Hybrid Virtual & In-Person Meeting of the Policy Committee

Wednesday, February 10, 2021, 8:30 AM

The County Center and Plan Hillsborough offices continue to be closed to the public in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. A minimum number of board members will meet in person at the County Center, and all other participation will continue to be virtual.

This meeting may be viewed on Hillsborough Television (HTV) by visiting Spectrum: 637, Frontier: 22 or live stream from Hillsborough County’s Live YouTube Channel or the County website’s Live Meetings link, also found in the County Newsroom.

The agenda packet, presentations, and any supplemental materials are posted on the MPO’s online meeting calendar.

Public comment opportunities:
To speak during the meeting - No later than 30 minutes before the meeting, please sign up here or phone 813-756-0371 for assistance. Provide the phone number you will call in from, so that we can recognize your call in the queue. You will receive an auto-reply confirming we received your request, along with instructions.

Comments may also be given up to 5pm the day before the meeting:
• by leaving a voice message at (813) 756-0371
• by e-mail to mpo@plancom.org
• by visiting the event posted on the MPO Facebook page.

Advance comments will be provided in full to the board members and verbally summarized during the meeting by MPO staff.

Agenda: Workshop on School Siting & Transportation

I. Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance

II. Approval of Minutes – May 26 and September 22, 2020 and January 13, 2021

III. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

IV. Action Items
   A. Election of Committee Officers (Cameron Clark, MPO Attorney)

V. Discussion Items
   A. School Siting Coordination in South Hillsborough County (Amber Dickerson, School District of Hillsborough County, Growth Management)
B. Hillsborough County School Route Safety Improvements (John Lyons and Josh Bellotti, Hillsborough County Public Works)

C. Transportation System Performance at Current Funding Levels (Beth Alden, MPO Director)

VI. Old & New Business

VII. Adjournment

VIII. Addendum

- Letter from Hillsborough County regarding Interlocal Agreement for School Facilities Planning, Siting, and Concurrency

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) 576-2313 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) 272-5940 or (813) 273-3774 and dial 1.

Se recomienda a las personas que necesiten servicios de interpretación o adaptaciones por una discapacidad para participar en esta reunión, o ayuda para leer o interpretar los temas de esta agenda, sin costo alguno, que se pongan en contacto con Joshua Barber, (813) 576-2313 o barberj@plancom.org, tres días hábiles antes de la reunión. Si sólo habla español, por favor llame a la línea de ayuda en español al (813) 272-5940 o (813) 273-3774 ext. 1.

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.
The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee (MPOPC), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Regular Meeting, scheduled for Tuesday, May 26, 2020, at 9:00 a.m., held telephonically.

The following members were present:

Pat Kemp, Chairman
Guido Maniscalco
   (arrived at 9:08 a.m.)
Kimberly Overman (alternate)
Mariella Smith
Cindy Stuart
   (arrived at 9:08 a.m.)
Joseph Waggoner

Commissioner, Hillsborough County
Councilman, City of Tampa City Council
Commissioner, Hillsborough County
Commissioner, Hillsborough County
Hillsborough County School Board
Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority

I. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, AND ROLL CALL

Chairman Kemp called the meeting to order at 8:59 a.m. and led in the pledge of allegiance to the flag. The Deputy Clerk called the roll and noted a quorum was present.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - MARCH 24, 2020, AND OCTOBER 22, 2019

Chairman Kemp called for a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Smith said approval, seconded by Commissioner Overman, and carried unanimously by members present.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

a. Comments on Regional Transit Development Plan “Envision 2030”

Messrs. William Ball, Tindale Oliver and Associates Incorporated representing Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority (TBARTA) and Richard Clarendon, MPO, presented the item. Commissioner Smith requested the presentation slides, questioned who wanted TBARTA to adopt the Regional Transit Development Plan, discussed the low/high impact scenarios on TBARTA managing HART/Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority lines, and expressed concern for the transportation budget. Commissioner Overman sought direction on Hold Harmless funding for local transit agencies. Chairman Kemp opposed the item, queried about money lost, and did not feel transit should be privatized. Commissioner Smith was not supportive of
the TBARTA plan and inquired about money given to TBARTA and spent on lobbyist. ▶ Mr. Waggoner desired to know if TBARTA had benchmarks based on urban areas that had a regional local/arrangement and how the concept worked. ▶ Ms. Beth Alden, MPO Executive Director, clarified staff recommendations for the item. Upon suggestion from Commissioner Smith, no action was taken.

b. Public Participation Measures of Effectiveness Report

▶ Ms. Wanda West, MPO, discussed the item. After favorable remarks, ▶ Commissioner Smith moved acceptance of the report, seconded by Commissioner Overman, and carried unanimously by members present.

c. Public Participation Plan Amendments

▶ Ms. West expounded on the item. ▶ Commissioner Kemp appreciated the organizational chart. Commissioner Smith inquired about the cooking demonstration. ▶ Commissioner Smith made the motion to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Overman, and carried unanimously by members present.

V. STATUS REPORTS

a. Hurricane Evacuation Analysis and Assumptions

▶ Mr. Marshall Flynn, Director, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, presented the item. ▶ Commissioner Overman requested the background material. ▶ Chairman Kemp wanted information about interstate lanes being switched from southbound to northbound during evacuations, addressed the lack of available gasoline during a hurricane, and inquired on a shelter-in-place and shouldering during a hurricane.

b. Mobility after COVID-19 - Will telecommuting be our “New Normal”?

▶ Dr. Peng Chen, University Of South Florida, School of Public Affairs, provided a presentation. ▶ Chairman Kemp and Commissioner Overman offered appreciative remarks. Mr. Waggoner spoke on population density in Florida versus the northeast United States, opined the immigration of businesses/workers might increase, and asserted transportation facilities wound need to be enhanced. ▶ Chairman Kemp remarked on the ridership drop in the transit system. Commissioner Overman requested the presentation be sent to the MPOPC. ▶ After opining on telecommuting resources/benefits, Chairman Kemp questioned the role of government in promoting telecommuting. ▶ Mr. Waggoner discussed the federal
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transit plans for employers/employees and payroll tax deductions by cosponsoring employee transit service/rides and wondered if the same would be done for employees working from home.

VI. OLD BUSINESS AND NEW BUSINESS - None.

VII. Addendum
   a. Vision Zero Quarterly Report
   b. Plant City Transit Master Plan Workshop Flyer

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
   ► There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:18 a.m.

READ AND APPROVED: ________________________________ CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
PAT FRANK, CLERK

By: ________________________________
   Deputy Clerk

ad
SEPTEMBER 22, 2020 – METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE SUMMIT

The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee, Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Vision Zero Leadership Summit, scheduled for Tuesday, September 22, 2020, at 9:00 a.m., held telephonically.

The following members were present:

Pat Kemp, Chairman
Joseph Citro
    Guido Maniscalco
Mariella Smith
Kimberly Overman
Joseph Waggoner
Gina Evans
Melanie Williams
Adam Harden
Michael Maurino
Robert Frey
Commissioner, Hillsborough County
Councilman, City of Tampa (Tampa) City Counsel
Commissioner, Hillsborough County
Commissioner, Hillsborough County
Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority
Hillsborough County Aviation Authority
Hillsborough Area Regional Transit (HART)
HART
Planning Commission (PC)
Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority

Chairman Kemp called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. and led in the pledge of allegiance to the flag. Ms. Cheryl Wilkening, MPO, called the roll for members present.

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Kemp provided the meeting process.

II. PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

Ms. Beth Alden, MPO, Executive Director, supplied the meeting purpose.

III. VISION ZERO OVERVIEW

Ms. Gena Torres, MPO, Executive Planner, delivered an overview.

IV. LAND USE AND DESIGN – SINCE SAFE COMMUNITIES DON’T HAPPEN BY ACCIDENT, HOW DOES THE MPO AVOID MAKING DECISIONS NOW THAT REQUIRED COSTLY FIXES LATER?

Chairman Kemp introduced the panelist. Mr. Ian Lockwood, P.E., Toole Design; Ms. Melissa Zornitta, PC, Executive Director; Ms. Lucia Garsys, Deputy County Administrator, Development and Infrastructure; and Mr. Michael Callahan, Tampa, supplied a presentation.
V. HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT – WORKING TOGETHER, HOW COULD THE MPO MAKE THE BEST USE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT RESOURCES TO DETER THE MOST DANGEROUS TRAFFIC BEHAVIORS?

Chairman Kemp welcomed panelist for the item. Chief Brett C. Railey, Institute of Police Technology and Management; Sergeant Paul Pramberger, Hillsborough County Sheriff Office; Captain Patrick Messmer, Tampa Police Department; and Mr. David Gwynn, Florida Department of Transportation, expounded on the item. Chief Railey summed up the item.

VI. PUBLIC MESSAGING – ACKNOWLEDGING THE HUMAN TENDENCY TO BE SKEPTICAL OF CHANGE, HOW DOES THE MPO ENGAGE RESIDENTS AND BUSINESS PEOPLE IN BECOMING CHAMPIONS FOR SAFE STREETS?

Chairman Kemp greeted the presenters. Mr. Billy L. Hattaway, P.E., Principal, Fehr and Peers; Ms. MaryLou Whaley, Hillsborough County Public Schools; Ms. Liana Lopez, Chief Communications Administrator; and Ms. Ashley Bauman, Tampa, presented the item. Mr. Hattaway questioned how to encourage community involvement for safer streets and create a cultural shift to support bike rides/walking, to which the panelists responded.

VII. WRAP-UP AND OBSERVATIONS

Dialogue began on the safety of crosswalk designs, future cost prevention fixes, and creating relationships with developers to leverage investments to improve safety. Mr. Callahan noted the Land Development Code would need updating, creating new fees, and provide developer forums between the cities and developers. Chairman Kemp inquired about providing an interconnected network with smaller streets and current challenges. Ms. Zornitta addressed grid connectivity/patterns, roadway/pedestrian connection, community/property buy-in, and environmental concerns. Ms. Alden indicated the 1950-1960 transportation framework was the reason for lack of street/network interconnectivity. Chairman Kemp believed better-built environment and creating a place where people want to be/live/work was a direction the MOP should move. Commissioner Overman responded to pedestrian generator traffic and urged the technical manuals needed updated to include the Vision Zero plan. Ms. Williams supplied favorable remarks.

Ms. Alden shared questions from the audience regarding crosswalks and
crosswalk spacing, the hardships caused by State legislation, and State lawmakers being more informed.

VIII. ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:43 a.m.

READ AND APPROVED: ____________________________ CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
PAT FRANK, CLERK

By: ____________________________
   Deputy Clerk

ad
CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & INVOCATION

The Chairman, Commissioner Pat Kemp called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m., led the pledge of allegiance. The regular monthly meeting was held in-person and virtual via Webex. There was a moment of silence for the Hillsborough County Corporal Brian LaVigne.

The following members were present in person:

Commissioner Pat Kemp and Commissioner Harry Cohen.

The following members were present virtually:

Commissioner Mariella Smith and Councilman Guido Maniscalco.

A quorum was not met in person.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 26, 2020 and September 22, 2020

Postponed to the next meeting. There was not an in-person quorum.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chris Vela commented on organization documents. There should be an extension of the public comment because transportation is a complex issue so 4 minutes would be sufficient. Since 1995 we made bad decisions where 300 people were displaced and a lot of pedestrian deaths. Reconsider who will profit more and appoint a citizen to be on the board.

ACTION ITEMS

A. Election of Officers

Postponed to the next meeting. There was not an in-person quorum.

Discussion Items

A. Board Requests & MPO Organizational Documents

Beth Alden, MPO Director, noted the board officer term limits, organizational name change and changes in quorum/voting members were discussed at the December Board Meeting. The first two items can be done relatively simply, with changes to the bylaws and the filing of a fictitious name. Ms. Alden reviewed the steps for considering changes to the voting membership of the board. A review of the board’s voting membership, a.k.a. Membership Reapportionment, is on tap within the next 1-2 years as a follow-up to the 2020 Census. Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, will give an overview of the process to update the membership apportionment plan. A change to the voting membership will need to seek approval from the Hillsborough County Commission.
County BOCC, the City of Tampa, and the Governor for the updated membership apportionment and the redesignation of the Hillsborough to serve this geographic area. Then the interlocal agreement for the creation of the MPO and obtain signatures from all organizations that are voting and non-voting members of the MPO. The MPO may begin the process at any time by reviewing its voting membership against current population estimates. However, the Apportionment Plan cannot be finalized until the Census Bureau releases 2020 counts and urbanized area maps.

Commissioner Kemp would like to move forward on both the board officer term limit and organizational name change. Commissioner Cohen believes we should move these two items to the board and agrees with these changes. Commissioner Smith also agrees with the change of term limits and name changes. Commissioner Smith stated it is worth considering a fictitious name and would like to look at the voting membership and which members are allowed an alternate. Cameron Clark clarified BOCC only has one alternate for all Commissioners on the board. Commissioner Cohen agreed to give them a fictitious name and questioned why it says organization. Ms. Alden commented organization is per federal law and other MPO’s use the word council. Commissioner Kemp commented that other agencies use TPO but she prefers Commission. Ms. Alden stated using Commission might be confused with Planning Commission. Commissioner Cohen then suggested Transportation Planning Agency. Councilman Maniscalco agreed with the suggestions.

B. MPO Reapportionment Process Overview

Sarah McKinley, MPO Staff, presented the MPO reapportionment process. It identifies the geographic area and voting membership of the MPO. The Federal Law states that the MPO must be designated for each urbanized area over 50,000 (as defined by the Census). State law requires apportionment be reviewed after each Census. The MPO designation/re-designation is based on agreement between Governor and local elected officials representing 75% of the population and the central city. The designation of an existing MPO remains in effect until the MPO is re-designated. State Law restricts MPO membership to between 5 and 25 members. More than one MPO may be designated to serve an urbanized area if appropriate for the size and complexity of the area. The apportionment plan approval is updated and approved by the board, the BOCC and Central City approve the redesignation, the governor approves the redesignation, the interlocal agreement is signed by all members of the organizations, including non-voting member. It is about an eighteen month process. The current MPO apportionment is 16 voting members. The Jurisdictional representatives based on population are Hillsborough County, Tampa, Plant City and Temple Terrace. The agency representatives are Aviation Authority, Expressway Authority, Planning Commission, FDOT (non-voting), HART, Port Authority, and School District. There were changes made to the apportionment in 2013. At that time, they designated FDOT as an advisor, not a member. Per recent state law all members, even non-voting, are subject to Government in the Sunshine. They established a voting membership for Planning Commission due to State law it calls for voting members of a statutorily authorized planning board for land use coordination. They also increased County Commission members by one but to population growth in the unincorporated County. The next steps would be to receive population estimates and urbanized area maps from 2020 Census but we are unclear when exactly this will be so for now we can discuss voting representation using current BEBR 2020 population estimates. MPO Staff will bring back option to consider at a future Board meeting.

Commissioner Kemp inquired on how to proceed with the process. Ms. Alden noted she will show a table with population estimates and representation to the board. It is a State Law that we represent 75 percent of the population. Commissioner Smith was surprised non-voting members are recognized by the Sunshine so maybe a technical committee member could attend the meetings and then advise the board. Cameron Clark stated simply the Sunshine Law is for voting meeting. Commissioner Kemp commented that the Sunshine Law is restraining to the Port, Airport, Expressway Authority, Hart and School Board the staff member should not be voting members but instead be on the technical advisory committee. Commissioner Kemp noted they need their expertise and could get that from a technical committee. Commissioner Cohen made note that those who serve on other boards need to think of what hat they are wearing at the time to...
make decisions. Commissioner Smith stated her perspective is that the MPO was created to represent the citizens and provide a voice for citizens for grant funding from State and Federal government. Cameron Clark commented on the voting members from the authorities can change the By-Laws to reflect they are a board member. The citizens voting member are restrained by federal and state law of who are allowed to be a voting member. Ms. Alden commented we will take a look at the structure of other large MPOs and Florida Statue has a lot of provision for different types of representatives. The section about apportionment talks about general purpose and local government representation of department of transportation will be a non-voting member and additional non-voting advisors may be appointed as necessary. Ms. Alden would like to bring back options and more research on provisions and statues to the board.

OLD & NEW BUSINESS

There was no old or new business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:38 a.m.
Election of Officers

Presenter
Cameron Clark, MPO Attorney

Summary

The MPO By-Laws require that officers are to be elected each year. There are no term limits for officers, therefore they can be re-elected and serve indefinitely. The By-Laws state:

Officers of Standing Committees: The committee shall hold an organizational meeting each year for the purpose of electing a committee chair and a committee vice-chair. Officers shall be elected by a majority vote of a quorum of the members.

The current Policy officers are:

- Chairman                  Commissioner Pat Kemp
- Vice Chair                Councilman Guido Maniscalco

Members can nominate themselves or any other member. No second is needed, and each nomination is voted on individually until one member receives a majority of votes for an officer’s position.

Recommended Action
Hold Election of Officers

Prepared By
Cheryl Wilkening, MPO Staff

Attachments
None
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
School Siting Coordination in South Hillsborough County

Presenter
Amber Dickerson, Hillsborough County School District Growth Management Manager

Summary
The Hillsborough School District budget for school construction and maintenance is approximately $1.8 billion over the next five years, which includes higher impact fees on new construction approved in early 2020 and a voter-approved 1/2 cent sales tax in 2018. The school district 5-year work plan included a new high school off Bishop Road in 2024, that is surrounded by new development, which was found inconsistent by Hillsborough County due to inadequate transportation.

To meet mandated school capacity needs the district needs to construct on average, two new schools a year to keep pace with growth in south Hillsborough. Over 30 are needed in the next 15 years in the fast-growing southern part of Hillsborough County.

One challenge is substandard transportation. It appears there are no current sites that have adequate transportation infrastructure to support a school in south county.

Per state law, the school district cannot spend school funding on offsite improvements that are not contiguous to the school property. Solutions seem to be to either allow schools to be located on substandard roadways or find other funding to create the transportation infrastructure needed by schools. Without a solution, the district faces the potential for overcrowded schools and/or double sessions, and inadequate school facilities for proposed development in South County.

During a September 2020 Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) meeting, after a presentation on the South County school siting crisis, the BOCC approved setting up a School Siting Task Force that would include a school board member and school district staff, county staff, a county commissioner, the directors of the Planning Commission and Metropolitan Planning Organization, and members of the development community.

Recommended Action
None; for information and discussion

Prepared By
Lisa K. Silva, AICP, PLA

Attachments
Presentation slides
Outline & Objectives

- Outline the School Siting Traffic Infrastructure Issues
- Evaluate the Critical Need for School Sites
- Assess the Consequences of No School Sites
- Discuss Next Steps & Solutions
### Proposed Construction Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-21 (Year 1): Opening August 2020</td>
<td>New Sumner High School (&quot;TTT&quot;) with Middle School, New Belmont Elementary School (&quot;D&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21 (Year 1): Opening January 2021</td>
<td>Tampa Heights Elementary (reconstruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22 (Year 2): Opening August 2021</td>
<td>Spoto High School Addition, Wimauma Elementary School Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23 (Year 3): Opening August 2022</td>
<td>New PK-8 (Waterset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-24 (Year 4): Opening August 2023</td>
<td>Collins PK-8 Addition*, New PK-8 Manhattan Site (South Tampa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024-25 (Year 5): Opening August 2025**</td>
<td>New High School “UUU” Partially Funded (South County)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent upon property acquisition to north of school site  
** High School is partially funded, therefore will open 2025

---

### Project Revenues (Years 1-5)

#### PROJECTED CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE REVENUE

- Total Funds: $1,827,953,674
  - Local Millage (1.5)
  - Impact Fees (Increase Approved)
  - Community Investment Tax
  - PECO Maintenance Revenue
  - CO&DS Bond Revenue
  - Sales Tax Revenue: Projected $550,440,474 in 5 years

#### PROJECTED MAINTENANCE & CONSTRUCTION NEEDS

- Major Maintenance: $683,671,684
- New Construction: $190,202,680
- Other (Buses, Debt, Property Purchases, Conversion, General Fund etc.): $954,079,310

Note: New construction includes $48,616,107 to partially fund a new High School to open beyond year 5
## Potential School Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rhodine Road</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Reserved in PD zoning*</td>
<td>Limited Access, Substandard Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Waterset</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Reserved in PD zoning*</td>
<td>No Access, Lack of Roadway to Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bishop Road</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>School District Owned</td>
<td>Finding of No Consistency due to Substandard Roads, Appeal Filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cypress Ridge</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Reserved in PD zoning*</td>
<td>Access to Substandard Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Berry Bay Farms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reserved in PD zoning*</td>
<td>No Access, Lack of Roadway to Site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* HCPS does not own, must negotiate conveyance with developer. Not guaranteed.

---

### Pre-submittal
- Berry Bay PD
- Wes Investments
- Collins PK-8

### New Transportation Methodology required by County staff

---

**Note:** The transportation methodology has changed since Bishop Road (both methodologies exceed developer requirements)
How Did We Get Here?

Lack of school impact fee funding
School District was unable to purchase land or build schools required to support residential growth

Lack of transportation infrastructure funding
A lack of infrastructure funding to support residential growth = No viable school sites with adequate infrastructure

Legal restrictions on District
School District legally prohibited from funding transportation infrastructure not contiguous to a school per an administrative decision

Consequences of No Transportation Infrastructure to Support School Sites

• Impact Fees increased, but no school sites to spend the funds

• No school sites for propshare mitigation means approved developments cannot move forward

• Overcrowding at all school levels:
  ○ Double Sessions
  ○ Modular Units
  ○ Stressed Infrastructure
  ○ Safety Issues
  ○ Boundary Change Issues
We MUST Build New Schools

- South County area will require 31 new schools per the Long-Range Plan probable scenario in the next 15 years
  - 19 Elementary, 5 Middle, and 7 High Schools, average 2 new schools per year
  - Will still require portable units
- The District owns one site on Bishop Road that could fit two schools
- The County issued a finding of no consistency due to no funding to upgrade substandard roadways
- No easy or quick solution to substandard roadways due to lack of funding

We MUST work together to solve this issue, or a school capacity crisis is imminent

New Students are Moving in NOW

- Students being generated by already approved development
- Not building schools will have major negative consequences for the School District, the County, and families
- 1,266 ES, 524 MS, and 1,134 HS total of 2,924 projected student per year to be housed per Long Range Plan in South County
Next Steps

**Short Term Solution:** School District Exemption or Waiver from Non-contiguous Transportation Improvements
- School District is legally prohibited for paying non-contiguous improvements, but must have County’s approval
- The County does not have the funds to make transportation improvements
- Schools are overcapacity in areas that are continuing to grow with approved homes

**Long Term Solution:** Form a Public School Siting Taskforce to address streamlining the siting process and address transportation needs

Thank you!

Amber K. Dickerson, AICP
General Manager, Growth Management
Amber.Dickerson@hcps.net

https://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/departments/22/growth-management-planning/about/
## Hillsborough County Public Schools

### 2020-2021 Five Year Work Plan: Proposed New Schools and Additions

**Table 1 (2019-21)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Student Demand</th>
<th>New Student Demand</th>
<th>Total Student Demand</th>
<th>Est. Student Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Cost</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 (2020-22)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Student Demand</th>
<th>New Student Demand</th>
<th>Total Student Demand</th>
<th>Est. Student Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Cost</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3 (2021-23)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Student Demand</th>
<th>New Student Demand</th>
<th>Total Student Demand</th>
<th>Est. Student Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Cost</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4 (2022-24)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Student Demand</th>
<th>New Student Demand</th>
<th>Total Student Demand</th>
<th>Est. Student Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Cost</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5 (2023-25)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Student Demand</th>
<th>New Student Demand</th>
<th>Total Student Demand</th>
<th>Est. Student Capacity</th>
<th>Proposed Cost</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,539,100</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hillsborough County Public Schools

**Note:** The proposed schools may be subject to change based on community input and funding. The estimated costs are approximate and subject to change. The opening dates are tentative and subject to approval.
Agenda Item
Hillsborough County's School Routes Safety Improvements

Presenter
Joshua Bellotti, Hillsborough County Staff

Summary
The Hillsborough County's Engineering & Operations staff, working with school administrators and local law enforcement officials, have developed a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Initiative. The program is based on evidence that physical upgrades help provide for students' safety, reduce motor vehicle traffic and encourage exercise.

Two changes helped spur the initiative. In 2017, Hillsborough County Public Schools ended courtesy (non-funded) busing for middle and high school students who live within 2 miles of their schools and do not meet state hazardous walking conditions criteria. In 2018, the school district changed starting (bell) times for elementary, middle, and high school students. The changes meant more students had to find their own way to and from campus, and elementary school students began some school days in the dark.

All county schools were prioritized by their access needs, staff are developing plans to improve walk/bike safety to and from each school. Improvements can be physical features such as sidewalks, lighting, crosswalks, turn lanes or signage, which will be implemented in phases.

Three schools in northwest Hillsborough County will be the first to see changes under the SRTS program, Pierce Middle and Alexander Elementary schools are adjacent campuses just north of Hillsborough Avenue. Leto High is less than 1 mile north on Sligh Avenue. After these initial improvements are made, staff will make similar safety enhancements at other schools in Hillsborough County

Recommended Action
For Information Only

Prepared By
Lisa K. Silva, AICP, PLA

Attachments
Presentation Slides
School Routes Safety

Goal is to support safe routes to schools for all school transportation users: pedestrians – walkers, bike riders, school buses, and student and parent drivers.
Surtax

Identified Safe Routes to School as major program in the County’s 2020 and 2021 Surtax plans

$16M in 2020 plan
$7M in 2021 plan

Included top 15 school group (areas)
MPO School Safety Study

Considerations include safety walkability, demographics, transportation disadvantaged, number of walkers.

Meanwhile, have begun pilot process for project development
First school group – Leto HS, Pierce MS, Alexander ES

Community Engagement

SRTS Program Development Team
• Hillsborough County Public Works
• Transportation Consultants

SRTS Advisory Committee
• School Staff
• HC Public Schools
• HC Sheriff’s Office
• HC Sheriff’s Office-Crossing Guards
• School’s PTA Representatives
• Sidewalk Stompers
• Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR)

Advisory Committee

Public Meeting
Investigation / Analysis

- Identified area/routes for the three schools
- Determined primary walking routes used by students

Field Observed Walking/Rolling Routes

Desktop Analysis - GIS Based Shortest Path Analysis
Proposed Improvements

1. Pedestrian Facilities
   a) Crosswalk
   b) Sidewalk
   c) Streetlights
2. Speed Management
3. Maintenance
4. Traffic Signal Timing Modifications
5. Additional Signs
6. School Fencing

Infrastructure Proposed Improvements Phases

Phase 1 Short term
(low-cost/easy)
1. Crosswalks
2. Signs
3. Pavement Markings
4. Signal timing updates, blank out signs
5. Maintenance – clearing vegetation and repairs (sidewalk, lighting, signs)

Phase 2 Mid-term
(moderate)
1. Sidewalks
2. Streetlights
3. Speed Management

Phase 3 Long term
(complex)
1. Sidewalks
2. Streetlights
3. Speed Management
4. Traffic Circulation
Questions?
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Transportation System Performance at Current Funding Levels

**Presenter**
Beth Alden, MPO Director

**Summary**
Maintaining and upgrading roads to current standards is a challenge not only in South Hillsborough County but countywide. Current transportation funding is inadequate to ensure a state of good repair and meaningfully reduce crash rates, much less to upgrade technology, expand access to transit and walk/bike transportation, or widen highways. The one-cent sales tax for transportation that was approved by county voters in 2018 would have made a significant difference in performance outcomes in all categories. In light of the delay in implementation of the sales tax, staff will provide a brief overview of the scope of the funding shortfall in transportation and some revenue options, as documented in the 2019 long range transportation plan.

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

**Prepared By**
Beth Alden

**Attachments**
Presentation slides
Transportation System Performance at Current Funding Levels

“It’s TIME Hillsborough”
Long Range Transportation Plan Forecasts for 2045
Good Repair & Resilience

Trend Investment Scenario

- Roads: only **60% resurfaced on time**
- Bridges: continued routine maintenance, plus **1 major and 1 minor rehab/replacement project** each year (FDOT bridges)
- Bus fleet: 10% older than 12 years, average of 8 breakdowns per weekday

Trend + Sales Tax Scenario

- Roads: **100% resurfaced on time**
- Bridges: continued routine maintenance, plus **3 major and 11 minor rehab/replacement projects** each year
- Bus fleet: 100% replaced on time, half as many breakdowns per bus
Funding for Stormwater Improvements

- Currently in local government CIPs & FDOT work program: $46m/yr

- Protecting critical roads from inland flooding with additional stormwater drainage improvements would require + $22m/yr

- Protecting critical roads from storm surge with wave attenuation along coasts, hardening pavement, & raising road profiles would require + $72m/yr

20% of network vulnerable to CAT3 storm with 2045 SLR

11% vulnerable to dramatic flood events
Trend Scenario - $18m/yr

- 130 miles of the highest-crash roads treated as Complete Streets
- **>15% reduction** in total crashes, bike/ped crashes, fatal & injury crashes

Trend + Sales Tax Scenario - $62m/yr

- 350 miles of the highest-crash roads treated as Complete Streets
- 500 miles of street lights
- 1400 miles of sidewalk gaps
- **>35% reduction** in total crashes and fatal/injury crashes, >30% reduction in bike/ped crashes
Smart Cities

If no improvements are made by the year 2045, vehicle hours of delay could increase more than 2.8x

Trend Scenario - $60m/yr

- 130+ miles of major roads improved
- 40% reduction in delay on major roads from 2045 conditions with no improvements
- 10% improvement in mean travel time

Trend + Sales Tax Scenario - $102m/yr

- 220+ miles of major roads improved
- 80% reduction in delay on major roads from 2045 conditions with no improvements
- 30% improvement in mean travel time
Trend Scenario:
- 50 new miles of trails
- 22 bus routes improved
- ~300 miles of roads with frequent or somewhat frequent bus service

Trend + Sales Tax Scenario:
- 150 new miles of trails
- 38 bus routes improved
- 7 new BRT routes
- 5 new local routes
- 3 new express routes
- New svc. in So. County, Plant City
- 3 new transit centers
- Potential for more
- ~800 miles of roads with frequent or somewhat frequent service
Existing Funding: Federal & State Sources

- FDOT Strategic Intermodal System
- FDOT Other Arterials
- FDOT Operations & Maintenance
- Metropolitan & Regional Programs
  - TMA, TALU, TALT, TRIP
- FDOT Transit
- FTA Formula Funds
  - Sections 5307, 5337, 5339
- Statewide Fuel Taxes collected for Local Governments

Existing Funding: Local Sources

- Local Option Fuel Taxes (LOFT)
  - Ninth Cent
  - First LOFT
- Local Option Sales Tax
  - Charter County and Regional Transportation System Surtax
  - Local Government Infrastructure Surtax (Community Investment Tax)
- Mobility Fees
- Transit Funding
  - Fares, advertising, HART ad valorem
- County Revenues for Transportation
## Unlevied Funding: Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Growth Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second LOFT</td>
<td>County could tax an additional 1 to 5 cents per gallon of gasoline</td>
<td>• Ranged between 0 and 1 percent from FDOT Revenue Estimating Conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ad Valorem Taxes                            | 1 mill                                                                   | • State Revenue Estimating Conference (2017) included estimates of taxable property values through 2023.  
  • After 2023, 5.55% annual growth                                             |
| Transp Network Company (TNC) Fee            | $1 fee per trip; 1.5% of county trips are by TNCs                         | • 1.48% annually, plus inflation                                                                                                           |
| Off-Street Parking Fee                      | $ fee per day per space assuming 100% occupancy,                          | • Assumed parking spaces grow with employment, plus inflation                                                                           |
| Vehicle Miles Traveled Fee                  | $0.01 per mile within the County                                          | • Same as VMT growth and inflation                                                                                                         |
| Driver License Fee                          | $1 fee per Class E original, renewal, and replacement license             | • Proportional to population                                                                                                               |
| Other: Tolls                                | Tolls on 1-4 Connector, Veteran’s Expwy, Selmon Expwy, and future tolls  | • Selmon Expressway 4.4% per year  
  south of downtown, I-4, and I-75 in the county                                   |
|                                            |                                                                          | • I-4 = 4.5% per year  
  • Veteran’s Expressway = 4.7% per year                                            |
|                                            |                                                                          | • I-275/I-4/I-75 based on FDOT T&R Study                                                                                                   |
| Vehicle Registration Fee                    | $1 fee per vehicle registration                                          | • Autos and light trucks growth based on population growth  
  • Heavy trucks growth based on employment growth                                 |
## Unlevied Funding: Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Transportation Network Company (TNC) Fee** | • Adding a fee to TNC trips in the County.  
• Tampa Int’l Airport implements a TNC fee on trips originating at the airport; fees are currently $4 per trip and all revenues are retained by the airport.  
• Assumes 1.5% of trips in the County are by TNCs. |
| **Off-Street Parking Fee**          | • Effectively a property tax.  
• Could be implemented on a per-space per-transaction basis or as a sales tax.  
• Done in many other metropolitan areas. |
| **Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Fee** | • Fee levied on the number of miles driven annually in the County.  
• Becoming increasingly necessary as fuel taxes are less reliable for future funding.  
• Pilot program ongoing in Oregon, and other states are considering the fee.  
• Could require the state to establish an annual vehicle registration or inspection to obtain odometer readings; alternately could be based on GPS. Many privacy concerns. |
| **Driver License Fee**              | • Adding a fee to Class E licenses: originals, renewals, and replacements. |
| **Vehicle Registration Fee**        | • Adding a fee to auto and heavy truck registrations. |
Unlevied Local Funding, FY 2026-2045

- Tolls: $7,602
- 2nd LOFT (5-cents): $623
- Ad Valorem (1 mill): $4,897
- HART Ad Valorem (3 mills): $8,695
- Transportation Network Company (TNC) Fee: $1,120
- Off-Street Parking Fee: $534
- Vehicle Miles Traveled Fee: $5,064
- Vehicle Registration Fee: $53
- Driver License Fee: $12
Summary of Total Revenues, FY 2020-2045
(assumes CIT and Ninth Cent are renewed)

Unlevied Funds

- Unlevied Tolls
- Unlevied Other User Fees
- Unlevied HART Ad Valorem
- Unlevied Ad Valorem
- Unlevied 2nd LOFT
- Transit
- Local and County
- Community Investment Tax (CIT)
- Charter County Transit Surtax
- Fuel Taxes
- Metro/Regional
- State O&M
- Federal + State

Existing Funds

- $0
- $2,000
- $4,000
- $6,000
- $8,000
- $10,000
- $12,000
Questions & Discussion
January 15, 2021

Mr. Addison Davis, Superintendent
Hillsborough County Public Schools
901 E. Kennedy Blvd.
Tampa, Florida 33602

Subject: Response to Evaluation of Consistency Request per the Interlocal Agreement for School Facilities Planning, Siting and Concurrency for Wimauma Elementary School Addition

Dear Superintendent Davis,

We agree that the safety and education of our children is a priority for our community. We have been committed to assisting the School Board on the selection and processing of school sites. We are cognizant of your urgency to move forward with these projects and have been facilitating resolution with them.

As we are all challenged with limited funding for projects, locations that leverage existing infrastructure should be a top priority. This will reduce costs to provide safe travel zones for all modes of transportation in the neighborhoods and at the schools.

On Tuesday January 5, County and School District staff had presubmittal meetings for proposed projects at Collins Elementary, Berry Bay and the Wes property on West Lake Drive in Wimauma.

In response to specific schools identified, we offer the following:

1. Collins PK-8 School – School District and County staff have been meeting since late summer 2020 to jointly develop a preliminary site plan taking advantage of County property adjacent to Collins. This joint effort will result in providing additional school capacity, shared athletic facilities, after school care, senior programs, and a community center. Conversations are ongoing for cost sharing, mutual use of facilities, and discussing the terms of an agreement.

2. Wimauma Elementary School Addition – The siting request for the proposed addition to Wimauma Elementary School was approved on December 21, 2020. Accordingly, the School District is able to proceed with permitting and work on the school addition.
3. Future School Development Sites:

Wes Property (folio 079458-0200): 100 Acres
This site was discussed at the January 5th presubmittal meeting between County and District staff. At this meeting County staff provided guidance on the methodology for the traffic study being prepared for this site including consideration of safe routes to school. Additionally, County staff provided feedback on the proposed modification to the existing planned development zoning for this site.

Cypress Ridge (folio 079672-0300): 25 Acres
This site has not yet been the subject of a presubmittal meeting. However, we have received a request this week from the property owner’s representative, working with District staff, seeking to initiate the review process and a presubmittal meeting is being scheduled.

Berry Bay Farms (folio 079715-4000): 15 Acres
This site was discussed at the January 5th presubmittal meeting between County and District staff. At this meeting County staff provided guidance on the methodology for the traffic study being prepared for this site including consideration of safe routes to school.

Rhodine Rd (folio 077423-0000): 30 Acres
Your letter indicated that the developer was not interested in extending the timeframe for conveyance provided in the planned development zoning, and as a result this property may no longer be an option for a school site. While this position is acknowledged, we are aware that the District has sent correspondence to the property owner requesting a meeting to begin a dedication agreement negotiation process to secure the site for a future school site.

4. Dorothy Thomas. We concur that Dorothy Thomas needs to move forward in a timely manner. To simplify the agreement, we will leave the utilities in place which will relieve the School Board from the $1.5M relocation cost. However, Hillsborough County and the School Board can negotiate on the land exchange and the gym.

Sincerely,

Bonnie M. Wise
County Administrator

c: Amber K. Dickerson, Hillsborough County Public Schools
Christopher Farkas, Hillsborough County Public Schools
Lucia E. Garsys, Deputy County Administrator
Christine Beck, County Attorney
Melissa Zornitta, Executive Director, Planning Commission
Beth Alden, Executive Director, Metropolitan Planning Organization