FEHR✦PEERS

Draft Memorandum

Date: May 3, 2021

To: Lisa Silva, Hillsborough MPO

From: Kathrin Tellez, Fehr & Peers

Subject: Park Speed Zone Pilot – Park Selection

OR21-0009

Introduction

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

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

Park Definition

One of the project directives is to evaluate different types of parks in different community and roadway network contexts. For the purposes of this analysis, four different park types were

classified. These classifications may differ slightly from other official definitions used in the county, but there was not one consistent set of park definitions across all agencies in the region.

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

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

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

Liner Parks – For the purposes of this study, linear parks are ones that typically follow a natural linear feature, such as a shoreline or other waterway. Walking and bicycling trails are typically provided for the length of the park, with limited other active or passive activities provided.

Bayshore Linear Park is the most prominent linear park in area, with other examples including Tampa Riverwalk, Fremont Linear Park, Upper Tampa Bay Trail and Ignacio Haya Linear Park.

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

Evaluation Criteria

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

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

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

Table 1: Evaluation Criteria

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

Source: Fehr & Peers.

Initial Ranking

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

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

Table 2: Local Park

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

Source: Fehr & Peers.

Table 3: Passive Regional Park

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

Source: Fehr & Peers.

Table 4: Active Regional Park

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

Source: Fehr & Peers.

Table 5: Linear Park

Name	Location	Length	Points (out of 95)
Tampa Riverwalk	1000 N Ashley St (City of Tampa)	2.6 miles	77
Fremont Linear Park	3008 W Cherry St (City of Tampa)	¼ mile	68
Upper Tampa Bay Trail	9201 W. Waters Ave., Tampa FL 33635 (unincorporated County)	14.3 miles	63
Ignacio Haya Linear Park	5000 N River Blvd (City of Tampa)	½ mile	51
Sydney Dover Trail	717 N. Dover Rd., Dover FL 33527	4.4 miles	43
Bayshore Linear Park	Bayshore Blvd (evaluated as 10 separate segments) (City of Tampa)	4.5 miles	Average score of 25, with a range of 18-34
Suncoast Trail	Various	42 miles	20
Courtney Campbell Trail	W Courtney Campbell Causeway	10.5 miles	8

Source: Fehr & Peers.

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

Recommended Pilot Locations

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

Borrell Park/Robles Park – Borrell and Robles parks are classified as **Local** and **Passive Regional** parks for the purpose of this study and both received the highest scores for their respective category prior to the application of ease of community outreach points. They are also located approximately 500 feet from each other, with the I-275 freeway serving as a barrier between them. As these parks are located in similar urban contexts within the urbanized area of the City of Tampa, but with the potential for different visitor travel patterns, we recommend considering these parks as a single location for the pilot project, allowing for the inclusion of a linear park in the study. If either Borrell or Robles park are not advanced for the pilot process, either another pair of candidate parks in close proximity would need to selected, or the linear park excluded from the pilot as they are small percentage of the overall park types in the County.

University Area Park and Community Center – This park is located in northern Hillsborough County in an unincorporated area approximately 1.5 miles from the University of South Florida and received the highest score in the **Active Regional** park category. There are planned activities throughout the project timeframe at the Park and Community Center, and it is expected that community outreach could be facilitated through collaboration with other planned activities. Other candidate locations in this category are primarily in the City of Tampa, and there is a desire to have geographic diversity in the selection of pilot project sites.

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

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

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

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

The completes our initial screening to select the parks to include in the Park Speed Zone Pilot. Please contact [Kathrin Tellez](#) at (321)754-9902 if you have questions.