Meeting of the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Wednesday, August 11, 2021, 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

All voting members are asked to attend in person, in compliance with Florida’s Government in the Sunshine Law. Please RSVP for this meeting. An accurate headcount will allow us to plan facilities. People attending in person are required to wear mask while inside the County Center building consistent with CDC guidance.

All Others:
Audience members, presenters, and any others are asked to participate remotely, to minimize the potential for transmitting illness.

- To view presentations and participate your computer, tablet or smartphone: https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/3365777032872865039 Register in advance to receive your personalized link, which can be saved to your calendar.
- Dial in LISTEN-ONLY MODE: (631) 992-3221 Access Code 721-939-547
- Presentations, full agenda packet, and supplemental materials posted here, or phone us at 813-756-0371 for a printed copy.
- Please mute yourself after joining the conference to minimize background noise.
- Technical support during the meeting: Chris English at (813) 836-7380.

Rules of engagement:
Professional courtesy and respect for others at this meeting are expected, and failure may result in dismissal from the meeting. For more information on expectations for participation, please see the TPO’s Social Networking & Media Policy.

Call to Order

I. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please

Public comments are welcome and may be given in person at this teleconference meeting by logging into the website above and clicking the “raise hand” button. Comments may also be provided before the start of the meeting by e-mail to reynoldsw@plancom.org. Written comments will be read into the record, if brief, and provided in full to the Committee members.

II. Members’ Interests

III. Approval of Minutes – June 16, 2021 and July 14, 2021

IV. Action Items
   A. Approval of New Membership (Wade Reynolds, TPO Staff)
      a. Victoria Klug
b. Danny Camacho

B. Election of Officers (Wade Reynolds, TPO Staff)

V. Status Reports
   A. Park Speed Zone Pilot Study (Lisa Silva, TPO Staff)
   B. Heights Mobility Study Next Steps (FDOT, City of Tampa, and HART Representatives)

VI. Old Business & New Business

VII. Adjournment

VIII. Addendum
   A. TPO Meeting Summary & Committee Report
   B. Florida Bicycle Association Legislative Update
   C. Article: If Cars are Getting Safer, Why are they Killing More of Us?

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.
I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Forbes called the workshop to order at 5:45 PM

Members Present In-Person: Jonathan Forbes, Jim Shirk, Alana Brasier, Peter Davitt, Katrina Corcoran, Faye Miller, Sally Thompson


Others Present: Wade Reynolds, Gail Reese

II. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- Attendees introduced themselves.

III. DISCUSSION ON LIST OF ROADS ON RESURFACING PLANS (Maps and LRTP pages included in July Agenda)

- City of Tampa Projects
  - Alana Brasier noted that the loss of the surtax is resulting in challenges.
  - Evaluating for safety, pedestrian, and bike improvements.
  - Develop major safe streets for Floribraska, 34th St.
  - Collector and Arterial projects
  - Neighborhood improvements – Ridgewood Park
  - 22nd south of Selmon. Multiuse path, first scooter fatality
  - 30th south of Bruce B. Downs, working on Green ARTery Trail
  - 34th between Hillsborough and Columbus – this is done, now going south
  - W. Riverfront, Main Street
  - El Prado, Dale Mabry
  - El Prado to West Shore study starting – Sally Thompson inquired if this area is wide enough for separated lanes.
  - West River area ties into West River Riverwalk and a larger project Bayshore to Kennedy - Chair Forbes asked about 22nd, bike paths on flyover, is this included?
**Hillsborough County Projects**
- Wade Reynolds noted that Hillsborough County would have a more complete list in October.
- Chair Forbes requested the county list be brought back to the committee prior to October for review and input.

**LRTP First Five (5) Years – Good Repair and Resilience (includes FDOT Projects)**
- Noted that many of the projects are more than resurfacing, other improvements are in them.
- Particular projects called out
  - FPN 4347815 SR 685/SR 60/SR 45 from west of MacDill Ave to Hillsborough River – installing signals at Walmart, other additional signals should slow traffic
  - FPN 4387841 US 92/ SR 600/ Gandy Bridge WB #100585 over Tampa Bay – PD&E study along Gandy
    - **Sally Thompson** asked about both ways for trails being on one side.
    - **Jim Shirk** inquired whether a double deck was thought about. Noted presentation in June on the Gandy
    - **Chair Forbes** asked if Beth Alden had talked about this.
  - FPN 4394121 South Maydell Drive bridge over Palm River – under construction
  - FPN 4402511 SR 60/Bandon Blvd from west of Valrico Rd to west of Turkey Creek Rd – Chair Forbes asked about prices; Note: worth exploring with FDOT to enhance safety
  - FPN 4402531 SR 597/Dale Mabry north from n of S Village Dr/ W Fletcher to south of Van Dyke – side path going in, see if FDOT would be able to talk to this committee; Chair Forbes asked if this was dependent on Patterson Park.
  - FPN 4413871 US41/SR 45 from north of 15th Ave to south of Bullfrog Creek – unsure if there is an opportunity here; overgrown and possible grading
  - FPN 4413881 US 301/SR 43 from north of Lake St. Charles Blvd to north of Progress Blvd. – hoping for consistency with other improvements.
  - FPN 4414931 SR 574/MLK Blvd west of N MacDill Ave to N Habana Ave – not sure if facilities there, worth talking to FDOT and keep on radar for opportunity.
  - FPN 4416601 SR 582/E Fowler Ave from west of Tampa Bypass Canal to US 301/SR41 – project discussed, possible side path on this one; pleased it has extended past I-75.
  - FPN 4416611 SR 60 from east of Clarence Gordon Jr Rd to Polk County line – Discussion on widening to 6 lanes, Plant City would like it; offers opportunity to get into Polk County.
    - **Jim Shirk** asked if there is a side path there.
  - FPN 4433471 SR 573/S Dal Mabry from south of Pinewood St to north of Ballast Point Blvd – Gandy to MacDill AFB limiting through east/west, installed one palm beacon.
  - FPN 4439231 Platt St Bridge at Hillsborough River
  - FPN 4439241 Columbus Dr Bridge at Hillsborough River – 4 lanes over bridge goes into 2 on the road. Some discussion on changing 4 to 2 lanes on west side and possibly adding bike lane.
  - FPN 4459201 US 301/SR 43 from north of Bloomingdale Ave to MLK Blvd – logical connection
  - FPN 4460261 US 41/SR 45/ S 50th St. from Denver south to north of 27th Ave S // FPN 4460511 SR 60 from west of Turkey Creek Rd to west of SR 39/James L. Redman Pkwy – Seem like same segments
  - FPN 4467231 US 301/SR 41 from north of Cherry Tree Ln to north of Hillsborough River

LRTP grid included in [July 14, 2021 Agenda](#)
IV. IDEAS FOR FUTURE PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION TOPICS / OPEN DISCUSSION

- Hillsborough County before October
- Road maintenance and road clean-up (Peter Davitt) – how can we help request/support more funding? Noted that areas of safety challenges can be reported through the website.
  - Noted that FDOT District 1 includes shoulder clearing in contracts
  - **Jim Shirk** inquired about as-needed sweeping; maybe a numbering of complaints submitted so the submitter can follow-up on later
  - **Chair Forbes** noted that there needs to be an easier point of access to provide areas of concern
  - **Peter Davitt** noted that lanes are overgrown and when there is grading done, there is not cleaning after.
- **Chair Forbes** – committee is made of up 40% citizens and 60% in system; what does staff need to help move things with citizen opinion?
  - **Jim Shirk** – Commissioners are listening to people advocating, they want to listen
  - **Wade Reynolds** – A lot of people in unincorporated Hillsborough County are seeing growth and the need for new facilities; SIS has a proposed change for funding streams to allow spending on multimodal and parallel facilities, is happy to request for BPAC if desired. **Jim Shirk** made the request.
- **Faye Miller** inquired if there is a trail at Bypass Canal
- Discussion of future meetings
  - In-person meetings
  - Possibly doing in-person quarterly unless action items come up
  - **Faye Miller** – noted that the committee gets more done in-person

V. ADJOURNMENT – Workshop adjourned at 6:50 PM

VI. GROUP BIKE RIDE ON RIVERWALK
Agenda Item:
Park Speed Zone Pilot Study

Presenter:
Lisa Silva, TPO staff

Summary:
The Park Speed Zone Pilot Study will develop a process that can be replicated at parks throughout Hillsborough County to implement safety countermeasures with a focus on speed management. A toolbox of safety countermeasures will be developed as part of the process. The pilot project will include three different types of park facilities in Hillsborough County, including local and regional park facilities whose context and transportation safety issues broadly represent other facilities in the region such that the findings from this pilot project can be applied elsewhere in the County.

During the first step we identified park facilities to include in the pilot project. Based on a quantitative process that considered equity and transportation safety metrics, the three park locations selected for inclusion in the pilot are Copeland Park, the Upper Tampa Bay Trail (UTBT), and Sulphur Springs Park. For more on the evaluation criteria see Park Selection Process and Park Prioritization (attached).

Once the three pilot project locations were identified, a detailed existing conditions assessment was conducted to document the transportation networks in the park vicinity, prevailing travel patterns including speeds, and collisions. (attached)

Feedback from the public will be an important component of the project to identify safety concerns that might not be readily apparent with the data. We will then develop a countermeasure toolbox that can be applied to subsequent projects. We are seeking your assistance in providing input and getting the word out.

Recommended Action:
Feedback only.

Prepared By:
Lisa K. Silva, AICP, PLA, TPO Staff

Attachments:
Project website with:
Interactive crowdsourcing map for comments
Park Selection Process
Park Prioritization
Existing Conditions Assessments-Copeland, Sulphur Springs and UTBT
Introduction

Fehr & Peers is working with the Hillsborough Metropolitan Transportation Organization (MPO) to develop a Park Speed Zone pilot project (project or pilot). The purpose of this project is to develop a process that can be replicated at parks throughout the County to implement safety countermeasures with a focus on speed management. A toolbox of safety countermeasures will be developed as part of the process. This pilot project will include three different types of park facilities in Hillsborough County, including local and regional park facilities whose context and transportation safety issues broadly represent other facilities in the region such that the findings from this pilot project can be applied elsewhere in the County.

The first step is to identify park facilities to include in the pilot project. During an initial discussion with project stakeholders, numerous candidate locations were identified. As there are over 400 locations in Hillsborough County that are classified as park facilities, a process was developed to more equitably identify park locations that could benefit the most from inclusion in this pilot project rather than select from park locations that are most well-known. This memorandum is organized to provide a definition of the different park types considered in this analysis, the data and weighting criteria used in the analysis, the results of the weighting process, and preliminary recommendations of park locations for inclusion in the pilot.

Park Definition

One of the project directives is to evaluate different types of parks in different community and roadway network contexts. For the purposes of this analysis, four different park types were
classified. These classifications may differ slightly from other official definitions used in the county, but there was not one consistent set of park definitions across all agencies in the region.

**Local Park** – For the purposes of this study, a local park is defined as park with a size of less than 5 acres that has no programmed activities or staff. Local parks are typically adjacent to residential areas and people most often walk or ride bikes to the park. These parks typically include play structures, picnic tables, shade structures and benches. Limited parking is typically provided. Bus service is typically not provided to local parks as a key destination. Examples of local parks include Borrell Park on 26th Avenue in Tampa, and Simmons Bowers Park on 86th Street and Progress Boulevard in unincorporated County. Approximately 200 local parks are included in the data set.

**Passive Regional Park** – For the purposes of this study, a passive regional park is defined as park greater than 5 acres that has no programmed activities or staff. Passive regional parks are located in a wide variety of contexts, including urban settings where walk and bike modes are the typical mode of travel, and in more suburban/rural settings where many people may choose to drive to the park. Bus service is typically not provided to passive regional parks as a key destination. While the catchment area for these parks is typically the local community, there may be a regional draw depending on the natural features of the park. These parks can provide a wide range of amenities, including walking/bicycle trails, fishing, restroom facilities, play structures, picnic tables, shade structures and benches. Some may also provide outdoor basketball court and tennis courts, as well as areas to launch a boat. Parking is typically provided. Examples of passive regional parks include Sweetwater Park in unincorporated County and Robles Park in the City of Tampa. Approximately 115 passive parks are included in the data set.

**Active Regional Park** – For the purposes of this study, an active regional park is defined as park greater than 5 acres that has programmed activities and staff. Similar to passive regional parks, regional parks are located in a wide variety of contexts, including urban settings where walk and bike modes are the typical mode of travel, and in more suburban/rural settings where many people may choose to drive to the park. Bus service may be provided to some active regional parks as a key destination, especially those closer to the urban core. In addition to many of the facilities provided in passive park locations, active regional parks may house a community center where indoor sports are played or serve as a major hub for other recreational sports like softball/baseball. These parks may also offer after school programs, and summer programs. Some offer watersports rentals, such as boats or canoes. Examples of active regional parks include Vance Vogel Sports Complex in unincorporated County, Copeland Park in the City of Tampa, and Turkey Street Sports Complex in Plant City. Approximately 115 active regional parks were included in the data set.

**Linear Parks** – For the purposes of this study, linear parks are ones that typically follow a natural linear feature, such as a shoreline or other waterway. Walking and bicycling trails are typically provided for the length of the park, with limited other active or passive activities provided.
Bayshore Linear Park is the most prominent linear park in the area, with other examples including Tampa Riverwalk, Fremont Linear Park, Upper Tampa Bay Trail and Ignacio Haya Linear Park.

Approximately 440 parks were included in the initial analysis, which may include some locations that are not truly parks, such as Oaklawn Cemetery, and some duplicates – for example, Bayshore Park was evaluated as several different segments due to its length. The park database includes approximately 200 parks in unincorporated county, 195 in the City of Tampa, 23 in each Temple Terrace and Plant City.

**Evaluation Criteria**

Various data sets were provided by the Hillsborough MPO, Hillsborough County, and the City of Tampa. Additionally, Fehr & Peers summarized Census Data and collision data from the CDMS collision database system. A web map was developed to display the various datasets, which includes:

- Park locations
- Communities of Concern
- High Injury Network
- Bicycle and Pedestrian fatality and serious injury locations (2016-2020)
- Schools, libraries and other community facilities
- Location of bus stops
- Average daily traffic
- Roadway speed limit
- Frequency of hard braking events
- Bicycle facilities
- Sidewalk facilities
- Planned transportation network improvements

Other data that was also considered in the analysis includes residential density and employment density. Based on the available data, the following weighting criteria was developed to help identify park locations that should be considered for inclusion in the pilot project. Scoring is out of 100 points, with up to 40 points awarded to criteria that relates to equity, 40 points awarded to criteria that relates to transportation safety, and 20 points awarded for all other criteria. For the initial scoring only 95 points are available. The final 5 points will be awarded based on an assessment of the ease of public engagement during the project period. The evaluation criteria used for this initial assessment is presented in Table 1.
# Table 1: Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description/Data</th>
<th>Max Points/Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Within a community of concern</td>
<td>A Community of Concern is a census block group that has a high proportion of two or more protected classes, such as racial minorities, low-income groups, persons with disabilities, and those with limited English proficiency. Nine different characteristics are considered by the Hillsborough MPO. Parks in communities with the most protected classes would receive the most points.</td>
<td>35 / Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited prior investment</td>
<td>City of Tampa and Hillsborough County Capital Improvement program projects were considered. Parks located in areas where there are no planned investments would receive the most points.</td>
<td>5 / Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Within a half mile of a Top 50 Corridor</td>
<td>The Vision Zero Plan identifies 50 Corridors in the County that experience disproportionally high rates of fatal and serious injury collisions (KSI). Parks in close proximity to these corridors would receive priority.</td>
<td>20 / Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of Bike/Ped KSIs within a half mile</td>
<td>Data representative of 2016 to 2020 was obtained from the CDMS system and all KSI collisions involving a person walking or bicycling where mapped. 28 bike/ped KSI were experienced near one park; this park would receive maximum points with others based on the proportionate difference.</td>
<td>15 / Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Proximity to more than 50 hard braking events in a month</td>
<td>Connected vehicle data was obtained at a countywide level and locations of routine hard braking were identified, as this can be an indicator of a speed limit or prevailing travel speed too high for actual roadway conditions that if reduced through engineering measures could improve safety outcomes.</td>
<td>5 / Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Density of residents within a half mile</td>
<td>Based on census data to consider the relative amount of people who would benefit from an improvement.</td>
<td>5 / Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Density of jobs within a half mile</td>
<td>Based on census data to consider the relative amount of people who would benefit from an improvement.</td>
<td>5 / Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Within a half mile of a school/library/community activity hub</td>
<td>Project could provide co-benefits to other nearby activity centers.</td>
<td>5 / Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ease of public engagement during project time frame</td>
<td>It is important to hear from the community, and if a park is closed, or large volume of use is not expected during the study period, we may not fully capture how people in the community engage with the park, what access challenges they have, and ideas they have for improvement.</td>
<td>5 / Other (allocated after initial ranking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fehr & Peers.
Initial Ranking

Based on the data described above and the evaluation criteria, the 10 parks in each category that received the most points were identified, as shown in Table 2 for local parks, Table 3 for passive regional parks, Table 4 for active regional parks, and Table 5 for linear parks. The majority of the top 10 locations in each category are within the City of Tampa. This is due to several factors, including that the City has more communities of concern that other parts of the county, and as the City has a large proportion of the roadway network, a higher proportion of roadways are on the high injury network. As there is also a desire to achieve geographic diversity amongst pilot locations, a high-ranking park in Tampa may not be selected for inclusion in the pilot if there are parks in other communities that also received high scores to ensure geographic diversity.

The local park top 10 locations have the tightest score ranking in that all top 10 locations for this category is between 70 and 78 points (out of 95); this is in part due to the higher number of local park locations and that these tend to be located in developed areas within the county. The average score for local parks is 40 with an overall range between 5 and 79. There is a much wider range for the other park types, the range for the top ten passive parks is 50 and 80 with an average score of 29 and an overall range of 5 to 80. The range for the top ten active regional parks is 60 to 79, with an average score of 35 and a range between 9 and 79. The range for all linear parks was 8 to 77, with an average of 34.

Table 2: Local Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Points (out of 95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrell Park</td>
<td>808 E 26th Ave (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphur Springs Park</td>
<td>701 E Bird St (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Works Park</td>
<td>1710 N Highland Ave (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Mesa Park</td>
<td>2105 N Morgan St (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Park Plaza</td>
<td>1314 Scott St (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle Carlton Drive</td>
<td>Doyle Carlton Dr, Estell to 275 (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman C Massey Park</td>
<td>1002 N Franklin St (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kid Mason Center</td>
<td>1101 N Jefferson St (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruis-a-cade</td>
<td>606 W Palm Ave (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuccio Parkway</td>
<td>Nuccio Parkway, 7th Ave to E Palm Ave (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purity Springs Park</td>
<td>8126 N River Shore Dr (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fehr & Peers.
### Table 3: Passive Regional Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Points (out of 95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robles Park</td>
<td>3305 N Avon Ave (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragan Park</td>
<td>1200 E Lake Ave (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Tower Park</td>
<td>8105 N Florida Ave (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuscaden Park</td>
<td>2800 E 15th St (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macfarlane Park</td>
<td>1801 N Lincoln Ave (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate Park</td>
<td>7606 Paula Dr. (Unincorporated County)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDugald Park</td>
<td>1211 E Sligh Ave (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scout Park</td>
<td>911 Bellemeade Avenue (City of Temple Terrace)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview Village Park</td>
<td>1530 Lakeview Village Dr (Unincorporated County)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Taylor Park</td>
<td>611 W Indiana Ave (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causeway Park</td>
<td>2810 90th St. (Unincorporated County)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruskin Commongood Park</td>
<td>107 1st Avenue, NW (Unincorporated County)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fehr & Peers.

### Table 4: Active Regional Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Points (out of 95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Area Park and Community Center</td>
<td>14015 N. 22nd Street, Tampa (Unincorporated County)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland Park</td>
<td>11001 N 15th St (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Trail/Julian B Lane Riverfront Park</td>
<td>1001 N Boulevard (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Hixon Waterfront Park</td>
<td>402 N Ashley Dr (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Harvey Sr Park</td>
<td>1201 N Orange St (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.L. King Jr Recreation Complex</td>
<td>2200 N Oregon Ave (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Legion Park</td>
<td>106 E Sligh Ave (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus Greene Park</td>
<td>2101 E Dr Martin Luther King Blvd (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellwood Park</td>
<td>4918 N Mendenhall Dr (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston Park and Community Center</td>
<td>7605 Destin Dr. (Unincorporated County)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fehr & Peers.
### Table 5: Linear Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Points (out of 95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Riverwalk</td>
<td>1000 N Ashley St (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>2.6 miles</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Linear Park</td>
<td>3008 W Cherry St (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>¼ mile</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Tampa Bay Trail</td>
<td>9201 W. Waters Ave., Tampa FL 33635 (unincorporated County)</td>
<td>14.3 miles</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignacio Haya Linear Park</td>
<td>5000 N River Blvd (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>½ mile</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Dover Trail</td>
<td>717 N. Dover Rd., Dover FL 33527</td>
<td>4.4 miles</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore Linear Park</td>
<td>Bayshore Blvd (evaluated as 10 separate segments) (City of Tampa)</td>
<td>4.5 miles</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suncoast Trail</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>42 miles</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Campbell Trail</td>
<td>W Courtney Campbell Causeway</td>
<td>10.5 miles</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the top three locations in any of the four park categories resulted in a park location in Temple Terrace or Plant City. The park location in Plant City that received the highest score is Burchwood Park that received 38 points and the park location in Temple Terrace that received the highest score is the Ridgedale Sports complex that received 57 points.

**Recommended Pilot Locations**

Based on our review of the initial park scoring, we recommend the following parks for further consideration as candidate park locations:

**Borrell Park/Robles Park** – Borrell and Robles parks are classified as **Local** and **Passive Regional** parks for the purpose of this study and both received the highest scores for their respective category prior to the application of ease of community outreach points. They are also located approximately 500 feet from each other, with the I-275 freeway serving as a barrier between them. As these parks are located in similar urban contexts within the urbanized area of the City of Tampa, but with the potential for different visitor travel patterns, we recommend considering these parks as a single location for the pilot project, allowing for the inclusion of a linear park in the study. If either Borrell or Robles park are not advanced for the pilot process, either another pair of candidate parks in close proximity would need to selected, or the linear park excluded from the pilot as they are small percentage of the overall park types in the County.
**University Area Park and Community Center** – This park is located in northern Hillsborough County in an unincorporated area approximately 1.5 miles from the University of South Florida and received the highest score in the Active Regional park category. There are planned activities throughout the project timeframe at the Park and Community Center, and it is expected that community outreach could be facilitated through collaboration with other planned activities. Other candidate locations in this category are primarily in the City of Tampa, and there is a desire to have geographic diversity in the selection of pilot project sites.

Alternatively, to further promote geographic diversity in the park site, inclusion of the **Ridgedale Sports Complex** in Temple Terrace could be considered under the Active Regional Park category. However, this park is most actively used for Little League who spring season is complete at the end of May, and there may not be a robust schedule of activities during the data collection window.

**Upper Tampa Bay Trail** – Although the Upper Tampa Bay Trail did not score the highest in the Linear park category, the scoring for Tampa Riverwalk is primarily influenced by the adjacent roadway network and may not be indicative of trail connections. The Fremont Liner Park is a 1/4 mile in length and does not extend through a diversity of place types. The Upper Tampa Bay Trail extends through a wide variety of contexts, including rural and suburban place types. Countermeasures that would be identified through a review of this linear park include where the trail interfaces with the public street network, such as at street crossings of the trail, as well as trail access locations from formal and informal areas. This trail is also in the unincorporated County.

The above 4 park locations represent a wide array of contexts within the County, including urban, suburban, and rural. There are also a wide variety of roadway types that provide access to each park location, including local, collector and arterial roadways, and roadway ownership, including local agency, County and FDOT. This diversity of place types and roadway facility types is important to include in the pilot project for the development of a toolbox that is applicable to a wide variety of park and place types within the County.

Should alternate park locations be substituted for the above recommended locations after the application of points for ease of community engagement and feedback from the stakeholder group, the overall scoring and geographic diversity should be primary considerations. Additionally, to keep one park of all park types within the study, a pair of local and passive regional park locations would need to be in close proximity (500 feet) if Borrell Park and Robles Park are not advanced to the next stage of the project.

The completes our initial screening to select the parks to include in the Park Speed Zone Pilot. Please contact Kathrin Tellez at (321)754-9902 if you have questions.
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Heights Mobility Study Next Steps

**Presenter**
FDOT, City of Tampa, and HART Representatives

**Summary**
The Heights Mobility Study is an effort to improve safety and mobility in the Greater Seminole Heights/Tampa Heights area, especially, along the Florida Avenue and Tampa Street/Highland Avenue corridor between downtown Tampa and the Hillsborough River. Additionally, the Study Team will work with the community to develop a long-term vision for transportation improvements in the area.

The Study Team will be providing an update on short-term improvements, presenting long-term concepts for the Phase I improvements along Florida Ave/Tampa Street from Tyler St to Dr. MLK Jr Blvd, potential interim pilot concepts, and providing details on upcoming public engagement.

**Recommended Action**
None. For information only.

**Prepared By**
Gena Torres, TPO staff

**Attachments**
Visit the [Heights Mobility Study website](#) for more information.
The Transportation Planning Organization (TPO), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Regular Meeting and Public Hearing, scheduled for Wednesday, June 9, 2021, at 6:00 p.m., in the Boardroom, Frederick B. Karl County Center, Tampa, Florida, and held virtually.

The following members were present:

Harry Cohen, Chair
Charles Klug for Paul Anderson
Joseph Citro
John Dingfelder (arrived at 6:05 p.m.)
Derek Doughty
Gina Evans for Joe Lopano
Pat Kemp
Nate Kilton for Rick Lott
Guido Maniscalco
Gwen Myers
Kimberly Overman
Andrew Ross
Mariella Smith
Joe Waggoner for Robert Frey
Jessica Vaughn

The following member was absent:

Melanie Williams

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
   ▶ Chair Cohen called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL
   ▶ The Deputy Clerk called the roll and noted a quorum was present.
III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MAY 12, 2021

Chair Cohen sought a motion to approve the May 12, 2021, TPO minutes. Commissioner Kemp so moved, seconded by Commissioner Overman. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried fifteen to zero. (Ms. Williams was absent.)

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS OTHER THAN THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) - None.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Bill Roberts, Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), and Ms. Davida Franklin, TPO, delivered the reports.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

A. Revised Committee Appointments

Ms. Cheryl Wilkening, TPO, sought a motion to affirm the appointment nominations. Commissioner Overman moved to confirm, seconded by Councilman Citro. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried fourteen to zero. (Ms. Vaughn was out of the room; Ms. Williams was absent.)

B. Renewal of Internship Agreement with University of South Florida (USF) Master of Urban and Regional Planning

Ms. Allison Yeh, TPO, expounded on the item. Chair Cohen announced the retirement of Dr. Mark Hafen, USF, who made remarks. Commissioner Overman commented on the importance of college youth involvement. Commissioner Overman moved the item, seconded by Councilman Citro. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried fourteen to zero. (Ms. Vaughn was out of the room; Ms. Williams was absent.)

C. TPO Public Participation Plan Amendment

Ms. Franklin presented the item. Responding to Commissioner Overman, Ms. Beth Alden, TPO Executive Director, affirmed public outreach on the TIP amendment would begin 14 days in advance of TPO Board consideration and suggested utilizing a press release to increase TPO transparency. Commissioner Overman expressed concern on the equity of shortening the public outreach time frame. Commissioner Kemp sought an explanation of the time frame deadline advantages. Discussion ensued on the deadline, funding, and
advertisement. Upon recommendation by Ms. Alden, Chair Cohen agreed to hold the item until the next meeting.

VII. PUBLIC HEARING: TIP ANNUAL UPDATE

TIP for October 1, 2021 – September 30, 2026

• Staff Presentation

Subsequent to highlighting the item, Chair Cohen deferred to Dr. Johnny Wong, TPO, who supplied the presentation.

• Public Comment

Chair Cohen called for public comment. The following individuals spoke: Attorney Ronald Weaver; Mr. Nathan Hagen; Ms. Sharon Graham; Mr. Joshua Frank; Ms. Connie Rose; Attorney Ricardo Fernandez; Ms. Ann Kulig; Messrs. Shane Ragiel, Andrew Van Cleave, and Mauricio Rosas; Ms. Lena Young Green; Mr. Jose Salazar; and Ms. Alexandra Khalel.

• Summary of Comments Submitted in Advance

Ms. Franklin relayed background material.

• Board Discussion and Action

After remarks, Mayor Ross moved to adopt staff’s recommendation to move that second phase of that project back to table two, so that the TPO would not lose that placeholder for funding when the TPO needs the funding, seconded by Commissioner Overman. Talks occurred. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried fifteen to zero. (Ms. Williams was absent.)

Expressing rapid growth concerns, Commissioner Overman moved to direct the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) (TPO) staff to coordinate with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and other local stakeholder agencies to develop cost estimates and approximate timelines for implementing a passenger rail service along the CSX lines in our region and to identify eligible requirements for Federal and State financial participation; further, staff would also identify possible roles and responsibilities of each pertinent agency in that effort, and desired to move the project forward. The motion was seconded by Councilman Dingfelder, who suggested
coming back to the item later in the meeting. Discussion ensued. Chair Cohen said the TPO would revisit the motion later.

Touching on the CAC recommendations in background material, reading from the CAC’s recommendation: “Phase 2 funding requested from north of Hillsborough Avenue to north of Bearss Avenue, construct one additional general purpose lane in each direction, noise walls, and hardened shoulders; interchange improvements at Bearss Avenue,” and making remarks, Commissioner Kemp supported removing Phase 2, as read, as the CAC voted removing 47 Phase 2, what was just read, language, again recommended by the CAC, from the TIP at this time, seconded by Commissioner Overman. Talks occurred on the rationale for the change. Citing Pasco County growth and the possibility of a chokepoint at Hillsborough and Bearss Avenues, Mayor Ross would not support the motion. Councilman Maniscalco and Commissioner Overman backed the motion. Commissioner Myers noted the Board Of County Commissioner appoints CAC members and their recommendation should be given weight. Commissioner Smith favored more careful assessments of TIP prioritizations. Following a suggestion by Councilman Dingfelder, Commissioner Kemp amended the motion to leave the sound walls and take every single other part out; just construct sound walls, seconded by Commissioner Overman. After dialogue, Mr. Waggoner looked to District Secretary David Gwynn, FDOT, who clarified federal money could not be used without the other improvements, reminded the TPO board the project was not funded yet, and wanted the TPO Board to consider large traffic flows from the north and the idea of using right of ways (ROW). Conversations arose on sound walls/shoulder hardening, transit options, and road capacity. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried eleven to four; Members Evans, Kilton, Klug, and Ross voted no. (Ms. Williams was absent.)

Confirming staff would look into the MacDonald Training Center Incorporated’s request for sidewalks in backup material, and referring to 2021 Priority Line 49 (Table 2), Councilman Dingfelder moved to strike that particular provision, striking the words “add express lanes on Interstate (I) 275 from west of Lois Avenue to north of Hillsborough River (section 5) with connections at Himes Avenue and downtown Tampa,” seconded by Commissioner Smith for discussion. In response to Councilman Citro, Mr. Gwynn said any modifications would negate the project. Councilman Citro opined on community impact and the light rail alternative. Commissioner
Smith asked if there was a more surgical way to remove toll lanes without taking out the Westshore interchange. Based on the conversations, Councilman Dingfelder accepted a friendly amendment to the motion, instead of striking that sentence, maybe if the TPO added the parenthetical, so instead where the item says “add express lanes (untold).” Chair Cohen corrected the motion to “non-told.” In response to Chair Cohen, Mr. Gwynn commented on the project being vetted already and any changes would set the project back. Commissioner Myers agreed. Chair Cohen wondered how to eliminate toll lanes without jeopardizing the project. Ms. Alden verified the project had been debated on many previous occasions. Mr. Gwynn detailed lane strategies/configurations. Discussion occurred on toll lanes/management. Councilman Dingfelder suggested an amendment to the motion, after the words, “add express lanes,” the TPO would add the parenthetical (managed lanes, that do not necessarily include toll lanes). Following talks, Councilman Dingfelder amended the motion after the words “express lanes,” was trying to define what an express lane was (managed lanes, that do not necessarily include toll lanes), seconded by Commissioner Smith. Mr. Waggoner touched on the implications of the motion. Ms. Evans expressed concern the motion would jeopardize the project. Chair Cohen and Commissioner Kemp would not support the motion. Upon roll call vote, the motion failed four to eleven: Chair Cohen and Members Doughty, Evans, Kemp, Kilton, Klug, Maniscalco, Myers, Overman, Ross, and Waggoner voted no. (Ms. Williams was absent.)

Commissioner Myers moved the TPO accept Line Item 48 as is. (The motion died for lack of a second.) Chair Cohen informed Commissioner Myers the item would be included with the approval of the TIP. Raising concerns on Line Item 49 regarding road safety and the I-275 flyover, Commissioner Overman moved to modify that particular item, 49, to an additional lane on the fly over ramp on Southbound I-275 to I-4 and if necessary not to add an additional footprint, but to add a lane to the Westbound to I-275 as you approach the on-ramp to go north on I-275, and expressed interest in seeing improvements and safety concerns addressed on the flyover. In response to Chair Cohen, Commissioner Overman clarified the motion was to remove the language beyond the comma before and; so keep, addition of a lane on the flyover ramp from Southbound I-275 to I-4 and addition of a lane on the ramp from Westbound I-4 to Southbound I-275 and downtown Tampa; all that past that comma would be removed, seconded by Commissioner Kemp for discussion.
(The motion was subsequently withdrawn.) Commissioner Overman explained the purpose of the motion was to fix the Southbound I-275 flyover. Dialogue ensued. Ms. Alden shared the MPO (TPO) would not be able to unilaterally remove items from the TIP without FDOT agreement, which Senior Assistant County Attorney Cameron Clark affirmed and summarized Florida Statute Section 339.175 Subsection 8 D. Following discussion, Commissioner Overman withdrew her motion. Ms. Alden provided details on District 7 identifying ROW impacts with the Quick Fix project, the letter of comment on the supplemental environmental impact statement from October 2019, adopting the Quick Fix program into the Long Range Transportation Plan, and fixing the language used to advertise the project to the public. Councilman Dingfelder suggested the item for consideration for next year. Attorney Clark deliberated on Florida Statute implications regarding the motion. Commissioner Myers wanted the effects of the statute on the project included in a future report. Mr. Waggoner emphasized the consequences of removing certain project elements. Commissioner Kemp remarked on projects needing traffic counts. Chair Cohen pondered the best way to move the project forward.

Referencing prior meetings on the Smart Cities program, Commissioner Kemp inquired about adding HART scheduling software in and save the other priorities for next year, would like to make sure that a priority that would serve so many people and was so important, would definitely be an express priority, seconded by Commissioner Smith for discussion. (The motion was not voted on.) Subsequent to Commissioner Kemp explaining the motion, Ms. Alden recommended the TPO make a motion to move the HART project further up the Smart Cities program priority list. Commissioner Kemp moved to move the item to Priority 18, seconded by Commissioner Overman. Chair Cohen clarified the motion was to move the HART scheduling software to Priority 18 of the Smart City’s list. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried fifteen to zero. (Ms. Williams was absent.)

Responding to Councilman Dingfelder on the potential project addition of middle turn-lanes on Westshore Boulevard, Ms. Alden and Dr. Wong expounded on the projects priority list. Commissioner Smith pointed out a scrivener’s error in Item 41 and stated the item should have said “South Coast Greenway” not the South County Greenway. Chair Cohen sought a motion. Mayor Ross
moved to approve the TIP as amended tonight, seconded by Mr. Klug. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried eleven to four; Members Citro, Dingfelder, Maniscalco, and Vaughn voted no. (Ms. Williams was absent.)

After talking on project challenges, referring to her previous motion, and requesting Mr. Gwynn to outline the motion intent, Commissioner Overman moved to have a workshop with the stakeholders to really understand who had to do what, what kind of funding mechanisms could be implemented to make this happen, and who needed to be at the table in order to make this work, seconded by Councilman Dingfelder. Dialogue ensued on including light rail and developing transit strategy for passenger rail access. Mayor Ross clarified the motion was to have the TPO get all the stakeholders together and how to get the conversation moving. Commissioner Overman amended the motion to direct the MPO (TPO) staff to coordinate with FDOT and other local stakeholder agencies to develop cost estimates and approximate timeline for implementing a passenger rail service along the CSX lines in our region and to identify eligibility requirements for federal and State financial participation; further, staff would also identify possible roles and responsibilities of each of the pertinent agencies in this effort. Mayor Ross questioned if the motion was feasible without enough funding. The motion was seconded by Councilman Dingfelder. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried fifteen to zero. (Ms. Williams was absent.)

VIII. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

- Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area Leadership Group and Suncoast Transportation Planning Alliance (formerly known as CCC) meetings: June 25, 9:30 a.m. and 11:30 a.m. respectively, FDOT District 7 Auditorium and GoToWebinar

Ms. Alden gave the report, touched on the addendum, highlighted summer camp educational opportunities, and shared information on an upcoming July 31, 2021, event.

IX. OLD BUSINESS AND NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Smith invited TPO members to review the addendum regarding the State Road (SR) 56 extension before the June 15, 2021, meeting.
ADDENDUM

A. Announcements

- Public comment period through June 7 on Big Bend Road widening Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study
- SR 56 Extension public meeting, June 15
- Tampa Mobile Opportunity Vision Equity Safety Plan – Leave comments on the Idea Map
- Gulf Coast Safe Streets Summit: Save the Date, November 2-4
- Call for Entries: PC’s Planning and Design Awards

B. Project Summaries and Other Status Reports

- Federal transportation spending reauthorization bill summaries
  - National Association Regional Councils summary of Senate Bill
  - Association of MPOs summary of Senate Bill
  - Senate bill – Grand Old Party counteroffer
- Gandy Bridge Replacement PD and E Study
- Federal Highway Administration Publishes Transportation Performance Measure Data

C. Correspondence

- From MPO Advisory Council to FDOT re: MPO’s Freight Priorities
- To Federal Transit Administration re: support for HART application for service development grant for Uptown Circulator
- To Engineering Research Center re: commitment to support INFABS proposal by USF

D. Articles Related to TPO Work

- https://www.bizjournals.com/tampabay/news/2021/05/21/study-reveals-which-transit-mode-is-the-bay-areas.html
- https://www.fox13news.com/video/934917


https://www.wtsp.com/article/news/local/bayshore-bike-event-tampa/67-76246920-980c-4ae6-a8d3-a97c939f34a0

XI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

READ AND APPROVED: ______________________________

CHAIR

ATTEST:
CINDY STUART, CLERK

By: _______________________
    Deputy Clerk

ms
Committee Reports

Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) June 2

Under Action Items, the CAC approved:

- Transportation Improvement Program for FY22-26 -- with the removal from the Priority List, line item #47, of the words “[construct] an additional general-purpose lane” on I-275 between Hillsborough Ave and Bearss Ave.
  - Members had an in-depth discussion, touching on regional trails, tolled versus managed express lanes, improvements to the downtown interchange, and the Florida/Fowler arterial BRT project.

- Public Participation Plan Amendment to change the public notice timeframe for TIP amendments.
  - Members suggested some additional outreach steps, such as reaching out to community leaders, using QR codes on roadside signs, and engaging more on social media. Staff will pursue these steps.

Members also discussed a recent NY Times article titled “Can Removing Highways Fix America’s Cities” which highlighted efforts in 16 U.S. cities, including Tampa, to convert Interstate highways to surface-level arterials. Several members asked how the I-275 boulevard study could be advanced, including whether it could be included in the Transportation Improvement Program. This and remainder of the items on the CAC’s June meeting agenda will be taken up in July.

Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on May 19

Meeting virtually with no physically present quorum, the BPAC heard status reports on:

- Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
  - Members raised no objection to moving forward with the TIP, after receiving clarification about several projects that have been on the TPO’s priority list:
    - Green ARTery Segments D and E – Segments were removed due to the projects being funded through All For Transportation Surtax. Tampa is not seeking federal grants in 2027 because the City is continuing to look for funding sources to implement these projects as soon as possible, and has design underway.
- Trailhead beneath Selmon Expressway – This project has been delayed due to construction of a large reclaimed water line as well as the requirement of remediation of contaminated soil at the site.

- Rome Ave West River Project – This project is being funded through a BUILD grant, is listed only for illustrative purposes and is being constructed along with stormwater projects.

- Green Spine Segment 2B – This has already been constructed along with adjacent stormwater projects.

✓ Regional Trail Priorities
  - Members raised no objection to the regional trail priorities after asking about the Dale Mabry Overpass project. This project is requested to be constructed along with adjacent I-275 improvements.

✓ USF – GreenARTery Trail Study
  - Members asked how equity will be considered in this TPO trail feasibility study that is just getting underway. Staff responded that public outreach and equity are major components of the study, and that the study area is largely a food desert with high concentrations of chronic health conditions and economic disparities.

Meeting of the Livable Roadways Committee (LRC) on May 19

Meeting virtually with no physically present quorum, the LRC heard status reports on:

✓ Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
  - Members supported the TIP after discussion, with clarification on inquiries regarding congestion mitigation projects, air quality funding, timing of projects, and sidewalk distribution.

✓ McIntosh Road Widening PD&E Study, Advance Notification
  - Members provided comments that the study should look at number of pedestrian crossings and at the project’s relationship to the three schools in the area.

✓ USF – GreenARTery Trail Study - No discussion.

Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on June 7

A verbal report will be provided at the TPO meeting.
In the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic and the proliferation of its variants, we wish all of our members, families and friends good health. Please follow best practices and sound judgements to take care of yourselves and each other.

WE HAVE A LAW!

We received notification this morning that CS/SB 950 was approved by the Governor and becomes effective July 1, 2021.

CS/SB 950 addresses issues relating to bicycle and pedestrian safety. The bill changes certain elements of the Florida statutes. These changes include:

- Providing that no-passing zones do not apply to motorists who safely and briefly drive to the left of center of the roadway to overtake a bicycle, provided that such a passing continues to give the cyclist the necessary three feet passing clearance. If a motorist cannot safely pass at a distance of 3 feet or more, the law clearly states they must wait until a safe moment to pass.
- Requiring a vehicle making a right turn while overtaking and/or passing a cyclist to do so only if the cyclist is at least 20 feet from the intersection and at a distance that the driver of the vehicle may safely turn.
Authorizing cyclists riding in groups, after coming to a full stop, to go through an intersection in groups of 10 or fewer. Motorists are now required to let one such group pass before proceeding.

Providing guidelines for riding a bicycle in a substandard width lane and authorizing cyclists to ride two abreast to avoid dangerous conditions.

A thorough examination of the changes can be found on our FBA ClubExpress membership website / Documents Library / Legislative Platform / 2021 Legislative Outcomes.

Please consider sending a quick/brief thank you to the bill sponsors, co-sponsors and Governor DeSantis (and use Thank you as the subject line). Sample language can be found on our website.

**CS/HB 605**
Representative Christine Hunscofsky / Sponsor
Representative Anna Eskamani / Co-sponsor
Representative Emily Slosberg / Co-sponsor
Representative Cyndi Stevenson / Co-sponsor
Representative Jackie Toledo / Co-sponsor
Representative Marie Paul Woodson / Co-sponsor

**CS/SB 950**
Senator Lauren Book / Sponsor

The Florida Bicycle Association will continue its efforts to improve conditions for cyclists. Have an idea? Please send an email to becky@floridabicycle.org.

**Thank you for your support of FBA!**

_Education is our mission - Ride Smart / Be Safe - teach by example and share the road._

Becky Afonso
Executive Director
Florida Bicycle Association

_Do you have a bicycle story to tell? Photos to share? Be our guest and be our next guest blogger! Send your story and photos to becky@floridabicycle.org. Speaking of stories, our quarterly Messenger newsletter is available online for your internet reading pleasure. Visit the FBA website [Home page](mailto:homepage) and scroll down to Publications to check out the latest edition._

---

**Florida Bicycle Association, Inc.**
Copyright © 2021
PO Box 2452
Oldsmar, FL 34677
813-748-1513
[Visit FBA!](mailto:VisitFBA)

The Florida Bicycle Association, Inc. is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization. Contributions are tax deductible to the fullest extent allowed by law. All proceeds benefit FBA programs.
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IF MODERN CARS ARE GETTING SAFER, WHY ARE THEY KILLING MORE OF US?

(WE’RE KILLING OURSELVES.)

42,060 PEOPLE DIED IN MOTOR VEHICLE CRASHES IN THE UNITED STATES IN 2020.

This number is appalling for many reasons. It translates to five roadway deaths every hour of every day. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, it represents the number-one killer (pre- and post-COVID) of people under 54. And it is fodder in the fantastical pursuit of self-driving vehicles, on which countless billions have been spent, to no great effect.

In our rush to wash these rivers of blood from our roadways with interventionist technology, we’ve overlooked the fact that this carnage has profoundly analog roots—roots that pre-date the microchip, anti-lock brakes, collision avoidance, and Elon Musk.

“Belts, booze, and speed are contributing factors to an overwhelming majority of traffic fatalities in this country,” says Jake Nelson, director of traffic safety advocacy and research for the American Automobile Association (AAA). Add in human distraction—daydreaming, or being lost in our mobile devices, or elaborate-by-design in-car infotainment systems—and we can draw a clear cause to the bulk of these deaths.

If the past year is any indication, these problems are getting worse, even as cars are technologically “safer” with each successive model. 2020 saw an increase of 8 percent in vehicle fatalities over 2019. And this was during a crippling pandemic, when many people stayed home, and miles driven decreased by more than 13 percent, the largest single-year decline in history. For context, the European Union saw a 17-percent reduction in roadway deaths in 2020, part of a 36-percent drop in the past decade.

The U.S. trend goes in the other direction; we’re up 10 percent since 2010. And last year, as measured in fatalities per 100-million vehicle miles
traveled, the U.S. saw a nearly 25 percent jump in the roadway death rate, the largest increase in 96 years of measuring.

“We don’t usually use the word unprecedented,” says Michelle Chaka, division director for data and analytics at the Virginia Tech Transportation Institute (VTTI) in Blacksburg, Virginia. “But if you get the sense that this change was unprecedented, that is correct.”

Chaka cites some background factors for this horrifying spike. Unlike previous economic crises, the pandemic brought historically low gas prices, which incentivized car travel. It resulted in a massive reduction in the use of public transportation, so that people were increasingly commuting in private vehicles. It also encouraged an uptick in bicycling and walking, increasing roadway exposure for these vulnerable groups. It shut down driver licensing centers, allowing untested novices and those with expired licenses onto the road. And, notably, it caused a stark reduction in traffic enforcement, as police avoided contact with motorists and the virus.

Most importantly, the willingness to shelter in place during stay-at-home orders varied, so COVID also incurred a marked expansion among certain populations of what Chaka calls “risky behaviors.” “Older drivers, who are characteristically more safe and more risk-averse, stayed home and minimized travel patterns,” Chaka says. This freed up room on the roadways for drivers (predominantly 18- to 34-year-olds) who, by the very act of venturing out during the pandemic, were risk-takers. And their risks all come back to the three cardinal sins: belts, booze, and speed.

“Before the pandemic, seatbelt use was around 90 percent,” says Chaka. “But if we look at data from the pandemic, there are a couple sources that indicate a decrease in seatbelt use.” Ejections per 100 vehicle crashes, as recorded by national Emergency Medical Services (EMS) statistics, are used by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) as a standard for tracking seatbelt use. According to NHTSA’s most recent data, ejection rates increased significantly in the first half of 2020. In a special report on the spike in traffic deaths during the pandemic, the agency states that, “the peak ejection rate in April 2020 was double the ejection rate in April 2019.” Double.

Driving unbelted has a multiplying effect on other behaviors strongly associated with traffic fatalities. According to a NHTSA report, “Drivers who
do not always wear seatbelts are, on average, more impulsive, less averse to risk, and less perceptive of risk.” This means that these drivers are more likely to engage in other perilous actions, like drinking or taking drugs before they get behind the wheel.

Alcohol sales and consumption, and rates of crashes attributed to impaired driving, typically decline during periods of economic uncertainty. According to NHTSA, in the recession of 2008, beer sales declined by 3.5 percent and alcohol-related crashes went down by 10 percent compared to the previous year. That was not the case last year. Alcohol sales in the summer of 2020 increased by 20 percent over 2019. During that same time period, Colorado and Oregon, two states with a long history of legal recreational cannabis sales, saw marijuana tax receipts increase by 38 percent and 45 percent, respectively.

These statistics translated to devastation on our roadways. Driving while under the influence is generally a factor in about one-third of roadway deaths. An ongoing study conducted by NHTSA at five trauma centers around the country showed a shocking increase in the use of mind-altering substances among seriously and fatally injured drivers in 2020. The presence of one active drug at the time of death increased by more than 25 percent compared to the same time period in 2019. The presence of more than one active drug increased by 43 percent. The presence of opioids during the pandemic almost doubled.

Finally, there is velocity. “Speeding tends to be involved in about one-third of all motor vehicle fatalities,” says Chaka. This is no small matter. According to studies cited by NHTSA, increased speed amplifies both the probability of accidents and the severity of injuries. A crash that is survivable at 40 mph can be fatal at 50, as occupants’ heads batter through airbags and ricochet off hard surfaces. NHTSA studies showed that rates of speed in many metropolitan areas increased during the pandemic by an astounding 22 percent.

Inebriated drivers in speeding cars also contribute to the demise of other vulnerable roadway users. According to the Governors Highway Safety Administration, the number of pedestrian deaths increased by a staggering 46 percent from 2010 to 2019. And though they remained about steady, at a hideous 3000, in 2020, this number is based on the aforementioned radical decrease in vehicle miles traveled, meaning that the rate of
pedestrian deaths per 100-million vehicle miles traveled actually increased by 20 percent.

Nelson attributes this marked increase solely to a more active populace. “As the proportion of people walking and biking increases, we would expect to see the rates of them being injured or killed in car crashes go up as well,” he says. “And that’s exactly what we think has happened.” But other analysts have a different perspective.

“The vehicle mix has changed a lot in the past ten years. There’s been this huge growth in SUVs, and sedan sales have really declined,” says Angie Schmitt, who wrote a book, Right of Way, about the soaring rates of pedestrian deaths, and runs a planning and consulting firm called 3MPH, focused on pedestrian safety. “There’s a lot of data that shows that SUVs are far more likely to kill pedestrians when they strike them.” A 2015 NHTSA meta-analysis concluded that pedestrians are two-to-three times more likely to be killed if they’re struck by an SUV than a car.

Schmitt also cites the increased migration to Sun Belt cities that were not constructed with pedestrians in mind, the lack of focus on pedestrians in driver-assistance technology, speed limits that are too high in urban and suburban areas, and urban gentrification and the “suburbanization of poverty,” which leaves many people without cars in areas that require and are dominated by them.

All of this has an unfair impact on already underprivileged populations. According to a Smart Growth America report, Dangerous by Design, “Older adults, people of color, and people walking in low-income communities are disproportionately represented in fatal crashes—even after controlling for differences in population size and walking rates.” From 2010 to 2019, Black Americans were struck and killed by drivers at a rate that was 82 percent higher than White Americans.

Most experts we spoke to herald technology as the solution to all of these problems, citing studies that show that roadway deaths can be significantly reduced by the incorporation of advanced driver-assistance systems (ADAS), like blind-spot monitoring, automatic emergency braking, and lane-departure warning.
But these systems have intrinsic shortcomings. First, many are not standard features; nor are they standardized in their operation, so different manufacturers’ systems work differently under different circumstances, and many are affected adversely by poor weather. Second, consumers who have these features on their cars frequently aren’t educated about them, so they are often not implemented even if they’re available. And third, even if every single car currently produced had a suite of ADAS, the average age of a car on the road is about 12 years.

Moreover, research by AAA and VTTI has shown that drivers who do use these systems often have overconfidence in their capabilities, relinquishing control to them and increasing, not decreasing, their risk. According to NHTSA, distracted driving is already a rising factor in fatal crashes, responsible for 8 percent of such wrecks. A key study from VTTI demonstrated that, when these systems were engaged, drivers showed an 80 percent increase in tasks that required them to take their eyes off the road or their hands off the wheel.

While the COVID-19 crisis exacerbated some of these tendencies, our death bubble is unlikely to burst. “I tend to believe that the trends that we’re seeing can’t be explained away by the pandemic and lockdowns of 2020,” says Nelson. Given the stubborn analog causality of America’s roadway deaths, perhaps our solutions are similarly analog.

Our standard for intoxication, a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of .08, is 60 to 400 percent higher than nearly every European country, and our enforcement is far more lax. Studies have shown that lowering the BAC limit to .05 would decrease alcohol-related roadway deaths by 10 percent. The use of alcohol-level ignition interlocks, which prevent a car from starting if the driver’s breath reveals them to be intoxicated, could also contribute to diminishing the rate of driving under the influence, as could additional enforcement.

Physical solutions, like rumble strips at the middle and edges of roads, can reduce head-on crashes by up to 64 percent. Separated lanes can decrease run-off collisions between cars and bikes by half, and proper pedestrian crossings can limit interactions between cars and humans. Lower speed limits can also significantly reduce deaths. “Pedestrians struck at 20 mph almost always survive, while those struck at 40 mostly die,” says Schmitt.
So, speed limits matter. [See sidebar “Spain Cracks Down on Speed”.] Other traffic-calming measures, particularly in congested urban and suburban areas, are also needed. Adjusting lane width, sight distance, and other roadway cues can force drivers to slow down, without any additional measures.

But perhaps the largest impact can be made through a simple analog component that has been in every single new car sold in America for nearly 50 years: the three-point seatbelt. Though only 10 percent of Americans don’t wear their belt, unbelted occupants account for an astonishing 47 percent of roadway deaths. Among 25- to 34-year olds who died in crashes, 60 percent were unbelted.

In the early Seventies, a seatbelt interlock law—one that required occupants’ belts to be fastened before a car could be started—fell victim to rushed implementation, consumer complaint, and congressional fiat. [See sidebar “When America Failed to Mandate Seatbelts”.] But back then, belt usage was just for outliers. (Even by the early Eighties, only 14 percent of Americans regularly belted up.) Such a law should be an easy sell now and would be the cheapest, simplest way to significantly curtail roadway deaths. At the very least, making seatbelt use a requirement for all vehicle occupants, and adding it to the books as a primary law, would strongly increase belt-wearing compliance. Yet such laws are far from universal among the states, and they’re spottily enforced.

Perhaps the demographics of those resistant to seatbelts has something to do with our national disinterest in establishing the political will for new laws. According to Nelson, that stubborn 10 percent of non-users is predominantly made up of young males, Blacks and Latinos, and/or motorists driving older model-year vehicles—all categories associated with lower income. In a country founded on a brutal practice of capitalism and White supremacy, one that treats these populations as disposable, is it any wonder that we don’t take action?

Yet, the argument for universal seatbelt use is never described in these terms. Rather, it’s done in a way that reflects adherence to specious foundational American myths. “It really is just people wanting their freedom,” says Chaka. “I don’t really have a good reason other than people wanting to have that choice whether to buckle up or not.”
As learned during the pandemic, if we actually want to fix our problems, we have to move away from tempestuous and fantastical notions of what constitutes “freedom” and toward rational and humane ideas of what constitutes solutions.

SIDEBAR: WHEN AMERICA FAILED TO MANDATE SEATBELTS

In 1973, NHTSA passed a rule mandating that all cars be sold with a piece of equipment called a seatbelt interlock mechanism. This system would prevent a driver from starting a car unless the belt was fastened. It also required a minute-long alarm that would buzz relentlessly if both front-seat occupants weren’t belted in.

The auto industry had long resisted any meaningful advances in safety, and passive restraints—or any technology of the sort—were anathema to it. The industry engaged in a disinformation campaign, and Americans went ballistic, claiming that being reminded and required to wear a seatbelt was tantamount to Stalinism.

However, contemporary studies showed that belt use more than doubled when the systems were implemented—from 28 percent use to 67 percent. And the number of roadway fatalities dropped almost 18 percent in 1974. America was on its way to behavior modification.

Still, the auto industry and other anti-regulatory forces rebelled, insisting that it was Americans’ God-given right to drive unbelted, and die. The intensity of their stirrings caused NHTSA to do away with the interlock and limit the buzzer to a useless four-to-eight seconds.

Unsurprisingly, belt usage plummeted. NHTSA then refocused its energies on passive restraints, like automatic belts and airbags, punting regulation to the states, where it floundered into the scattershot, ad-hoc assemblage of laws we have today.

The auto industry successfully fought airbags for decades; they didn’t become mandatory until 1998. Though studies show that airbags can actually increase the risk of injuries among unbelted occupants, seatbelts are still not universally mandatory in this country.
The Spanish government recently made an interesting observation: Following a decades-long campaign to reduce roadway deaths, it had seen an immense diminution—an 80 percent drop in fatalities from 1990 to 2017, according to the International Transport Forum.

But alongside this decrease, Spain had seen an alarming rise in both the number and proportion of these deaths occurring among pedestrians and bicyclists. In 2019, for the first time, more people killed on the country’s roads were outside of cars—walking, biking, e-scootering—than inside of them.

The government took action, and in May 2021, new regulations went into effect. From that point forward, speeds on the majority of Spanish streets were set at 30 km/h (around 19 mph). Roadways with sidewalks at the same level as the street were reduced to 20 km/h (12 mph). Roads with two lanes traveling in each direction can allow speeds of up to 50 km/h (31 mph).

This law doesn’t impact highways, where pedestrian, bicycle, and e-scooter travel is prohibited. But it affects about 60 to 70 percent of the nation’s roads.

It also aligns with Spain’s overarching roadway initiative, the 80-20 Model. This sets a goal of seeing 80 percent of vehicle travel take place on 20 percent of the roadways, and just 20 percent of the vehicles moving around on 80 percent of the country’s roads. The idea being that cars should be used for moving long distances quickly on the highway and then parked, or driven very slowly, in congested areas.