Meeting of the Policy Committee

Wednesday, October 13, 2021, 8:30 AM

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 head-count will allow us to plan facilities. People attending in person are required to wear a mask while inside the County Center building consistent with CDC guidance. Some voting members may participate via web conference due to the ongoing national and local states of emergency re: COVID-19.

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

This meeting may be viewed on Hillsborough Television (HTV) by visiting Spectrum: 637, Frontier: 22 or live stream from Hillsborough County’s Live YouTube Channel or the County website’s Live Meetings link, also found in the County Newsroom. The agenda packet, presentations, and any supplemental materials are posted on the TPO’s online calendar.

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

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

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

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.

Workshop on Performance-Based Planning & Programming

Agenda

I. Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance

II. Roll Call of Committee Members & Welcome of Other TPO Board Members (Gail Reese, TPO Staff)
III. Approval of Minutes: September 14, 2021

IV. Public Comment – 3 minutes per speaker, please

V. Discussion Items
   A. Purpose of today’s workshop (Beth Alden, TPO Director)
   B. 2021 State of the System Report (Vishaka Shiva Raman, TPO Staff)
   C. TIP Prioritization Criteria Adjustments (Johnny Wong, TPO Staff)
      - Equity
      - Resilience
      - Technology
      - PTASP
   D. IF TIME PERMITS: HART Transit Oriented Development Study (Sarah McKinley, TPO Staff) – deferred from September meeting

VI. Old & New Business

VII. Adjournment

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, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Kemp, called the meeting to order at 8:31 AM and led the pledge of allegiance. The regular monthly meeting was held in-person and virtual via WebEx.

II. ROLL CALL OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS & WELCOME TO OTHER TPO BOARD MEMBERS (Gail Reese, TPO Staff)

The following members were present in person: Commissioner Kemp, Commissioner Cohen, Commissioner Overman, Charles Klug

The following members were present virtually: Bob Frey

Welcome to other TPO Board Members present: Commissioner Kilton, Councilman Citro

A quorum was met in person.

Some members are participating virtually because of medical reasons and the local declaration of emergency.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 11, 2021 – skipped

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – None at this time

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. What was in the long-range plan we adopted in 2019? (Beth Alden, TPO Director)
   • Talked in June about CSX rail corridors and how to move forward in reusing those for passenger rail service
   • Fixed-Guideway is not just rail, it can be busses as well. It a commitment to a specific geographic location for operation.
   • There are several Fixed-Guideway projects
   • LRTP adopted in 2019 – standing with the Federal Government
     o Plans have evolved
     o Share we are now with that and how it stacks up with latest cost estimates and potential, available funding and grant opportunities.
     o Identified our best opportunities for Fixed-Guideway
       ▪ Right-of-Way available
       ▪ Forecast out the transportation surtax
       ▪ Identified a number of corridors
Public outreach – identified that fixed-guideway, particularly rail, is a high priority with the community. Included tri-county survey with more than 10K responses and the Hillsborough specific with more than 5K responses.

Highlight of information in agenda packet is the forecast of the highest ridership areas.
- As population grows, able to promote redevelopment and infill as opposed to expanding the urban services boundary outward.
- There are productive corridors with CSX corridor ROW opportunities
- Looked at two ferry routes
- Looked at new corridor from downtown to Westshore/Airport – no existing rail in that area.
- Westshore to Downtown to USF area are the highest indicated ridership areas.
- South Tampa, South County, east to Brandon/Plant City, west to Oldsmar routes are predicted to do very well.
- Expected that the rail system would be accompanied by an expansion of the bus system.
- These were studied together as it was assumed they would feed into each other.
- Review of station activity and frequency around the county.
- Review of station locations in Tampa
- Water Transit – did well, lower cost project

Adopted open-ended diagram – next steps by transit agencies and possibly the county for water.
- Identified high priority areas – population and job density areas
- Identified funding for corridors
- Reviewed cost per mile

Website: [2045 Transportation Plan](#)

B. **Current status of fixed-guideway projects & costs** (Sarah McKinley, TPO Staff)
- Reviewed Fixed Guideway Proposals in Hillsborough County today
  - Streetcar Modernization & Extension to Heights
    - Modernize and add stations
    - Reviewed costs
  - HART Arterial BRT
    - Ongoing study
    - Next Steps coming from HART
    - Improving network
    - In compliment with Heights Mobility Plan
    - Reviewed costs
  - TBARTA Rapid Transit
    - 41-mile limited stop express route
    - XX Counties
    - Has not applied for Grant yet
    - Reviewed costs
- Water Transit
• Limited service between Tampa and St. Petersburg
• Noted additional service to go all year and expand to MacDill AFB
• Proposed operating costs to be paid by private company
• Commissioner Kemp inquired about operating costs clarification

• Brightline
  • Intercity Rail Tampa – Orlando
  • Proposed Ybor station
  • Reviewed segments
  • Commissioner Cohen asked about other stop locations between Disney World and Tampa; are there any other locations on the table for stops? (Brightline in talks with Lakeland, no others known at this time.)

• CSX Joint Use between Downtown Tampa and USF
  • Reviewed types of cars that could be used
  • Will be SunRail
  • Reviewed cost per mile
  • Commissioner Kemp inquired 10 mil / mile. Noted the light rail cost per mile. SunRail purchased ROW, stations, rail, cars. Noted that is included in the cost. Doesn’t believe the cost should have been presented. Noted that I-275 without adding capacity is $120 mil per mile. Would like to put in perspective. Noted that the functional and operational costs are not really addressed along the way.
  • Commissioner Cohen noted that this cannot be compared “apple to apples” due to variability.
  • Beth Alden noted that there is a lot more that goes into the studies and variable costs. The studies do need more work on that.

• Wide range in cost per mile with recent FTA projects
  • Will need to refine a lot of the costs
  • Did not account for everything when negotiated

• SunRail
  • Reviewed how it happened and the timeline.

• Reviewed Estimate of freight trains per day or week
  • There is capacity along the rail corridors

• Downtown – Westshore New Connection
  • Reviewed the studies

• Next Steps
  • Grant Opportunities
    ▪ FTA Capital Investment Grants
    ▪ Florida New Starts Program – 1:1 match to local dollars (Ms. Alden noted new opportunity provided by FDOT. Previously, had to go through FTA Grant process. Now, if you don’t go through that process willing to match 50%)
    ▪ FTA has Passenger Ferry Grant Program
    ▪ FHWA Surface Transportation Block Grants
    ▪ Operations Support: FDOT Transit Corridor Program
    ▪ Operations Support: FDOT Service Development Program
    ▪ Other FDOT support for operations
Reviewed costs and how things could, potentially be funded.
Summarized the opportunities

**Presentation:** Fixed Guideway Transit

**Discussion:**

**Commissioner Kemp:** Requested to go back to TBARTA. Is this on the long-range plan? Does not recall this coming up in her time on this board. **Beth Alden** noted that the LRTP is a very broad schematic of plans. All these projects are at stages that are partial or have more potential. Wanted to confirm that this is not in a priority list on the Hillsborough County priority list. **Ms. Alden** noted that an amendment to the Long-Range Plan would be required for any of the plans.

**Commissioner Overman:** Commented on the first presentation. We expect 2 million people to move to Hillsborough County by 2025. Any of these projects could manifest in that time and could take that long. Prioritizing needs to be done. Noted the funding potentials and the new possible funding formula. Emphasized the response to the two surveys done and that it was significantly more than other surveys. Citizens are recognizing that fixed-guideway transportation is a desired option. Citizens are concerned about the congestion that continues to grow. First presentation offered congestion relief numbers. Would like to see the dollar comparison per person in any of the fixed-guideway solutions versus congestion for use in prioritizing projects and solutions. Frequently use the cost-per-mile comparison. We don't look at how that compares to the possible congestion costs. It will be difficult to prioritize these projects, but not impossible. Thanked Ms. Alden for bringing this together at Commissioner Overman's request. Would like all the boards to consider these options in their strategic plans. Need to address what citizens are most concerned about whether they are business owners, individuals trying to get to work, or individuals trying to get to school. Referred to slide 6 from first presentation; this is where the citizens are going to be, they are concerned about the solutions. Transit has been a priority for over 30 years. Fixed-guideway can very effectively increase it’s capacity. Noted the Denver RTD increases and decreases train cars during peak and non-peak times. We have to look at all methods of transit. In all scenarios, there is a local match required. In order to build a regional and county transit solution, we have to have the revenues to do so. That’s why all of our plans go back to “If we had a surtax...”, but we don’t right now. It becomes a prioritization matter.

**Councilman Citro:** Noted agreement with Commissioner Overman. We all know that the lowest bid is not always the best. We need to seize the opportunity to move as many people as we can at one time. Any transportation needs that this TPO plans forward will affect the City of Tampa the most which has the most amount of people per mile. Several options were presented, all are spokes in the wheel. Where is the hub going to be for all of it? Noted travelers trying to get from Disney World to Tampa airport and whether they can trust first, last, and middle mile to get there; USF student trying to get to Polytechnical; heard no mention of a central terminal. We need to move as many people as we can, get them off the roadways, but make it simple and easy.
**Commissioner Kemp:** Noted a problem, overall, there isn’t a coordinated, coherent overall plan. Noted that you must apply for an FTA grant, you get FTA funds for up to 50% but may be going up under the current infrastructure bill. 50% FTA, 25% state, and 25% local match. If you didn’t go for FTA, you received 12% state. Questioned clarification, if you don’t go for the federal funding that the state is going to possibly give a 50% match?

**Beth Alden:** Yes, this has been officially announced. If you have a lower cost project, HART Arterial BRT project may be a good candidate, taking some of the on-road improvements and fund those through roadway related grants. Could take bus improvements and possibly split those 50/50 between the state and local. It makes some of the projects more feasible. FDOT and HART are both on the line to answer questions.

**Ming Gao (FDOT):** This has not been made official yet, the secretary has not signed off yet, but it has been talked about. FDOT wants to do more for transit. Due to current statute in place, any individual fixed-guideway project not eligible for federal funding could only get up to 12.5% of state funds. Trying to work around this and figure out how to put more money towards fixed-guideway projects. Putting together a new policy to support that. The DDR (District Dedicated Revenue), if an MPO wants to put that into priority, FDOT can fund any new, premium transit project operation for up to five years in a declining scheme: 80/20 first year down to no more than 25% state funds in the fifth year.

**Beth Alden:** There was an official statement from FDOT last month, asked for slides to share with this committee, they provided them. Pretty confident that this is the direction Tallahassee is going.

**Commissioner Kemp:** Will be talking to everyone about the ferry. Historically, the State of Florida has lost billions because of federal funding for legacy projects. We have had a large inability to fund legacy projects. Is wondering about metrics used by the state in terms of prioritizing projects that will be funded without a federal look at them. The five years of operations, that’s new and a big change. Arterial BRT, was in Seattle, spent weekend and a few weekdays. Seattle has a reputation for being one of the best transit cities in the nation. There have been approximately 60K jobs added downtown and there are less cars. Does not know of any curtailing of cars in the downtown. Was in and out of very touristy and busy areas, there were a lot of busses all the time, articulated busses. There were six or seven regularly. The streetcar was nearby. It was amazing to look at. Would say fixed-corridor, that’s what the ferry is. When there is frequency of service, increasing the frequency increases the capacity and allows for flexibility. We do look at the CSX tracks and they are corridor possibilities. Knows that some are more available than others. We have been talking about USF to Downtown for three decades. That is exactly where the CSX corridor goes. At a far lower cost than any of the other options. As a dedicated corridor, it is a low-hanging fruit that we are missing. Looking at the east and balance, the ferry service going from South County to MacDill and not having to go an hour and a half using a land route, and the low operating cost. Doesn’t know of any area that the operation cost is not put on the jurisdiction. The operating cost is not focused on as much. You can set up the route, but if you can’t set it up with frequency, you can’t continue to operate it with efficiency or growth. All the projects, as far as I can tell and no one has said differently, this all has to be in HART’s purview in terms of equity for the
entire county, in terms of what we can afford in terms of continued operations, it all has to be worked out in HART’s wheelhouse when we talk about transit. Has a lot of confidence in the new CEO. Inquired if anyone at HART, not on the board, would like to speak.

Beth Alden: On the agenda, if you would like to hear it, the plans for transit-oriented development on the streetcar and HART Arterial BRT. Invited a representative from HART to share observations.

Commissioner Overman: Thanks for this topic to be done in a workshop forum. Given that HART is in the middle of developing their long-range, strategic plan and the MPO and county are all looking at this, there are greater opportunities to partner with the state, as well as with FTA, as well as the Federal Infrastructure Bill as it evolves. There is an opportunity to look at each of the projects, to prioritize and coordinate them to work together. If Brightline comes in and we have rail and streetcar, where does that gel together so that there is an easy transfer point. Where does it make sense with the way that Tampa has evolved for the connection between Downtown and Westshore? Need to communicate and explore strategic planning and understand how to stage the expansion to address the congestion; work with HART and include them in the planning process so they can be part of the planning for long-term operation and cost. Need to put forward a financial plan; the State has made it clear that they realize Hillsborough County is growing and that they need to help that growth.

Commissioner Kemp: The only agency that can get federal funding is HART. They need to be able to provide operational funding for up to 30 years. They have to be the table and we have to be at their table.

Commissioner Cohen: Commissioner Kemp, right about USF to Downtown on the CSX tracks. Impressed about all the CSX corridors. To the point about some being more available than others, they are all good and need to look at which is going to be the easiest to start with. Any one of those corridors would be transformative; if they tied into a multi-modal center, that would be terrific. Need to be aggressive with the ones we think we can get.

Commissioner Kemp: The most available corridor, CSX has said in the past, is USF to Downtown. Some are not available as they are still used for freight.

Beth Alden: We can come back in the future with the transit-oriented development in the future. Has heard the members speaking about prioritizing and connectivity. Question for HART, is there a role where the TPO can assist HART with any of it?

Teri Wright (HART): Thanked for being invited and the robust conversation and the recognition that HART’s role is beyond capital and it is the operations. Agrees that the projects need to be prioritized. That prioritization will come in the strategic plan. Sees the benefits of the projects for the citizens of Hillsborough County and the City of Tampa. The funding is critical to move these projects forward into implementation and sustain them operationally.
Ming Gao (FDOT): Appreciate all the information and projects being looked at. While projects are being focused on Hillsborough County, need to get neighboring counties on board with efforts especially for major capital investment. Anything over $5 mil of State investment, must get legislative approval. Critical that legislative delegation in other counties will be in support of the efforts.

C. Steps to move forward & the bottom line (Beth Alden, TPO Staff)
   • Covered in A and B.
   
   Presentation: Steps to Move Forward and The Bottom Line

D. Transit oriented development on the Streetcar & HART Arterial BRT Corridors (Sarah McKinley, TPO Staff) – Bring back to future meeting

VI. OLD & NEW BUSINESS – None

VII. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting adjourned at 9:49 AM
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
2021 State of the System Report

Presenter
Vishaka Shiva Raman, TPO Staff

Summary
The 2021 State of the System Report demonstrates performance trends across a three-year period from 2018 to the end of 2020. The performance evaluation includes measures related to infrastructure condition, resiliency, crashes, transit assets, travel time reliability, and mobility. The report is typically updated bi- or triennially to assess the impact of our transportation investments across these key areas.

Whereas previous versions of the State of the System report were static, the new report will be presented in an interactive dashboard which allows users to toggle through the various measures, explore the report in a new way, and see data updates more frequently. The dashboard is a product of a yearlong TPO effort to organize and consolidate data sources into one location and build a platform capable of producing analytics. The data and analytics platform is called Urban SDK; and the presentation will guide users to visualize the tool and export tables, charts and maps for their use.

Recommended Action
None. For informational purposes only.

Prepared By
Vishaka Shiva Raman, TPO Staff

Attachments
Presentation slides
Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Prioritization Criteria Adjustments

Presenter
Johnny Wong, PhD, TPO Staff

Summary
TPO staff are exploring some modifications to the TIP prioritization methodology, the process for soliciting priority requests, and distribution of the TPO’s Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Transportation Alternative (TA) funds.

The existing methodology for prioritizing TIP projects requires minor adjustments to address directions from the board. Over the past few years, the TPO has approved a Nondiscrimination and Equity Plan, a Resilient Tampa Bay study, will soon receive a Smart Cities Mobility study, and adopted Transit Performance Targets. By adjusting the prioritization criteria to incorporate recommendations from these plans and studies, our TIP will more clearly articulate the benefits of investing in these project types.

Staff will present the adjustments, a new process for soliciting priority projects, and a proposed formula for awarding the TPO’s STBG and TA funds, which amount to a total of approximately $15-20M per year.

Recommended Action
None. For informational purposes only.

Prepared By
Johnny Wong, TPO Staff

Attachments
1. Presentation slides
TIP Prioritization Criteria Adjustments

October 2021
Why do we need to adjust the prioritization methodology?

Existing methodology does not consider:
1. Equity
2. Resilience
3. Technology
4. Some federally-required performance measures
Equity

• Plan Hillsborough *Nondiscrimination and Equity Plan* adopted Aug 2021

• Recommendations for advancing nondiscrimination and equity
  • recognize benefits & impacts of projects on low-income & minority communities
  • encourage partners to do the same
  • incorporate equity in prioritization methodologies
  • if negative impacts are anticipated, mitigate them as best as possible
Resilience

• One-fifth of major roads in Hillsborough could be washed out in a CAT3 storm

• LRTP goal to protect 250 lane miles of highly vulnerable-highly critical roads

• Resilient Tampa Bay study, approved last year, recommends:
  • stormwater investments increased by 50%
  • road resurfacing investment increased by 100% to address pavement hardening
  • targeting highly vulnerable – highly critical roads
Technology

• LRTP goal is to improve travel time reliability by 20% using technology & bottleneck solutions

• 200 miles of intersection improvements & enhanced road network coverage with advanced traffic management systems

• TPO Smart Cities Master Plan in development, with ITS Committee

• New Smart Cities prioritization matrix will select the best tech projects from our partners before next TIP update cycle
Public Transit Safety & Asset Targets

- Federal Highway & Transit Administrations requiring MPOs to consider how investments will affect transit performance
  - Transit Asset Management
  - Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans
Process Changes

Project Solicitation, Performance Assessment & Funding Distribution
22/23 TIP Development Timeline

- 3rd week of Jan: meet with partners to discuss priorities
- 3rd week of Feb: partners submit final priority requests
- Feb-Mar: evaluate performance of candidate projects
- Mar 19: funding applications due
STATE OF GOOD REPAIR & RESILIANCE PROGRAM - Transit asset preservation, bridge preservation, hardening & stormwater projects

New TIP Prioritization Considerations - SGR

1. Percent of transit assets “Not in a State of Good Repair”, by asset class

2. Does project reduce vulnerability of transportation assets identified as “high vulnerability-high criticality”?

3. Does the project improve conditions for an underserved population?
VISION ZERO PROGRAM – Crash reduction, including Safe-Routes-to-School projects

New TIP Prioritization Considerations – VZ

1. (Current method:) Sum of fatal & serious injury crashes per centerline mile OR sum of fatal & serious injury crashes on 1/4mi approach to intersection

2. Road listed on TPO Speed Mgmt Action Plan priority list?

3. Sum of transit safety events, by mode

4. Does the project improve conditions for an underserved population?
SMART CITIES PROGRAM - Intersection improvements such as turn lanes and traffic signals, Advanced Traffic Management Systems, smart technologies

New TIP Prioritization Considerations – SC

1. Average peak period Travel Time Index
2. Avg travel delay in mins per centerline mile OR avg delay on 1/4mi approach
3. Does the project improve conditions for an underserved population?
4. Is the project listed in the Smart Cities Vision Map?
5. What are the best tech projects?
REAL CHOICES PROGRAM - Multi-use trails, ped bridges and sidepaths separated from vehicle lanes; expansion of bus service

New TIP Prioritization Considerations – Real Choices

1. (Current method:) Base year population + job density within 1/4mi of trail/sidepath or bus service expansion

2. Does the project improve conditions for an underserved population?
New TIP Prioritization Methodology – MP

1. (Current method:) 2045 Job density and Volume/Capacity ratio

2. Does the project improve conditions for an underserved population?
Long-Range Allocation of All Future Transportation Funding, 2026-2045 (includes sales tax) to achieve desired performance outcomes

$32,186 allocated in millions, YOE

- 25% $8,204 Good repair and resilience
- 38% $12,141 Major investments for economic growth
- 11% $3,435 Smart Cities
- 6% $2,088 Vision Zero
- 20% $6,318 Real choices when not driving
Proposed Fund Allocation of TPO Grants

Evenly divide the $15-20M/year of sub-allocated Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) & Transportation Alternative (TA) dollars across all four categories:

- State of Good Repair: 25%
- Vision Zero: 25%
- Smart Cities: 25%
- Real Choices: 25%
Questions & Discussion

What did we miss? What should we add?
Board & Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item:**
HART Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Pilot Project

**Presenter:**
Sarah McKinley, TPO

**Summary:**
In March 2020, HART, with the City of Tampa, Planning Commission, and MPO staff kicked-off a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) sponsored study to review and update the City’s TOD related policies. The study focuses on the Florida Avenue corridor, in coordination with the HART BRT Study, the Tampa Streetcar Extension and station area planning for the Palm Avenue Streetcar Station to look at Comprehensive Plan Policies to promote and incentivize TOD. The study will conclude in recommending new policies that will be applied to the corridor and throughout the City and Hillsborough County.

This presentation is a status update in preparation of a joint workshop to be held in October.

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

**Prepared By:**
Sarah McKinley, TPO Staff

**Attachments:**
1. Presentation Slides
2. Project Website: https://goharttod.org/
HART TOD Pilot Project
TPO Committee Update

Welcome!

HART and our partners at the City of Tampa and Hillsborough County are studying land use and development along the planned corridors for improved transit service connecting Downtown Tampa and USF.

Study Goals

- Protect and improve community character, livability, and resilience.
- Encourage a diverse mix of transit-supportive uses—housing, workplaces, shops, and supportive services.
- Create complete, safe, walkable, and bikeable streets and street networks.
- Ensure context sensitive buildings and public spaces.
- Improve walk, bike, and transit access to local and regional destinations.

Study Progress

- Studying conditions along the corridor
- Meeting with Working Group
- Exploring strategies to guide development, meet community needs, and take full advantage of planned transit projects

What’s TOD?

Steve Schukraft, HDR

“TOD” stands for Transit Oriented Development. TODs are places designed to capitalize on access to enhanced transit.

Walkable & Connected

Walkability is a key feature of successful TODs. TODs are places that encourage walking, with pedestrian-friendly streets, buildings, and public spaces. TODs offer travel choices, from walking and biking and local and regional transit to last mile mobility like bike share, car share, and emerging forms of micro-mobility.

People within a half-mile radius are 5 times as likely to walk to a major transit stop than others.

—Transit-Oriented Development: Factors and Elements of Success, Center for Transit-Oriented Development.

Study Update

Steve Schukraft, HDR

WHAT IS TOD?
**STUDY UPDATE**

**HIGH GROWTH**

Overall, the HART TOD Plan Project corridor is projected to experience an 88% increase in residents and a 71% increase in employees from 2023 to 2045.

**UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES**

Several corridors along the corridor have uneven distributions of low-income and transit-dependent residents. While these residents may benefit from expanded transit service, other residents may face challenges in access to essential services.

**PERCENT BELOW POVERTY LEVEL**

Transit investment improves access to employment, education, and community services for neighborhoods with high concentrations of lower income residents.

**ZERO VEHICLE HOUSEHOLDS**

Improved transit is designed to benefit communities with low levels of access to private vehicles.

**FORM & CHARACTER**

The corridor represents a microcosm of the development story of American cities, from traditional patterns of development Downtown to more auto-oriented suburban patterns to the north.

**TOD OPPORTUNITIES**

Opportunities for new development and redevelopment differ greatly by subarea but fall within the three primary categories.
**Plan Strategies**

Steve Schukraft, HDR

---

**PLAN STRATEGIES**

1. Improve walking, biking and access to transit
2. Promote housing affordability and diversity
3. Encourage TOD and protect neighborhood character

---

**IMPROVE WALKING, BIKING & ACCESS TO TRANSIT**

1. How can we make it easier and safer to walk and bike along the corridor and to transit stops?

---

**Distance Between Protected Crossings**

*Distance between traffic signals and pedestrian crossings contributes to high-speed driving and makes it difficult to safely cross the corridor.*

---

**IMPROVING WALKING, BIKING & ACCESS TO TRANSIT**

**Poor Walkability Along the Corridor**

Sidewalks are generally narrow and in poor condition, and there is no buffer between sidewalks and travel lanes.

---

**IMPROVING WALKING, BIKING & ACCESS TO TRANSIT**

**STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

**SPEED MANAGEMENT**

• Explore signal timing adjustments and other “speed management” techniques to slow travel speeds

**PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES**

• Add additional mid-block crossings
• Improve crosswalk pavement markings and lighting
• Provide high quality streetscape and shelter improvements at streetcar and BRT stops
• Prioritize improvements at stop locations

**BICYCLE FACILITIES**

• Improve connections to existing and planned trails
• Encourage expansion of bike share and micromobility options

**DEVELOPMENT REGULATION**

• Require modest front setbacks to allow for wider sidewalks
• Limit front parking and minimize driveway cuts

---

**PROMOTE HOUSING AFFORDABILITY & DIVERSITY**

2. How can we protect existing housing affordability, encourage new affordable housing, and increase the diversity of housing options?

---

**Understanding Rental Affordability**

Completed research to understand market pressures and the potential for displacement as transit investment impacts local and regional accessibility.

---

**NATURALLY OCCURRING AFFORDABLE HOUSING (NOAH)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>Minimum Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>$625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>$725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BR</td>
<td>$825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 BR</td>
<td>$925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**LOCALLY RESTRICTED AFFORDABLE HOUSING (LRAH)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>Minimum Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>$625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>$725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BR</td>
<td>$825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 BR</td>
<td>$925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**HIGHER REY HOUSING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>Minimum Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>$625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>$725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BR</td>
<td>$825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 BR</td>
<td>$925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affordability at Risk
• Limited presence of NOAH units in Downtown, Tampa Heights, and Seminole Heights.
• The limited number of NOAH units in Seminole Heights are at risk of displacement due to strong market performance and recent price increases.
• The highest percentages of renter occupied units and NOAH units are in neighborhoods north of the Hillsborough River.
• Areas north of the river are at the greatest risk of declining affordability and displacement as market conditions improve.

Addressing Affordability
Crafting tools to address the deficit of affordable housing, including development of anti-displacement strategies and programs to protect naturally-occurring affordable housing and develop new affordable housing.

HOUSING PROGRAMS
- Locally operated programs to build and/or maintain affordable housing
- Local regulations which protect affordability

REGULATORY OPTIONS
- Regulatory tools to streamline review processes and increase the supply of affordable units

ZONING TOOLS
- Funding mechanisms
- Tools that establish funding sources for affordable housing
- Tools that will garner support and partnerships for affordable housing

ENCOURAGE TOD & PROTECT NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER
3. How can we encourage development of underused and auto-oriented sites, bring new uses to the corridor, and ensure projects fit communities?

TOD Place Types
• A planning tool to guide development and redevelopment
• Foundation for comprehensive plan policies and zoning standards
• Guidance about the appropriate form and scale of buildings
• Tailored to fit different communities and contexts

TOD PLACE TYPES
Downtown
LOCATION
- Downtown Tampa South of I-275

OPPORTUNITIES
• The most “transit rich” place in the region.
• Continued infill and redevelopment of full and partial blocks

ACTIVITY/USE
• Regional employment center and destination for entertainment, culture, sports, and education
• Mixed uses including office, residential, civic, and educational

BUILDING FORM
• Tall buildings with structured parking
• Active storefronts along priority pedestrian streets
• Walkable streets and streetscapes
ENCOURAGING TOD & PROTECTING NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

**TOD PLACE TYPES**

**Urban Centers**

**LOCATIONS**
- North of Downtown to Palm Ave
- Suburban Retrofit Sites @ Waters and University Mall
- Employment Intensive Locations @ USF & the VA

**OPPORTUNITIES**
- More intensive development in locations with large blocks of vacant and underutilized sites
- Plan for phased development of larger sites and those with weaker market potential

**ACTIVITY/USE**
- Community centers for commercial activity, higher density housing, education, and employment

**BUILDING FORM**
- Midrise buildings with active ground floor uses
- Surface and structured parking behind buildings
- Walkable streets & streetscapes

Local Examples: The Pearl, Heights Union & Midtown Tampa

---

**TOD PLACE TYPES**

**TOD Centers**

**LOCATION**
- Primary BRT Stops in Tampa Heights, Seminole Heights, and along Fowler

**OPPORTUNITIES**
- Infill along the corridor frontage near primary stops

**ACTIVITY/USE**
- Community centers for commercial activity, higher density housing, education, and employment
- Missing Middle housing transitioning to neighborhood
- Mix of ground floor uses

**URBAN FORM**
- Three to five story buildings aligned along sidewalks
- Surface and structured parking behind buildings
- Lower building heights close to neighborhoods
- Improved sidewalks along the project corridor and side streets

Local Example: The Altes
ENCOURAGING TOD & PROTECTING NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

TOD PLACE TYPES

TOD Corridors

LOCATION
- Smaller sites fronting Florida, Nebraska, and Fowler between Centers

OPPORTUNITIES
- Incremental infill and redevelopment of auto-oriented and underutilized sites directly on the corridor
- Missing Middle housing transitioning to neighborhood

ACTIVITY/USE
- Neighborhood supporting uses and diverse housing

URBAN FORM
- Two to four story buildings aligned along sidewalks
- Lower building heights close to neighborhoods
- Mix of ground level uses

Local Examples: The Avenue Lofts

ENCOURAGING TOD & PROTECTING NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

TOD Neighborhoods

OPPORTUNITIES
- Vacant and underutilized sites within walking distance of planned stops

ACTIVITY/USE
- Missing middle housing types including small lot single family, accessory dwelling units, and attached single family

BUILDING FORM
- Two to three story scaled to fit neighborhood context

CLOSING

Next Steps
- Refine strategies and recommendations
- Workshop with Planning Commission and TPO Cmts - Oct 2021
- Prepare Plans for Palm Avenue Station Area
- Finalize Plans in Fall 2021

Project updates will be sent to all workshop participants
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