Bicycle Association, will provide an update on the 2021 Florida Legislature and bills that will be considered relating to pedestrians and bicycles in the upcoming legislative session.

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

**Prepared By**
Wade Reynolds, MPO Staff

**Attachment**
2021 Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Bill
A bill to be entitled
An act relating to bicycle and pedestrian safety;
amending s. 316.003, F.S.; defining the terms "bicycle lane" and "separated bicycle lane"; amending s. 316.083, F.S.; revising and providing requirements for the driver of a motor vehicle overtaking a bicycle, pedestrian, or nonmotorized vehicle; providing exceptions; providing a penalty; requiring the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles to provide an awareness campaign, and include information in certain educational materials, regarding certain safety precautions; amending s. 316.0875, F.S.; exempting a motor vehicle driver from certain provisions relating to no-passing zones when overtaking a bicycle, pedestrian, or nonmotorized vehicle; providing a penalty; amending s. 316.151, F.S.; revising requirements for turning at intersections; providing turn signaling and distance requirements for a motor vehicle driver when overtaking and passing a bicycle; providing a penalty; amending s. 316.2065, F.S.; prohibiting persons riding bicycles in a bicycle lane from riding more than two abreast; providing requirements for persons riding bicycles in groups when stopping at a stop sign; providing a penalty; amending s. 322.12, F.S.;
Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

Section 1. Subsections (4) through (57) and (58) through (99) of section 316.003, Florida Statutes, are renumbered as subsections (5) through (58) and (60) through (101), respectively, present subsection (57) is amended, and new subsections (4) and (59) are added to that section, to read:

316.003 Definitions.—The following words and phrases, when used in this chapter, shall have the meanings respectively ascribed to them in this section, except where the context otherwise requires:

(4) BICYCLE LANE.—A portion of a roadway or highway that is designated by pavement markings and signs for preferential or exclusive use by bicycles.

(58)(57) PRIVATE ROAD OR DRIVEWAY.—Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (81)(b) (79)(b), any privately owned way or place used for vehicular travel by the owner and those having express or implied permission from the owner, but not by other persons.
(59) SEPARATED BICYCLE LANE.—A bicycle lane that is separated from motor vehicle traffic by a physical barrier.

Section 2. Section 316.083, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

316.083 Overtaking and passing a vehicle, bicycle, or pedestrian.—The following rules shall govern the overtaking and passing of vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians proceeding in the same direction, subject to those limitations, exceptions, and special rules hereinafter stated:

(1) The driver of a vehicle overtaking another vehicle proceeding in the same direction must shall give an appropriate signal as provided for in s. 316.156, must shall pass to the left thereof at a safe distance, and must shall not again drive to the right side of the roadway until safely clear of the overtaken vehicle.

(2) The driver of a vehicle overtaking a bicycle, pedestrian, or nonmotorized vehicle occupying the same travel lane must vacate the lane or, if such movement cannot be safely accomplished, must remain at a safe distance behind the bicycle, pedestrian, or nonmotorized vehicle until the driver can safely vacate the lane and must not reenter the lane until safely clear of the overtaken bicycle, pedestrian, or nonmotorized vehicle.

(3) The driver of a vehicle overtaking a bicycle or other nonmotorized vehicle occupying a bicycle lane must pass the bicycle or other nonmotorized vehicle at a safe distance of not
less than 3 feet between the vehicle and the bicycle or other nonmotorized vehicle.

(4) Subsections (2) and (3) do not apply when a bicycle or nonmotorized vehicle occupies a separated bicycle lane.

(5)(2) Except when overtaking and passing on the right is permitted, the driver of an overtaken vehicle must shall give way to the right in favor of the overtaking vehicle, on audible signal or upon the visible blinking of the headlamps of the overtaking vehicle if such overtaking is being attempted at nighttime, and must shall not increase the speed of his or her vehicle until completely passed by the overtaking vehicle.

(6)(3) A person who violates violation of this section commits is a noncriminal traffic infraction, punishable as a moving violation as provided in chapter 318.

(7) The department must provide an awareness campaign informing the motoring public about the safety precautions to be taken pursuant to this section when overtaking a bicycle, pedestrian, or nonmotorized vehicle and must provide information about such precautions in all newly printed driver license educational materials.

Section 3. Section 316.0875, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

316.0875 No-passing zones.—

(1) The Department of Transportation and local authorities may are authorized to determine those portions of any highway...
under their respective jurisdictions and may, by appropriate signs or
markings on the roadway, indicate the beginning and end of such
zones, and when such signs or markings are in place and clearly
visible to an ordinarily observant person, a every driver of a
vehicle must shall obey the directions thereof.

(2) Where signs or markings are in place to define a no-
passing zone as set forth in subsection (1), a no driver may
not drive on the left side of the roadway within with such no-passing zone or on the left side of any
pavement striping designed to mark such no-passing zone throughout its length.

(3) This section does not apply to a driver who safely and
briefly drives to the left of the center of the roadway only to
the extent necessary to:

(a) Avoid when an obstruction;

(b) Turn exists making it necessary to drive to the left
of the center of the highway, nor to the driver of a vehicle
turning left into or from an alley, private road or driveway;

(c) Overtake and pass a bicycle, pedestrian, or
nonmotorized vehicle pursuant to s. 316.082(2) or (3).

(4) A person who violates violation of this section
commits commits a noncriminal traffic infraction, punishable as a
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moving violation as provided in chapter 318.

Section 4. Section 316.151, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

316.151 Required position and method of turning at intersections.—

1. (a) Right turn.—The driver of a vehicle intending to turn right at an intersection onto a highway, public or private roadway, or driveway must shall do so as follows:

1. Make Right turn.—both the approach for a right turn and a right turn shall be made as close as practicable to the right-hand curb or edge of the roadway.

2. When overtaking and passing a bicycle proceeding in the same direction, give an appropriate signal as provided for in s. 316.156 and make the right turn only if the bicycle is at least 20 feet from the intersection.

(b) Left turn.—

1. The driver of a vehicle intending to turn left at an any intersection onto a highway, public or private roadway, or driveway must shall approach the intersection in the extreme left-hand lane lawfully available to traffic moving in the direction of travel of such vehicle, and must make, after entering the intersection, the left turn shall be made so as to leave the intersection in a lane lawfully available to traffic moving in such direction upon the roadway being entered.

2. A person riding a bicycle and intending to turn left in
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accordance with this section is entitled to the full use of the
lane from which the turn may legally be made. The person must:

a. Whenever practicable, make the left turn shall be made
in that portion of the intersection to the left of the center of
the intersection; or

(c) Left turn by bicycle.—In addition to the method of
making a left turn described in paragraph (b), a person riding a
bicycle and intending to turn left has the option of following
the course described hereafter: The rider shall

b. Approach the turn as close as practicable to the right
curb or edge of the roadway; after proceeding across the
intersecting roadway, make the turn shall be made as close as
practicable to the curb or edge of the roadway on the far side
of the intersection; and, before proceeding, the bicyclist shall
comply with any official traffic control device or police
officer regulating traffic on the highway along which the person
bicyclist intends to proceed.

(2) The state, county, and local authorities in their
respective jurisdictions may cause official traffic control
devices to be placed within or adjacent to intersections and
thereby require and direct that a different course from that
specified in this section be traveled by vehicles turning at an
intersection. When such devices are so placed, a no driver of a
vehicle may not turn a vehicle at an intersection other than as
directed and required by such devices.
(3) A **person who violates** violation of this section commits is a noncriminal traffic infraction, punishable as a moving violation as provided in chapter 318.

Section 5. Subsections (5), (6), and (19) of section 316.2065, Florida Statutes, are amended to read:

316.2065 Bicycle regulations.—

(5)(a) A **person** operating a **bicycle** upon a **roadway** at less than the normal speed of traffic at the **time** and **place** and under the conditions then existing **must** shall ride in the **bicycle** lane marked for **bicycle** use or, if there is no **bicycle** lane on the roadway is marked for **bicycle** use, as close as practicable to the right-hand curb or edge of the roadway except under any of the following situations:

1. When overtaking and passing another **bicycle** or **vehicle** proceeding in the same direction.

2. When preparing for a **left turn** at an intersection or into a private road or driveway.

3. When reasonably necessary to avoid any condition or potential conflict, including, but not limited to, a fixed or moving object, parked or moving **vehicle**, **bicycle**, **pedestrian**, **animal**, surface hazard, **turn lane**, or substandard-width lane, which makes it unsafe to continue along the right-hand curb or edge or within a **bicycle** lane. For the purposes of this subsection, a "substandard-width lane" is a lane that is too narrow for a **bicycle** and another **vehicle** to travel safely side
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by side within the lane.

(b) Any person operating a bicycle upon a one-way highway with two or more marked traffic lanes may ride as near the left-hand curb or edge of such roadway as practicable.

(6) (a) Persons riding bicycles upon a roadway or in a bicycle lane may not ride more than two abreast except on a bicycle path paths or parts of roadways set aside for the exclusive use of bicycles. Persons riding two abreast may not impede traffic when traveling at less than the normal speed of traffic at the time and place and under the conditions then existing and must shall ride within a single lane.

(b) When stopping at a stop sign, persons riding bicycles in groups, after coming to a full stop and obeying all traffic laws, may proceed through the stop sign in a group of 10 or fewer at a time. Motor vehicle operators must allow each such group to travel through the intersection before moving forward.

(19) Except as otherwise provided in this section, a person who violates violation of this section commits is a noncriminal traffic infraction, punishable as a pedestrian violation as provided in chapter 318. A law enforcement officer may issue traffic citations for a violation of subsection (3) or subsection (15) only if the violation occurs on a bicycle path or road, as defined in s. 334.03. However, a law enforcement officer may not issue citations to persons on private property, except any part thereof which is open to the use of the public.
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for purposes of vehicular traffic.

Section 6. Subsection (3) of section 322.12, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

322.12 Examination of applicants.—
(3) For an applicant for a Class E driver license, such examination shall include:

(a) A test of the applicant's eyesight given by the driver license examiner designated by the department or by a licensed ophthalmologist, optometrist, or physician.

(b) and A test of the applicant's hearing given by a driver license examiner or a licensed physician.

(c) The examination shall also include A test of the applicant's ability to read and understand highway signs regulating, warning, and directing traffic; his or her knowledge of the traffic laws of this state, including laws regulating driving under the influence of alcohol or controlled substances, driving with an unlawful blood-alcohol level, and driving while intoxicated; and his or her knowledge of the effects of alcohol and controlled substances upon persons and the dangers of driving a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol or controlled substances. Twenty percent of the test questions related to this paragraph must address bicycle and pedestrian safety.

(d) and shall include An actual demonstration of ability to exercise ordinary and reasonable control in the operation of
Section 7. Paragraph (c) of subsection (1) of section 212.05, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

212.05 Sales, storage, use tax.—It is hereby declared to be the legislative intent that every person is exercising a taxable privilege who engages in the business of selling tangible personal property at retail in this state, including the business of making mail order sales, or who rents or furnishes any of the things or services taxable under this chapter, or who stores for use or consumption in this state any item or article of tangible personal property as defined herein and who leases or rents such property within the state.

(1) For the exercise of such privilege, a tax is levied on each taxable transaction or incident, which tax is due and payable as follows:

(c) At the rate of 6 percent of the gross proceeds derived from the lease or rental of tangible personal property, as defined herein; however, the following special provisions apply to the lease or rental of motor vehicles:

1. When a motor vehicle is leased or rented for a period of less than 12 months:
   a. If the motor vehicle is rented in Florida, the entire amount of such rental is taxable, even if the vehicle is dropped off in another state.
   b. If the motor vehicle is rented in another state and
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dropped off in Florida, the rental is exempt from Florida tax.

2. Except as provided in subparagraph 3., for the lease or rental of a motor vehicle for a period of not less than 12 months, sales tax is due on the lease or rental payments if the vehicle is registered in this state; provided, however, that no tax shall be due if the taxpayer documents use of the motor vehicle outside this state and tax is being paid on the lease or rental payments in another state.

3. The tax imposed by this chapter does not apply to the lease or rental of a commercial motor vehicle as defined in ss. 316.003(13)(a) to one lessee or rentee for a period of not less than 12 months when tax was paid on the purchase price of such vehicle by the lessor. To the extent tax was paid with respect to the purchase of such vehicle in another state, territory of the United States, or the District of Columbia, the Florida tax payable shall be reduced in accordance with the provisions of s. 212.06(7). This subparagraph shall only be available when the lease or rental of such property is an established business or part of an established business or the same is incidental or germane to such business.

Section 8. Subsection (1) of section 655.960, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

655.960 Definitions; ss. 655.960-655.965.—As used in this section and ss. 655.961-655.965, unless the context otherwise requires:
(1) "Access area" means any paved walkway or sidewalk which is within 50 feet of any automated teller machine. The term does not include any street or highway open to the use of the public, as defined in s. 316.003(81)(a) or (b), 316.003(79)(a) or (b), including any adjacent sidewalk, as defined in s. 316.003.

Section 9. This act shall take effect July 1, 2018.
Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on October 13

In lieu of our October meeting, we had a CAC workshop on managed lanes, which was held the evening before your workshop on the same topic. Mr. Todd Litman of the Victoria Transport Policy Institute, who spoke at your workshop, was our featured speaker. We had a lengthy conversation with Mr. Litman, during which members voiced concern about the State's policy governing the use of toll revenues for transit, the impact of managed lanes on low-income individuals, establishing a cap on variable tolls, how BRT could operate in toll lanes, and the lack of a robust transit system with first and last mile connections that would provide a viable alternative for those who couldn't afford variable tolls.

Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on October 19

The TAC heard status reports on:

- Review last year’s legislative positions and suggest new ones
- ClearGuide - HART staff liked the tool and thanked the MPO for the training.
- MPO Non-Discrimination Plan
- Fowler Ave Multimodal Study

Meeting of the Intelligent Transportation Systems Committee (ITS) on October 8

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

- Reevaluation of Transit Asset Management, Pavement & Bridge, and System Performance Targets
- Regional Transportation Systems Management & Operations Memorandum of Understanding

The committee heard status reports on legislative positions and their 2021 meeting calendar.

Meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on October 14

The BPAC heard status reports on:

- All Love Rideout Introduction – This introduction was from a group that conducts large bicycle rides and highlighted groups with over 300 people participating.
- Review last year’s legislative positions and suggest new ones – The BPAC was supportive of previous positions and also suggested the Florida Bicycle Association legislative priorities be considered.
- Tampa Activities Update – The committee received a report from the Parks Dept. and the Transportation Dept. on the many projects underway in the City.
- Overview of ClearGuide Data Analytics Platform
• Fowler Ave. Multi-Modal Study – Committee members provided feedback on FDOT’s proposed multi-modal improvements for Fowler Ave.

**Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board (TDCB) on October 23**

Under Action items, the TDCB approved and forwarded to the MPO Board:
• Community Transportation Coordinator Annual Operating Report
• Plant City Transit Plan

The TDCB heard status reports on reviewing legislative positions and on the MPO Non-Discrimination Plan.

**Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee (LRC) on October 28**

The LRC heard status reports Overview of Clearguide Data and Analysis Platform, the Nondiscrimination Plan Update and last year’s Legislative Positions. During legislative review the Committee made a motion to change language referencing “inner city rail” to “fixed guideway” to allow bus rapid transit to be eligible for funding.
Virtual MPO Board Workshop on Managed Lanes

CALL TO ORDER and PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The MPO Vice Chairman, Commissioner Pat Kemp, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and led the pledge of allegiance. The meeting was held virtually via GoToWebinar.

ROLL CALL

Roll call was taken by Cheryl Wilkening, MPO Staff. The following members were present:

Commissioner Kemp, Commissioner Overman, Commissioner Smith, Councilman Citro, Councilman Dingfelder, Gina Evans, Melanie Williams, Paul Anderson, Joe Waggoner, Michael Maurino, Bob Frey, Adam Harden and Cindy Stewart.

The following members were absent: Commissioner Les Miller, Councilman Guido Maniscalco, Commissioner Ken Hagan, Mayor Lott, Mayor Ross.

Goals for Today’s Workshop

Beth Alden, MPO Director, shared background on managed lanes in the Tampa Bay area. The FDOT has planned express lanes, sometimes called managed lanes, for our area interstates since the early 1990s. There were questions expected to be answered later like how those would the express lanes operated, would they have tolls, where would access points be, and would there be transit in parallel with them. We are now 30 years later at the point we need to start answering some of those questions. The first express lanes expected to be built in the Tampa Bay area are the Tampa Bay Next Managed Lanes. The first express lanes would be over the Howard Frankland Bridge into Pinellas county. The next ones would be on I-275 through the center of Tampa to the Westshore Interchange area (shown in red on the map). The LRTP indicates Interstate 4 (shown purple on the map) would be next and it would head towards Orlando then after I4 they would look at I75 through most of the county. Ms. Alden explained a map of what is included in the Transportation Improvement Program. She then provided a brief introduction of all the speakers.

FDOT’s Managed Lanes Program

Raj Pannaluri, FDOT Arterial Management Engineer, presented the FDOT’s Managed Lanes Program. FDOT’s Managed Lanes Policy provide safe travel choices, offers predictable travel times, and prioritizes long distance trips. The goals of managed lanes are to offer safe choice to bypass congestion, reduce congestion and improve traffic flow, ensure efficient use of road capacity and provide innovative travel alternatives. The benefits of managed lanes are to provide drivers with safe travel choices, offer more predictable travel time, reduce fuel consumption, decrease air pollution and support transit usage. There are 80 miles of managed lanes in operation, 100 miles under construction and 400 miles under consideration. Allison Stettner, FDOT Office of Policy Planning Director, noted that there is continuous public engagement through life of the project, align with community vision, match the strategy for...
community and facility and solutions must be adaptable and developed collaboratively. The managed lanes guidebook provides direction for the implementation of the managed lanes policy. The managed lanes guidebook content includes project identification, project development, alternatives, design consideration and operations & maintenance. The key takeaways are tailored to community and facility, include an open and collaborative process, apply holistic approaches to manage congestion, follow a consistent process documented by the managed lanes guidebook and are dynamic and flexible.

Councilman Dingfelder inquired about the pricing structure and the exemptions like the Transportation Disadvantaged folks. Councilman Citro commented on the pictures provided that the express lanes were empty and the other lanes were full of traffic. He stated there are accidents everyday on our roads and if there are polls separating the express lanes how will people be diverted to the express lanes and how will mass transit buses be rapid if the lanes are tied up. Commissioner Kemp inquired if the Veterans is activated as congestion management and pointed out in South Florida, they used the existing lanes. Councilman Citro inquired if COVID 19 and telecommuting have been considered. Commissioner Smith commented FDOT will manage the lanes with cost pricing which will price some people out to where they can’t afford the toll lanes and congest the regular lanes so how is that more efficient than allowing everyone to use all lanes.

**Economic, Social, & Community Implications of Congestion Pricing**

Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute Executive Director, presented managing lanes for transportation efficiency and fairness. Public roads are valuable and scarce resource so the question is how should they be managed for maximum efficiency and fairness. Most people assume that user fees, such as fuel taxes and tolls, fund roads, but in fact, about half of all roadway costs are funding by general taxes that people pay regardless of how they travel. User fees are more equitable. They ensure that users “get what they pay for and pay for what they get.” They also give travelers an incentive to use alternatives when possible, reducing traffic problems. Most motorists dislike paying tolls, but unpriced roads are not really free, travelers either pay with money or time. Paying with money is more efficient and generates revenue. High Occupancy Toll lanes allow motorists to avoid congestion for urgent trips, if they are willing to pay a premium. Efficient pricing is the only effective way to reduce long-term traffic congestion. When motorists oppose user fees, they are choosing congestion. A basic economic principle is that prices should equal the marginal cost of producing that good. Motorist want roadway expansions provided somebody else pays for them, but if charged the full cost, they often choose alternatives. There is no vocabulary that describes underpricing. With current pricing, people who never drive during peak periods pay for urban highway expansions they never use. With unpriced roads, traffic congestion maintains self-limiting equilibrium which means traffic volumes increase until delays cause motorist to forego some peak-period trips. Expanding those lanes generally does not reduce long-term congestions because the additional capacity is soon filled with generated traffic. Traffic volumes increase until a road experiences congestion. At that point, delays discourage additional peak-period trips. If roads expand, traffic volumes grow to reach a higher equilibrium. The additional peak-period trips on that roadway are called generated traffic. Increases in total vehicle mileage are called induced travel. High occupancy toll lanes during congested periods and discounts during off-peak periods, encourage travelers to shift when and how they travel. Managed lanes make public transit more efficient and attractive. Congestion pricing applies higher during peak periods to reduce congestion. The most effective and cost-effective solution is generally an integrated package that includes roadway management that favors high-occupant vehicles, efficient pricing, public transit service improvements and transportation demand management. Mr. Litman provided ideas on how to attract discretionary riders and gave success stories. He also explained how to respond to criticisms for example pricing can include a limited number of free trips or discounts for lower-income households. A basic planning principle is that individual, short-term decisions should support strategic, long-term goals.
Commissioner Overman asked in the process of FDOT funding and planning where in that process do we address identifying prioritization of our priorities. Commissioner Kemp inquired about frequency and service. Joe Waggoner commented on fast times and reliable trips. Councilman Citro commented on the Westshore interchange and an express bus system would not be able to work here.

**Use of Toll Revenue for Multimodal Capacity in Northern Virginia**

Kate Mattice, Northern Virginia Transportation Commission Executive Director, presented providing transit options for Northern Virginia Manages Lanes. The Northern Virginia Transportation Commission is responsible for funding and stewardship of WMATA, managing state and regional funding for five jurisdictional bus systems, working across jurisdictional boundaries to coordinate transit service and administering the commuter choice program. Ms. Mattice provided a map of the Northern Virginia’s Express Lane Network and the commuter choice program. The commuter choice is to move more people, reduce roadway congestion, increase travel options, enhance transportation and improve transit service. Eligible types of project include expanded transit services and related capital improvements, roadway improvements specific to the corridor, access to transit improvements, transportation system management strategies and transportation demand management. Ms. Mattice explained the technical evaluation process and provided an outline of current projects. The I-66 commuter choice project consists of 35 projects and it is a $41.5 million dollar investment which includes nine new express bus routes, added service to seven bus routes, park and ride lot, bus stop improvements bikeshare operations carpool and vanpool incentives and ITS/Traveler information. The I-395/95 commuter choice project consists of 10 projects and $19 million dollar investment. There are eight new bus services and two transportation demand management campaigns. Ms. Mattice explained the changes in I-66 performance to date. The commuter choice program is administered by three FTE plus consultants. Dedicated transit funding does provide toll-free options and may help with community buy-in/equitable access, a competitive metric based program gives public confidence of investment, oversight and performance reporting will ensure funding supports goals and revenue certainty will vary depending on corridor characteristics.

Councilman Citro inquired how did they get the VDOT to fund the grant program and what percentage of their own money was put into this fund. Commissioner Smith commented on slugging and are the toll facility funding transit. Councilman Dingfelder commented about the equity issue and try to allocate to all drivers. Commissioner Kemp commented on the $35 cost on the express lanes.

**Addressing Impacts on Lower Income Residents: L.A. Metro’s Approach**

Mark Linsenmayer, Congestion Reduction Programs Deputy Executive Officer, presented the Los Angeles Metro Express Lanes Low Income Assistance Program. Mr. Linsenmayer provided a metro system map which consists of 515 freeway miles. The Metro Express Lanes Program goals consists of safety & reliability, throughput, service, economics, sustainable and growth. Mr. Linsenmayer provided a sample cross-section of the express lanes. Express Lanes are equitable and fair. Free roads subsidize driving, and the wealthy drive benefit the most. The transportation disadvantaged are more likely to take transit than drive and road pricing keep transit moving. Road users benefit from free roads, while nearby non-users must deal with the generalized costs. Express Lanes corridor enhancements include reinvest the revenue so that those who incur the costs also receive the benefits and keep revenues focused on transportation investments. There is a low-income assistance plan which is the only program of its kind in the country. There are transit rewards, carpool loyalty and clean air vehicle discounts. The net toll revenue reinvestment targets are transit, roadway improvements and system connectivity and active transportation. Low income assistance plan accountholders make more express lanes trips on average than standard accountholders after adjusting for the effect of income on total annual miles driven. This
includes trips that are charged the SOV toll rates, suggesting that the LIAP is effective at reducing barriers to entry for express lanes among low-income users.

Councilman Dingfelder inquired how LIAP is verified and why not a greater subsidy of the $25.00. Commissioner Smith inquired about the revenue reinvestment targets. Commissioner Kemp commented on local impacts on the community on the road widening in the urban areas.

**FDOT Perspectives on Next Steps**

David Gwynn, FDOT District 7 Secretary, noted there are several ways to look at this and there are building blocks with the County, City and State to work together. He commented that we need regional transit to help the local transit. After listening to everyone’s concerns that managed lanes is not the concern it is how equity is applied to the managed lanes. Next year they will start the process of determining the tolling strategies and everyone will be involved. They will take everyone’s concerns into account while the managed lanes handbook is developed. Mr. Gwynn does believe Managed Lanes will provide some benefits.

Councilman Dingfelder thought a unified discussion across the bay should happen. Commissioner Overman believes consulting with other organizations that have adopted a managed lanes strategy that does address equity then we can get the results we are looking for. Commissioner Kemp noted options for people to get to places better and commented on the South Florida transit.

**Public Comment**

Chris Vela commented on equity in TBX and Florida. He stated we have under 1000 miles of toll lanes in Florida which more than anyone in the Nation and we are still in gridlock. It can’t hurt the revenue if you operate the train. He pointed out the express lanes are going through the CRA as noted in the SEIS. There is an incomplete report on equity and civil rights matter.

Christopher Gleason commented that he attended the CAC Managed Lanes Workshop and today’s MPO Managed Lanes Workshop and he is upset that the speaker was from Canada and he cannot fathom how backwards Florida is. Everything that was said today was all theoretical situations. He feels the speakers should be from our state and city to know exactly the situation we are in today and if there isn’t money available to do the projects it doesn’t matter what you say anyways.

There were no other public comments.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.