



Hillsborough TPO

Transportation Planning Organization

Commissioner Harry Cohen
Hillsborough County
MPO Chair

Commissioner Pat Kemp
Hillsborough County
MPO Vice Chair

Paul Anderson
Port Tampa Bay

Councilman Joseph Citro
City of Tampa

Councilmember Lynn Hurtak
City of Tampa

Commissioner Nate Kilton
City of Plant City

Adelee Marie Le Grand, AICP
HART

Joe Lopano
Hillsborough County
Aviation Authority

Councilman Guido Maniscalco
City of Tampa

Commissioner Gwen Myers
Hillsborough County

Commissioner
Kimberly Overman
Hillsborough County

Cody Powell
Planning Commission

Mayor Andrew Ross
City of Temple Terrace

Greg Slater
Expressway Authority

Commissioner
Mariella Smith
Hillsborough County

Jessica Vaughn
Hillsborough County
School Board

Beth Alden, AICP
Executive Director



Plan Hillsborough

planhillsborough.org
planner@plancom.org

813 - 272 - 5940
601 E Kennedy Blvd
18th Floor
Tampa, FL, 33602

Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Wednesday, July 13, 2022, at 9:00 AM

County Center, 18th Floor – Plan Hillsborough Committee Room

All voting members are asked to attend in person, in compliance with Florida's Government in the Sunshine Law. Please RSVP for this meeting. Presenters, audience members, and committee members in exceptional circumstances may participate remotely.

Remote participation:

- To view presentations and participate on your computer, tablet or smartphone:

<https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/1964318628422402315>

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

- Dial in LISTEN-ONLY MODE: 1-562-247-8422 Access Code: 853-761-808

Presentations, full agenda packet, and supplemental materials are [posted here](#). Please 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: Michael Rempfer 813-273-3774.

Rules of engagement:

Professional courtesy and respect for others at this meeting are expected. Failure to do so may result in dismissal from the meeting. For more information on expectations for participation, please see the TPO's [Social Networking & Media Policy](#).

I. Call to Order & Introductions 9:00

II. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum (Gail Reese, TPO staff)

A. Vote of Consent for Remote Member Participation – if applicable

III. Chairman's Request: *Per the TPO Bylaws, all speakers are asked to address only the presiding Chair for recognition; confine their remarks to the question under debate; and avoid personalities or indecorous language or behavior.*

IV. Public Comment - 3 minutes per speaker, please 9:15
Public comments are welcome and may be given at this meeting virtually by logging onto the website above and clicking the "raise hand" button. Staff will unmute you when the chair recognizes you.

V. Minutes 9:25

A. Approval of Minutes (June 1, 2022)

VI. Status Reports

- A. Corridor Preservation Best Practice Report 9:30
(Richard Ranck, Hillsborough County and Kristine Williams, CUTR)
- B. Tampa Vision Zero Implementation through Maintenance 10:10
(Cal Hardie, City of Tampa)
- C. CAC Organizational Survey 10:50
(Johnny Wong, TPO Staff)

VII. Unfinished Business & New Business

11:30

- A. TPO Apportionment Plan Update
- B. Next CAC Meeting: August 3, 2022
- C. Vote on Next Month's Agenda Topics

VIII. Members' Interests & Future Topic Requests

11:45

IX. Adjournment

X. Addendum

- A. [Mid-Year Attendance Review](#)
- B. [Florida Traffic Safety Dashboard](#)

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 or (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.

**HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
HYBRID MEETING OF JUNE 1, 2022**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Roberts called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM.

II. ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM (Gail Reese, TPO Staff)

Members Present In-Person: Bill Roberts, Ricardo Fernandez, David Bailey, Christina Bosworth, Steven Hollenkamp, Christine Acosta, Don Skelton, Jr., Joshua Frank (in at 9:31A)

Members Present Virtually: Aiah Yassin (out at 9:56A), Ed Mierzejewski (in at 9:30A), Rick Richmond

Members Absent/ Excused: Hoyt Prindle, Carolyn Brown, Meaza Morrison, Nicole Rice, Artie Fryer, Nicholas Glover, Jonathan Knudsen, Sharon Gaumond, Terrance Trott

Others Present In-Person and Virtually: Johnny Wong, Christopher English, Priya Nagaraj, Joshua Barber, Wade Reynolds, Vishaka Shiva Raman, Lisa Silva, Connor MacDonald, Davida Franklin, Gail Reese (TPO Staff); Sarah Caper, Richard Ranck (Hillsborough County); Siasosi Fine, Justin Hall (FDOT District 7); Kristine Williams (USF); Candace Savitz (Public)

An in-person quorum has been met.

- A. *(Timestamp 0:01:52)* **Chair Roberts called for a Vote of Consent for Remote Member Participation. Voice vote, the motion carries with a majority and two nay votes.**

B. **Committee introductions**

- III. CHAIRMAN'S Request:** *(Timestamp 0:07:21)* Per the TPO Bylaws, all speakers are asked to address only the presiding Chair for recognition; confine their remarks to the question under debate and avoid personalities or indecorous language or behavior.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT *(Timestamp 0:07:30)*

Candace Savitz was online for public comment; had sound challenges. Comment read into the record. There was a second Public Comment emailed and read into the record. These comments are in the [Email section](#) following the minutes.

Discussion:

Christine Acosta noted that email public comment needs to be kept to the three-minute limit as with in-person/call-in public comment.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (*Timestamp 0:20:29*)

A. Approval of Minutes – May 4, 2022

Rick Fernandez moves to approve the May 4, 2022 minutes, seconded by Steven Hollenkamp. Voice vote, the motion passes unanimously.

Rick Fernandez asked that speakers be identified with their comments in the minutes. This will make it easier to review for accuracy.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

A. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Update, FYs 2022/23 – 26/27 (Johnny Wong, TPO Staff) (*Timestamp 0:22:43*)

- Review of the three tables in the TIP and their purpose.
- Went over how projects are submitted by the jurisdictions and agencies.
- Identified how projects are funded and pointed out new funding sources for this year that are included in Table 2
- Review of Table 1 – existing priorities funded for construction
 - Noted projects that have been completed and removed for this update.
- Review of Table 2 – the priority list. Identified the columns and what they mean. Added the column of “No Return” and if funding is received and allocated, it is at the point of no return would indicate a joint action from the TPO Board and FDOT.

The point of no return was questioned by committee members. Dr. Wong was asked to provide an example of this. Used the Westshore Interchange as an example. This is under statute Section 339.175 sub 8d. Further clarification was asked for. This project is already on the priority list. Any further funding would be construction funds. At that time, it would come as a TIP amendment. If approved, it would be awarded, and construction would start. Further elaboration was asked on how the request for seeking construction occurs. It was indicated that Cameron Clark would be best to address that. It was asked if any of the statuses have changed in this column have changed since the first reading in May.

- Went over the projects – bus replacement and service-related projects are not able to have refunds if the project is recommended for funding. PD&E still has more time. Once funding for preliminary design is allocated, it is past the point of no return.
- It was asked if a project says “NO”, will the committee see it again. Yes, if they are seeking funding from the TPO.
- Purpose of Table 2 – ranked order of projects for the most amount of impact with the least amount of money. Come up with funding sources to go after to complete the projects.
- Quick review of Table 3 – these are CIP projects and are allocated outside the TPO purview.

- Went over funding percentages of the projects.
- Coordination with partners and committees
- Regional Project review for TRIP and MUT
- Presentation Schedule – LRC & BPAC May 25th (passed both), CAC June 1st, TAC June 6th, Public Hearing June 8th.

Presentation: [TIP FY2022/23 - 26/27 Presentation](#)

Draft: [Measures of Effectiveness Report](#)

Public Hearing Flyer (English): [TIP Public Hearing Flyer - English Version](#)

Public Hearing Flyer (Spanish): [TIP Public Hearing Flyer - Spanish Version](#)

FY2022/23 – 26/27 TIP Tables 1, 2, 3 Included: [TIP FY22/23-26/27](#)

[Priority Request Letters submitted to the TPO by the Jurisdictions](#)

Recommendation: Approve the TIP Update for FY2022/23 – 26/27 And Approve the TIP Priority List (Table 2).

Discussion:

Rick Fernandez – Table 1, Howard Frankland Bridge with 4 new express lanes; it was asked if these lanes are going to be managed, variable toll lanes. There is no formal declaration to toll these lanes at this time from FDOT. N Tampa St & N Florida Ave from Columbus Dr to MLK Blvd and Tyler St. to Floribraska & Palm; it was asked about the dedicated transit lanes. Coordinating with FDOT and HART, due to construction cost increases, it is no longer part of the plan. FDOT believes HART should be leading the process; waiting for HART to come forward with a financial plan. The Raise Grant money was obtained because the transit lane was part of the plan but now that the money has been granted, the dedicated transit lane is pulled. It was asked if the Raise Grant application included the dedicated transit lane. Yes, it was in there. It has been noted that the improvements being made by FDOT will allow for the conversion of a through the lane to dedicated transit. Asked about Travel Behavior Surveys and what that is for. Every few years, FDOT and the TPOs engage in finding out travel behavior by system users to help support the efforts of the LRTIP. All of the regional TPO/MPOs contribute to this to have the predictive modeling of future behavior. The \$196,000 is the Hillsborough County portion of that. It was asked if there could be a procedural motion to move this funding from Table 1 into something else for Table 2. Yes, procedurally, that can be done. In Table 1, the Westshore Interchange, FPN #s 5311-6141, it was understood this was fully funded. However, there is \$1 billion in Table 2 waiting for funding. It was asked for clarification on what has been funded in Table 1. That TIP amendment was approved in 2021 and the funded improvements can be found on the project website. This is Phase 0 and the preliminary work to get the project started. For the set of projects for the Downtown Interchange; the CAC moved to strike the two TIP amendments 8 and 9. Those are projects 4450562 and 4450571. A recommendation has been made to the TPO Board. Project 4318212 on Table 1 is what Candace Savitz’s public comment was regarding. It is a significant issue. This project is in the process now. It was brought up at the TPO Board meeting in May.

Christine Acosta – noted that the public comment about the Cross Bay Ferry and the committee should do what it can, in advance of that project, to make sure it serves as many people as possible, to have the routes. It was noted that Federal Law prohibits specialty transportation funds

cannot be used for specific military projects. It was noted that there is no Park and Rides in South County. Requested further information on this area. There is trail development being done in this area. Would like to look into whether micro-mobility parking is available for transit so people can get to and from transit without using their cars. There is a challenge getting people to and from the vanpool rendezvous points. Would like to make sure that the vanpools are made available to people trying to get to transit stops and have good access to meeting points. There is a petition online with nearly 10,000 signatures for the Bayshore area to have trail expansion on the water. Is there a potential to include this in the seawall reconstruction? The signal replacements under Smart Cities, asked for more information on what that means. What type of signals and technology are these to support pedestrians? Provided examples of technology available. Also asked about the timing involved for reduced speed in the Urban Core. She expressed extreme disappointment that there is no dedicated bus lane on Tampa and Florida Avenues. If transit modes are stuck in the same traffic, people will not use them. Dedicated lanes are being moved forward in Pinellas County. Is upset that Hillsborough County is so far behind and she doesn't like the way the Raise Grant funds were applied for and then the lanes were pulled out. Remarked about the Funding Allocation by Project Type and Vision Zero; appreciates there is funding. Noted that Vision Zero is also known as the Safe System Approach. There is nothing on this graph that should not have the Safe Systems Approach integrated. If you want to see what a community values, look at the budget.

Josh Frank – Noted the Raise Grant funding for Florida and Tampa; believes this is a “bait and switch”. Pulled up the grant application, this project is called the Tampa Heights Mobility Project. Estimated at \$38 million total project cost and the grant was for \$18 million. Read the description of the project. The exclusive transit lane is not a small part of the project built on transit. This is unacceptable. Putting the burden on HART, which is already cash-strapped, is not right. In St. Pete and other places, they are getting it done. Johnny Wong expressed that TPO Staff, HART, and FDOT are working together on this. The TPO is working hard to make sure that the project is fulfilled as described. The TPO is using some of its money to make sure safety improvements get done.

On the Westshore Interchange, it was asked for clarification if Phases 1, 2, and 3 have not sought funding at this time. TPO Staff is unaware of what is going on behind the scenes. Due to that, how is Phase 0 in design but the other phases cannot be removed from the plan; can the other phases be split off from each other? The YES in Phase 0, how are the other phases past the point of no return. It was noted that Cameron Clark believes that, on engineered projects, stripping out part is like removing the whole thing. If this is Phase 0 and not related to the interchange, Mr. Frank believes that the other phases can be removed from this project. Expressed that this is a fundamental problem with the TIP process. Need to find a way that is a check for these projects where the committee and the TPO can take action before projects get to the point of no return. When one project starts, others cannot be removed from the list due to bundling projects. Would like to see this reformed for the next TIP update. Also noted are the amendments that the committee passed; is concerned that the amendments will be heard at the same time as the TIP Hearing. Would like to have seen that separated to give time, based on whether or not the CAC adopts the TIP in today's vote. Asked that these projects be highlighted and noted as pending action. There are things on the TIP that the CAC has voted against in the past.

Christine Bosworth – The Cross Bay Ferry from public comment is not asking to be stricken but to have it expanded to include Apollo Beach and Downtown. Noted that there are a lot of people who work at MacDill that live in the Riverview and Ruskin area. The benefit would be reducing the traffic. There are also a lot of people who live in that area that work Downtown that could benefit as well if the service is expanded. Also noted the lack of park and ride facilities in South County; a number of years ago, HART cut South County routes. There is a nice park and ride lot that is fenced up and chained off as a result. There are not enough bus routes in South County, which is not in the TIP. She supports the Cross Bay Ferry but believes it needs to be expanded service from Apollo Beach to Downtown.

Chair Roberts – Asked about the overall plan for the South County Ferry. It is his understanding that the plan will expand, not sure when, to include service to the Channelside and Downtown. Asked if this is correct. Line 74 is for purchasing a ferry boat. Operations would be a subsequent phase. Alignments are not certain at this time. There is money in the FDOT Work Program for operations but the timing and service area are not known. Chair Roberts noted the large shrinkage that HART went through in the last few years and said that many would like to see those routes return.

David Bailey – Asked about the purchase of the boat and other alternatives.

Comments from chat were relayed to the committee including information from Justin Hall regarding funding for the Westshore Interchange.

Justin Hall – Noted that in the full TIP document with the five-year Work Program pages (Table 3), on pages 160 and 161, the additional funding is shown. *(These pages were printed and distributed to committee members present)* Advised that he would work with Dr. Wong to update the tables to make sure the FPID #'s are referenced for the entire project.

A clarification conversation took place on the Westshore Interchange; the phases, funding, and years allocated.

Christine Acosta – Asked about the Green Spine Phase 2B in the Vision Zero category on Table 1, third item, and which portion that is. Chair Roberts also asked about Phase 3C and where that is.

Justin Hall – Noted that 2B is to the west of the river, it is up for request because the City of Tampa prioritized specific sections to connect to other areas. The grant for West Riverwalk was won and that is part of 2B as well. *(Wade Reynolds of TPO Staff provided: <https://www.tampa.gov/document/brochure-26921> which shows the Green Spine segments)*

Ed Mierzejewski – Followed up with information about the Travel Behavior Surveys done every five years. These provide basic trip-making information that is then made into models that can be used to make future forecasts. It was noted that the surveys may reflect that more people are working from home and trips may be reduced. These are critical to long-range forecasts.

Rick Fernandez – In Table 2, Line Item 66, noise walls and multi-modal safety enhancements at cross streets north of Hillsborough Ave to Bearss. Previously known as Section 7 in TB Next. Commissioner Kemp moved to remove the lane additions in 2021. The noise walls are still in the TIP. It was asked if the two general lanes that were struck remain in the LRTP for future reference

and potential resurrection, but they were removed from the five-year TIP. Yes, they live in the LRTP; suspect that when the LRTP is updated, the change may be made at that time. Asked if the removal from the LRTP would be a separate action. Yes, it will come before the committee in 2024 with updates along the way. Asked about the project numbers, and what else they might be linked to. Also asked what the reconnecting language is for and noted there are separate FPNs. It was clarified that the funding was coming from the Reconnecting Communities Act.

Josh Frank – Asked if this is the same reconnecting project that was being tracked for the Boulevard Study? Yes.

Rick Fernandez – Asked about line 67 in Table 2 and would like to have language expressing whether or not the express lanes are going to be tolled. This line item goes into the City of Tampa. Asked if there has been any clarification as to what is intended for the express lanes. Noted that he expects the Howard Frankland express lanes to be tolled. Is questioning sections 4 and 5 that go into the City of Tampa.

Justin Hall – Does not believe the management strategy has been selected at this time. This is true for any managed lanes that have not been specified at this time. Have done studies on the three projects and tolling seems to be the best strategy at this point.

Chair Roberts – Noted that Secretary Gwynn was asked about this at a TPO Board meeting a couple of months ago. The TPO Board has expressed that they do not want toll lanes.

Johnny Wong – The TPO Board put a motion on the table for language indicating no toll lanes. After Secretary Gwynn explained that the strategy had not been determined, the motion was not brought forth. FDOT offered to bring the pros and cons to each strategy to the board.

Justin Hall – Part of what goes into the determination is tolling and revenue study. That is an FDOT decision and not a District 7 decision, to wait until a project is closer to opening to do that study. The reason is to make sure that the strategy chosen is the best one and that there isn't a new strategy that is better. There is a separate process, public meetings, and engagement process that goes into that.

Rick Fernandez – Is concerned about the trust issues. The committee is being asked to approve something blind when the managed lane strategy has not been determined. FDOT has had years to come up with a study. Believes this is a fault in the plan and the document.

Johnny Wong – Noted that the TPO Board has been very specific on this topic, and they are paying close attention to this.

Justin Hall – Noted Table 2, Section 7, the two FPIDs are still referencing lanes. Will get with Dr. Wong to have them removed to eliminate confusion. A new FPID would be created for the noise walls if they receive funding.

Josh Frank – Followed up noting the connection of major job clusters.

There was discussion on how the projects get funded and the cost estimates that come into play. Categories were brought up at LRC as well. This will likely come up at the next LRTP update because of the magnitude of change necessary. Safety benefits is at the top of the list.

Justin Hall – Noted his follow-up to the Green Spine questions in the chat. ([Located at the end of the minutes](#))

Christine Acosta – Section 2B of the Green Spine is along Cass St. from Willow Ave. to the Cass St. Bridge. Asked if the bridge was in the table. Yes, bridge repairs are in Table 2. Asked if THEA's projects were reflected in the Priority List. No, they did not make any requests this year.

Ed Mierzejewski – Is not aware of any requests. THEA has active projects underway. There was a recent change in their Executive Director as well.

Christina Bosworth – Noted the items that came off the TIP for being complete at the beginning of the report and asked if projects come off for other reasons. Yes; local funds might be used, projects could be paused,

Motions:

1. **Rick Fernandez moved that the three-lane movements in Table 1; project numbers 445056 2 and 445057 1, that the record of this CAC meeting incorporate the actions of the March 2, 2022 motion to strike and report out that we have recommended striking FPN #s 445056 2 (TIP Amendment 8) and 445057 1 (TIP Amendment 9). Seconded by Don Skelton? The roll call vote resulted in a 5 to 5 tie.**

It was noted that the result of the vote would result in a motion to rescind the motion of March 2, 2022. That would require a 2/3 vote. Asked if that is the intent, that someone make that motion.

2. **Josh Frank moved to remove two items on Table 1, under Economic Growth relating to the Tampa Heights Mobility Corridor FPN 440511 7 and 440511 8. Seconded by Rick Fernandez.**

Discussion: Christine Acosta asked if a modified motion would be acceptable to have FDOT build the transit-only lane before sending it to HART. Mr. Frank's concern is that there is no language that would change FDOT's sentiment on the project. Would rather the project be thrown out and have FDOT figure it out and reapply. Rick Fernandez noted that the CAC is aspirational, that the process is flawed, and that the message is saying this is wrong and this is a policy message. The intention of removing it is to not do these things but to have FDOT come back and submit the project that they want to do. David Bailey does not want to negate the project and asked that the motion be re-defined to ask for what they want. Josh Frank noted that the only way for a dedicated lane to be put in place is to do it all at once. The grant was written on the transit being moved forward. Until the promise is kept, the other things can wait. Christine Acosta asked to include in the motion that the strike is because they do not deliver the transit project that was promised. Chair Roberts clarified that the message trying to be conveyed is that the transit being left out is a gross error. If this passes, he will certainly give the explanation to the TPO Board during the committee report. Believes that this needs to be included.

Christine Acosta offered a motion modification to include that this is a direct result of the loss of the transit facility which was, in large part, the basis of the grant application and award; seconded by Christina Bosworth.

Justin Hall – Worked on the grant application. One caveat for the entire process that was communicated clearly is that the process requires lane repurposing. The process being followed is the same process that was followed in Pinellas County. There is no eligible agency that has come forward willing to sponsor the lane repurposing. The only difference in the work is striping and signage. This is a ten-foot by six-foot box culvert to handle the flooding where the transit lane would operate and improvements to meet ADA accessibility from the curb lane. In the grant application, there is a section noting that there has to be lane repurposing for transit and that FDOT needs someone to own it. It is stated again on the Fact Sheet. This was made clear to everybody that this was a requirement. If HART steps forward with the lane repurposing, FDOT will move forward with it. At this time, HART does not believe they have the service for a dedicated lane, and they are worried about the optics. The other parts of the scope are all needed to facilitate the transit. For the cost-benefit analysis used by the feds, the transit is part of that analysis, but the greatest benefits were the increase in safety to the management of the water and the crosswalks and the cost-benefit to the state of good repair. The drainage is what scored the highest on this application. Drainage in this area is not part of the City of Tampa's drainage plan. Transit did receive points but there was an \$80 million benefit for the drainage.

Motion with the amendment was voted on with a roll call vote; the motion passed 8 – 2.

The main motion with the amendment was voted on with a roll call vote; the amended motion failed 6 – 4.

Josh Frank noted that it would be good to have someone like Justin Hall comment during the discussion instead of after the motion. It may have an undue amount of sway. Christine Acosta noted that it would be good to have a representative from HART; there is one on the CAC, they are not present at this meeting.

- 3. Rick Fernandez moved that project #422904 2 under Major Investments, the Howard Frankland Bridge Express Lanes, be amended to include language specific to the mode of management to be pursued by FDOT. Seconded by David Bailey.**

Discussion: On the TIP, it does not show this as being sponsored by FDOT. Clarification was offered that this project is sponsored by FDOT but it is a regional project also sponsored by SCTPA.

Roll call vote, the motion passes 8 – 2.

4. **Rick Fernandez moved that line item under Major Projects Table 2, number 67, to be amended to include language specific to the mode of management to be pursued by FDOT. Seconded by David Bailey. Roll call vote, the motion passes 8 – 2.**

5. **Josh Frank moved to add additional text to projects on Table 1 440511 7 and 440511 8, after the words North Tampa Street and North Florida Avenue from Columbus Drive to MLK Boulevard and also after North Tampa Street and North Florida Avenue from Tyler Street to Floribrasca and Palm Avenue “(no longer to include transit lanes)”;**

Discussion: Christine Acosta asked for clarification on the lane repurposing requirement, it is a process, and an eligible agency needs to request it. Mr. Hall noted that HART does not want it for a few different reasons. It was asked if FDOT was an eligible agency and would just do this as it is striping and signage. Justin Hall noted that HART would be the agency to request the lane repurposing be done. FDOT cannot take a lane from their facility for transit that they do not operate. HART is currently doing a study looking at all of their routes and demand. It is too early to commit until the analysis is complete. Construction starts in 2023 and will take two and a half years. If HART comes forward during that process, FDOT could restripe. The restriping is in plans if it is needed. No, FDOT cannot submit for it, HART will be operating the lane. It is easy to do. Josh Frank asked how this was included in the grant application without HART’s blessing. It was included with an initial application for lane repurposing. At that time HART and the City of Tampa were on board with the initial application for lane repurposing, they were co-applicants. HART wanted to do further analysis before doing the final application. **Josh Frank withdrew the amendment.** Chair Roberts asked for clarification that FDOT would not be the owner/operator in any transit lane. That is correct. Josh Frank would like to know that FDOT is in full support to provide HART having that lane in the future if they request it. It was clarified that FDOT was the only applicant on the grant. HART and the City of Tampa submitted an initial application for the dedicated transit lane to FDOT. FDOT did an initial analysis of the traffic for these streets. They determined that it would have a slight reduction in efficiency of Florida and Tampa but told HART that if they seek and submit lane repurposing with the transit they prescribe, a higher frequency, FDOT will approve and supply it.

6. **Steven Hollenkamp moves to accept the TIP amended by the CAC and recommend it to the TPO Board; Don Skelton, Jr. seconded.**

Rick Fernandez had an objection to the motion as stated due to Amendments 8 and 9. That would be in contradiction to the action taken on these items.

Roll call vote to approve the report and recommendations as amended to the TPO Board passes 8 – 2.

Christine Acosta asked that Chair Roberts include in his recap to the TPO Board to convey that the CAC has previously made motions to the two lane movements. Chair Roberts noted that it is appropriate for that to be included in his report to the TPO Board. He noted there is a written report provided to the TPO Board as well.

Josh Frank noted that the CAC supported the TPO Policy Committee’s recommendation for the TPO Board Reapportionment plan. Chair Roberts would like to have this brought back to the committee. He will bring it up at the Public Hearing if appropriate.

Rick Fernandez encouraged members to show up to the Public Hearing for Public Comment.

Josh Frank asked for the attendance report and Board information on who and who has not been showing and possible further action and/or removal from the committee.

VII. STATUS REPORTS *(Timestamp 3:18:21)*

- A. **FDOT Urban Corridor Improvements** (FDOT Representative) – deferred
- B. **Hillsborough County Corridor Planning and Preservation Best Practices Study** - deferred

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS & NEW BUSINESS *(Timestamp 3:18:52)*

- A. **Next CAC Meeting July 13, 2022** *(Optional attendance)* – It will be Status Updates that have been deferred. If there is a quorum, Chair Roberts would like to take action on limiting email comments to the 3 minutes required for in-person comments.
- B. **Rick Fernandez** – Asked if a protocol has begun to develop among other committees and the TPO Board as to whether the hybrid meetings are going to continue. Believes it affects the work being done.

IX. MEMBERS’ INTERESTS & FUTURE TOPIC REQUESTS *(Timestamp 0:06:19)*

- A. **Christine Acosta** – Noted that there is a world-renown speaker in town next week; encouraged everyone to attend

X. ADJOURNMENT *(Timestamp 3:25:23)*

Meeting adjourned at 12:28 PM

A recording of this meeting may be viewed at:

https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCsojHyZb_mkYIU3o32Tbg4w/videos

From Chat:

Justin Hall (to Organizer(s) Only):

10:47 AM: 447107-2 Has Construction funding in FY 24

447107-3 has construction funding in FY 26

That is \$680M of the construction for Westshore Interchange

Justin Hall (to Me - Private):

10:48 AM: If you would like me to but it is in the TIP pages 160 and 161. I just think it is important that they understand that it is in the TIP document.

Me (to All - Entire Audience):

11:04 AM: For those online... the pages handed out are on the website...

<https://planhillsborough.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/TIP-FY-22-23-5-25-22-3-1.pdf>

Me (to All - Entire Audience):

11:04 AM: PDF pages 160 & 161 // Table 3 pages 99 & 100

Justin Hall (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

11:07 AM: Segment 2b Cass Street from Willow Avenue to Cass Street Bridge

Justin Hall (to Organizers and Panelists Only):

11:07 AM: <https://www.tampa.gov/document/brochure-26921>

Public Comment Email

Candace Savitz
3812 N Arlington Ave, Tampa Heights 33603
813-696-8836
CAC MEETING - 6/1/2022

My name is Candace Lane Savitz. I am a homeowner in Tampa Heights for 17 years now.

I am again calling about the 275 Expansion project. This project is toxic and is hurting the residents of Tampa Heights and Seminole Heights.

I collected over 50 top soil samples in May, marking each one on a map and securing them. I am following chain of custody procedures.

Previously I worked at the Harbor Islands construction site in Hollywood Florida, where we built the infrastructure - utility backbone, all roads, a bridge into the project, also a marina. On a regular basis, soil samples were taken at this project. I know what I am doing.

I took a large sample of wet dust off a barricade at the Lake / 275 underpass, and took it to an established environmental lab for analysis. The results show levels of nitrates, sulfates, poisonous silica and LEAD. This is what the people in these neighborhood are breathing as a result of this project.

And it only makes sense that these are the results. The edge of these 50 year old overpasses were pulverized using jackhammers and the toxic concrete dust flew into the air from 20 feet above. There was NO DUST MITIGATION, no water trucks, no dust barriers. I saw it personally. And since then, I have taken soil samples and photographs of all the underpasses where toxic concrete dust was created.

In particular, I'd like to point out that the residents of Robles Park village rely on window units for air conditioning. This toxic dust most likely has blown into the outside vent and filter of these units causing health hazards for this impoverished community. Does anyone care? Well, I DO.

I am reminded of the serious consequences that occurred at the Gopher Resources lead plant here in Tampa. Toxic dust harmed many people. There is now a class action lawsuit as a result.

On a personal note, I am also very sick as a result of living nearby and driving under the overpass at Lake Ave. This is a path that I always take when returning from Winn Dixie at MLK. Just last week, I was diagnosed with serious ear infections in both ears, plus nasal congestion and laryngitis. I also will be taking a blood test to see what toxins are in my bloodstream. If this dust can make me sick from driving by 2 or 3 times per week, think about the people who LIVE nearby, who walk their dogs, let their children play outside.

Tampa is a beautiful city with historic neighborhoods and great job opportunities. Why are we doing this to our community?

PLEASE, I implore anyone on this committee to care more about the people and less about the cars. This project is AWFUL AND IT IS HURTING US.

I am submitting this written transcript to committee via email. Thank You.

From: randileeab@gmail.com

Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 5:52 PM

To: Johnny Wong

Subject: Public Comment, CAC 6/1/2022

South Hillsborough County has a population of 240,000+ residents.

The South County ferry project (Table 2, Line 74) makes no sense. I have no problem with the procurement of an actual ferry boat which is the \$5 million on this line item; my challenge is with the overall project and planned service area. It is going to be serving a very small portion of the citizens in the area while, potentially, impacting other transit riders currently using the existing HART system that

runs to East and South County. Real transit alternatives do not exclude the majority of residents in an area in favor of serving a few.

The ferry from the Mosaic terminal in the Apollo Beach area to MacDill AFB is a commuter ferry for military personnel and civilians working at MacDill only. The schedule of the ferry will be every 15 minutes during peak service hours Monday – Friday, starting at 5:30A to 8:30A in the morning and from 3:00P to 6:00P in the afternoon/evening. The estimated travel time is 15 minutes between terminals. Between peak times, it will run hourly and may be able to take people from South County to Downtown Tampa. However, the daytime service is intended for MacDill. It is proposed to run an intercity service on weeknights and weekends with more runs during high-demand events. There is no mention of where non-MacDill travel will originate from in South County and it may run to the Downtown Tampa area where the Cross-Bay Ferry from St. Pete serves. For the MacDill commuters, HART is going to adjust the current service to shift to the Mosaic commuter terminal instead of going to MacDill. This project is estimated to cost \$54 million dollars with operating costs on top of that. At this time, the Federal Government pays the cost of HART passes for military personnel and subsidizes civilians going to MacDill. It is likely that the same will happen for the commuter ridership of the ferry. That means GSA pricing will be in effect.

Commissioner Kemp has noted that there are many other routes that can be done... when and for who? She has said that this was identified as the most viable route over a decade ago. How has South County changed in the last 10 years? This ferry route is based on 11-year-old information with updated data from MacDill employees only. It is beneficial to one group of the population in South County for a commute alternative. And for those trying to use it that are not covered under the MacDill pricing/subsidy in non-peak hours, it may be available, but it is going to be pricy based on the round-trip rates for the Cross-Bay ferry from St. Pete. \$54 million of taxpayer money is going to bring a solution based on the threat of a military base being closed in the mass base shut-downs 10 – 15 years ago and for a small number of people who reside in the area. How does this pass the litmus test of equity? How is this a real transit solution of any kind? During peak times the service will be for MacDill only leaving the other residents to drive or try and figure out a way to get places via HART after they modify their routes to serve the MacDill commuters. Which HART routes are going to be impacted?

Currently, there is one bus route that serves South County, it's HART Route 31. This route runs every 30 minutes from the South County Amazon Warehouse to the Brandon Town Center via US Highway 41, Gibsonton, US 301, and Providence Road. It runs on weekdays only from 5:30A to 8:30P. There is no weekend service. In South County, there is no park and ride facilities and most of the stops are a sign along the road with a grown-over sidewalk and no cover; not to mention the dangerous crossing of US 41. There is HART Route 24LX from FishHawk to South Tampa. It is a limited express service that runs on weekdays only. In the morning, it goes from FishHawk, along Boyette, and the last pick-up is at US 301. From there, it goes to I-75, to the Selmon, to Kennedy where it drops off at Kennedy and Pierce then goes on to the Hospital/Clinic, Zemke, and the Hillsborough Loop. In the afternoon, it does the reverse with the last Downtown stop being Jackson and Pierce. The morning route picks up every 35 minutes from 5:10A to 6:20A (three pick-ups). In the afternoon, it runs from 3:15P to 4:00P. People in South County will still need to drive to get to a bus stop on this line. The average drive is 2 - 6 miles. If someone wants to try and use Route 31 and 24LX during the week, they have one inbound option on the 31-line. This is a difficult line due to the lack of parking and the rider would need to be on the 5:30A bus in hopes of picking up the 24LX route at US 301 for a 6:01A or 6:36A pick-up. The walk time between stops at Boyette and US 301 is about five minutes. If there is no delay, a rider could

potentially make the 6:01A as Route 31 drops off at approximately 5:55A. If the rider misses that run, they would have to get on the 6:36A or they will not be able to get Downtown.

So, instead of spending \$54 million dollars on a ferry that serves a small number of riders, how about investing that money in a real solution that would serve the people of South County? How about a limited HART express bus from South County and real park and ride facilities? Better yet, let's get that regional commuter rail going or open up the South County Ferry to general commuters and travelers into Downtown. Instead of more express lanes on I-75 for through traffic, how about a commuter rail in that same space? It is long past time to get the Tampa Bay region off the road and into real transit. On the boards at the Open House in Ruskin on March 7th, there was a sticky note for bus service from Sun City Center and one for commuter rail. With the new Wimauma plans going into place, wouldn't it be nice to have transit options there? You have heard the saying, "Build it and they will come...". Fuel prices are going up. The price of fuel-efficient (hybrid, EV) vehicles is going up and production is behind demand. The goal is to reduce congestion, and the area around MacDill in South Tampa has a lot of congestion, as does I-75, US 41, and US 301. The only way to do that is to have real options when not driving... i.e., transit. Start now. Instead of \$54 million going into a ferry to a restricted place for a specific audience and a PD&E study for express lanes on I-75 for through traffic or widening US 301 from SR 674 to the Manatee line, use that money for real solutions. If you are going to insist on moving ahead on the ferry, at least make it available to other commuters with a real transit center with a parking deck and HART service and make sure it is affordable to an average person or build it into Flamingo Fares.

I appreciate that this committee has a lot on its plate. I appreciate the time and consideration.

Sincerely, Randi Lee, Resident of Wimauma/Apollo Beach area.



Hillsborough TPO Transportation Planning Organization

Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item:

Hillsborough County Corridor Planning and Preservation Best Practices Report

Presenter:

Richard Ranck, Hillsborough County and Kristine M. Williams, CUTR

Summary:

In early 2022, Hillsborough County completed a [Corridor Planning and Preservation Best Practices Study](#) in anticipation of the recently started Corridor Preservation Plan. The purpose of the Best Practices Study was to provide insight and guidance on the current state of the practice in Florida, best practices within the State, and also best practices nationally, focusing on multimodal corridor planning and preservation.

The Study includes policy and planning context for corridor management in Florida, best practices for integrating land use context and modal options, and how resilience to climate change and emerging technology may be reflected in contemporary thoroughfare plans. The recommendations included in the study provide guidance on future corridor planning needs.

The presentation will provide an overview of the Best Practices Study and seeks input in updating the Corridor Preservation Plan.

Recommended Action:

None. For information only.

Prepared By:

Gena Torres, TPO Staff

Attachments:

[Presentation Slides](#)



Plan Hillsborough
planhillsborough.org
planner@plancom.org
813 - 272 - 5940
601 E Kennedy Blvd
18th floor
Tampa, FL, 33602



Hillsborough TPO Transportation Planning Organization

Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item:

Tampa Vision Zero Implementation through Maintenance

Presenter:

Cal Hardie, City of Tampa

Summary:

In 2019, Mayor Castor and the City's Transportation Advisory Team released five strategic recommendations to address a number of mobility related issues facing the City of Tampa. These recommendations include:

- Implement strategic transit projects
- Focus on trails and greenways as transportation options
- Adopt Vision Zero as a citywide policy
- Reinvent urban parking & mobility
- Enhance neighborhood engagement

Tampa MOVES (Mobility, Opportunity, Vision, Equity, and Safety) is the City of Tampa's new transportation plan to address these recommendations.

A major component of the MOVES effort is to implement Vision Zero. The City recently completed its first ever Vision Zero Action Plan, which details the strategies the City and its partners will take in the short-term to reach the goal of zero roadway fatalities and severe injuries. Staff will share highlight implementation of the Vision Zero Action Plan through maintenance projects.

Recommended Action:

None. For information only.

Prepared By:

Lisa K. Silva, AICP, PLA, TPO staff

Attachments:

- [City of Tampa MOVES webpage](#)
- [City of Tampa Vision Zero webpage](#)



Plan Hillsborough
planhillsborough.org
planner@plancom.org
813 - 272 - 5940
601 E Kennedy Blvd
18th floor
Tampa, FL, 33602



Hillsborough TPO Transportation Planning Organization

Board & Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item:

Citizens Advisory Committee Organizational Survey

Presenter:

Johnny Wong, TPO Staff

Summary:

The 2021 Plan Hillsborough Nondiscrimination and Equity (ND&E) Plan made several major recommendations regarding issues of community access, accessibility, and representation and diversity of TPO committees.

Earlier in the year, staff distributed a survey to both the CAC and public, soliciting feedback on these topics and more. A summary of results from the CAC was presented in April and staff will now present results from the public survey during the July meeting.

Staff will propose some solutions for the committee to discuss and consider implementing at a future meeting.

Recommended Action:

None. For information only.

Prepared By:

Johnny Wong, PhD, TPO Staff

Attachments:

None.



Plan Hillsborough
planhillsborough.org
planner@plancom.org
813 - 272 - 5940
601 E Kennedy Blvd
18th floor
Tampa, FL, 33602

**HILLSBOROUGH MPO
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
2022 ATTENDANCE REPORT**

CAC Member	Representing	Appointed By	Appointed	Term Expires	Term												TBD
					1/5/22	2/2/22	3/2/22	4/6/22	5/4/22	6/1/22	7/13/22	8/3/22	9/7/22	10/5/22	11/2/22		
Trott, Terrance	African-American Origin	Member-at-Large	3/3/2020	3/3/2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No						
Roberts, Bill	Aviation Authority	HCAA Board	6/30/2020	6/30/2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Gaumont, Sharon	Business Community	Member-at-Large	4/14/2021	4/14/2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No						
Hollenkamp, Steven	City of Plant City	City Commission	4/14/2021	4/14/2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
VACANT	City of Tampa	Councilwoman Hurtak	VAC	VAC	Yes	Yes	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC						
Rice, Nicole	City of Tampa	Councilman Maniscalco	2/12/2020	2/11/2022	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No						
Acosta, Christine	City of Tampa	Councilman Citro	2/12/2020	2/11/2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Aiah Yassin	City of Temple Terrace	City Council	5/12/2021	5/12/2023	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes							
Ed Mierzejewski	Expressway Authority	Joe Waggoner	2/12/2020	2/11/2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Glover, Nicholas	HART	HART Chair	4/14/2021	4/14/2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No						
Prindle, Hoyt	Hillsborough County	Commissioner Kemp	10/1/2019	9/30/2021	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No						
Bailey, David	Hillsborough County	Commissioner Overman	1/13/2021	1/13/2023	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes							
Bosworth, Christina	Hillsborough County	Commissioner Smith	9/14/2021	9/14/2023	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes						
Brown, Carolyn	Hillsborough County	Commissioner Myers	1/13/2021	1/13/2023	VAC	VAC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No						
Morrison, Meaza	Hillsborough County	Commissioner Cohen	6/9/2021	6/9/2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No						
Fernandez, Ricardo	Hispanic Origin	Member-at-Large	4/14/2021	4/14/2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
VACANT	Neighborhoods	Member-at-Large	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC						
Knudsen, Jonathan	Persons <30	Member-at-Large	4/14/2021	4/14/2023	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No						
Skelton Jr., Don	Port Tampa Bay	Port Authority CEO	7/28/2020	7/28/2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Fryer, Artie	Transp. Disadvantaged	TDCB Chair	4/2/2019	4/1/2021	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No						
VACANT	Women	Member-at-Large	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC	VAC						
Richmond, Rick	Planning Commission	Planning Commission	6/30/2020	6/30/2022	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes							
Frank, Josh	School Board	Cindy Stuart	8/11/2021	8/11/2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Members Present					18	17	16	15	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CAC Membership Less Declared Vacancies					20	20	21	21	21	22	23	22	22	22	22	22	22
Needed for Quorum					7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Quorum Achieved					YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Legend:	YES = Attended
	NO = Did Not Attend
	VAC = Vacant
	DVAC = Seat Declared Vacant
	NO = Three (3) or More Consecutive Absences
	Attended Virtually
	= Term Expired; Member may continue until reappointed or replaced.

The MPO may review & consider rescinding the appointment of any member who fails to attend three (3) consecutive meetings.