Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee
Wednesday, November 18, 2020 *** NOTE AFTERNOON MEETING ***1:30 PM ***

The County Center and Plan Hillsborough offices continue to be closed to the public in response to the pandemic. A minimum number of board members will meet in person at the County Center 18th Floor, and all other participation will continue to be virtual. For technical support during the meeting, please contact Michael Rempfer at (813) 273-3774 ext. 348.

To view presentations and participate from your computer, tablet or smartphone, go to https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/7469228089282463758

You can also dial in using your phone: 1-562-247-8422
Access Code: 195-977-394

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

The County Center and Plan Hillsborough offices are closed to the public in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Members of the public may access this meeting and participate via the GoToWebinar link above, or by phoning in and visiting the Plan Hillsborough website for the agenda packet and presentation slides. Please mute yourself upon joining the meeting

I. Call to Order & Introductions

II. Chairman’s Request: Per the MPO Bylaws, all speakers are asked to address only the presiding Chair for recognition; confine their remarks to the question under debate; and avoid personalities or indecorous language or behavior.

III. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

IV. Approval of Minutes – September 9 & October 13

V. Action Items

A. Transportation Improvement Program Amendments (Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO staff)
   i. Project 448139-1: HART/FTA Discretionary Bus and Bus Facilities Program
   ii. Project 445507-2: Wrong Way Driver Vehicle Detection System
   iii. Project 439829-9: Corridor Lighting at Various Locations

B. Plant City Transit Plan (Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO staff)

C. Vision Zero Corridor Studies (Wade Reynolds & Lisa Silva, MPO staff)

D. 2021 Meeting Calendar (Rich Clarendon, MPO staff)

VI. Status Reports

A. MPO Non Discrimination Plan (Joshua Barber, MPO staff)

VII. Unfinished & New Business

A. At-Large Seat for Person under 30

B. Hillsborough County/School District Coordination
C. HART Capital Improvements Program

VIII. Adjournment

IX. Addendum & Links of Interest

A. MPO Meeting Summary & Committee Report
B. Vision Zero Mourning of Remembrance Event – Sunday, Nov. 15th, 9 AM
C. Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit – Nov. 16 – 19
D. TBARTA/NASA Vertiport Project
E. Hillsborough County Community Sustainability Action Plan Survey & Open Houses
F. Community Resiliency Information System Hurricane 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, 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.
I. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

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

Virtual Members present: Bill Roberts, Ricardo Fernandez, Hoyt Prindle, III, Steven Hollencamp, David Bailey, Rick Richmond, Terrance Trott, Camilo Soto, Jeff Lucas, Edward Mierzejewski, Christine Acosta, Vivienne Handy, Cliff Reiss, Luciano Prida, Nicole Rice, Amy Espinosa, Vivienne Handy

Members excused: Leticia Walker, Artie Fryer, Cheryl Thole, Sky White, Don Skelton, Jr., Barbara Kennedy Gibson

Others virtually present: Rich Clarendon, Paula Flores, Cheryl Wilkening, Michael Rempfer, Johnny Wong, Chris Cochran, Chris Vela, and Debbie Guest

II. CHAIRMAN'S REQUEST

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

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chris Vela, Ybor City 33605, touched on a couple of items on the agenda. Mr. Vela brought attention to Johnny Wong's report which states that the interstate is looking to be in great shape in terms of reliability and that they are allowing the Tampa Bay NEXT project to proceed forward. He noted that it is not the interstate but the surface roads that are the problem and, more importantly, it is transit. This leads to the other problem, which is the bus stops, and Chris Vela's recommendations are with Route 48 and Route 14. As an option, Mr. Vela emphasized the CAC can make recommendations to the MPO, even though it is not an action item.
In regards to Westshore, Mr. Vela recommends that the FDOT complete the trail north of Carmen Street that links to Lemon Street, which extends to Cypress Pointe, as many cyclists use that area. He also emphasized, with the bus situation, that modifications enable everyone to have access to safe shelters.

IV. MEMBER'S INTERESTS

Christine Acosta noted that earlier this week the City Council in Tampa was presented with the speed reduction results, which were compiled at the request of Council earlier this year, to consider speed throughout the City, in particular Bayshore Boulevard. She felt that the presentation was fantastic and that the CAC should hear it and asked for a motion that it be added to a future agenda. Rich Clarendon stated that a motion isn't necessary, and they will reach out to the City.

Chair Roberts brought up one item for the committee that he feels is critical and one that the CAC may want to look at. He shared that the School Board appeared before the County Commission and discussed the condition of roadways and feeder roadways, particularly in the south county area, with regard to the building of new schools. The request from Amber Dickerson of the School Board was that they form a study committee.

David Bailey also added to Chair Roberts’ comments that one of the streets that is really in need and that is a feeder street is Balm Road off of Highway 301. There is a new high school that was just built there, and he wanted to amplify the Chair’s point with this example. There was a study done a while ago regarding the widening of the street, but it was shot down. This would be a good time to reevaluate that road in particular because that is a huge need right now in the south county area.

Vivienne Handy stated that the Balm Road study had moved forward. The CAC had actually voted it down, but the MPO went forward with it because of the school issue. Ms. Handy thinks they might be a little behind on those things but does agree that south county needs attention, stating they are very much putting the cart before the horse because development is overthrowing everything, and then they end up with a school issue as well as a traffic issue. Chair Roberts emphasized his request was to get a Staff report on what plan is in place to address the issue.

Rich Clarendon stated that later in the meeting he will be bringing forth information on Balm, reminding that Mr. Bailey brought it up last month, and he has a number of items in
follow-up for the meeting. Mr. Clarendon also suggested Cheryl call the roll, just to make sure we know who is on the line.

A quorum was met at the start of the CAC meeting. Cheryl Wilkening now called the roll, and Rich Clarendon announced there is a new member for the City of Temple Terrace, Leticia Walker, but she is not present.

Ricardo Fernandez stated that in going through the minutes he was reminded of the Chair's request at the last meeting that there be an agenda item added to this meeting regarding Sections 6 and 7 of Tampa Bay NEXT, the downtown interchange, and the section of the interstate north of the downtown interchange up to Bearss. The underlining reason being that there was some expressed confusion at the MPO meeting when they reviewed the TIP and asked if the item is referenced somewhere, as it is not specifically on the agenda. Rich Clarendon emphasized that there are a number of follow-up items from the August meeting that he will address later.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY AUGUST 12TH

The Chair sought a motion to approve the August 12th meeting summary, Ricardo Fernandez so moved, Camilo Soto seconded, and the motion carried unanimously with those present virtually.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

A. Reevaluation of Transit Asset Management, Pavement & Bridge and System Performance Targets

Johnny Wong, MPO staff, brought forward three federally required measures, which are transit asset management, pavement, and bridge system performance. All three measures originate from MAP-21 and FACT Act legislation.

Mr. Wong went over the schedule for performance evaluations, and the targets he's discussing are done every four years, with the exception of safety, which is done every year. The first time MPO set targets was in 2018, and those were regarding transit asset condition, pavement, and bridge and system performance, so what he is providing is basically a report card of what they are doing. This presentation should inform a decision on whether to adjust the set targets in two years.

The first section explained was transit asset condition. Transit asset management is a business model that uses the condition of assets to optimize funding priorities in order to
keep our transit networks in a "State of Good Repair." "State of Good Repair" means that assets are performing their intended function, there are no known safety risks, and the investment has been recovered.

TAM rule applies to all providers that receive funding, and there are two tiers of transit agencies. HART falls into the Tier 1 agency. What is required for providers is 1. Inventory all capital assets belonging to one of four categories - rolling stock, equipment, facilities, and infrastructure; 2. Rate the condition of each asset and create a method of prioritizing investments; 3. Coordinate with MPOs and DOTs to establish performance targets of the percentage of each asset category in a "State of Good Repair." The MPO wants HART to improve its assets condition, and they have prioritized $4 million a year in grant funds for the past five years for bus replacement, they have prioritized a $10 million grant to invest in upgrading Computer-Aided Dispatch, and have prioritized $1 million for Marion Transit Center concrete improvements.

The second performance rule is pavement and bridge condition. Under this rule, DOTs and MPOs are required to establish pavement and bridge targets for the National Highway System and report them in the TIPs and LRTPs and went on to explain the adopted targets. Over the past two years, the performance of each of the asset categories has remained stable.

The third and final rule is system performance and is a little more complicated. System performance is measured in terms of level of travel time or reliability. The federal measure for this is prescribed, so they need to do their best to understand it, even though it is counterintuitive. Mr. Wong presented a few slides to explain. First, you need to understand travel time reliability (TTR). It is to be considered as dependability or consistency of your travel time on a daily basis across different times of day.

After explaining high reliability and lower reliability, Mr. Wong stated that it doesn't mean congestion doesn't exist but means that it is fairly consistent on a daily basis. If you live in one part of the county and work in another part of the county, you are going to be sitting in traffic. The goal is to not sit in traffic for an hour more than what you'd expect on a daily basis. Lower reliability is primarily a function of non-recurring congestion, but you need to assume there's going to be some level of congestion. But the things that really have an impact on reliability are bottlenecks, incidents like
crashes, vehicle breakdowns, poor weather, road construction, and natural hazards.

In November of 2018, in Hillsborough, the MPO agreed to support statewide targets regarding their level of travel reliability, and the targets are shown on the Adopted Targets slide. You can address low reliability by addressing bottlenecks, reduce crashes, and other causes of non-recurring congestion, and with integrated corridor management.

The recommended action is to approve a correction on the TAM targets by changing less than 81 percent equipment assets not in an SGR to less than 19 percent equipment assets not in an SGR.

Discussion/Questions: Christine Acosta stated there was a news report broadcast the day before that gave credit for a new complete street happening on Floribraska to the All For Transportation funding that is amassing. She was confused and asked if there were funds that have been released. Mr. Wong responded that he has not been briefed from any agencies about funds being released to invest in projects. As far as he knows, he thought all of the agencies were just allowing that money to accumulate. Unless something happened behind the scenes that he is unaware of, he would question the accuracy of the reporting, to which Christine Acosta concurred.

Ricardo Fernandez followed up, sharing that he saw the same report and thinks it was a simple matter of the reporter getting out over her “skis” in how she defined the effort being made. There aren't any monies that have been released, to his knowledge, from his position on the IOC. It is all being sequestered at present, and he clarified that maybe what she meant to say, but did not do very artfully, was that money has been earmarked for expenditure, if and when they ever see it.

Vivienne Handy inquired as to how the inconsistent travel time, for example, from Wimauma to downtown in the morning, which can be anywhere from 45 minutes to an hour and 45 minutes, will be addressed and is wondering what are the criteria that will be looked at. Mr. Wong replied that as far as what's being done on some of the county roads now, the elements in the toolbox that are available to planners and engineers are limited by fund availability. For now, they're all looking for low-cost ways of improving reliability, and that could be things like traffic signal re-timing and encouraging transit use. Making more significant changes requires laying down infrastructure and deploying technologies that are fixed in the ground. There are
a ton of roads across the county and not just in the county's jurisdiction but owned by the City of Tampa and DOT that are not performing well. It is a matter of getting them on the priority list for one reason or another. There are many county roads that have a level of travel time reliability near 2, and he cannot speak to Wimauma specifically but stated, in general, they are meeting with county staff because they are about to update their comp plan. They are working with them to identify better ways of measuring congestion. The measure they traditionally look at is the level of service, and they don't think that's appropriate because most of their roads are failing already and it makes it difficult to distinguish a bad road which is failing from a terrible road which is also failing. The scale doesn't match the problems that they are seeing. So, they are going to be working with them to introduce travel time reliability and potentially a host of other performance measures so they can prioritize the roads better.

Ms. Acosta followed up by stating that what she is hearing is the information is shared with the Planning Commission and the Board but not a lot can be done based on funding limitations and what solutions are available. Mr. Wong stated that he won't speak specifically to the county's capital improvements program. All he could say is the real challenge is prioritizing which roads can be addressed first. Ms. Acosta emphasized that nobody steps up to stop all of this urban sprawl since the roads are never going to keep up, and that seems like a no-brainer.

Hoyt Prindle expressed that one of his concerns is that when they are providing the data on this, that the data is available in such a way to distinguish between the rush hour times and non-rush hour times. His understanding of the way these metrics work is that it's analyzing the road across the entirety of its usage and times. To him, that allows peak travel times to skew whether there is a need to widen a particular road or freeway, for example, and asked Mr. Wong to speak on this for a bit. Mr. Wong disclosed that there are benefits and limitations to picking any period of time during the day, but by establishing the range from 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., they are including both peaks, as well as off-peak during the day. Hoyt Prindle followed up by inquiring as to the improvement on the arterial roads from 2018 to 2020, it increased from 59 percent to 81, and have they determined a cause and effect for that increase in reliability. Mr. Wong responded that it is very difficult to pinpoint and he doesn't feel that he could give him an educated response. He will speak with DOT staff and ask what treatments they implemented and what the rationale was behind them.
Ricardo Fernandez, referencing the comments made by Chris Vela at the top of the meeting, emphasized that Mr. Vela did have suggestions or recommendations the CAC could make to the "big board" perhaps out of this meeting or some future meeting and asked in November if the CAC would come back and revisit what Mr. Vela had to say and perhaps they would be in a position at that point to tailor some recommendations around his thoughts.

Mr. Fernandez asked Mr. Wong if there was anything in particular that Mr. Vela said that they might be able to pick up and run with today by way of a recommendation. Mr. Wong replied that he doesn't know if it would be flushed out enough to generate a recommendation but agrees with Mr. Vela that the lack of consistent revenue stream for bus replacement is a real problem that has been reiterated to him by HART staff, especially the new transit asset manager. The county maintenance facility is generating a real problem for them because they are trying to prepare for electric vehicle deployment and having water on the floor of the facility is a real hazard, particularly because the water on the floor in the facility turns into humidity. That humidity, he's been told, is responsible for rotting some of the plywood floorboards on these buses, so many of them are deteriorating faster than anticipated under normal circumstances, i.e., a dry facility. That was one of the primary issues that was conveyed to him each time he spoke with HART staff in preparing for this report. Mr. Wong doesn't know if there is a motion or recommendation nestled in there somewhere but thinks that is a problem that should be carefully watched.

Chair Roberts relayed there is no motion quite ready for the presentation but he would like to ask that they schedule this item for the November meeting and maybe Mr. Wong can give an update with regard to where some of the items stand with HART, in particular. It seems HART is relying very heavily on the community investment tax, and he thinks it would be very interesting to know what their "Plan B" is in regard to capital funding, because between capital expenditures and operating revenues, HART is struggling significantly. Mr. Wong confirmed he would be happy to speak to that or invite HART's program manager. His experience would extend to this particular topic.

Chair Roberts sought a motion to recommend a correction on the TAM targets, Ricardo Fernandez so moved, Steven Hollenkamp seconded, and the motion carried unanimously with those virtually present.
B. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment – Deferred at the request of the presenter.

VII. STATUS REPORTS

A. HART Service Changes for 2021

Chris Cochran: HART is currently looking into making some changes, taking into consideration that they may not be receiving the surtaxes and may have to create a backup plan. Mr. Cochran went over the outline of what the service changes would look like. As far as a background, they evaluated the system from a holistic level in order to be both not only fiscally responsible under current budgetary constraints but also looking at it from a standpoint of balancing their focus with a desire to serve the needs of the community to be most effective and efficient as possible.

Mr. Cochran outlined the proposed changes that they have for January of 2021 that they will be presenting to the public. Starting at the University area, Route 5 would shift to serve USF on Spectrum Boulevard instead of Fowler Avenue, and Route 48 would also shift to serve USF on Holly Drive instead of Fletcher Avenue. This is in Temple Terrace. Looking at Route 48, as a response to community requests, they plan to extend Route 48 in order to restore service north of Fletcher Avenue. He then reviewed the three options.

Continuing with the University area, they would like to improve connections and travel times going to Westshore and to help those traveling north to Fletcher. They are therefore proposing that part of Route 42 be merged into Route 45, so Route 45 would be extended north of Busch Boulevard and end at the Yukon Transfer Center via 15th Street. It would no longer serve the Yukon Transfer Center.

Getting from the University area to Northdale, HARTFlex Northdale is proposed to be removed. Route 33 would be extended to serve St. Joseph's Hospital North. Route 33 would also reduce frequency from 30 minutes to 60 minutes on weekdays.

Moving into the New Tampa area, traveling from the University area to New Tampa, Route 275LX would be shortened to run between UATC and TPA. Route 22LX (previously Route 275LX) would serve between Wiregrass Park-n-Ride and the University Area Transit Center, noting over 50 percent of the ridership occurs between Wiregrass and UATC on 275LX.
Regarding the West Tampa area, one of the express routes they are proposing to remove is Route 60LX. So, for traveling between Brandon to downtown, Route 25LX and Route 360LX will become the alternatives. Also, Route 7 would serve Main Street instead of North Boulevard.

Traveling between downtown and Westshore, they are proposing a new route, Route 10, that would serve between MTC and TPA via Cypress Street, and they believe it will be a win-win for everybody in making these changes.

Looking at the Ybor and downtown area, they would shift Route 8 to serve 4th Avenue instead of 7th Avenue and to serve Kennedy/Jackson instead of Meridian and Channelside.

Concerning the Town 'N Country area, they would restore the previous Route 30 and Route 35 that was discontinued. Route 35 is to be merged into Route 30.

In the Brandon area, Route 38 would be extended south of Martin Luther King Boulevard to Westfield Brandon Mall via Parsons and Oakfield Drive. HARTFlex in Brandon would no longer be in service.

Regarding the South Tampa area, Route 14 would be extended south of Swann Avenue to Britton Plaza. This would create another connection within the entire HART network to other routes in the system by bringing it to Britton Plaza. There are two options they are considering.

Some of the other changes they are considering would be taking 15-minute routes and reducing them to 20-minute frequencies. That would allow them to make significant changes that are needed within the constraints they are dealing with that are necessary for the service change while minimizing the impact, as much as possible, to the network as a whole. Mr. Cochran discussed the “Other Changes” slide. So, in a nutshell, they're looking to remove all HARTFlex services throughout the county.

Mr. Cochran then proceeded to go over the “Proposed Changes” slide and discussed the highlights of the plan. What is important to note is the most impacted stops will still be served or have a fixed route service within a quarter mile. Although it is not ideal for everybody, they did their best to minimize that impact. A quarter mile to be able to get to a transit stop is, for the most part, a standard acceptability to be able to access transit. If they were to remove service
completely, there will still be options for public transit within a quarter mile.

The “Modifications Plan” of the proposed weekday service map slide was presented. What is important in the map is to be able to view the different colors, which will help you understand the frequency of the network. As expected, you will see the most frequent services continue to be focused in the core areas of Tampa. There are a couple that are yet to be determined because they are looking at what those routes are going to be, how they are going to look, and those are primarily out in east county and south county.

Looking at numbers, there is a total reduction of about 10 percent of the service hours, with a total annual savings of $4.3 million. Since they are proposing this to start in the second quarter of next year, they won't realize the full annual savings. But they are projected to save about $3.2 million in fiscal year 2021, and about $2.2 million of that will be directly related to operator savings, not in operator cuts but in overtime, which is a huge expense for HART. And part of this plan allows them to reduce the average weekly hours that the drivers will be driving. So, with the reduction of an estimated 66,325 annual vehicle hours, this helps to create a 10 percent total reduction.

Mr. Cochran went over the current schedule. They are now in the public outreach phase and the expectation is a January launch of the service changes. “Next Steps” includes, one, public meetings and input and, two, a survey with the calendar. Please go to HARTserviceinput.com to participate in the survey.

Chair Roberts clarified that this is a plan that HART will implement if there is no new funding available from any source. Mr. Cochran concurred.

Discussion/Questions: Regarding the idea of reducing overtime, Edward Mierzejewski questioned if there is any possibility to hire additional drivers and if there's any consideration of raising the millage rate. Mr. Cochran stated the millage rate is likely to come up in the budget hearing on Monday, but it is up to the board. At the board's discretion, they can always raise it. They are a quarter of a mil lower than PSTA. If they were to come up to PSTA's level, they would get an additional, potentially, $20 million. It might be $12 million, but it could be $20 million.
As to hiring more drivers, if they are cutting service, it looks like right now what they have projected out with their current staff, if they were to maintain the current staff level with attrition, they would be able to get that overtime down to a level that meets their financial goal. If necessary, one solution would be to hire more people, which would negate the need to pay overtime, with an ear on the Union's take on that. They do have contracts in place that allow HART to do that.

Ricardo Fernandez inquired if there were any efforts made to any part of the analysis that goes into the impact of these service reductions on communities of concern that have been identified by their leadership throughout the county. Mr. Cochran responded that whenever they make changes of this significance, the transit agency has a threshold that if they identify any change that has a potential disparate impact on a low-income or minority community of 25 percent or more, whether it be based on 25 percent or more of the route or 25 percent or more of the ridership of that route that goes through that community is impacted by a change that you make, you have to complete a Title VI analysis. That is something that is being done as part of this.

Mr. Fernandez confirmed there is a Title VI analysis taking place, and Mr. Cochran confirmed that, yes, it would be a federal requirement. Mr. Fernandez followed up by asking if there are any areas of the city or county that are particularly impacted, as he understands these changes now, and Mr. Cochran stated East Tampa, West Tampa, which is no surprise. If they are moving or changing frequencies of service or looking to move routes from any of those areas, they are certainly considered. The changes do not remove a lot of actual geographic coverage. They are more about reducing service from a frequency standpoint, with the exception of the HARTFlex routes. But they have found ways to serve most of those flex route areas with other routes.

Nicole Rice volunteered that she has taken the online survey and, being familiar with transit, she could not understand the questions and proceeded to list the negatives, including the data charts being complex, and asked if it’s too late to make changes. Mr. Cochran responded that he hasn’t heard anything to date and appreciates the feedback. Ms. Rice encouraged the CAC to take the survey and thinks they will notice it is not user-friendly. She feels that the survey was designed by
engineers. Christine Acosta stated that she would also like to discuss with Mr. Cochran her feedback on the BRT survey.

Chair Roberts asked since the plan is in the works to be implemented in 2021, if there is funding made available through the recent sales tax initiative, will this plan be scrapped and something else put in its place, or what is Plan A. Mr. Cochran replied that if the funding does go through, yes, this will be scrapped, and they will move forward with the first year of the IOC plan that the IOC already adopted back in 2019.

Rick Richmond mentioned, regarding the millage rate, that HART does have the ability to raise funding through increased millage through the ad valorem tax and wanted to make the committee aware of that. Fifty-eight percent of their operating budget is collected through ad valorem taxes, and that millage rate has gone unchanged since 2013.

Lou Prida commented that from a business standpoint, you have to spend money to make money. Increasing the ad valorem tax and making financial investments that need to be made in the community, especially involving transit, are significant and will pay off in the long run because the community will have great transit. As a business rep, he fully supports the investment that needs to be made.

VIII. UNFINISHED & NEW BUSINESS

A. Follow-up from August 12th CAC meeting

Rich Clarendon conducted an overview of the items brought up at the August CAC meeting by a number of different members and responded to the requests and questions.

Terrance Trott had asked about Safe Routes to Schools, which is a program that was originally started by the feds in a number of states, including Florida, and is institutionalized as a funding source for making improvements to the bike/pedestrian network that will allow students to access schools without having to get into a car or ask a parent to drive them, and presented a graphic. Mr. Trott wanted to know what is going on locally and said they are trying to get this scheduled to have an update to talk about specific projects in Hillsborough County on the November agenda.

The next item dealt with the status of Balm Road and the new Sumner High School down in the south county area. Highway 301
runs north and south. Balm Road runs east and west. Mr. Clarendon shared that he received a report from the county manager. School markings were installed before school started, and the speed limit reduction to 35 miles per hour has been made. There are improvements being designed now with the anticipation they will be constructed in time for the next school year. The county is seeking money to widen Balm Road, all the way up to Clement Pride Road.

A request was made for the CAC to start receiving TBARTA agendas. The response Mr. Clarendon got from TBARTA is that they don't maintain a mailing list, but they can go online and access their agendas. Nicole Rice made a point of clarification that when you try to forward the TBARTA agenda attachments to others, it is encrypted so that it cannot be opened.

Both Chair Roberts and Vice-Chair Fernandez had requested to recap the motions made on the TIP program and what happened to those. There was a motion to ask TBARTA to consider multimodal connections, i.e., trails. There were also a number of motions regarding priorities for new funding and moving some of the projects up on the priority list. In addition, there were motions made to remove a number of priorities and projects listed -- Priority 31, Priority 32. The projects listed would be adding express lanes on I-275 from south of Lois to east of the Hillsborough River, and then a design project to add express lanes on I-4 from the Selmon connector to east of Branch Forbes Road. The last motion made related to TIP is to support the use of CSX corridors as a top priority, and this was highlighted in green as this is the only motion the MPO acted on affirmatively.

Another question was on the Laurel Street roundabout. Can the CAC do something in the interim in the form of a pop-up project to remove the free-flow right turns around this sort of traditional intersection. And the feedback from the city was that it most likely would not be feasible because of the sharp radii and the fact that you will probably have traffic swinging into the opposing lane. Mr. Clarendon presented a graphic from the City Council meeting. This is a project the city has in design this fiscal year 2021, with construction funding programmed from FDOT three years out in fiscal 2024.

Next there was a question on who is responsible for maintaining county roads that are within the city. The county is basically responsible for making capital improvements on the roads, but the city has agreed in an interlocal agreement to take on maintenance responsibilities; maintaining sidewalks, landscaping; maintaining traffic signals on county roads that are within the city, et cetera. Mr. Clarendon provided a graph
that breaks down what arterials and connector roads run through the city and who's responsible for them, emphasizing it is not a simple answer as the interlocal agreement also governs the responsibility for maintenance and needs to be looked at along with the graph. He also suggested going to the "Who do I contact" button in the upper right-hand corner of the graph if they have a question.

The last request that was made involved discussion pursuant to the resolution on racial discrimination and equity, which the MPO adopted unanimously at their last meeting, to see if they could prioritize funding for disenfranchised neighborhoods. This is something they are all considering, especially at the Staff level. The first request that Mr. Clarendon made of the CAC involves funding and how they would determine what the needs are of the "communities of concern," since part of their mission is to do outreach to disenfranchised neighborhoods that have not received the full benefit of transportation improvements. This concluded the follow-up items.

Chair Roberts commented on the amendments to the TIP that this committee recommended to the MPO Board, and the two of concern to him were the removal of Sections 31 and 32 that specifically described the toll lanes. If the committee wants to ask the MPO Board to revisit their endorsement of that plan, they would certainly welcome that kind of interest. Chair Roberts congratulated and thanked Hoyt Prindle and the committee on the resolution for non-discrimination in transportation and transit projects. That resolution was presented by Hoyt Prindle at the MPO Board meeting, and the MPO unanimously adopted that resolution.

Terrance Trott asked for clarification on what exactly the MPO said about the I-75 and Gibsonton interchange as far as them not formally recommending it be moved up in priority. Mr. Clarendon responded that what they normally do is create a report that is delivered by the Chair. All of the motions that are passed at the CAC meetings are forwarded on to the MPO as recommendations. Sometimes the MPO will take them up. In this case, the only recommendation that was made that was actually acted upon by the MPO Board and approved was to move up the study of the CSX corridors. So, to answer the question, the interchange at Gibsonton and I-75 is still high priority but in essentially the same position, which means it's seeking funding. Its position on the priority list did not change.

Terrance Trott asked that since it is not funded, is there still a potential for the design to be a diverging diamond, to
which Mr. Clarendon stated he does not know the answer, but his
gut tells him there may not be a right-of-way that is needed.
He would have to ask the DOT. Chair Roberts asked Mr. Clarendon
to give the CAC the response he gets back from DOT at the next
CAC meeting.

B. Plant City Transit Plan Virtual Open House & Survey

This is an ongoing project that will be brought to the
committee at the CAC November meeting. Plant City has asked the
MPO's help to develop a transit plan to reinstitute bus service
in Plant City, and it is at the point now where public input is
being sought. There was a virtual open house that started in
August and runs through September 13th, 2020. There is also a
survey that is open through September 13th, 2020.

C. Vision Zero Leadership Summit, scheduled for September 22nd, 2020 at 9:00 a.m.

This meeting is currently virtual.

Christine Acosta commented she would like to go on the record
expressing disappointment that there is no interim solution to
improve the safety of the Laurel and Doyle Carlton intersection.
Trail usage along the Riverwalk is up between 150 to 200 percent
because of COVID. This is a very active corridor. There is a
junction on Riverwalk just south of there at the Straz that is
inoperable. There is a lot of activity there and closing the
slip lanes is a consideration. There is no vehicular traffic
there right now, and she is disappointed that consideration of a
four-way stop and closing the slip lanes is not something that
can be done sooner, instead of waiting for a roundabout that is
years away.

D. TBARTA CAC report

Rick Richmond reported TBARTA met on August 19th, 2020. They
had no action items on the agenda, but they did have just a few
updates from prior meetings. One was an update on the
forecasts riderships that the committee had asked per segment
for the Regional Rapid Transit, and they replied that Wesley
Chapel to Tampa would be the highest forecasted ridership,
followed by Westshore to Tampa, and Tampa to St. Pete. MCAT is
applying for a grant for their service expansion for their
Route 99, which serves U.S. 41 from Bradenton all the way to
Sarasota and stops at the airport. The TBARTA Board provided a
resolution in support of that, and the CAC members encouraged
supporting that resolution as well.
E. Special CAC Workshop on Managed Lanes, October 13th, at 5:30 p.m.

F. Next Regular Monthly CAC meeting, November 18th, at 9:00 a.m.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The virtual meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

NOTE: A video recording of this meeting is available online.
I. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Bill Roberts called the virtual meeting to order at 5:31pm. There was a roll call for attendance.

Members present: Bill Roberts, Rick Fernandez, Hoyt Prindle, Steven Hollenkamp, David Bailey, Luciano Prida, Rick Richmond, Nicole Rice, Barbara Kennedy Gibson, Terrance Trott, Christine Acosta, Jeff Lucas, Cliff Reiss, and Amy Espinosa

Members excused: Ed Mierzejewski, Sky White, Vivienne Handy, Artie Fryer and Camilo Soto

Others present: Rich Clarendon, Cheryl Wilkening and Beth Alden

II. GOALS FOR TODAY'S WORKSHOP

Rich Clarendon, MPO Staff, noted that the members of the CAC requested more information on Toll Facilities in the Tampa Bay Region. Mr. Clarendon then introduced Todd Litman from the Victoria Transport Policy Institute.

III. Economic, Social & Community Implications of Congestion Pricing

Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute Executive Director, presented Managing Lanes for Transportation Efficiency and Fairness. Mr. Litman noted that public roads are a 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’s costs are funded 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 motorists 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.

IV. **Q&A and Discussion**

Rick Fernandez inquired about the connection between toll revenue and transit improvements. Steven Hollenkamp commented about the gas tax that covers half, if any of the toll revenue goes towards public transit and where in the US has this been done. Christine Acosta inquired if Mr. Litman had a recommendation for one thing we should support. Nicole Rice commented on the demonstration that showed buses transport more people and toll lanes are great, but she noted in Tampa there is no infrastructure to cover first mile or last mile. Hoyt Prindle commented about freeway managed lanes projects and a cap on pricing. Mr. Prindle also inquired if tolls affect low income workers and if we are getting more efficient trips on other surface roads. Nicole Rice provided an updated statistic on poverty in Tampa. Bill Roberts commented we have a bus rapid transit system and wondered if Mr. Litman has any examples on a bus rapid transit system with a managed toll lane. Rich Clarendon commented that there is a transit orient development study going on around HART’s bus rapid transit project. Then he provided the presentations on managed lanes from around the country for tomorrows’ MPO Managed Lanes Workshop in the chat box.

V. **Public Comment**

There are no public comments.

The next CAC meeting is November 18 @1:30pm. Rich Clarendon discussed with the members their preference in attending the meeting in person or virtually.

VII. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:25 pm.

A video recording of this meeting is available online.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

**Presenter**
Vishaka Shiva Raman, MPO Staff

**Summary**
Hillsborough MPO received three amendment requests from FDOT for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) FY 2020/21 through 2024/25. The TIP Amendments included for this month are as follows:

**Amendment #15 - HART FTA Discretionary Bus and Bus Facilities Program** will add US DOT Revitalize American Bus Infrastructure Grant Funding towards HART’s discretionary bus and bus facilities program. HART was one of the 96 recipients to receive funding to purchase new electric buses and charging infrastructure. The project will allow HART to improve access, mobility, and service reliability for residents of Tampa and Hillsborough County. This amendment will add $5,485,350 as Capital funds to the project.

**Amendment #16 - I-275, I-75, I-4 Wrong Way Drive Vehicle Detective System at Various Locations in Hillsborough County** is a countermeasure implementation plan to install Wrong Way Drive Vehicle Detective System at the entrance and exit ramps at various locations across Hillsborough County. This amendment adds $1,194,789 towards the construction funds.

**Amendment #17 - Corridor Lighting at various locations** is a project to expedite the retrofit the existing FDOT owned light poles. The existing High Pressure Sodium (HPS) lamps will be replaced with Light-Emitting Diode (LED) lamps to improve safety and reduce significant nighttime crashes at the most critical top 12 corridors in Hillsborough County identified by FDOT. An amount of $1,835,884 will be added to this project with this amendment.

**Recommended Action**
Recommend approval of Amendments 15, 16 and 17.

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

**Attachments**
Comparative Report for TIP amendments 15, 16 and 17.
Factsheet for Amendments 15, 16 and 17.
Comparative Reports for Amendments 15, 16 and 17

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
FY2020/21 through 2024/25
### FDOT 5 Year TIP
Hillsborough County, District 7

**FLP: TRANSIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Amended Date: 12/01/2020</th>
<th>Amendment Number: 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Number:</td>
<td>448139 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>HART FTA DISCRETIONARY BUS AND BUS FACILITIES PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Description:</td>
<td>HART FTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Length:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Work:</td>
<td>TRANSIT IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRTP: Choices when not driving, p. 43</td>
<td>NON-SIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CAPITAL - Managed by HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2021</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>&gt;2025</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added LF</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,742,675</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,742,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added FTA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,742,675</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,742,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,485,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,485,350</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 448139 1 Totals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2021</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>&gt;2025</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added LF</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,485,350</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,485,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added FTA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,485,350</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,485,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FDOT
#### 5 Year TIP
Hillsborough County, District 7

### HIGHWAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Amendment Date:</th>
<th>Amendment Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amended</td>
<td>12/01/2020</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number: 445507 2</th>
<th>Description: I-275, I-75, I-4 WWVDS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY</th>
<th>LRTP: Vision Zero, p. 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Related Project:</td>
<td>Extra Description: COUNTERMEASURE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR WWVDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Work: SAFETY PROJECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2021</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>&gt;2025</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION - MANAGED BY FDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added ACID</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,194,789</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,194,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,194,789</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,194,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 445507 2 Totals:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,194,789</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,194,789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FDOT**  
**5 Year TIP**  
Hillsborough County, District 7  

**HIGHWAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Amended</th>
<th>Amendment Date: 12/01/2020</th>
<th>Amendment Number: 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Number:</td>
<td>439829 9</td>
<td>Description: CORRIDOR LIGHTING - HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY VARIOUS LOCATIONS</td>
<td>LRTP: Vision Zero, p. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Project:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extra Description: LIGHTING AND RETROFIT TO ADDRESS PED/BIKE NIGHTTIME CRASHES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Work:</td>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction - Managed by FDOT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>&lt;2021</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>&gt;2025</th>
<th>All Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added</td>
<td>ACSS</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,835,884</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,835,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,835,884</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,835,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 439829 9 Totals:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,835,884</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,835,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amendment 15
448139-1 HART FTA DISCRETIONARY BUS AND BUS FACILITIES PROGRAM

The amendment adds US DOT Revitalize American's Bus Infrastructure grant funding for HART’s discretionary bus and bus facilities. HART was 1 of 96 recipients who received funding to purchase new electric buses and charging infrastructure. This project will allow HART to improve access, mobility and service reliability for residents of Tampa and Hillsborough County.

Amendment 16
445507-2: I-275, I-75, I-4 WWVDS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

The project will install Wrong Way Drive Vehicle Detection System on the entrance / exit ramps at the following locations:
- I-4 @ Columbus Dr;
- I-4 @ US 41/50th St;
- I-75 @ Fowler;
- I-275 @ Bird St;
- I-275 @ Busch Blvd;
- I-275 @ Scott St;
- I-275 @ Ashley Dr

The map showing the locations is also attached.

Amendment 17
439829-9: CORRIDOR LIGHTING - HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Funding to expedite the retrofit of existing FDOT owned light poles. By replacing deficient High Pressure Sodium (HPS) lamps with Light-Emitting Diode (LED) lamps, the purpose is to improve safety by enhancing roadway illumination and visibility of vehicle, pedestrians and bicycles traveling at night on the State Highway System. FDOT has identified the most critical top 12 corridors in District 7 that have significant nighttime crashes resulting in pedestrian or bike fatalities and/or severe injuries. This project has identified 5 corridors in Hillsborough County eligible for lighting retrofit of existing FDOT owned poles.
- W Hillsborough Ave from Dale Mabry to I-275
- US 301 from Balm Rd to Bloomingdale Ave
- SR 674 / College Ave from US 41 to 30th St SE
- SR 60 / Brandon Blvd from Falkenburg Rd to S of Rolling Hills Blvd
- US 301 from S of Crescent Park Dr to S of E Broadway Ave
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></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning-Level Cost Estimates and Potential Funding Sources</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>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></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

## Top Destinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>
PLANT CITY TRANSIT STUDY
OUTREACH EFFORTS

Hillsborough MPO
Metropolitan Planning for Transportation

The City of PLANT CITY
Preserving the Past - Embracing the Future

www.goHART.org
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
PLANT CITY TRANSIT STUDY
ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS
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.
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>Annual Operating Cost</td>
<td>$600 - $650K</td>
<td>$1.12M-$1.22M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Cost</td>
<td>$72K-78K</td>
<td>$136K-146K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vehicles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</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>Travel Time (round trip)</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>Connection to other routes</td>
<td>Limited stop alternatives</td>
<td>Limited stop alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of people within ½ mile</td>
<td>10,056</td>
<td>18,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of jobs within ½ mile</td>
<td>4,942</td>
<td>7,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in poverty within ½ mile</td>
<td>18.74%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% minority within ½ mile</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% seniors within ½ mile</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% households w/no vehicles within ½ mile</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 Options
## 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday: $3K Sat/Sun: $2,228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weekdays: $2,700 Sat/Sun: $2K</td>
<td>Weekdays: $3K Sat/Sun: $2,250</td>
<td>Weekdays: $3K Sat/Sun: $2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays: $2,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays: $2,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat/Sun: $2,228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays: $2,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays: $2,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat/Sun: $2K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays: $3K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat/Sun: $2,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays: $2,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat/Sun: $2K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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
### Performance Measures

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

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
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 recommendations.

Prepared By
Gena Torres

Attachments
Draft Reports
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item:**
2021 Meeting Calendar

**Presenter:**
Rich Clarendon, MPO Assistant Director

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

The following dates are proposed for the Citizens Advisory Committee. Unless indicated otherwise, all meetings are scheduled to start at 9 AM in the Plan Hillsborough Room on the 18th floor of the County Center.

- January 6th
- February 3rd
- March 3rd
- April 7th
- May 5th
- June 2nd
- July – Recess (no meeting)
- August 4th
- September 1st
- October 6th
- November 3rd
- December 15th (noon, joint meeting & luncheon with TAC on 26th Floor)

**Recommended Action:**
Approve the CAC meeting dates for calendar 2021.

**Prepared By:**
Rich Clarendon, AICP

**Attachments:**
None
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**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 3 - Community Mapping
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
UNFINISHED & NEW BUSINESS
September 9, 2020

Mr. Adam Gormly  
Director, Hillsborough County Development Services  
601 E. Kennedy Boulevard  
Tampa, Florida 33602

Subject: Hillsborough County’s Tentative Five-Year Work Plan Review

Dear Mr. Gormly,

Thank you for your review of the School District’s Tentative Five-Year Work Plan. Per the Tindale Oliver Long Range School Plan’s probable projection, 31 new schools will be required in the South County area within the next 15 years. The reality is the District currently owns one site in this area, the Bishop Road site, which could accommodate an elementary and middle school or a high school and is referenced in the plan.

Without approved school sites, the District will no longer be able to process school concurrency mitigation agreements, which will result in approved developments not being able to construct in an already stressed economy. The consequences of school overcrowding include double session, modular units, stressed core facilities, safety issues, and frequent attendance boundary changes.

The District understands the Bishop Road school site is surrounded by substandard roads. Unfortunately, this not an anomaly, and is the case with all available properties in South County. This particular property is currently being surrounded by new residential development, which will also add users to these substandard roadways.

The District too is fully committed to bike and pedestrian access and safety for all students and the community. In the case of Sumner High School, which was referenced in the review, we were assured by County staff that the offsite sidewalks would be in place prior to the school’s opening. The County later informed us they experienced permitting issues that would delay the sidewalk installation until after the opening of school, which was unfortunate for all parties.

We are open to any properties that the County can identify that have the adequate transportation infrastructure to support new schools. However, to date, the County and District have been unable to locate any potential sites with the necessary roadway infrastructure. Moreover, the District is legally prohibited from funding noncontiguous transportation improvements per an administrative judgement. Therefore, we are placed in a frustrating predicament of major transportation infrastructure deficiencies at all potential new school site properties with no funding mechanism or legal ability to remedy the transportation deficiencies.

The County’s review encouraged locating with Planned Developments that have reserved school sites. The issue with these sites is (1) they too do not have adequate infrastructure for schools, and (2) they are not guaranteed school sites. The School District must negotiate with the developers in order to
acquire those sites through school dedication agreements and provide impact fee credits. However, the developer could refuse to accept the price or terms, and develop those sites with residential homes. Additionally, there are no Planned Development sites with adequate acreage to accommodate a high school, which is within the fifth year of the plan.

Our team will move forward with the dedication and conveyance process on any of the Planned Development sites, but requests the County to determine which site or sites are most desirable. The Bishop Road school siting process, from the District’s request took four months to obtain and finding of no consistency and was very costly to the District. Consultants were required to navigate the siting process and the transportation study alone cost $10,000. As a result, we unfortunately still do not have an approved school site.

The District is aware and has noted in the plan that Collins PK-8 addition is contingent upon the agreed to acquisition between the County and the School District. This addition and associated conveyance are of upmost importance to the District, as it is the only current option the District has to provide middle school capacity in the South County area to support approved residential developments. We extremely thankful for your coordination on this site.

As we all know, public education is the foundation of an any thriving community. The School District and Hillsborough County must unite to correct this school siting crisis. I would suggest the establishment of a School Siting Taskforce comprised of topic experts and decision makers from the School District, Hillsborough County, the Planning Commission, the Metropolitan Planning Organization, and stakeholders from the development community. I am confident that the talent and aptitude of this team will have the ability to tackle this most monumental issue. Time is of the essence.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Amber K. Dickerson, AICP
General Manager, Growth Management
Hillsborough County Public Schools

CC: Addison Davis, Chris Farkas, Bonnie Wise, Hillsborough County Public Schools Chairperson (Melissa Snively), and Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners Chairperson (Les Miller), Melissa Zornitta, Beth Alden, John Lyons, Mike Kemp, Julia Mandell, Jim Porter, Jeff Gibson, Christine Beck, Johanna Lundgren, Mike Williams, Lucia Garsys
# Capital Improvements Program Summary

## FY2020 to FY2021

### Revenue Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE SOURCE</th>
<th>FY2020 Budget Adopted</th>
<th>FY2021 Budget Adopted</th>
<th>FY21 vs. FY20 Variance</th>
<th>% of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Surface Transportation Block Grant</td>
<td>$9,646,263</td>
<td>$13,371,082</td>
<td>$3,724,819</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Discretionary Grants</td>
<td>$5,516,694</td>
<td>$12,591,559</td>
<td>$7,074,865</td>
<td>128.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART General Fund</td>
<td>$216,674</td>
<td>$9,393,884</td>
<td>$9,177,210</td>
<td>4235.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation</td>
<td>$9,965,028</td>
<td>$6,752,141</td>
<td>-$3,212,887</td>
<td>-32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Bus and Bus Facilities Formula (5339)</td>
<td>$5,759,259</td>
<td>$5,079,073</td>
<td>-$680,186</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA State of Good Repair Formula (5337)</td>
<td>$3,196,671</td>
<td>$3,544,785</td>
<td>$348,114</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Urbanized Area Formula (5307)</td>
<td>$3,137,146</td>
<td>$2,817,798</td>
<td>-$319,348</td>
<td>-10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Impact/Mobility Fees &amp; Other</td>
<td>$523,291</td>
<td>$1,963,193</td>
<td>$1,439,902</td>
<td>275.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,961,026</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,513,515</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,552,489</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures/Project Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES/PROJECT CATEGORY</th>
<th>FY2020 Budget Adopted</th>
<th>FY2021 Budget Adopted</th>
<th>FY21 vs. FY20 Variance</th>
<th>% of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Stock/Maintenance</td>
<td>$7,570,247</td>
<td>$23,128,370</td>
<td>$15,558,123</td>
<td>205.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Construction</td>
<td>$11,986,853</td>
<td>$14,041,035</td>
<td>$2,054,182</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$6,155,597</td>
<td>$5,949,983</td>
<td>-$205,614</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Studies</td>
<td>$4,989,090</td>
<td>$4,410,032</td>
<td>-$579,058</td>
<td>-11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stops/Shelters</td>
<td>$873,893</td>
<td>$2,891,855</td>
<td>$2,017,962</td>
<td>230.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/Security</td>
<td>$2,732,198</td>
<td>$2,148,333</td>
<td>-$583,865</td>
<td>-21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Equipment</td>
<td>$3,154,538</td>
<td>$1,568,834</td>
<td>-$1,585,704</td>
<td>-50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Revenue Vehicles</td>
<td>$498,610</td>
<td>$852,470</td>
<td>$353,860</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Contingencies</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$522,603</td>
<td>$522,603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,961,026</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,513,515</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,552,489</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Capital Improvements Program

### Projects by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY2021 Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities and Construction</strong></td>
<td>$76,175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th Street Improvements</td>
<td>$4,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Skid Expansion</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Maintenance Building Renovation/Reconstruction</td>
<td>$53,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance facility and fleet storage expansion (Hartford St.)</td>
<td>$4,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/design support for capital projects (A&amp;E)</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater System Repair/Replacement</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unleaded Fueling Station</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rolling Stock and Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>$23,014,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine and Transmission Replacements</td>
<td>$1,746,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of 40' Diesel Buses with CNG Buses</td>
<td>$21,168,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Paratransit/Flex Vans</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance Equipment</strong></td>
<td>$3,844,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Bay Post Lifts (2 sets)</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Communications Replacement</td>
<td>$3,716,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Impression Washing System</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Industrial Floor Scrubber</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus Stops and Shelters</strong></td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Bus Bay, Landing &amp; Shelter Pads</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design for Shelters &amp; Bus Bays</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters and Amenities</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning/Studies</strong></td>
<td>$1,292,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous Mobility Services Pilot</td>
<td>$1,292,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Revenue Vehicles</strong></td>
<td>$721,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Non-Revenue Vehicles (NRVs)</td>
<td>$721,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and Security</strong></td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Improvements for Bus Yard</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$107,498,187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDUM ITEMS
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 where 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 forgo 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.
Committee Reports

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 a 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.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
TBARTA/ NASA/ MPO Vertiport Pilot Project

Presenter
Brian Pessaro, TBARTA
Roger Mathie, MPO Staff

Summary
In July 2020, TBARTA completed the Innovative Transit Technology Study that looked at three modes of transit: hyperloop, aerial gondolas, and air taxis. A copy of the study can be found here: https://www.tbarta.com/en/planning-programs/innovative-transit-technology/. The study was intended to be a high-level evaluation of the current state of technology of each mode. One of the study recommendations was for TBARTA to collaborate with NASA on modeling work that they are doing related to air taxis.

Researchers from NASA have been developing an Urban Air Mobility Regional Modeling and Simulation Tool. This is a GIS-based simulation model that will help state and local governments to identify the best locations for air taxi vertiports. TBARTA and the Hillsborough MPO have been collaborating with a researcher from NASA on developing a customized model for Hillsborough County. Once completed, the model will be provided to the Hillsborough MPO for use in long range transportation planning.

Recommended Action
None; for information only.

Prepared By
Allison Yeh, AICP, LEED GA - MPO Staff

Attachments
None