Virtual Workshop of the Livable Roadways Committee
Wednesday, August 18, 2021, 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

To view presentations and participate your computer, tablet or smartphone: https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/6985679373790661647. 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 185-248-572
- 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: Jason Krzyzanowski at (813) 836-7327 or JasonK@plancom.org.

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 leaving a voice message at (813) 273-3774 ext. 6.
- by e-mailing mpo@plancom.org
- By visiting the event posted on the MPO Facebook page.

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

II. Approval of Minutes – June 16, 2021

III. Status Reports

A. Hillsborough County Mobility Section Announcement (Katrina Corcoran, Plan Hillsborough Staff)

B. Heights Mobility Study Next Steps (FDOT representative)

C. Park Speed Zone Pilot Study (Lisa Silva, TPO Staff)
IV. Old Business & New Business
   A. By-Law Amendment for LRC and BPAC Quorum-September TPO (Lisa Silva, TPO Staff)
   B. Non-Discrimination and Equity Plan (Lisa Silva, TPO Staff)
   C. 2021 Idelio Valdes Leadership Award recipient Arizona Jenkins (Chair Citro, COT Councilman)

V. Adjournment

VI. Addendum
   A. TPO Meeting Summary and Committee Reports
   B. Hillsborough MPO Mobility Profile
   C. Publication of NOFO for the FY 21 ATCMTD Program
   D. 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 Citro called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Members Present Virtually: Joseph Citro, Cal Hardie, Oona Johnsen, Mark Hudson, Michael Maurino, Melissa Collazo, David Hey, Emily Hinsdale, Karen Cashon, Larry Josephson (in at 9:51 AM), Karen Kress, Matthew Lewis, Justin Willits, Cayce Dagenhart, Catherine Coyle, Arizona Jenkins, Sara Hendricks, Robert Frey, Sandra Picirilli, and Matthew Pleasant

Members Absent: Carlos Ramirez and Gus Ignas

Other Attendees: Lisa Silva, Allison Yeh, Dayna Lazarus, Jason Krzyzanowski, Beth Alden, Wade Reynolds, Vishaka Shiva Raman, Johnny Wong, Gail Reese (TPO Staff); Craig Fox, Mary Lou Godfrey, Alex Henry (FDOT); Claire Apaliski (HNTB); Jake Mirabella, Mike Campo, Emily DeGaetano

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES from May 19, 2021

Cal Hardie moves to approve the minutes from the meeting on May 19, 2021; Seconded by David Hey. Motion passes unanimously.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Branch Forbes Road and SR 56 ETDM Review (Allison Yeh, TPO Staff)
   • Part of the Florida Efficient Transportation Decision-Making process (ETDM)
     o Look at potential environmental impacts early on in the transportation project(s)
   • Branch Forbes Road
     o Approximately .9 miles, north of I-4
     o Completely in Hillsborough County
     o Improve functional operation as well as pedestrian/bicycle amenities.
     o Capacity project with safety enhancements.
     o Facility is failing at level of service F.
     o Crash rates are above the state average.
     o Advance notification package included in Agenda Packet.
Highlighted Community and Cultural Considerations, Environmental Considerations, and Physical Considerations

- TPO asked for formal review and consistency findings; found to be consistent with the Comp. Plan.

- SR 56 Extension
  - Connecting 301 and 98 in Pasco County
  - The TPO has not been formally asked for an evaluation on this project.
  - Extension, primarily, across Pasco County but dips into the northern border of Hillsborough Co.
  - Approximately 7 alternatives looked at; 2 have floated to the top.
    - One corridor is entirely in Pasco Co.
    - Second corridor goes into the northern border area of Hillsborough Co.
  - Preliminary environmental analysis included in Agenda Packet.
  - Concern points included in presentation.
  - Believes this project will come back for formal review if it moves to the next phase.

Preliminary Environmental Discussion Report (included in June 16, 2021 Agenda Packet)

Presentation: Branch Forbes Road and SR 56 ETDM Review
Public Comment Site: SR 56 Extension from US 301 to US 98

Branch Forbes Discussion:

Comments noted from chat.

David Hey: Noted that the future land use for Branch Forbes; NMU 4 and R 4 present are defined as suburban in the Unincorporated County Plan. Expecting a more suburban scale in that location.

Matt Lewis: Developing a context-based classification system to go into the Comprehensive Plan; based on the future land use. Asked to reflect in the comments the suburban scale in existing conditions based on the road patterns in the area, they are more suburban.

SR 56 Discussion:

Chat Question: Is there a demonstrated need?

Chair Citro: Inquired as to when the next phase timeline is going to be.

Cal Hardie: Inquired about any existing roadway corridors near the 98 corridor or if it would all be new.

Sara Hendricks: Commented that, based on presentation, new corridor crossing into Hillsborough Co. is going to be problematic.
Cal Hardie: Has DOT looked at the regional impact? Is there another solution that could be used to get the road access that we could work with them on? Has there been any meetings/discussions at a regional level?

Beth Alden - Bob, I have reached out to the Pasco MPO Director to better coordinate on cross-border road network issues.

** Chair Request: For those taking part in the meeting and discussions, for the record, please state your name so that the record shows who is asking questions or making comment.

B. Gandy PD&E Study Kick Off (Craig Fox, FDOT)
- From 4th Street in Pinellas County to Westshore Boulevard in Hillsborough County.
- Reduce traffic congestion and improve bicycle/pedestrian travel.
- Widening and reconstruction; safe routes crossing Gandy Blvd.
- Three segments:
  - Seg 1 – Pinellas Co.: 3.6 miles from 4th St. to Gandy Bridges on commercial, residential, and recreational land use areas.
  - Seg 2 – Gandy Bridges: 2.6 miles of Gandy Bridges over Old Tampa Bay.
  - Seg 3 – Hillsborough Co.: 1.0 mile from Gandy Bridges to Westshore Blvd on commercial and residential land use areas.
- Provided Alternative and Concept Development for all segments.
- Included milestones in presentation.

Presentation: Gandy PD&E Study
Website: FDOT’s Gandy PDE project study page

Discussion:

Arizona Jenkins: Noted that the sidewalks on the bridges should be 8’ wide instead of 6’.

Justin Willits: Inquired about the Pinellas section and dealing with how low the grade is dealing with resiliency and storm surge. Asked about super, high-level cost, to get this project for light rail. Will talk to Mr. Fox off-line. South Tampa Spur would be more viable if it connected to Pinellas.

Cal Hardie: Asked for clarification on connecting to the Selmon. Due to an expected reduction in traffic on the Gandy to the Selmon, asked about a consideration of reducing the speed limit on the Gandy and surface streets and look at it as a Safe Streets corridor. Requested coordination with the Parks Department on the trail segments.

Beth Alden From Chat: At the east end of the bridge, there are park facilities on both the north and south side of Gandy. How will the project improve walk/bike connections on both the north and the south side? And is there a way to connect from the north side to the south side, at the east end of the bridge?
Cal Hardie: Noted that this should also look at the Pinellas trail system and the connections. This should inform future trail systems on a regional basis.

Bob Frey: Noted that the 4th Street area will be looked at with the Hwy 92 corridor and there will be opportunity to build on Cal Hardie’s idea for the regional trail.

Oona Johnsen: Noted that a connection to the Weedon Island Preserve would be a big amenity for the Pinellas side. On the Hillsborough side, it could use a couple of connections with the influx of people coming into that area.

Lisa Silva: Confirmed that the trail is part of the regional trail network.

Chair Citro: Great comments, great questions. Agrees with Arizona; would like to see wider pedestrian/bicycle lanes that are separate from the traffic lanes. Agrees with Justin that it would be more economically feasible to have rail going across Gandy and meeting a multi-modal hub. Agrees with Cal about lowering the speed.

C. FDOT I-275/Downtown Interchange Aesthetics Package/Trellis Noise (Mary Lou Godfrey, FDOT)
   • Provided examples of other interchanges that follow the Urban Design Guidelines
   • Project runs from north of I-4 to just south of Hanna Avenue.
   • Described signs that will be implemented.
   • Will upgrade underdeck lighting to LED and additional lighting will be added.
   • Summarized noise wall and fencing
   • Noted install of MSE walls and Public Art location. Art will be installed by the City of Tampa when the project is completed.
   • Went over new retaining and gravity walls and layout of underpasses at Floribraska Ave, Lake Ave., and Chelsea St.
   • Dr. MLK Jr. Blvd will have new retaining wall and wider sidewalk.
   • Improvements at Osborne Ave. include retaining wall, gravity wall, fencing, and art on the gravity wall.
   • Hillsborough Ave will have a new retaining wall, gravity wall, widened sidewalk, and art.
   • Construction timetable: begin Summer 2021 and complete Late 2024. Landscape and art follow construction.

Environmentally Sensitive Noise Wall Update (Lisa Silva, TPO Staff)
   • Before February of 2020, Wade Reynolds (correction, Michele Ogilvie) was the Project Manager for the Environmentally Sensitive Noise Walls White Paper.
   • The TPO was looking at various future projects that would be including noise walls.
   • Paper addresses public health concerns as well as noise.
   • Identified various barriers applications including plant and technology solutions, SMOGSTOP product.
   • LRC and TPO adopted the report and recommended a Noise Wall Working Group as a subcommittee of the LRC.
• Working committee found Green Screen being used in Pasco Co.; great establishment of plant material and low maintenance vegetation. Pilot being installed on I-75 in New Tampa, construction to begin in September 2021.
• Treatments are subject to maintenance by the City of Tampa.
• Treatments will be installed after the construction of roadway and noise walls are complete.

Presentations: FDOT I-275 (from north of I-4 to north of Hillsborough Avenue) Aesthetics and Noise Wall Update // Green Noise Walls Update

Discussion:

Via Chat from Beth Alden: 10:15 AM: Since the project goes almost to Hanna, would FDOT consider the same ped improvements at the Hanna Ave underpass as at Osborne? They are badly needed.

Arizona Jenkins: Inquired about the homeless that live under the bridges. This will give them a little more safety.

Chair Citro: Has citizens contacting him about the junk, trash, and debris that is on I-275 and the on/off ramps. Would like to have that addressed as well.

D. Non-Discrimination Public Involvement Findings (Dayna Lazarus, Plan Hillsborough Staff)
• Noted engagement methods and process.
• Summarized sampling by showing demographics for survey participants and Hillsborough County make-up.
• Looked at accessibility of community elements, what they feel contributes to personal quality of life, and the perception of access discrimination.
• Did thematic analysis of data on questions about challenges and solutions accessing transportation, housing, other community elements, and public engagement opportunities.
• Went over possible solutions to challenges across the topics.
• Recommendations package is being developed.
• Provided contact information and feedback/input channel.

Presentation: Preliminary Results Non-discrimination Engagement
Web Page: Title VI and Nondiscrimination Plan

Discussion:

Questions and comments from chat were from members who had to leave, will forward those to Ms. Lazarus to answer directly.

Arizona Jenkins: Is a user of the bus systems, said he has been using the bus for 45 years. Sits on the board of the HART Line ADA committee, for those who can’t use the bus, there is a door-to-door service. People need to apply for that and use it. If sidewalks need to be widened, need to let the
ADA for Hillsborough County know. People are getting around every day. There are solutions for later hours. People have to know their system. He is open for questions on this topic. Looking to minimize the complaints, many have already been dealt with.

Chair Citro: Inquired to the percentage of participation by the 350K+ people in the City of Tampa and the 800K+ people in Hillsborough County. The overall participation percentage.

Lisa Silva: The adopted version will be provided in the August Agenda Packet. This is the LRC’s opportunity for public comment and questions.

V. OLD BUSINESS & NEW BUSINESS

A. Reminder that July is a recess, and the next meeting is August 18, 2021. County offices are opening in July and the August meeting is expected to be in-person on the 18th floor.

VI. ADJOURNMENT Meeting adjourned at 11:15 AM

Chat Comments:

Lisa Silva (to All - Entire Audience):

9:11 AM: Hi Craig!

Craig Fox (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

9:14 AM: Hello Lisa

Craig Fox (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

9:14 AM: I’m on and ready to present on Gandy apologies for the delay.

Lisa Silva (to All - Entire Audience):

9:16 AM: Thanks, I suspect the chair will reutrn to your Gandy presentation next.

ROBERT FREY (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

9:16 AM: Is Plant City or their rep on? Curious their view. Or, any East County rep???

Lisa Silva (to All - Entire Audience):

9:17 AM: Yes Mark Hudson joined right after roll call.

ROBERT FREY (to Organizers and Panelists Only):
9:20 AM: There is a need for East/West routes in North County and South Pasco. Does this project help with this issue?

Calvin Hardie (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

9:30 AM: Can you go back to the map

Calvin Hardie (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

9:30 AM: for 56

Karen Kress (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

9:32 AM: this seems unnecessary and potentially irreparable harm to conservation areas

David Hey (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

9:36 AM: It may be helpful to actually show the Hillsborough River on the map.

Beth Alden - Bob, I have reached out to the Pasco MPO Director to better coordinate on cross-border road network issues.

Calvin Hardie (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

9:50 AM: I have a question, hand raised

Beth Alden - At the east end of the bridge, there are park facilities on both the north and south side of Gandy. How will the project improve walk/bike connections on both the north and the south side? And is there a way to connect from the north side to the south side, at the east end of the bridge?

Larry Josephson (to Organizer(s) Only):

9:51 AM: Sorry to be late to the meeting. tied up in a meeting for a project under construction in which immediate resolutions needed to be determined.

Beth Alden - Light rail on the HF Bridge was estimated by FDOT at $1.6 billion to construct, including $25 million for hardening the bridge structure to accommodate rail.

Justin Willits (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

9:59 AM: Thanks, Beth!

Beth Alden (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

10:15 AM: Since the project goes almost to Hanna, would FDOT consider the same ped improvements at the Hanna Ave underpass as at Osborne? They are badly needed.
Karen Kress (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

10:17 AM: Thank you MaryLou for such attention to detail. It will really make a difference to the community.

Oona Johnsen (to Organizer(s) Only):

10:17 AM: Question: landscaping was mentioned. will this include tree planting along the fences and sound barrier walls?

Craig Fox (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

10:27 AM: Mr. Cito and Lisa, I would like to make a correction to the group after this agenda item. There is not an existing trail underpass under the east end of Gandy Blvd. However, we do have an underpass planned as part of the PD&E study.

Beth Alden (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

10:29 AM: Thank you Craig!

Arizona Jenkins (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

10:33 AM: I have to go to another meeting now. You all have a great week

Catherine Coyle (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

10:39 AM: the Low-Income segment includes all races/ethnicities, correct?

Matthew Pleasant (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

10:59 AM: The results pointing to the practical need for good bike/ped facilities resonates - they're needed for more than recreation!

Oona Johnsen (to Organizer(s) Only):

11:00 AM: I have to sign off for another call at 11am. Very informative session. Thank you!

Matthew Pleasant (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

11:01 AM: Please feel free to share comments specific to safe routes and schools with me. There's lots of work to do here - we have schools that students could walk and bike to more if they had a safe route

Matthew Pleasant (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

11:01 AM: Have to hop off for another meeting, appreciate the presentation!
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Hillsborough County Mobility Section Announcement

Presenter
Katrina Corcoran, AICP, Planning Commission Staff

Summary
The Mobility Section revamps what was formerly known as the Transportation Element of the Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan. This Section provides a renewed focus on safety, equity, multimodal choices, resiliency, technology, and context-sensitive road design. Transportation maps within the Comprehensive Plan are also being updated as part of this process.

By establishing goals and providing policy direction, the Mobility Section will help ensure that the transportation system:

- Supports needs of all users to access necessities, opportunities, and each other
- Encompasses Vision Zero and prioritizes safety for all roadway users
- Is maintained in good repair with the ability to evacuate via the roadway system
- Utilizes technology to build a smart system
- Protects historical, cultural, natural assets when considering roadway changes

The update is a collaboration between the Planning Commission and staff from the County’s Community & Infrastructure Planning Department, Public Works, and the Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART).

Recommended Action
None. For Information Only.

Prepared By
Katrina Corcoran, AICP, Planning Commission Staff

Attachments
Mobility Section Project Page
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.
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**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
  - Interactive crowdsourcing map for comments
  - Park Selection Process
  - Park Prioritization
  - Existing Conditions Assessments-Copeland, Sulphur Springs and UTBT
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**Agenda Item:**
Advocacy Award

**Presenter:**
Chair Joseph Citro, City Councilman

**Summary:**
Acknowledgement of advocacy award.

**2021 Idelio Valdes Leadership Advocacy Award:**

Recipient Arizona Jenkins, New Horizons and Livable Roadways Committee member representing Americans with Disabilities

On July 15, 2021, Tampa City Council recognized Arizona Jenkins’ many achievements as a recipient of the Idelio Valdes Leadership Advocacy Award.

As a passionate advocate for persons of all abilities Mr. Jenkins has guided our transportation authority to continue to make investments in serving the citizens of Tampa. Through New Horizons Support Group, he has worked tirelessly to mentor citizens and the youth of our city to be champions of their own cause and independence. The skills New Horizons empowers its members with is free public transportation training, social gatherings and self-advocacy training. His kindness, generosity of spirit, and leadership that has inspired countless citizens have made City of Tampa a better place for all its citizens.

**Recommended Action:**
Acknowledge Member Jenkins

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

**Attachments:**
2021 Idelio Valdes Leadership Award
Commendation

Presented to

Arizona Jenkins

The Tampa City Council wishes to recognize and commend your many achievements as a recipient of the Idelio Valdes Leadership Advocacy Award.

As a passionate advocate for citizens of all abilities, you’ve guided our transportation authority to continue to make investments in serving all the citizens of Tampa. Through New Horizons Support Group, you have worked tirelessly to mentor citizens and the youth of our city to be champions of their own cause and independence. The skills New Horizons empowers its members with, free public transportation training, social gatherings, and self-advocacy training. Your kindness, generosity of spirit, and leadership that has inspired countless citizens have made the City of Tampa a better place for all its citizens.

[Signatures]

CITY OF TAMPA, FLORIDA
Authorized July 15, 1848

[Building Image]
JUNE 9, 2021 - TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION AND PUBLIC HEARING

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  HART

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.
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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
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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 Louis 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.
X. ADDENDUM

A. Announcements

- Public comment period through June 7 on Big Bend Road widening Planned Development and Environment (PD and 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
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- https://www.wtsp.com/article/news/local/bayshore-bike-event-tampa/67-76246920-980c-4ae6-a8d3-a97c939f34a0
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.

  o 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.

  o 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)

  o 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.
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Travel Time Reliability

Percent Miles
Heavily Congested
NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM
FREEWAYS
NON-FREEWAYS

Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay

48,700
NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
52,800
STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM
27,900
FREEWAYS
24,900
NON-FREEWAYS

Percent Miles Daily Truck Miles Traveled
Heavily Congested Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled

17% 1.5M 22.1M
16% 1.6M 23.1M
27% 1.1M 13.7M
11% 0.5M 9.4M

NOTE: Please go to Page 3 for measure definitions.
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 Traffic Characteristics Inventory, FDOT Roadway Characteristics Inventory, 2020 Quality/Level of Service Handbook, and HERE vehicle probe speed.
### 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></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>17%</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>16%</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>52%</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>18%</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>17%</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>57%</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>17%</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>16%</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>52%</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.
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.

| 2019 Hillsborough MPO | Population 1,444,900 |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Small-Sized MPO (Population ≤ 360,400)</th>
<th>Medium-Sized MPO (Population 360,400 to 813,700)</th>
<th>Large MPO (Population ≥ 813,700)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay (Thousands)</td>
<td>Low 0.3</td>
<td>Median 1.0</td>
<td>High 4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SHS Percent Miles Heavily Congested, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Small-Sized MPO (Population ≤ 360,400)</th>
<th>Medium-Sized MPO (Population 360,400 to 813,700)</th>
<th>Large MPO (Population ≥ 813,700)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Miles Heavily Congested</td>
<td>Low under 1%</td>
<td>Median under 1%</td>
<td>High 7%</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.
### 2019 Hillsborough MPO
#### Population, 1,444,900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vehicle Miles Traveled (Millions)</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HILLSBOROUGH MPO</strong></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&lt; 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&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (Population&gt; 813,700)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Truck Miles Traveled (Thousands)</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HILLSBOROUGH MPO</strong></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&lt; 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&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (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></th>
<th>On-Time Arrival</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HILLSBOROUGH MPO</strong></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&lt; 360,400 to 813,700)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large MPO&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (Population&gt; 813,700)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planning Time Index</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HILLSBOROUGH MPO</strong></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&lt; 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&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (Population&gt; 813,700)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>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.

<sup>2</sup>Seven Largest MPOs include Broward MPO, Hillsborough MPO, MetroPlan Orlando, Miami-Dade TPO, North Florida TPO, Palm Beach TPA, and Forward Pinellas.
The purpose of this email is to give you a heads up of the June 22, 2021 publication of the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for the FY 21 Advanced Transportation and Congestion Management Technologies Deployment (ATCMTD) program. The NOFO is published in Grants.gov (search using “693JJ321NF00005”) or accessed directly at: https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/view-opportunity.html?oppId=334272. The application due date is August 23, 2021. A webinar covering details of the program and the NOFO is being scheduled and we will follow up with the date and time as well as a link to register for the event. This information will be updated in the Grants.gov listing as well.

As background, section 6004 of the FAST Act created a new section – 503(c)(4) – under title 23 of the United States Code (23 USC 503(c)(4)) to establish the ATCMTD program. The ATCMTD program provides funding to eligible entities to develop model deployment sites for large-scale installation and operation of advanced transportation technologies to improve safety, efficiency, system performance, and infrastructure return on investment. The ATCMTD program is funded at $60 million per year for Fiscal Years 2016 through 2020, for between 5 and 10 awards per year with no more than $12 million to a single grant recipient each fiscal year. This authority was extended by the Continuing Appropriations Act 2021 and Other Extensions Act (P.L. 116-159). Eligible applicants include State or local government or political subdivision thereof, transit agency, MPO (representing populations of more than 200,000), multijurisdictional groups of eligible applicants, and consortium of research or academic institutions.

Please help raise awareness of this opportunity with your many partners.
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.
SIDEBAR: SPAIN CRACKS DOWN ON SPEED

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.