Virtual Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee
Wednesday, July 14, 2021, at 9:00 AM

The County Center and Plan Hillsborough offices continue to be closed to the public in response to the pandemic. All participation will be virtual for this meeting. For technical support during the meeting, please contact Michael Rempfer at 813-273-3774.

To view presentations and participate your computer, tablet or smartphone:
https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/8178512049957809424

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


Agenda packet, presentations, and supplemental materials posted here.

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

I. Call to Order & Introductions
II. Chairman’s Request: Per the TPO 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
Public comments are welcome and may be given at this virtual meeting by logging into the website above and clicking the “raise hand” button. Staff will unmute you when the chair recognizes you.
IV. Members’ Interests
V. Status Reports
   A. USF – Green ARTery Trail Study (deferred from May CAC Agenda) (Wade Reynolds, TPO Staff) 9:30
   B. I-275 Boulevard Study (deferred from May CAC Agenda) (Rich Clarendon, TPO Staff) 10:00
   C. Non-Discrimination Plan Public Involvement Findings (Dayna Lazarus, TPO Staff) 10:30
   D. Transportation Demand Management (Rich Clarendon, TPO Staff) 11:00
VI. Unfinished Business & New Business
   A. TBARTA CAC Report (Rick Richmond, CAC member)
   B. I-4 Right-of-Way Acquisition Independent Research (Amy Espinosa, CAC member)

Plan Hillsborough
planhillsborough.org
planner@plancom.org
813 - 272 - 5840
601 E Kennedy Blvd
18th Floor
Tampa, FL, 33602
C. Transportation Improvement Program Public Hearing Recap (Johnny Wong, TPO staff)

D. Palm Avenue and N. Florida Avenue Crash History (Rich Clarendon, TPO Staff)

E. Next Meeting: August 4, 2021

VII. Adjournment

VIII. Addendum

A. Hillsborough MPO Mobility Profile

B. Freeways Without Futures 2021 | CNU | Boulevard Tampa

C. Blvd Tampa article re Freeways Without Futures

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

The TPO 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 TPO Board members, TPO staff, or related committees or subcommittees the TPO supports. The TPO has no affiliation whatsoever with the originator of attached articles nor is the TPO 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 TPO 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.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item:**
USF-Green ARTery Trail Study

**Presenter:**
Wade Reynolds, TPO staff

**Summary:**
The USF-Green ARTery trail study will evaluate conceptual and new connections from the University area to the existing and proposed trail system in Tampa and Hillsborough County. With the redevelopment of the University Mall, expansion of the Veterans Administration, and continuing growth around the University of South Florida, safe nonmotorized spaces are an increasing priority. The study area contains several high-volume roadways, and safe crossings and connections will be a primary focus. The study kicked off in March and will explore the feasibility of a trail connecting the University of South Florida (USF) and Veterans Hospital with the planned Green ARTery Perimeter Trail and other neighborhoods to the south of Fowler including proposed safe crossing locations on Fowler and other roadways. This study will focus on the potential alignments for the trail, in coordination with area property owners and agency partners.

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

**Prepared By:**
Wade Reynolds, AICP

**Attachments:**
- Project Webpage
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item:**
I-275 Boulevard Study

**Presenter:**
Rich Clarendon, TPO Asst. Dir.

**Summary:**
At the March 3, 2021 meeting, under Members’ Interests, the Citizens Advisory Committee asked for a status report on this study.

**Recommended Action:**
None; for information only.

**Prepared By:**
Rich Clarendon, AICP

**Attachments:**
Presentation Slides: I-275 Blvd Study
I-275 Boulevard Study

Citizens Advisory Committee
May 5, 2021
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2017</td>
<td>Josh Frank presents concept to MPO based on M. Arch. Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>At CAC’s request, MPO amends UPWP to include study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2019</td>
<td>Consultant develops preliminary study scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td>FDOT requests more in-depth study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>MPO considers study again for FY 21-22 UPWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other studies &amp; plans given higher priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concept

• Conversion of I-275 N to At-Grade Boulevard
• Downtown to Bearss Ave
• Multimodal
• Reconnect surface streets
• Station Area Redevelopment
Preliminary Study

• Background & Research
• Field Reviews
• Stakeholder Meetings
• Problem Identification
• Initial Findings
• Develop 3 Alternative Design Concepts
• $150K budget
In-Depth Study

• Travel demand modeling/projections/diversions
• Alternatives development & screening level traffic analysis
• Detailed traffic analysis including intersecting roadways for 3 horizon years
• Transportation Demand Mgmt. strategies, transit impacts, etc.
• Public outreach, meetings, and presentations
• Project management and coordination
• Report
• $1.1M budget
Other Planning Studies Requested this Year

City of Tampa
- Guidance Ped & Bike-Friendly Bridge Designs
- School Safety Study for 5 Schools
- Speed Management Before & After Studies
- Vision Zero Corridor Studies for county roads in city limits
- Best Practices Report: Traffic Calming Solutions
- Advanced Parking Management System Feasibility Study
- Project Prioritization Tool
- Innovation speaker series

Technical Advisory Committee
- Air Quality Monitoring Project

Plant City
- Canal Connector Trail Feasibility Plan

City of Temple Terrace
- Mobility Fee Study

Hillsborough County
- Truck Route Plan Update
What is Tampa M.O.V.E.S.

Tampa M.O.V.E.S is a concept that emerged from Mayor Jane Castor’s Transforming Tampa’s Tomorrow strategic initiative. M.O.V.E.S is an acronym that represents the City of Tampa’s core values and guiding principles in planning for the future:

- **Mobility for All**: Everyone should have access to quality transportation choices.
- **Opportunity**: Connect people to jobs and economic opportunities.
- **Vision**: Be visionary and dream big! Create a healthy, sustainable, and resilient future.
- **Equity**: Remove barriers and improve transportation for people who need it most.
- **Public Safety**: Safety is our first priority. One death or injury on our streets is one too many.

These values are the driving force behind this initiative to create a new Citywide Mobility Plan and Citywide Vision Plan. The Citywide Mobility Plan will serve as our roadmap to improve and expand mobility and transportation around the City. The Citywide Vision Plan will serve as the guiding framework for how and where the City will grow, change and redevelop into the future.

Your voice is critical to the success of this process. Check the ‘Listen & Share’ tab above to learn about ways to get involved and help us Transform Tampa’s Tomorrow!

[Register for Updates]
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item:
Nondiscrimination Plan Public Involvement Findings

Presenter:
Dayna Lazarus, Plan Hillsborough staff

Summary:
Between December 2020 and March 2021, staff conducted public engagement to collect input from Hillsborough County residents about the challenges they face accessing community elements including transportation options, quality housing, public engagement meetings and other important places in the County. The goal of this engagement was to learn about the needs and access issues of underserved communities. Outreach included a countywide survey, a Storytelling Forum, seven weeks of field outreach, and five focus groups. Since the conclusion of these outreach activities, we have been performing data analysis on 456 survey responses and 150 pages of narrative data, and we have identified some trends and themes in the challenges and ideas that were shared.

Those themes, combined with staff feedback and best practices research, are being used to create a list of preliminary recommendations designed to help the agency grapple with the area's history of discriminatory planning and move towards a County where there are no longer underserved or underrepresented neighborhoods or demographics.

At this meeting, staff will present the findings from engagement and ask for the committee’s feedback and recommendation ideas for addressing the challenges identified.

Recommended Action:
None, for information only

Prepared By:
Dayna Lazarus, Community Planner II

Attachments:
None; see “Preliminary Public Engagement Findings – Challenges and Solutions (05/20/2021)” at www.planhillsborough.org/title-vi-and-nondiscrimination-plan/
CAC member Christine Acosta requested this item.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is any action or set of actions intended to influence the intensity, timing and spatial distribution of vehicle demand for the purpose of reducing the impact of traffic, managing parking needs, reducing greenhouse gases, enhancing mobility options.

TDM is a program of information, encouragement and incentives provided by local or regional organizations to help people know about and use all their transportation options to optimize all modes in the system – and to counterbalance the incentives to drive that are prevalent in subsidies of parking and roads. These are both traditional and innovative technology-based services to help people use transit, ridesharing, walking, biking, and telework.

**Recommended Action**
None; for information only

**Prepared By**
Rich Clarendon, AICP

**Attachments**
Presentation slides
What is TDM?

“Transportation Demand Management helps people use the transportation system more efficiently.”

- Changes how people travel
- Changes when people travel
- Provides substitutes for the need to travel
- Influences where people live and route

Increasing the use of existing capacity
Bruce B. Downs Blvd.

Tuesday 7:52 a.m.  
Tuesday 10:05 a.m.

Enabling Transportation Choices

Whether using an existing option or introducing a new technology, we recognize that we are seeking to influence behavior.

And our behavior is determined by multifaceted and interactive effects of personal and environmental factors.
TDM can support the proposed Hybrid Scenario
Source: Plan Hillsborough, 2045 Growth: Forecasts & Scenario Planning


Understanding Needs of Different Markets

Drive Alone Travel Times

Transit Rider Travel Times
Regional Priorities and Possible TDM Tactics

- **Reduce congestion**
  - Increase use of existing passenger capacity
  - Commute outside the peak periods

- **Use new technologies to improve transportation efficiency**
  - Integrated transit fare payment
  - AVL, trip planning apps
  - Vehicle occupant detection
  - Dynamic ridematching

- **TOD, bus, BRT, fixed guideway**
  - Neighborhood Transit “Ecopasses”
  - Parking management
  - Transit benefit ordinance

Encouraging TDM in LGCPs in Support of Regional Priorities

- **Reinvest in neighborhoods**
  - Neighborhood Transit “Ecopasses”
  - Neighborhood2Go travel planning
  - Support services like Emergency Ride Home

- **Strengthen downtowns**
  - Parking management
  - Transit benefit ordinance
  - Employer support and recognition

- **Minimize outward growth**
  - Greater mobility fees outside urban service areas
  - Affordable housing in urban neighborhoods near good quality transit service
Parking Management

- Encourage employers to cash out parking
- Initiate parking maximums
- Unbundle parking from leases
- Share parking
- Provide carsharing option

Transit Benefit
Ordinances

Qualified
Transportation
Fringe Benefits
Our Forgotten Vehicle Capacity

Regional Average Vehicle Occupancy = 1.18

- Every 100 cars transports 118 people
- 100 Drivers + 18 Passengers
- If each car has 4 seats
- That’s 400 seats or 282 Empty seats

Vanpooling in Tampa Bay

Top Vanpool Programs in US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>UZA Name</th>
<th>Vanpools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>King County Department of Transportation - Metro Transit Division</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>1606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Miami-Dade Transit</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Tampa-St. Petersburg, FL</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vanpool Performance in Tampa Bay (May 2019)
- 198,000 vehicle revenue miles
- 27,000 Unlinked trips per month
TDM Does Work

Mode Share – Before and After Contacting TBARTA

In Conclusion

TDM complements capital investments

- Improves person throughput
- Provides more mobility choices

TDM adds value

- Flexible
- Responsive
- Quick to implement
- Lower cost
- Engages more stakeholders (employers)
- Resiliency

Thank you

Sara J. Hendricks, AICP
Senior Research Associate
USF CUTR
813-974-9801
Hendricks@cutr.usf.edu

Phil Winters
TDM Program Director
USF CUTR
813-974-9811
winters@cutr.usf.edu
Unfinished Business & New Business
CAC Independent Research Report
Regarding TIP Amendment: FPN: 445056-1

RESEARCHER: AMY ESPINOSA, AT-LARGE REPRESENTING WOMEN

GOAL
To conduct factual and unbiased research to better understand the perspective of the demographic I represent with regard to the loss of their homes under eminent domain to expand the I-4 interchange northbound to I-275 (TIP Amendment: FPN: 445056-1).

RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS
1. Spoke to two home owners and one tenant to better understand their perspective on the proposed acquisition.
   • Clearly communicated I was a concerned citizen doing independent research to bring their point of view back to the CAC.
   • Stated that I was not affiliated with FDOT or the MPO nor did I have any legal background or knowledge on the topic of eminent domain.

2. Read the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Chapter 61), Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan (April 2020) and reviewed the TIS Master Plan (1989) relating to the area of interest (2B).

3. Called FDOT representative Joseph Murphy, District Right of Way Administrator, Acquisition to better understand if there are provisions given to offset the property taxes when a new home is purchased by the home owner.
   • Joe offered to give a presentation on right of way acquisitions to our committee.

4. Called Hillsborough County Property Appraiser to better understand if any provisions are given to home owners impacted by eminent domain acquisitions.
   • Florida homeowners have Portability, also known as the “Transfer of Homestead Assessment Difference”. It is the ability to transfer the dollar benefit of the Homestead CAP from one Homestead to another.

5. Spoke with 3 professionals in the real estate industry to better understand the approximate home values based on today's market.
   • Two Realtors who have been in the business for more than 15 years; one of which has also been in commercial real estate for more than 30 years.
   • One Appraiser who’s company works specifically to appraise homes that will be taken under eminent domain.
PROPERTY INFO & RESIDENT PERSPECTIVES*

*AVM (Automated Value Model) is an approximate range given by licensed Realtors based on the market as of May 2021. FDOT has confirmed that appraisals have not been completed nor have they made an offer to homeowners at this time.

2502 N 12th St (Tenant)

Built in 1923 on a 5200 sqft lot (52 x 100)

2020 Taxes were 1,418.03
Square footage is 1,668

Assessed Value: 118,313
Zillow Estimate: 211,922
AVM Range: $122,000 - 272,000

1013 14th Ave (Owner)

Retired. No mortgage. Well informed. Does not appear to be bothered by the loss of the home but is adamant about getting a fair price.

Built in 1908 on a 4,845 sqft lot (50 x 96.9)

2020 Taxes were 164.74
Square footage is 1,332

Assessed Value: 119,422
Zillow Estimate: 219,275
AVM Range: $156,000 – 230,000

1011 14th Ave (Owner)

Retired. No mortgage. Well informed and has stated this is not the first time the home has been threatened. Does not seem to be bothered by the loss of the home but is adamant about getting a fair price.

‘I don’t want to get in the way of progress. I was a truck driver and I see the backups daily in my backyard.’

Built in 1949 on a 5000 sqft. Lot (50 x 100)
2020 Taxes were 539.00
Square footage is 853

Assessed Value: 95,195
Zillow Estimate: 185,220
AVM Range: $127,000 – 195,000

1005 14th Ave (Tenant)

Built in on a 8,800 sqft lot (88 x 100)

2020 Taxes were 1,423.81
Square footage is 1,147

Assessed Value: 147,348
Zillow Estimate: 211,807
AVM Range: $147,000 – 184,000

914 14th Ave (Tenant)

Built in on a 18,000 sqft lot (90 x 200)

2020 Taxes were 2,129.20
Square footage is 2,634

Assessed Value: $236,367
Zillow Estimate: 342,994
AVM Range: $235,000 – 318,000

702 E Columbus Dr (Tenant)

Did not seem to be aware that the home could be taken under eminent domain. Left a copy of the Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan (April 2020).

Built in 1915 on a 5,170 sqft lot (55 x 94)

2020 Taxes were 1,701.48.
Square footage is 1,613

Assessed Value: $122,598
Zillow Estimate: 272,802
AVM Range: $161,000 – 305,000
ADDENDUM

Due to personal circumstance I, Amy Espinosa, was unable to attend the June 2nd CAC Meeting to take questions or present the research contained herein.

This addendum has been added in response to questions sent via email from Rick Fernandez, Hispanic at-large member of the CAC. His questions and my responses are below with each name preceding the respective question/response pairing.

Additional Context:
This research was completed within a short timeline (little more than a week). It is in no way in-depth research and was merely prompted by my own internal quest to better understand the perspective of the residents I represent to bring that perspective back to the committee in a factual and unbiased way. For this reason my focus was solely on speaking to the people who may lose their homes.

Rick Fernandez (RF):
As I understand Amy’s report, she spoke with one “tenant” and two home owners connected seven parcels we have been discussing. First: is that correct on head count? Were there any other collateral contacts? Any follow up conversations?

Amy Espinosa (AE):
Yes that is correct: one tenant and two owners. With respect to collateral contacts and/or followup conversations, due to the time I had, I did not interview any nearby residents whose properties are located outside of the ‘acquisition zone’.

I conducted this research in a manner that would respect the of privacy of those involved. I only approached people who were outside and those that did not have gated entryways. Of the six homes identified within the report, two homes had gates with no one visibly in view to approach and one residence had no response to my door knocking. No contact was made with residents of 3 tenant occupied properties and I left no contact information. Two attempts were made.

To those I did speak with, I offered my contact info in the event they wanted to follow up at a later date. Neither home owner was interested and the tenant offered to pass my contact info along to the owner. Although the people I spoke to were very polite and helpful, they did not seem to be interested in continuing the conversation at a later time and explained they said what they wanted to say. For this reason, I did not contact them again.

RF:
Of those contacted, whether generally “informed” on the issues or not, have any of them been contacted by FDOT or notified in any other way about the ROW acquisitions being envisioned NOW. This area has been under FDOT cloud for years. The fact that someone is generally aware their home is in the zone for some future taking is not the same as being aware of FDOT’s plans today.

AE:
The two owners did appear to have knowledge of the current TIP proposal and recent contact with FDOT. One even stated that they had already seen homes that were available.
• When I spoke with the FDOT representative, Joseph, he was not aware any homes had been seen and indicated that was further along in the process. For this reason, the statement from the resident was left out of my report as I could not determine if it actually occurred.

The tenant I spoke to did not appear to be as informed as the two home owners and I did not confirm whether FDOT had already reached out to them. To be fair, I did not speak with this resident nearly as long as the other two. They were polite but did not seem to have the interest to discuss the matter with me. Instead, they offered to pass along the message to the homeowner. Silently acknowledging their discomfort, I thanked them for their time and offered to leave a copy of the Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan (April 2020) along with my contact information on their porch. They accepted. I never received any communication from the actual homeowner regarding this matter.

RF:
Although beyond the scope of Amy’s efforts, I have one other question: We have been discussing FDOT’s acquisition of 7 parcels for $2.5M. How many other properties (and at what price point) have previously been taken/purchased within the footprint being impacted by FDOT’s proposed lane modification from WB I4 to NB I275? This isn’t JUST about 7 parcels … more properties are involved and (I suspect) people too … Thoughts??

AE:
You are correct this was beyond the scope of my research. If a list cannot be provided for some reason, per your request, additional properties can be found by searching on the Hillsborough County Property Appraiser’s website by address (in the event you do not already know this).

Below are links to the FDOT properties I am aware of in the vicinity of this amendment. All are vacant.

• 1009 14th Ave
• 1015 14th Ave
• 1017 14th Ave
• 916 14th Ave
• 918 14th Ave
• 920 14th Ave
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item:**
Palm Ave. and N. Florida Ave Crash History

**Presenter:**
Rich Clarendon, TPO Staff

**Summary:**
CAC Member Hoyt Prindle, III requested this item.
A review of the crash database showed that 61 crashes were recorded from 2011 to 2021 at this intersection. Of those:
- 4 involved pedestrians
- 2 involved bicyclists
- 1 resulted in an incapacitating injury
- 1 resulted in a fatality

**Recommended Action:**
None; for information only.

**Prepared By:**
Rich Clarendon, AICP

**Attachments:**
None
Addendum Items
Hillsborough MPO Mobility Profile - 2019

Travel Time Reliability

- **Planning Time Index**
  - FREEWAYS: 2.24
  - NON-FREEWAY STRATEGIC INTERMODAL SYSTEM: 1.73

- **On-Time Arrival**
  - FREEWAYS: 76%
  - NON-FREEWAY STRATEGIC INTERMODAL SYSTEM: 97%

- **Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay**
  - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM: 48,700
  - STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM: 52,800
  - FREEWAYS: 27,900
  - NON-FREEWAYS: 24,900

- **Percent Miles Heavily Congested**
  - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM: 17%
  - STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM: 16%
  - FREEWAYS: 27%
  - NON-FREEWAYS: 11%

- **Daily Truck Miles Traveled**
  - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM: 1.5M
  - STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM: 1.6M
  - FREEWAYS: 1.1M
  - NON-FREEWAYS: 0.5M

- **Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled**
  - NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM: 22.1M
  - STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM: 23.1M
  - FREEWAYS: 13.7M
  - NON-FREEWAYS: 9.4M

- **Average Job Accessibility by Automobile**
  - Within 30 Minutes: 531.7 (thousands)

- **Average Job Accessibility by Transit**
  - Within 30 Minutes: 8.4 (thousands)

- **% Bicycle Facility Coverage**
  - Average: 76.0%

- **% Pedestrian Facility Coverage in Urban Areas**
  - Average: 52.0%

- **On-Time Arrival Planning Time Index**
  - Overall: 97%

NOTE: Please go to Page 3 for measure definitions.
Travel Time Reliability

Planning Time Index

On-Time Arrival

INTERSTATE

Non-Freeway Strategic Intermodal System

FREeways

Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay

Percent Miles Heavily Congested

Daily Truck Miles Traveled

Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled

National Highway System

State Highway System

Non-Freeways

Freeways
DEFINITIONS

**Travel Time Reliability:**
- **Planning Time Index:** The 95th percentile travel time divided by free flow travel time. A planning time index of 1.5 means a 20-minute trip at free flow speed takes 30 minutes - an informed traveler should plan for the extra 10 minutes to arrive on time. For this reporting, the measure is captured in the peak hour, which is from 5 to 6 pm.

**Vehicle On-Time Arrival:** The percentage of freeway trips traveling at greater than or equal to five mph below the posted speed limit. In the urbanized areas of the seven largest MPOs, on-time arrival is defined as the percentage of freeway trips traveling at least 45 mph. For arterials, travel time reliability is defined as the percentage of trips traveling greater than or equal to 20 mph. For this reporting, the measure is captured in the peak hour, which is from 5 to 6 pm.

**Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay:** Delay is the product of directional hourly volume and the difference between travel time at “threshold” speeds and travel time at the average speed. The thresholds are based on Level of Service (LOS) B as defined by FDOT. For the definitions of LOS B, please refer to [2020 Source Book Methodology](#) publication for more details.

**Percent Miles Heavily Congested:** Arterial segments operating at LOS E or worse in urbanized areas and D or worse in non-urbanized areas; highways operating at LOS E or worse; and freeways operating at 45 mph or worse. For more calculations details, please refer to [2020 Source Book Methodology](#) publication.

**Daily Truck Miles Traveled:** (for all trucks class 4 through 13): The total number of miles traveled daily by trucks using a roadway system. For truck classifications, please refer to [Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) classification](#).

**Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled:** The product of a road’s length and its AADT. If a 10-mile-long road has an AADT of 5,000 vehicles, then its daily VMT is 50,000.

**Percentage of Pedestrian Facilities:** The percentage of pedestrian facilities and shared path coverage along the SHS within the metropolitan planning organization’s (MPO’s) urbanized area.

**Percentage of Bicycle Facilities:** The percentage of bicycle facilities and shared path coverage along the SHS within the MPO’s boundary, the MPO’s urbanized area, and within the county boundary (or county boundaries if more than one county) that the MPO is comprised of.

---

**Average Job Accessibility by Automobile:** The number of jobs accessible within a 30-minute automobile trip for each MPO. The Accessibility Observatory at the University of Minnesota calculated accessibility at the Census block level by measuring the travel time from each block to the neighboring blocks, then summing the total number of jobs that can be accessed within a 30-minute time period. Visit the [FDOT Accessibility](#) page for more details.

**Average Job Accessibility by Transit:** The number of jobs accessible within a 30-minute transit trip for each MPO. The Accessibility Observatory at the University of Minnesota calculated accessibility at the Census block level by measuring the travel time from each block to the neighboring blocks, then summing the total number of jobs that can be accessed within a 30-minute time period. Visit the [FDOT Accessibility](#) page for more details.

**Three roadway systems are reported:** National Highway System (NHS), State Highway System (SHS), and Strategic Intermodal System (SIS).

---

**Sources**
### FDOT Supplied MPO Mobility Performance Measure Analyses for 2019 (Hillsborough MPO)

#### Hillsborough (MPO Boundary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: National Highway System</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>1,579.5</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: State Highway System</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>1,647.7</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Strategic Intermodal System</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1,202.1</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Freeways</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>1,130.4</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Interstates</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>981.8</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Non-freeways (SHS)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>517.3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Hillsborough (Urbanized Area Boundary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: National Highway System</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1,499.8</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: State Highway System</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>1,553.7</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Strategic Intermodal System</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1,153.0</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Freeways</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1,083.6</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Interstates</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>935.0</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Non-freeways (SHS)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>470.0</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Hillsborough (County Boundary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: National Highway System</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>1,600.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: State Highway System</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1,668.4</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Strategic Intermodal System</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>1,222.8</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Freeways</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>1,144.8</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Interstates</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>996.1</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Non-freeways (SHS)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>523.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. These six Annual Measures are reported each year.
2. These four Rotating Measures change every other year. Odd year measures consist of 1) Percent Sidewalk Coverage, 2) Percent Bicycle Lane Coverage, and 3) Average Job Accessibility within a 30-minute car trip and 4) within a 30-minute transit trip.
3. Measures C and D are captured in the peak hour, which is from 5 to 6 pm.
4. SIS On-Time Arrival and Planning Time Index exclude freeways.
Annual MPO Performance Measures by MPO Population Size

2019 Hillsborough MPO
Population 1,444,900

Florida Department of Transportation Mobility Measures Program provides valuable information on performance measures for all 27 MPOs in Florida. On an annual basis the MPOs receive reports on ten measures, six measures annually and four rotating measures biennially for the entire MPO boundary, urbanized area within the MPO, and for counties within the MPO. The annual measures, in combination with the rotating biennial measures, cover the spectrum of mobility dimensions and multiple modes. These measures can be used however each MPO sees fit such as in the development of an MPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan, Congestion Management Process, or State of the System Report. The following tables provide high, median, and low ranges for the State Highway System within the MPO boundary. MPOs are categorized as large, medium and small based on their population. The MPOs were distributed into the seven largest, ten medium, and ten small-sized MPOs. For more information, please contact Monica Zhong at Monica.Zhong@dot.state.fl.us or (850) 414-4808.

### SHS Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay in Thousands, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH MPO</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Sized MPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Population&lt;360,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Sized MPO</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Population 360,400 to 813,700)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large MPO</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>199.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Population&gt;813,700)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SHS Percent Miles Heavily Congested, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH MPO</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Sized MPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Population&lt;360,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Sized MPO</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Population 360,400 to 813,700)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large MPO</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Population&gt;813,700)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 2019 MPO Population is derived from FDOT Forecasting and Trends Office which provides population estimates each year based on the population study of the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) at the University of Florida.
2. Seven Largest MPOs include Broward MPO, Hillsborough MPO, MetroPlan Orlando, Miami-Dade TPO, North Florida TPO, Palm Beach TPA, and Forward Pinellas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHS Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled in Millions, 2019</th>
<th>Vehicle Miles Traveled (Millions)</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH MPO</td>
<td>Small-Sized MPO (Population &lt; 360,400)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium-Sized MPO (Population 360,400 to 813,700)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large MPO (Population &gt; 813,700)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHS Daily Truck Miles Traveled in Thousands, 2019</th>
<th>Truck Miles Traveled (Thousands)</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH MPO</td>
<td>Small-Sized MPO (Population &lt; 360,400)</td>
<td>149.6</td>
<td>434.2</td>
<td>939.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium-Sized MPO (Population 360,400 to 813,700)</td>
<td>390.2</td>
<td>907.9</td>
<td>1,365.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large MPO (Population &gt; 813,700)</td>
<td>380.0</td>
<td>1,820.4</td>
<td>3,118.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway On-Time Arrival, 2019</th>
<th>On-Time Arrival</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH MPO</td>
<td>Small-Sized MPO (Population &lt; 360,400)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium-Sized MPO (Population 360,400 to 813,700)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large MPO (Population &gt; 813,700)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway Planning Time Index, 2019</th>
<th>Planning Time Index</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH MPO</td>
<td>Small-Sized MPO (Population &lt; 360,400)</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium-Sized MPO (Population 360,400 to 813,700)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large MPO (Population &gt; 813,700)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 2019 MPO Population is derived from FDOT Forecasting and Trends Office which provides population estimates each year based on the population study of the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) at the University of Florida.
2. Seven Largest MPOs include Broward MPO, Hillsborough MPO, MetroPlan Orlando, Miami-Dade TPO, North Florida TPO, Palm Beach TPA, and Forward Pinellas.