THE PLANNING COUNCIL AND METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION FOR PINELLAS COUNTY

1. **CALL TO ORDER** (1:00)

2. **INVOCATION AND PLEDGE** (1:05)

3. **CITIZENS TO BE HEARD** (1:10)
   Citizen comments to the Board are invited on items or concerns not already scheduled for public hearing on today’s agenda. Please limit comments to three minutes.

4. **CONSENT AGENDA** (1:15)
   A. Approval of Minutes of the October 12, 2016 Meeting
   B. 2017 Board and Committee Meeting Schedules
   C. Approval of Committee Appointments (CAC)

5. **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS** – To begin at 1:00 p.m. or as soon thereafter as agenda permits
   **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION** (1:20)
   A. Proposed Amendments to the FY 2015/16 – FY 2019/20 Transportation Improvement Program
   B. Fall Update of the FY 2016/17 – FY 2020/21 Transportation Improvement Program

6. **PRESENTATION AND/OR ACTION ITEMS** (1:30)
   A. PSTA Activities Report
   B. San Martin Bridge - Action
   C. Long Range Transportation Plan Modification – Action
   D. Countywide Plan Map 2016 Annual Update – Action
   E. 2016 Traffic Crash Trends and Conditions Report – Action
   F. Regional Coordination Structure Research and Best Practices for the Tampa Bay Region – Action
   G. Committee Recommendations (TCC)
   H. Year-End Budget Report for FY16 – Action
   I. MPOAC Appointments - Action
   J. Establishment of Nominating Committee for 2017 Election of Officers - Action

7. **REPORTS/UPDATE** (3:15)
   A. Director’s Report
      1. SPOTlight Update
      2. USDOT MPOwerment Roundtable

8. **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS** (3:30)
      ([http://www.fleng.org/seminars.cfm?event_id=736](http://www.fleng.org/seminars.cfm?event_id=736))
   B. Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council Regional Transportation Summit, February 16, 2017
   C. Notice of Proposed Rule Making Response Letters from Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners and Hillsborough MPO
   D. Correspondence, Fatalities Map and Draft PAC Action Sheet
   E. CPA Actions and Tier I Countywide Plan Map Amendments
   F. Summary of Public Outreach and Stakeholder Meetings
   G. Holiday Gathering December 14th
   H. Committee Vacancies
   I. Other
9. **ADJOURNMENT**

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact the Office of Human Rights, 400 South Fort Harrison Avenue, Suite 300, Clearwater, Florida 33756; [(727) 464-4062 (V/TDD)] at least seven days prior to the meeting.

Persons are advised that, if they decide to appeal any decision made at this meeting/hearing, they will need a record of the proceedings and, for such purpose, they may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.
SUMMARY

It is approved Board procedure to place routine items under the Consent Agenda for approval with no discussion.

The Consent Agenda has been expanded to include those routine report items identified below. If an item requires discussion, that item may be removed from the Consent Agenda at the request of any member of the Board, discussed, and acted upon separately.

A. Approval of Minutes of the October 12, 2016 Meeting  
B. 2017 Board and Committee Meeting Schedule  
C. Approval of Committee Appointments (CAC)
ATTACHMENT(S): Minutes of the October 12, 2016 Forward Pinellas meeting
Forward Pinellas, the Planning Council and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Board for Pinellas County, met in regular session in the County Commission Assembly Room, Pinellas County Courthouse, 315 Court Street, Clearwater, Florida, at 1:00 P.M. on this date with the following members present:

Jim Kennedy, Chairman, City of St. Petersburg Councilmember  
Joanne “Cookie” Kennedy, Secretary, City of Indian Rocks Beach Commissioner  
Representing Beach Communities  
Doreen Caudell, Treasurer, City of Clearwater Councilmember  
Sandra Bradbury, City of Pinellas Park Mayor  
Julie Ward Bujalski, City of Dunedin Mayor  
Representing Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA)  
Dave Eggers, Pinellas County Commissioner  
Cliff Merz, City of Safety Harbor Commissioner  
Representing Oldsmar, Safety Harbor, and Tarpon Springs  
Darden Rice, City of St. Petersburg Councilmember  
Karen Williams Seel, Pinellas County Commissioner  
Tom Shelly, Town of Belleair Commissioner  
Representing Inland Communities  
Michael Smith, City of Largo Commissioner  
John Tornga, City of Dunedin Commissioner  

Not Present:  
John Morroni, Vice-Chairman, Pinellas County Commissioner  

Also Present:  
Whit Blanton, Executive Director, Forward Pinellas  
Al Bartolotta, Forward Pinellas  
Rodney Chatman, Forward Pinellas  
Tina M. Jablon, Forward Pinellas  
Alicia Parinello, Forward Pinellas  
Other interested individuals  
Jenny Masinovsky, Board Reporter, Deputy Clerk  

Minutes by Jenny Masinovsky and Helen Groves
AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

3. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

4. CONSENT AGENDA
   A. Approval of Minutes of the July 13, 2016 Meeting
   B. Approval of Minutes of the September 13, 2016 Meeting
   C. Approval of Committee Appointments – LCB and BPAC
   D. Approval of Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan Updates
   E. Quarterly Financial Statement

5. RECOGNITIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
   A. Community Planning Month – Proclamation
   B. Pedestrian Safety Awareness Week – Proclamation

6. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS - To begin at 1:00 P.M. or as soon thereafter as agenda permits
   PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL
   A. Subthreshold Countywide Plan Map Amendment
      None
      Regular Countywide Plan Map Amendment
      Case CW 16-24 – City of St. Petersburg

7. PRESENTATION AND/OR ACTION ITEMS
   A. PSTA Activities Report
   B. FDOT Corridor Studies (U.S. Highway Alternate 19, Pasadena Avenue, State Route 60)
   C. U.S. Highway 19 Safe Access to Transit Corridor Study
   D. Impact Fee Study Update and Review of Multimodal Impact Fee Ordinance

8. REPORTS/UPDATE
   A. Director’s Report
      1. Notice of Proposed Rule Making – Re-opening Comment Period
      2. SPOTlight Update
      3. Complete Streets Program Update
      4. Local Coordinating Board Letter of Support for Stretcher Van Transportation
      5. Tampa Hillsborough Expressway Authority Update

9. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
   B. Howard Franklin Bridge Update
   C. U.S. 19 North Projects Update
   D. CPA Actions and Tier I Countywide Plan Map Amendments
   E. Summary of Public Outreach and Stakeholders Meeting
   F. Correspondence, Fatalities Map, and Draft PAC Action Sheet
   G. Committee Vacancies
   H. Other

10. ADJOURNMENT
1. **CALL TO ORDER**

   Chairman Kennedy called the meeting to order at 1:00 P.M. and welcomed those in attendance. A sign-in sheet and all documents referred to in the minutes have been made a part of the record.

2. **INVOCATION AND PLEDGE**

   Commissioner Merz provided the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance; whereupon, at the request of the Chairman, the members introduced themselves.

3. **CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

   No one appeared in response to the Chairman’s call for citizens wishing to be heard.

4. **CONSENT AGENDA – APPROVED**

   Chairman Kennedy presented the Consent Agenda items as follows:

   A. Approval of Minutes of the July 13, 2016 Meeting
   B. Approval of Minutes of the September 13, 2016 Meeting
   C. Approval of Committee Appointments – LCB and BPAC
   D. Approval of Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan Updates
   E. Quarterly Financial Statement

   Commissioner Seel moved, seconded by Commissioner Smith, that Consent Agenda Items A through E be approved. Upon call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously (Vote 12 - 0).

   Mr. Blanton pointed out that the organization is undergoing an audit; and that a year-end financial report will be provided to the Board at the November meeting.

5. **RECOGNITIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

   A. **Community Planning Month - Approved**

   Mr. Blanton requested that October be declared National Community Planning Month, as established by the American Planning Association; whereupon, Commissioner Shelly moved, seconded by Mayor Bradbury, that October be proclaimed the National
Community Planning Month. Upon call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously (Vote 12 - 0).

B. Pedestrian Safety Awareness Week - Approved

Noting the challenges related to pedestrian safety in the region and statewide, Mr. Blanton indicated that staff will be doing a number of things to promote safe travel; whereupon, Mayor Bradbury moved, seconded by Councilmember Rice, that the week of October 30 through November 5 be proclaimed as Pedestrian Safety Awareness Week. Upon call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously (Vote 12 - 0).

6. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL

Chairman Kennedy announced that the PPC public hearing item is a quasi-judicial matter, and upon his request, all persons planning to give testimony were duly sworn by the Deputy Clerk.

Subthreshold Countywide Plan Map Amendments - None

Regular Countywide Plan Map Amendment

CASE CW 16-24, A PROPOSAL BY THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG TO AMEND THE COUNTYWIDE PLAN MAP BY CHANGING THE LAND USE CATEGORY FROM INDUSTRIAL & TARGET EMPLOYMENT CENTER TO MULTIMODAL CORRIDOR & TARGET EMPLOYMENT CENTER – APPROVED

Pursuant to legal notice published in the September 24, 2016 issue of the Tampa Bay Times as evidenced by affidavit of publication filed with the Clerk, public hearing was held on Case CW 16-24, a proposal by the City of St. Petersburg to amend the Countywide Plan Map by changing the land use category from Industrial to Multimodal Corridor, keeping the Target Employment Overlay, re 3.7 acres m.o.l., generally bounded by 6th Avenue South, 22nd Street South, 8th Avenue South/I-275, and 23rd Street South.

Referring to a map and an aerial photograph depicted in a PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Parinello pointed out the location of the property, noting that the property is owned by the City of St. Petersburg and is vacant, and described the surrounding uses. She indicated that the proposal would amend 25 parcels known as the St. Petersburg Commerce Park, formerly the Dome Industrial Park; and that the land was formerly part of the Dome Industrial Park Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) and is now part of the South St. Petersburg CRA.
She stated that the City issued a Request for Proposals for 14 acres and selected two proposals that uphold the CRA objectives of mixed use and target employment; and that the proposals have separate Development Agreements; whereupon, she related that the Pinellas County Economic Development Department supports the proposal; and that staff recommends approval.

In response to the Chairman’s request, Marcie Stenmark, Chairman, Planners Advisory Committee (PAC), related that the PAC voted unanimously to approve the item.

In response to the Chairman’s call for the applicant local government, Derek Kilborn, City of St. Petersburg, provided further information regarding the 10-year Development Agreements and leases and discussed the project, noting that the proposed development is critical to the City’s efforts in the South St. Petersburg CRA; that the development potential will actually increase in terms of total square footage and will provide employment for low- to middle-income people in the CRA area, as well as housing; and that the application is consistent with the City’s and the County’s Comprehensive Plans with regard to any change away from the Industrial land designation.

In response to queries by the members, Mr. Kilborn indicated that there are two parts to the overall plan: the Eurocycles of St. Petersburg and the St. Petersburg Commerce Park, both of which have made a commitment and signed a Development Agreement. He indicated that one portion of the site will include a motorcycle dealership and services and the other will have marine manufacturing and a solar energy company. He described the housing component, indicating that it will be part of a mixed-use portion that will front on 22nd Street South; whereupon, he discussed characteristics that influence a decision to change an Industrial designation to a Multimodal Corridor designation, including an opportunity to blend residential and commercial activity.

David Goodwin, Director of Planning and Economic Development, City of St. Petersburg, discussed the Development Agreements, and indicated that the minimum requirement for the entire parcel is the provision of 65 jobs, but he expects there will be more; and that many of the parcels will be developed simultaneously. He related that the area is part of the Warehouse District and the City is working with the Warehouse Arts Group; whereupon, Chairman Kennedy, with input by Councilmember Rice, observed that the area is referred to as the Warehouse Arts District, and provided further information.
Commissioner Shelly moved, seconded by Councilmember Caudell, that Case CW 16-24 be approved as recommended by staff. Upon call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously (Vote 12 - 0).

No one appeared in response to the Chairman’s call for citizens wishing to be heard. Noting that he had deviated from the normal protocol, Chairman Kennedy called for another vote; whereupon, the above motion, second, and vote were affirmed.

7. PRESENTATION AND/OR ACTION ITEMS

A. PSTA Activities Report

Mayor Bujalski provided the following information:

1. The PSTA serves as the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) for Pinellas County. The CTC five-year designation for the transportation disadvantaged will end in June 2017, and the PSTA Board has approved reapplying for a second five-year term. Congressman David Jolly and Representative Jimmy Greer were at a PSTA event this morning, and it was announced that a $500,000 federal grant to improve disadvantaged ridership has been received.

2. Millage of .75, the maximum the PSTA can levy, has been approved, and 100 percent of the additional $1.1 million revenue will be used to provide more evening and weekend service, as requested by the riders.

3. Discussed the Direct Connect pilot program, which allows people living in a specific area of Pinellas Park to take an Uber or United Taxi ride to connect to other routes. Staff is proposing that the program be expanded throughout the county for first and last miles of service, and the Board has asked them to further refine the goals and objectives of the program and bring it back for discussion.

4. Councilmember Rice provided an update on the Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit project, reporting that a delegation from the PSTA consisting of staff and Board members participated in a St. Pete Beach work session regarding the City serving as the beach terminus for the project. She indicated that the City has major infrastructure problems that need to be addressed, and the citizens and Commissioners have heard comments that the County would not consider a St. Pete Beach CRA unless the City joins the PSTA as a full member participant; whereupon, she opined that this is a
regional issue and the project should not be derailed by attempting to “squeeze” money out of St. Pete Beach, and discussion ensued.

Chairman Kennedy agreed that the rapid transit line is very important to the county, and stated that St. Pete Beach is easily the best beach terminus for the line, and Mayor Bujalski and Councilmember Rice concurred. Chairman Kennedy suggested that the Board provide direction to Mr. Blanton on how to voice the opinion of Forward Pinellas on the issue and decide whether to provide a letter of support for the St. Pete Beach terminus. Mr. Blanton suggested that the parties reach out to the hoteliers and businesses along the route to see if they would financially contribute to the project, and he and Commissioner Cookie Kennedy offered their assistance in getting everyone to cooperate for the good of the project. Commissioner Seel commented that the project is worthy and should be moved forward in a positive manner, and suggested that the consultant provide the expected make-up of the ridership in order to develop a funding formula.

Commissioner Eggers stated for the record that while the County did have a recent discussion regarding CRAs, there was no link to the St. Pete Beach/PSTA situation.

In response to query by Councilmember Caudell, Chairman Kennedy and Mr. Blanton indicated that in order to qualify for federal funding, the buses must be specifically branded for bus rapid transit and over 60 percent of the route must have exclusive bus lanes.

In response to query by the Chairman, Mr. Blanton confirmed that staff will prepare a letter that reflects the Board’s concerns, interests, and perspective on the issue; whereupon, Mayor Bujalski moved, seconded by Commissioner Seel and carried unanimously, that staff is to work on the project with whomever they deem appropriate (Vote 12 - 0).

B. FDOT Corridor Studies (U.S. Highway Alternate 19, Pasadena Avenue, State Road 60)

Bryan Shroyer, Project Manager, Federal Department of Transportation (FDOT), gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding corridor studies FDOT is conducting on Gulf-to-Bay Boulevard/State Road 60; Alternate 19/State Road 595 (from Park Street North to the Pinellas/Pasco County line); and Pasadena Avenue/State Road 693 (from Shore Drive South to 66th Street North). He indicated that the goal is to identify ways to improve safety
and mobility without building more roads or increasing the current roadway network; that each study will examine current and forecasted conditions; and that the studies will examine issues such as traffic operations, capacity, safety, access and egress, and transit, bicycle, and pedestrian movements; that the initial focus will be on short-term, cost-feasible, smaller projects; and that Forward Pinellas was involved and provided information during the development of the studies.

Mr. Shroyer related that FDOT will be gathering information from the PSTA, Forward Pinellas, and similar agencies, as well as County and municipal government representatives and the public; and that a Project Advisory Group will be formed early in 2017 to determine the roadway network envisioned for the future.

Mr. Blanton indicated that staff, working with Jacobs Engineering, met yesterday regarding the State Road 60 multimodal implementation plan that was approved by the Board, and the information they are gathering will be part of the study; whereupon, Commissioner Seel commented that the County is providing money to look at the State Road 60/Belcher Road intersection from a County standpoint; and, noting that Alternate 19 has 13 different names as it runs throughout the county, suggested that as all the local governments will be involved, the name issue be addressed once again; whereupon, Councilmember Caudell, noting that Belcher Road is a sensitive issue, stated for the record that the two latest fatalities involved homeless people under the influence crossing outside the crosswalks.

Councilmember Rice expressed concern that the corridor studies focus on safety and mobility, but not capacity, noting that capacity is a critical problem, and discussion ensued. In response to queries by Mayor Bujalski, who stressed the need for the City of Dunedin to be involved, Mr. Shroyer confirmed that the North and South studies on Alternate 19 would be done almost simultaneously. He and Mr. Blanton discussed the make-up of the proposed Project Advisory Committee, and related that, hopefully, FDOT and Forward Pinellas would be working together on a large corridor study for State Road 580 from Alternate 19 to U.S. 19; whereupon, Mr. Blanton suggested that due to the many corridor study requests, the Board needs to set some priorities.

Mayor Bradbury stated that for the study to be effective, traffic on roadways such as Gulf-to-Bay need to be measured during various times of the year to take into account holidays, “snowbirds,” and Spring break, noting that during the peak season, the driving time can double or even triple; whereupon, Mr. Shroyer indicated that due to cost, FDOT normally
only takes a representative sample, and Mr. Blanton remarked that in the State Road 60 study, he is factoring in the additional travel time needed during the peak seasons.

C. U.S. 19 Safe Access to Transit Corridor Study

Chris Keller, Tindale Oliver and Associates, provided a summary of the U.S. 19 pedestrian/bicycle Safe Access to Transit study, a partnership between FDOT, Forward Pinellas, and the PSTA, noting that the study looked at properties within one-half mile of U.S. 19 from Gandy Boulevard to the Pinellas/Pasco County Line. He indicated that the main purpose of the study is to make U.S. 19 safer for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users in general, and those trying to access transit in particular, noting that a large portion of the study dealt in data collection and evaluation.

Mr. Keller reported that some options brought out by the study are roadway overpasses and underpasses, pedestrian overpasses and underpasses, splitting the bus route, and transit circulators that would travel up and down U.S. 19 to take people from one side of the corridor to the other; and that the study revealed that all the ideas are potentially feasible, depending on the location. He related that Greenlight Pinellas was in play when the study was initiated and was taken into consideration; and that cost was another consideration, both to the pedestrians and for the construction and upkeep of the infrastructure and operating the circulators. He indicated that, ultimately, the study determined that U.S. 19 is evolving and changing, and there is a continuing need for a collaborative effort between all parties involved; whereupon, Mayor Bradbury expressed support for circular routes and Commissioner Mertz commented regarding the pedestrian safety aspects of underground crossings.

D. Impact Fee Study Update and Review of Multimodal Impact Fee Ordinance

Mr. Blanton indicated that the City of St. Petersburg has adopted a resolution asking that the impact fee study be updated.

Mr. Bartolotta provided historical information, reporting that the 1986 Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance has been renamed the Multimodal Impact Fee Ordinance; that the ordinance is applied countywide by local governments; and that by terms of the ordinance, land development projects adding new road trips are subject to paying impact fees commensurate with the scale of the project; whereupon, he provided information regarding the two fee schedule rates, noting that the rates are based on a 1990 impact fee study conducted by an MPO consultant.
Mr. Bartolotta indicated that since the ordinance was adopted, the MPO has provided technical assistance to the local governments for its implementation and been responsible for its ongoing update, including recommending fee schedule rates; and that the biennial updates were discontinued in 2011 while the Pinellas County Mobility Plan was being developed and until the local governments amended their Codes; whereupon, he indicated that Forward Pinellas staff has requested that the County Planning Department fund the update, using the four percent funding source stipulated in Section 150-43(g) of the Florida Statutes.

In response to queries by Commissioner Seel, Mr. Blanton indicated that he would check with his consultants, but he thinks the study would cost approximately $300,000. He explained that the County collects and distributes the fees; that the County receives 100 percent if the fee is generated by an unincorporated area and 50 percent if generated by a municipality, with the municipality receiving the other 50 percent; and that four percent of the fees received by the County are to be set aside for administrative purposes, and he will check with the Office of Management and Budget to see if the four percent has been routinely set aside and the amount of funds available. He related that the fee was discounted 75 percent during the recession, is collected by district, and generates about $4 million annually countywide; whereupon, discussion ensued regarding how the study would be conducted.

Following discussion and consultation with Mr. Blanton, Chairman Kennedy directed that staff bring back a more detailed report in January or as soon as possible.

8. REPORTS/UPDATE

   Director’s Report

   1. Notice of Proposed Rule Making – Re-Opening Comment Period

      Mr. Blanton indicated that a new rule the federal government is proposing would require that all MPOs in an urbanized area merge within a single metropolitan planning area; and that the proposed rule poses difficulties in combining MPOs in overlapping growth areas, such as in Florida, where there are a lot of County-based MPOs, noting that there is an option that would allow MPOs to remain separate and create a single long-range plan and other planning products for the urbanized area.
Mr. Blanton indicated that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) received a lot of pushback regarding the proposed rule, with a supermajority of the comments, both nationwide and across all types of respondents, opposing the new regulations; that a majority of the MPOs across the country requested that the time limit to comment on the proposed rule be extended; and that, initially, the FHWA refused to extend the comment period, but has recently extended it to October 24.

Mr. Blanton indicated that staff has been directed by this Board and by the Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area (TMA) Leadership Group to begin the conversation regarding merging the MPOs and afterwards to lay out a plan to move forward; that staff is following a deliberate process to evaluate different options to regionalize the three MPOs in Pinellas, Pasco, and Hillsborough Counties and possibly a broader region that would include the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority (TBARTA); whereupon, he discussed ways to make it a collaborative effort, including workshops.

Mr. Blanton indicated that he and Chairman Kennedy are undertaking a series of meetings with local governments to encourage their involvement and input; and that they have already met with the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and Treasure Island. He related that the discussion with the BCC included a concept presented by Commissioner Long regarding a regional council of governments to govern land use, housing, and transportation, noting that there is not a specific regional plan to merge the MPOs as yet, and that the Commissioner’s concept is one of several that will be considered.

Mr. Blanton advocated taking a different approach, stating that he would prefer a top down effort with grassroots input; and that he would need the Board’s direction, guidance, and support to make the case for this approach to the TMA Leadership Group and other partners, and discussion ensued. Mayor Bradbury referenced the Howard Frankland Bridge expansion as a unified effort between the three counties that failed; and stated that one lump sum to be divided between the three counties could prove contentious. Mr. Blanton explained how a single transportation management area could work, and opined that although the Federal Highway Administration has advised MPOs to hold off on having merger discussions until the proposed rule is final, as it may never happen, he thinks the discussion about regional MPOs would have occurred even if the federal rule had not been introduced.

Mayor Bradbury referenced the work that went into merging the PPC and the MPO in Pinellas County and the attempt to give the municipalities representation on the Board.
She expressed concern that smaller cities would not have a voice and would lose assistance and funding if the MPOs were merged. Mayor Blanton provided information about the required member composition of an MPO; whereupon, he acknowledged the danger to the smaller cities, but stated that he would prefer not to have that discussion at this time.

*   *   *   *   *

At this time, 3:10 P.M., Mayor Bujalski left the meeting.

*   *   *   *   *

Commissioner Merz observed that the federal government seems adamant about enacting the rule even though 90 percent of the MPOs in the country are in opposition, and suggested that if the rule is enacted, the smaller three-county group of MPOs advocated by Mr. Blanton would be more advantageous to smaller municipalities than the larger group preferred by some. He suggested massaging the language on page 96 of the TMA Leadership Group recommendation to read “evaluate unified planning products for strengthening our regional planning process,” replacing the word options.

Mr. Blanton stated that he has requested that FDOT support and fund a study on the issue, and that they essentially said that the counties and communities must first show that they are unified.

Mr. Blanton requested that the Board provide direction for him to draft a letter to be reviewed by his counterparts asking FDOT for assistance with the study re a single Long Range Transportation Plan covering the region and to develop a set of performance measures and targets, a project prioritization process to ensure equity, and a dispute resolution process, consistent with the proposed federal rule; whereupon, he discussed his ideas for developing a regional long range plan. Mr. Blanton further requested that the Board provide direction as to whether he should submit additional comments to the federal government.

Thereupon, Commissioner Seel moved, seconded by Councilmember Caudell, that a Collaborative Lab workshop be held to look at different options for the region that would include representatives from Pinellas, Hillsborough, and Pasco Counties. In response to query by Commissioner Merz, she confirmed that this motion and another she plans to make would be asking for FDOT support for the study. Upon call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously (Vote 11 – 0).
Thereupon, Commissioner Seel moved, seconded by Councilmember Caudell, that a unified set of planning products be developed, which would elaborate on what the Tampa Bay TMA Leadership Group has been doing. Upon call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously (Vote 11 – 0).

*   *   *   *

At this time, 3:19 P.M., Mayor Bujalski returned to the meeting.

*   *   *   *

Commissioner Seel provided a summary of the aforementioned meeting Mr. Blanton and Chairman Kennedy held with the BCC, indicating that following the discussion, BCC Chairman Charlie Justice directed that (1) Commissioner Long convene a meeting amongst the Commissioners and the Mayors and (2) that a regional discussion be held regarding what would need to be done legislatively. In response to query by Chairman Kennedy, she confirmed that it would be a regional discussion and would include the MPOs in order to make it a more collaborative process.

Commissioner Seel related that the Hillsborough County MPO has provided comments opposing the proposed federal rule on regionalization, but the Hillsborough County BCC wrote a letter in support; and that the Pinellas County BCC is considering writing a similar letter in support, but asking that the land use element be factored in; whereupon, she opined that if a regional MPO is realized, there should be local committees so that the input of elected officials is not lost.

Councilmember Caudell expressed support for the local committees, and in response to her query, Commissioner Seel stated that she would be in favor of having the discussion via the Collaborative Lab process and including the Mayors, the BCCs, and the MPO Boards. Commissioner Eggers concurred with Commissioner Seel, noting that the ultimate goal is to bring more money into the area and to protect the individual plans.

During discussion, Commissioner Shelly observed that it would be easier to work with three counties rather than seven, especially if the land use issue is added, and Mr. Blanton provided input. Commissioner Seel reported that FDOT has agreed to fund the State Road 60 exit from the Howard Frankland Bridge. Commissioner Rice referenced a January 2014 financial analysis of a transportation merger of the PSTA and the Hillsborough Area
Regional Transit Authority (HART), and suggested that the data might be relevant; whereupon, Mr. Blanton indicated that the MPO, PSTA, HART, and FDOT are searching for legislative remedies that might provide incentives for merging.

Thereupon, in response to query by the Chairman, Mr. Blanton indicated that in light of the motions the Board just approved, a motion regarding a follow-up letter would no longer be necessary; whereupon, he referenced a conference call scheduled for Friday with MPOs around the country who have already merged, noting that he will share the information with the Board, and discussion ensued.

2. SPOTlight Update

Mr. Blanton reported that the water transportation technical forum was postponed due to the hurricane, possibly to be rescheduled on November 3 at the Madeira Beach City Hall.

3. Complete Streets Program Update

Mr. Blanton announced that that a technical workshop will be held tomorrow, noting that staff issued a call earlier this week for projects for the program, and any local government is eligible to submit a project as long as there is a land use redevelopment component. He reported that FDOT gave approval to move forward with the $46,000 West Bay Drive pilot project, and discussion ensued.

4. Local Coordinating Board Letter of Support for Stretcher Van Transportation

Mr. Blanton announced that the BCC has approved a reduced fee for stretcher transportation for non-emergency medical uses.

5. Tampa Hillsborough Expressway Authority Update

Mr. Blanton related that the BCC has invited the Authority to explore options for a toll facility in Pinellas County, and more information will be provided at a later date.

9. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Information about the following items was included in the agenda packet and the items were not addressed at the meeting unless so noted:

B. Howard Frankland Bridge Update

Earlier in the meeting, Mr. Blanton referred to recent newspaper revelations, and indicated that FDOT is re-evaluating the design concept for the Howard Frankland Bridge, and staff will report on the changes as soon as they become known.

C. U.S. Highway 19 North Projects Update

D. CPA Actions and Tier 1 Countywide Plan Map Amendments

E. Summary of Public Outreach and Stakeholder Meetings

F. Correspondence, Fatalities Map, and Draft PAC Action Sheet

G. Committee Vacancies

Chairman Kennedy announced that there are vacancies on the Citizens Advisory Council for the Largo area, the Beaches area, and the At Large area categories.

H. Other - None

10. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:42 P.M.

____________________________________
Chairman
SUMMARY

Annually Forward Pinellas adopts a meeting calendar for the upcoming year along with committee meeting schedules and submittal deadlines. The attached are the proposed schedules for 2017.

ACTION: Board approve and accept the 2017 Board meeting schedules and deadlines along with committee meeting schedules

ATTACHMENT(S):
- Proposed Board meeting calendar for 2017 with submittal deadlines
- Proposed committee meeting schedules for 2017
### FORWARD PINELLAS MEETING CALENDAR – 2017

Schedule of Meeting Dates for the Metropolitan Planning Organization & Pinellas Planning Council (PPC) Public Hearings and Corresponding Meeting/Public Hearing Dates for the Planners Advisory Committee (PAC) and Countywide Planning Authority (CPA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline for Submittal of PPC Items Requiring Public Hearing</th>
<th>PAC Meeting Date 1:30 pm 1st Floor Conference Room 310 Court Street Clearwater, FL 33756</th>
<th>Forward Pinellas Hearing Date 1:00 pm Pinellas County Courthouse 5th Floor BCC Assembly Room 315 Court Street Clearwater, FL 33756</th>
<th>CPA Hearing Date 9:30 am (unless noted) Pinellas County Courthouse 5th Floor BCC Assembly Room 315 Court Street Clearwater, FL 33756</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 16, 2016</td>
<td>December 5, 2016</td>
<td>December 14, 2016</td>
<td>January 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2017</td>
<td>February 27, 2017</td>
<td>March 08, 2017</td>
<td>April 11, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8, 2017</td>
<td>April 3, 2017</td>
<td>April 12, 2017</td>
<td>May 9, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12, 2017</td>
<td>May 1, 2017</td>
<td>May 10, 2017</td>
<td>June 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10, 2017</td>
<td>June 5, 2017</td>
<td>June 14, 2017</td>
<td>July 18, 2017, 6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 2017</td>
<td>July 5, 2017 (Wednesday)</td>
<td>July 12, 2017</td>
<td>August 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 12, 2017</td>
<td>July 31, 2017</td>
<td>August 09, 2017</td>
<td>October 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 9, 2017</td>
<td>September 5, 2017 (Tuesday)</td>
<td>September 13, 2017</td>
<td>October 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 13, 2017</td>
<td>October 2, 2017</td>
<td>October 11, 2017</td>
<td>November 28, 2017, 6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11, 2017</td>
<td>October 30, 2017</td>
<td>November 08, 2017</td>
<td>December 12, 2017, 6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMMITTEES MEETING SCHEDULE 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization)</th>
<th>CAC (Citizens Advisory Committee)</th>
<th>TCC (Technical Advisory Committee)</th>
<th>BPAC (Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee)</th>
<th>Tampa Bay TMA Leadership Group 9:30 am (held in Tampa)</th>
<th>LCB (Local Coordinating Board) 9:15 am</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>8:30 am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>01/11/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>01/26/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>01/25/2017</strong></td>
<td><em>(4th Mon)</em> <strong>01/23/2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>02/08/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>02/23/2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>02/22/2017</strong></td>
<td><em>(4th Mon)</em> <strong>02/27/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>02/03/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>02/21/2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>03/08/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>03/23/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>03/22/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>03/20/2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>04/12/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>04/27/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>04/26/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>04/17/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>04/07/2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>05/10/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>05/25/2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>05/24/2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>05/15/2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>05/16/2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>06/14/2017</strong></td>
<td><em>06/22/2017</em></td>
<td><strong>06/28/2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>06/19/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>06/09/2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>07/12/2017</strong></td>
<td><em>07/27/2017</em></td>
<td><em>07/26/2017</em></td>
<td><em>07/17/2017</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*08/09/2017</td>
<td>08/24/2017</td>
<td>08/23/2017</td>
<td>08/21/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>09/13/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>09/28/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>09/27/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>09/18/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>09/08/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>09/19/2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10/11/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>10/26/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>10/25/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>10/16/2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11/08/2017</strong></td>
<td>Nov/Dec Combined</td>
<td>Nov/Dec Combined</td>
<td><strong>11/20/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>11/03/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>11/21/2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12/13/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>12/07/2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>12/06/2017</strong></td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Meeting Cancelled*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPOAC</th>
<th>STSC</th>
<th>TMMAC / ITS</th>
<th>PTSTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPOAC</td>
<td>(School Transportation Safety Committee)</td>
<td>(Transportation Mobility Management Advisory Committee)</td>
<td>(Pinellas Trail Security Task Force) (every 3rd month @ the Pinellas County Public Safety Services Office - 12490 Ulmerton Road, Largo, Rm 130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/2017 in Sunrise, FL (to be held in conjunction with the Safe Streets Summit)</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>1/10/2017 Meeting Room 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>2/1/2017</td>
<td>2/1/2017</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/6/2017 Regular Scheduled Meeting</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>04/11/2017 Meeting Room 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19/2017 in Boca Raton, FL (to be held in conjunction with the Floridians for Better Transportation Summit)</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>07/11/2017 Meeting Room 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/2017</td>
<td>9/6/2017</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/2017 - 11/7/2017 in Panama City Beach (to be held in conjunction with the Emerald Coast Symposium)</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

- Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

The CAC currently has an At Large opening. Forward Pinellas has received several applications from interested individuals of which three applicants attended the October meeting. After discussion and consideration of the criteria approved by the Board, staff recommends the appointment of John Estok to fill the At Large opening.

ATTACHMENT(S): CAC Membership Listing
John Estok Application and Statement of Interest

ACTION: Board, in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, approve application of John Estok for CAC membership

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the Board approve the application of John Estok for At Large representative on the CAC.
### St. Petersburg Area
1. Daryl Krumsie (11/13/13)
2. R. Lee Allen (10/10/12)
3. Cathy Lasky (10/08/08)
4. Robby Thompson (02/13/13)

### Clearwater Area
5. Neil McMullen (VC) (04/13/11)
6. Karen Cunningham (02/10/16)

### Dunedin Area
7. Karen Mullins (07/09/14)
8. Bob Henion (04/14/10)

### Pinellas Park and Mid-County Area
9. Edward Ameen (03/09/16)
10. David L. Carson, Jr. (03/12/08)

### Largo Area
11. Joe Falanga (Chairman) (06/10/09)
12. Vacant (as of 7-25-16)

### Beaches Area
13. Vacant (as of 7-25-16)
14. Terri Novitsky (12/09/15)

### Gulfport, Kenneth City, Seminole, Belleair, So. Pasadena, Belleair Bluffs Area
15. Jack Nazario (02/13/13)

### Tarpon Springs, Oldsmar, Safety Harbor Area
16. Larry Roybal (02/09/11)
17. Becky Afonso (07/13/11)

### At Large
18. Kim Marston (02/11/15)
19. Vivian Peters (03/11/15)
20. Patricia Rodriguez (12/09/15)
21. Norris Varkalhoff (05/11/16)
22. Carson Zimmer (04/13/16)
23. Jack Kleban (07/13/16)
24. Tammy Vrana (05/13/15)
25. Vacant (as of 7-25-16)
26. Jake Stowers (10/14/15)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Four-Year Term</th>
<th>Renewable Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Lee Allen</td>
<td>(10/10/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robby Thompson</td>
<td>(02/13/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Nazario</td>
<td>(02/13/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Krumzieg</td>
<td>(11/13/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Mullins</td>
<td>(07/9/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Marston</td>
<td>(02/11/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Peters</td>
<td>(03/11/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Vrana</td>
<td>(05/13/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Malone</td>
<td>(06/10/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Stowers</td>
<td>(10/14/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Novitsky</td>
<td>(12/9/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Rodriguez</td>
<td>(12/9/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Cunningham</td>
<td>(02/10/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Kleban</td>
<td>(07/13/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Ameen</td>
<td>(03/09/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Beal</td>
<td>(04/13/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Zimmer</td>
<td>(04/13/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris Varkalhoff</td>
<td>(05/11/16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Four-Year Terms</th>
<th>Term Ending Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Carson</td>
<td>(03/12/08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Lasky</td>
<td>(10/08/08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Falanga</td>
<td>(06/10/09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Henion</td>
<td>(04/14/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Schechner</td>
<td>(12/08/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Roybal</td>
<td>(02/09/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil McMullen</td>
<td>(04/13/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Afonso</td>
<td>(07/13/11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER APPLICATION

Name: Estok John Patrick

Home Address: 2035 Philippe Park Hwy #124 Safety Harbor, FL 34695

Work Address: 11701 28th Street North St. Petersburg, FL 33716

Home Telephone: 310 570-3149  jobeostok@hotmail.com

Do you prefer to be contacted/receive documents at your home or work address? Home

Date of Birth: 2/24/82

Advisory committee you’re interested in serving on: CAC Citizens Advisory Cntrl

Why are you interested in serving on this committee? (you may add an attachment if you need additional space)

Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Name and Location</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Major/Subjects of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starmount Salon HS Greenby,FL</td>
<td>11th grad</td>
<td>8th to 12th in 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you are appointed, do you know of any reason whatsoever why you will not be able to attend regularly scheduled meetings or otherwise fulfill the duties of the membership to which you have been appointed? No

Gender: Male   Female

Race: White   Hispanic   African American   American Indian/Alaskan Native

Asian/Pacific Islander   Other

* Applications may be submitted by electronic mail, FAX or mail. E-mail address: info@forwardpinellas.org

Fax: (727) 464-8212 - Mailing Address: Forward Pinellas, 310 Court St., Clearwater, FL 33756.
Statement of Interest

To whom it may concern,

My name is John Estok & I'm a 34 years old resident of Safety Harbor. I don't own a car and rely on my bike & PSTA for most of my travel. I would like to be considered for the Forward Pinellas Citizen's Advisory Committee/(CAC).

I have never held an elected office or served on any boards or leadership positions. I prepared a plan for a regional express commuter bus system in our county and shared it with my City Commissioner Cliff Merz. He suggested that I apply for the Citizen's Advisory Committee. I care a lot about infrastructure, public transit & just public policy in general. I almost always attend our local City Commission meetings here in Safety Harbor. I would like to use PSTA/public transit more frequently than I currently do—especially to Tampa or St Petersburg—but because of the slow & infrequent service here it just doesn't make sense to do so. I would like to see that change—along with raising the amount of people that use PSTA from the abysmally low 2.9% that it currently is. I also want our roads to be more user-friendly and safer. Traffic signals and street signs that are very difficult to see, roads-esp freeways with irrationally designed interchanges are some of my biggest concerns.

Sincerely,

John Estok
5A. Proposed Amendments to the FY 2015/16 – FY 2019/20 Transportation Improvement Program

SUMMARY

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is proposing an amendment to the Pinellas County FY 2015/16 – 2019/20 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). This proposed amendment adds $771,791 in FY 2016/17 for the construction of a shared-use trail within Honeymoon Island State Park. The trail will connect to the existing trail on the Dunedin Causeway, which connects to the Pinellas Trail Loop. The Pinellas Trail Loop will connect to a still larger Coast to Coast Connector Trail, which is a shared-use trail linking the City of St. Petersburg to the City of Titusville on the east coast. The funding source for the trail is the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program.

ATTACHMENT(S):
- TIP Amendment Form
- TIP Amendment Map

ACTION: Following a public hearing, Board, in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, approve the TIP amendment by roll call vote

ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION(S): The Technical Coordinating Committee and Citizens Advisory Committee reviewed the proposed TIP amendment at their October meetings. Both committees recommended that the Forward Pinellas Board approve the amendment.
On November 9, 2016, Forward Pinellas amended their Transportation Improvement Program that was developed and adopted in compliance with Title 23 and Title VI in a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process as a condition to the receipt of federal assistance. By signature below, the MPO representative certifies that the TIP amendment was adopted by the MPO Board as documented in the supporting attachments. This amendment will be subsequently incorporated into the MPO’s TIP for public disclosure.

Furthermore, this TIP revision does not adversely impact the air quality conformity or financial constraints of the STIP and is consistent with the Adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (page number above). The TIP remains Financial Constrained. The projects will be automatically amended into the STIP in July.

Jim Kennedy, Chairman
Forward Pinellas

Date

Brian Beaty, FCCM, Government Liaison
FDOT - D7

Date

*TIP amendment criteria:
A: The change adds new individual projects to the current TIP
B: The change adversely impacts financial constraint
C: The change results in major scope change
D: The change removes or deletes an individually listed project from the TIP
E: The change results in a cost increase that is >20% AND >$2 million.

CURRENT PROJECT(S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>438429-1</td>
<td>Honeymoon Island Spur Trail</td>
<td>Within the Honeymoon State Park adjacent to the roadway. The Legislature granted $300,000 Economic Development Funds to FDEP. EDTF not available so federal TA Funds were used.</td>
<td>TALT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALT</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALT</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALT</td>
<td>62-65</td>
<td>11,791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALT</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TALT Funds from TA Program Reserve 428030-3 - LF Funds from Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)

Project is in the current STIP so only the local TIP requires amending.
10' WIDE PROPOSED BIKE TRAIL
7111.65 L.F.
SUMMARY

Each year, Forward Pinellas, in its role as the metropolitan planning organization for Pinellas County, updates the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to incorporate changes in the county and municipal capital improvement programs. The TIP contains project descriptions, schedules, and corresponding funding allocations for the 25 local governments of Pinellas County, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA), the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority (TBARTA), local airports, and the Port of St. Petersburg. The projects include new construction, reconstruction, capital purchases, and maintenance work associated with roads, sidewalks, trails, transit services, airports, the Port of St. Petersburg, and the Transportation Disadvantaged Program. The TIP also identifies the MPO’s priority lists, which are required by law to be included in the TIP to receive state and federal funding.

The annual fall update incorporates the new locally adopted Pinellas County and municipal transportation work programs into the TIP. The new work program tables are attached, along with corresponding project maps. Also attached are summary tables intended to provide a summary report of Pinellas County transportation improvement projects. The summary tables include information on the status of the projects and any changes that have occurred from the previous year work program. Projects that changed from the previous year are shaded on the tables. Pending approval by the Forward Pinellas Board on November 09, 2016, the new work programs and accompanying maps will be incorporated into the FY 2016/17 – 2020/21 TIP.

Link to all attachments listed below:

ATTACHMENT(S):

- Map of Pinellas County Road, Intersection and Bridge Improvements
- Summary Table of Pinellas County Road, Intersection and Bridge Improvements
- Map of Pinellas County Intelligent Transportation System/Advanced Transportation Management Systems Projects
- Summary Table of Pinellas County Intelligent Transportation System/Advanced Transportation Management Systems Projects
- Map of Pinellas County Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects
- Summary Table of Pinellas County Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects
- Pinellas County Capital Improvement Program for Transportation Projects
- Work Program Table of the St. Petersburg-Clearwater International Airport
- Work Program Table of the Port of St. Petersburg
- Work Program Table of the Clearwater Airpark
- Work Program Table of the Albert Whitted Airport
- Map of Municipal Work Program Projects
- Municipal Work Program Tables
**ACTION:** Following a public hearing, Board, in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, approve the TIP update by roll call vote

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION(S):** The Technical Coordinating Committee and Citizens Advisory Committee approved the fall update of the TIP at their October meetings.
SUMMARY

This item includes a report from the board member representing the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA). This report will provide an opportunity for the PSTA representative to share information concerning planning initiatives, partnerships and collaboration and other relevant matters with the Board.

ACTION: None required; informational item
SUMMARY

Pinellas County is conducting a Project Development & Environment (PD&E) study for the rehabilitation or replacement of the existing San Martin Boulevard Bridge over Riviera Bay. The limits of the bridge study are from Tallahassee Drive to Weedon Drive in St. Petersburg. A second component of the project will evaluate trail enhancements from Macoma Drive to Gandy Boulevard. The study of San Martin Bridge improvement is needed to address the deficiencies of the existing bridge. The bridge was constructed in 1962 and is nearing the end of its service life. The existing bridge does not meet current design standards and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

Over the last year, the study team conducted a preliminary analysis of the rehabilitation and replacement alternatives. The results of the analysis and input from the July 2015 Kick-off Open House were used to develop three replacement alternatives for the San Martin Bridge. In addition, because trail enhancements to the facility have been identified as priorities in the City of St. Petersburg’s Trail Program, Pinellas County’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and the Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Long Range Transportation Plan, three alternatives were also developed for the alignment of a multiuse trail facility on the structure.

A representative from the project team will provide an overview of the study and the various alternatives for the bridge and trail facilities.

www.pinellascounty.org/sanmartinbridge.

ATTACHMENT: San Martin Bridge Project Fact Sheet

ACTION: Forward Pinellas, in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, to recommend a preferred alternative

ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION(S): The BPAC met on October 17, 2016 and recommended the Right-shifted (East) Bridge Alternative and Right (East) Trail Alignment Alternative by a vote of 21-0. The TCC met on October 26, 2016 and voted unanimously (13-0) to recommend the right-shifted (East) Bridge Alternative and the Hybrid Trail Alignment Alternative. The CAC met on October 27, 2016 and voted to recommend the right-shifted (East) Bridge Alternative and the Right (East) Trail Alignment Alternative by a vote of 13-0.
**Project Description**

Pinellas County is conducting a Project Development & Environment (PD&E) study for the rehabilitation or replacement of the existing San Martin Bridge over Riviera Bay. The limits of the bridge study are from Tallahassee Drive to Weedon Drive in St. Petersburg, Florida. A second component of the project is to evaluate trail enhancements from Macoma Drive to Gandy Boulevard.

**Bridge Alternatives**

Over the last year, the study team conducted a preliminary analysis of the rehabilitation and replacement alternatives. The results of the analysis and input from the July 2015 Kick-off Open House were used to develop three replacement alternatives for the San Martin Bridge. Detailed analyses of the following alternatives will be presented at the Public Alternatives Workshop:

- **No Build Alternative**
- **Left-shifted (West) Alternative** - New fixed bridge shifted to the left (west) of the existing bridge.
- **Centered Alternative** - New fixed bridge on the same alignment as the existing bridge.
- **Right-shifted (East) Alternative** - New fixed bridge shifted to the right (east) of the existing bridge.

**Trail Alternatives**

Alternatives for the extension of the North Bay Trail from Macoma Drive to Gandy Boulevard will also be presented as follows:

- **Left (West) Trail Alignment**
- **Right (East) Trail Alignment**
- **Hybrid Trail Alignment** - Right (East) Trail Alignment from Macoma Drive to just north of Weedon Drive then Left (West) Trail Alignment from north of Weedon Drive to Gandy Boulevard.

**Project Schedule**

- **PD&E Study**
  - Kick-off Open House: July 2015
  - Public Alternatives Workshop: July 2016
  - Study Complete: Summer 2017
- **Design Phase**
  - Construction*: 2017-2018
  - 2019-2020

*Dependent on availability of grant funding, which is currently undetermined.

**Project Contact:**

Nancy McKibben, MPA, Project Manager
Pinellas County Transportation Engineering Section
14 S. Ft. Harrison Ave., 6th Floor, Clearwater, FL 33756
Phone: (727) 464-4812
E-mail: nmckibben@pinellascounty.org

**Project Website:**

www.pinellascounty.org/sanmartinbridge
6C. Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Modification

SUMMARY

The Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) includes transportation projects to serve all modes, including roadway projects, transit service and bicycle and pedestrian projects. A modification to the LRTP has been requested to add the lane continuity improvements that resulted from the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) study in the I-275 corridor. The project is broken into two segments, the first of which is from S. of 54th Ave. S. to I-175, the other from I-175 to S. of Gandy Blvd., the planned terminus of the Tampa Bay Express project. These planned improvements will provide for two continuous through lanes along the entirety of the corridor through the addition of pavement in some locations and adjusting pavement markings in others. Modifications are being made to add the project to Map 5-3, the 2040 Pinellas LRTP Policy Plan Roadway Projects by Jurisdiction map, to Table 5-8, the 2040 Roadway Projects: State Roads, and to Appendix E, the Pinellas MPO LRTP Pinellas County Roads Phasing/Balancing spreadsheet.

Forward Pinellas staff is seeking approval of this modification to the 2040 LRTP. As these projects are not funded for construction, this modification will not affect the cost feasibility of the 2040 LRTP.

ATTACHMENT(S):
- Modified Map 5-3, Table 5-8 and Appendix E of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan

ACTION: Board, in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, approve the modification to the LRTP

ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION(S): The TCC met on October 26, 2016 and voted to recommend approval of the modification by a vote of 14-0. Subsequently, the CAC met on October 27, 2016 and unanimously (13-0) recommended approval.
2040 Pinellas LRTP Policy Plan Roadway Projects by Jurisdiction

Legend
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Beckett Bridge
Dunedin Causeway
SR 679 Bayway Bridge
San Martin Bridge
Gandy Bridge Replacement
I-275 Lane Continuity Improvements

Legend:
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### Table 5-8 (Continued)
#### 2040 Roadway Projects: State Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Number</th>
<th>Project Name and Limits</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Committed</th>
<th>Project Phase and Cost (YOE)</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55) from Pinellas Trail to Pasco County Line</td>
<td>6D + 2Aux to 6P</td>
<td>ROW: Committed</td>
<td>PE: $10,317,239 (TMA) CST: $52,660,000</td>
<td>2020-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Howard Frankland Bridge from 4th St to Pinellas County Line(^1)</td>
<td>2Aux + Transit Option</td>
<td>PE: Committed</td>
<td>CST: $567,875,878</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I-275 Ramp NB I-275 to Westbound Umlerton</td>
<td>NA to 2F</td>
<td>PE: Committed</td>
<td>ROW: $53,590,996 CST: $53,590,996</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I-275 at 31st St Interchange</td>
<td>2F (modify interchange)</td>
<td></td>
<td>PE: $17,811,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Tyrone Boulevard Overpass Removal/Trail Overpass Construction</td>
<td>4D at Grade + Trail Overpass</td>
<td>PE: $18,934,080</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I-175 at 4th St.</td>
<td>Interchange Modification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I-275 from S. of 54th Ave. S to I-175, Segment A</td>
<td>Lane Continuity Improvements</td>
<td>ROW: $4,400,000</td>
<td>CST: $23,950,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I-275 from I-175 to S. of Gandy Blvd, Segment B</td>
<td>Lane Continuity Improvements</td>
<td>ROW: $1,580,000</td>
<td>CST: $71,640,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL (funded) Cost: $1,422,517,683**

\(^1\)Includes the widening of the Howard Frankland Bridge northbound structure to accommodate a dedicated transit facility. Phasing of auxiliary lanes dependent upon the modification of the SR 60/I-275 Interchange, and may come before the transit improvements on the structure.

*PE = Preliminary Engineering, ROW = Right of Way Acquisition, CST = Construction*

‘U’ = Undivided; ‘D’ = Divided; ‘P’ = Partially Controlled Access; ‘F’ = Freeway; ‘AUX’ = Auxiliary Lanes; ‘O’ = One Way; ‘E’ = Enhancements. Enhancements may include any or all of the following: adding sidewalks; adding bike lanes; the provision of turning lanes at intersections; frontage roads; bringing the existing facility to urban section standards by providing the required lane widths, setbacks, drainage, curb and gutter

*TMA = Transportation Management Area (federal funds); OA = Other Arterial (state funds); SIS = Strategic Intermodal System (state funds)*

‘N/A’ in the Timeframe column denotes project phases that are not considered cost feasible before 2040 and costs are shown in Present Day dollars.
## Appendix E - Table 1

### Pinellas MPO 2040 LRTP

#### Pinellas County Roads Phasing/Balancing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Roads</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>FPDS/PS (2020)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>FPDS/PS (2025)</th>
<th>RDN cost (2025)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>CR Cost (2025)</th>
<th>Total Cost (2025)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Express SR 690 @ US 19 &amp; SR 686 &amp; @ CR 611 W of I-275</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43rd St. N. Extension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,715,000</td>
<td>SIS Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Funded with Gateway Express Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Funded with Gateway Express Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Funded with Gateway Express Committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55) SR 686 at 40th Street</td>
<td>6D 4P + 2O/3O each side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,346,800</td>
<td>SIS Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Funded with Gateway Express Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Funded with Gateway Express Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Funded with Gateway Express Committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 694 (Gandy Blvd) US 19 (SR 55)</td>
<td>6D 6D + 2E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$323,288</td>
<td>SIS Underway</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$12,889,589</td>
<td>SIS Committed</td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
<td>OA 2020</td>
<td>$25,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55) (Curlew Rd Interchange)</td>
<td>N of CR 95 N of Nebraska Ave. (Tampa &amp; 9th St. Interchange) 6/8F 6/8F + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$68,979,434</td>
<td>SIS 2020</td>
<td>$80,705,938</td>
<td>$80,705,938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55) S of Lake Street Pinellas Trail (Tarpon Interchange)</td>
<td>6D + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,284,000</td>
<td>SIS Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55) S of Timberland Rd</td>
<td>6D + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,084,000</td>
<td>SIS Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SR 686 (Roosevelt Blvd) SR 688 (Ulmerton Road) 28th St. N 4D 6D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SR 686 (Roosevelt Blvd) SR 688 (Ulmerton Road)</td>
<td>28th St. N W of 28th St. N/A 2U 2D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>Municipal Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Municipal Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Municipal Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Municipal Committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SR 66 (336 Connector) E. of 40th Street E. of 28th St. N/A 4P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SR 66 (336 Connector) E. of 4th Street W of 28th St. N/A 4P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SR 664</td>
<td>S of Highway Avenue S of 6th St N/A 4P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,800</td>
<td>SIS Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SR 664 60th St Bridge/Roosevelt Blvd. North of 60th Street (Roosevelt Blvd) 6D 4P 40% each side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$67,248</td>
<td>SIS Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$14,648,809</td>
<td>SIS Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SIS Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SR 664 US 19 (SR 55)</td>
<td>6D 4P 75% to 400 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SR 664 Brandon Blvd.</td>
<td>6D of 8th Street W of 10th Street (100 ft.)</td>
<td>6D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 664</td>
<td>North of Lake Street North Shore Avenue</td>
<td>6D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SR 664</td>
<td>South of Lake Street First Street North Shore Avenue</td>
<td>6D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SR 664 US 19 (SR 55) S of Lake Street Pinellas Trail (Tarpon Interchange)</td>
<td>6D + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$68,000,000</td>
<td>County Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SR 664</td>
<td>N. of Highway Avenue N. of 4th St N/A 4P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SR 664</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55) (Curlew Rd Interchange)</td>
<td>6D 4P + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SR 664</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55)</td>
<td>4P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SR 664</td>
<td>North of 40th Street North Shore Avenue</td>
<td>6D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SR 664</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55) S of Lake Street Pinellas Trail (Tarpon Interchange)</td>
<td>6D + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SR 664</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55) S of Lake Street</td>
<td>6D + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SR 664</td>
<td>N. of Highway Avenue N. of 4th St N/A 4P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SR 694 (Gandy Blvd) US 19 (SR 55)</td>
<td>E of I-275 (SR 93)</td>
<td>6D 6D + 2E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55) (Curlew Rd Interchange)</td>
<td>Northshore Dr. N of CR 95</td>
<td>6D + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SR 664 (Passaorg Passageway) Bridge 1</td>
<td>6D of 8th Street W of 10th Street (100 ft.)</td>
<td>6D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55)</td>
<td>S. of Highway Avenue S. of 6th Street (Roosevelt Blvd)</td>
<td>6D + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55)</td>
<td>S. of Highway Avenue S. of 6th Street (Roosevelt Blvd)</td>
<td>6D + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55)</td>
<td>S of Timberland Rd</td>
<td>6D + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55)</td>
<td>S of Timberland Rd</td>
<td>6D + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>US 19 (SR 55) S of Lake Street Pinellas Trail (Tarpon Interchange)</td>
<td>6D + 2 Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SR 660</td>
<td>S of 118th Avenue N. Park St. Tyrone Blvd. 54th Ave. N. 4D 4D + E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>County Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>County Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Committed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>SR 660</td>
<td>S of 118th Avenue N. Park St. Tyrone Blvd. 54th Ave. N. 4D 4D + E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Revenues</td>
<td>2020-2025</td>
<td>2026-2030</td>
<td>2031-2040</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$80,929,470</td>
<td>$107,262,000</td>
<td>$202,400,000</td>
<td>$390,591,470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIP</th>
<th>2021-2025</th>
<th>2026-2030</th>
<th>2031-2040</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$146,047,222</td>
<td>$125,942,594</td>
<td>$379,752,636</td>
<td>$651,742,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OA revenue is overcommitted during the last time period (2031-2040) by nearly 20%. However, since the earlier time periods of the plan include positive balances opportunities exist to advance projects during programming through the Transportation Improvement Program. Adjustments made during the programming of projects would be evaluated to determine the need for a future LRTP amendment to ensure consistency between the TIP and LRTP.

### Appendix E - Table 1

*Excludes TRIP revenues*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Construction Cost (YOE)</th>
<th>ROW Cost (PDC)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>PDBC/PS (PDC)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>PDBC/PS (PDC)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TMA = Transportation Management Area (federal funds); OA = Other Arterial (state funds); SIS = Strategic Intermodal System (state funds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

The Countywide Rules provide for the annual update and filing of the Countywide Plan Map and, in this case, it has been updated to include all the amendments that have been approved through the October 11, 2016 Countywide Planning Authority meeting.

ATTACHMENT(S):

- Draft copy of Forward Pinellas Resolution No. 16-3
- Link: Countywide Plan Map
- Link: Scenic/Noncommercial Corridor Map

ACTION: Board, in its role as the Pinellas Planning Council, to approve or deny Resolution No. 16-3, recommending acceptance of the updated Countywide Plan Map for filing as the official record copy.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION(S): The PAC voted unanimously (11-0) to recommend the Board recommend official acceptance of the updated Countywide Plan Map for filing.
FORWARD PINELLAS RESOLUTION NO. 16-3

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING TO THE PINELLAS COUNTY BOARD
OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, IN ITS CAPACITY AS THE
COUNTYWIDE PLANNING AUTHORITY, THAT THE AMENDED
COUNTYWIDE PLAN MAP BE ACCEPTED AND FILED WITH THE CLERK
OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AS THE OFFICIAL
COUNTYWIDE PLAN MAP.

WHEREAS, the Countywide Plan Map was duly adopted by Pinellas County Ordinance No. 15-30 on August 4, 2015, with an effective date of August 7, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Countywide Plan Map has been amended by ordinances approved by the Countywide Planning Authority through October 11, 2016; and

WHEREAS, Forward Pinellas, in its role as the Pinellas Planning Council, is authorized to update and print said map for acceptance and filing by the Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners in its role as the Countywide Planning Authority, consistent with Section 2.2.2 of the Countywide Rules; and

WHEREAS, said Countywide Plan Map has been prepared in accordance with that authorization and is available for acceptance and filing.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by Forward Pinellas that:

Section 1. The attached map entitled “Countywide Plan Map, Pinellas County, Florida,” effective August 7, 2015, and amended through October 11, 2016, is a true and correct copy, and includes the following:

a) 1"=3000' scale color composite Countywide Plan Map amended through October 11, 2016, referred to as Exhibit A;

b) 1" = 6000' scale color composite Scenic/Noncommercial Corridor map amended through October 11, 2016, referred to as Exhibit B.

Section 2. Forward Pinellas hereby recommends that the Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners, in its role as the Countywide Planning Authority, accept the attached map as the official Countywide Plan Map and file said map with the Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners.

Section 3. A copy of this Resolution is to be forwarded to the Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners, acting in its capacity as the Countywide Planning Authority.
This Resolution offered and adopted at the November 9, 2016 meeting of Forward Pinellas as hereinafter set forth:

__________________________ offered the foregoing Resolution, which was seconded by ________________________, and the vote was:

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT AND NOT VOTING:

ATTEST:

________________________________________ ______________________________
Whit Blanton, Executive Director Councilmember Jim Kennedy, Chairman
Forward Pinellas Forward Pinellas
SUMMARY

Forward Pinellas provides countywide transportation crash data to the public as well as other public agencies on an ongoing basis. This includes the production of an annual report, which provides information and analysis of crash trends and locations. This information is used for various purposes, including transportation safety studies and projects, prioritization of safety improvements, targeted law enforcement activities, and design plans for road construction projects. The 2016 Traffic Crash Trends and Conditions Report has been reviewed and recommended for approval by the Forward Pinellas advisory committees. Forward Pinellas staff will give a presentation summarizing the contents of this year’s crash report.

ATTACHMENT(S): 2016 Traffic Crash Trends and Conditions Report

ACTION: Board, in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, approve the 2016 Traffic Crash Trends and Conditions Report

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION(S): The BPAC and CAC voted unanimously to recommend approval of the report. The TCC voted 12-1 to recommend approval of the report.
2015 Pinellas County Traffic Crashes: Overview

This edition of the Traffic Crash Trends and Conditions Report summarizes the crashes, injuries, and deaths that occurred on Pinellas County roadways during the 2015 calendar year. The analysis contained in this report is based on available data from several sources including; the Pinellas County Crash Data Management System (CDMS), Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (FDHSMV), Florida’s Integrated Report Exchange System (FIRES), the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), and other traffic crash data repositories. In most instances 2015 data was utilized, however in other cases the latest available data is from 2014 and is so noted.

Effective January 1, 2011, the FDHSMV mandated the use of a new Florida Traffic Crash Form, HSMV 90010S, which has been utilized for all crashes involving a motor vehicle that occurred on or after that date. Several new fields were added to provide additional information on safety equipment, commercial vehicles, and crash conditions. Given the change in reporting formats that occurred in 2011, the bulk of the data contained in this report uses 2011 as a baseline year.

The information provided in this report will help to inform local governments, transportation planners, law enforcement agencies, consultants, traffic engineers, and others of the current trends in crashes, injuries, and fatalities in Pinellas County. This data should also be used, along with other criteria, in the planning and/or programming of transportation-related safety projects, grant applications, long-range transportation forecasting and targeted law enforcement activities.

In 2015:
- 28,501 traffic crashes occurred in Pinellas County and were reported to the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (FDHSMV) (up 7% from 2014)
- 101 people died (down 15% from 2014)
- 4,426 people were injured (up 4% from 2014)
- Estimated economic cost of crashes, injuries and fatalities in Pinellas County: $1,540,835,100

On an average day in 2015:
- 77 crashes
- .27 deaths and 12 injuries
- Average daily cost in Pinellas County: $4,221,466.03

Key findings from the 2016 Traffic Crash Trends and Conditions Report

- Teen driving traffic crashes continue to rise
  Over the past 5 years (2011 to 2015), the number of crashes involving drivers age 15 to 19 has dramatically increased from 1,616 to 3,128 (up 63%).

- Impaired driving traffic fatalities continue to decrease
  In 2015, Pinellas County experienced a total of 24 traffic fatalities due to driver impairment, a 57% decrease since 2011. This large percent reduction in fatalities is encouraging even though impaired driving crashes in Pinellas County have remained relatively constant since 2011 (up 1%).

- An alarming number of pedestrian fatalities are occurring at night along illuminated roadways
  Almost two-thirds (65%) of the pedestrians killed in traffic crashes were walking across roads at mid-block that were illuminated from overhead streetlights.

2015 distracted driving statistics:
- 3,164 crashes
- 9 deaths and 569 injuries
- Estimated economic cost in Pinellas County: $72,293,100

- The intersection of Gulf-to-Bay Blvd. (SR 60) and Belcher Road in Clearwater was the most dangerous intersection in 2015 with an intersection crash rate of 5.23 crashes per million entering vehicles
- The segment of Live Oak Street from Alt. 19 to Safford Ave. in Tarpon Springs was the most dangerous corridor in 2014 with a segment crash rate of 77.42 crashes per million entering vehicles

---

Introduction

Providing a safe and secure transportation system for the traveling public is a fundamental goal of the Forward Pinellas 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). This report supports that goal by detailing traffic crash trends and documenting progress towards achieving various safety goals. The purpose of the Traffic Crash Trends and Conditions Report is to provide summary information about the crashes that are reported each year. The term “crash” is used in preference to “accident”. The latter term suggests there is a random, unavoidable quality about the events in question. In fact, several decades of crash research strongly demonstrates that advances in engineering and technology, coupled with changes in public policy and individual human behavior, can dramatically reduce the number and severity of traffic crashes.

A single crash may have many contributing factors. For example, cell phone use or adjusting the radio may lead to driver distraction, which together with wet, slippery pavement and high traffic congestion at an intersection causes a traffic crash. In general, a handful of factors such as our land development patterns, roadway characteristics, and environmental factors affect the majority of traffic crashes. The following section outlines some of the factors most frequently associated with crash incidence and severity.

Vehicle Safety Factors - Engineering improvements to vehicle safety systems can help prevent crashes from occurring. Features such as lane departure warning systems and forward collision warning systems automatically notify the driver of unsafe situations and are becoming more common in new vehicles. When there is a crash, vehicles designed for safety can increase survivability. For example, the design of windshield glass and the location and durability of gas tanks can increase safety. The “passenger packaging” inside a vehicle can reduce injury severity through means such as padded dashboards and collapsible steering wheel columns. Passenger protection systems in vehicles (airbags, safety belts, etc.), if used, can eliminate injuries or reduce their severity. A review of the last 5 years of crash data in Pinellas County shows that while crashes have increased by 60% since 2011, the number of injuries have decreased by 20% over the same time period. This inverse relationship is most likely due to advances in vehicle safety systems.

Behavior factors - For all crashes and fatal crashes, the driver behaviors police cite most often as contributing factors are, in order of frequency: operating a motor vehicle in a careless or negligent manner, failure to yield and improper backing. Reducing these behaviors would reduce crashes. Further, when there is a crash, using seat belts will likely reduce a crash’s severity.

Roadway characteristics - Limited access facilities and high speed/high volume roadways carry a majority of the traffic volume in Pinellas County. As Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) increases along these corridors, so does the probability of crashes and injuries.

Environmental factors - Weather conditions affect crash incidence and severity. Pinellas County does not experience significant weather variability; consequently, fatal crashes do not have a pronounced seasonal variation.

This report provides a statistical summary of crashes, injuries, and fatalities in the areas noted below.

- Performance Measures (Federal Highway Administration - FHWA and Strategic Highway Safety Improvement Plan - SHSP)
- Overall Trends in Florida
- Overall Trends in Pinellas County
- Intersection and Segment Crash Rates
- Gulf Boulevard Crashes
- Pedestrian Fatality Benchmark Against Other Urbanized Florida Counties

The performance measures section of the report is new this year and is included to inform the reader of the State and National metrics that will begin to be tracked in Pinellas County to monitor the effectiveness of traffic safety programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration – Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act or &quot;FAST Act&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Florida's Strategic Highway Safety Improvement Plan (SHSP) Focus Areas

- Aggressive Driving
- Intersection Crashes
- Vulnerable Road Users
  | Lane Departures |
  | At-Risk Drivers |
  | Distracted Driving |
“FAST Act” Performance Measures

On December 4, 2015, President Obama signed the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act into law which among other things continued the reforms instituted in the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), enacted in 2012. This legislation requires the enactment of planning processes that are more streamlined, performance-based, and multimodal in order to address the safety challenges facing the U.S. transportation system. The FAST Act authorizes FHWA to establish safety performance measures however, local metropolitan planning organizations (MPO’s) have the ability to set their own targets. With this in mind, the 2016 Traffic Crash Trends and Conditions Report has been re-structured to begin the process of reporting on those safety performance measures. Although the safety performance measures for the transportation system have been established, safety targets and reporting requirements towards meeting those targets have not been set. The legislation requires that the identification of safety targets and reporting progress towards meeting those targets must begin within 180 days of the State of Florida establishing and reporting its Highway Safety Improvement Plan (HSIP) targets to FHWA. The process of identifying safety targets is anticipated to begin in the very near future.

Below are charts and a scorecard for the FHWA Safety Performance Measures, as applied to Pinellas County, which indicates a positive trend for most of these safety metrics. The data included in the 2015 5-year rolling average will become the baseline for all future safety performance measure reporting.

Table 1 – FHWA Safety Performance Measures, Pinellas County, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Motor Vehicle Crash-Related Serious Injuries</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Motor Vehicle Crash-Related Fatalities</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries of Non-Motorized Users</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities of Non-Motorized Users</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries per Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</td>
<td>46.90</td>
<td>43.43</td>
<td>41.07</td>
<td>41.60</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>43.25</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities per Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2015 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) data for Pinellas County was not available at the time this report was published
Florida’s Strategic Highway Safety Improvement Plan (SHSP) Performance Measures

Another element of transportation safety planning is the SHSP. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) developed their SHSP in 2012 in collaboration with the Departments of Education, Health, Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, Transportation, and the Florida Highway Patrol, dozens of traffic safety organizations, cities and counties, as well as private sector businesses. This effort resulted in a statewide, data-driven plan that addresses the “4-E’s” of safety – engineering, enforcement, education, and emergency response.

Florida’s SHSP goal is to achieve at least a five percent annual reduction in the actual number of fatal and serious injury crashes in seven focus areas that are defined below.

The hard work and dedication of safety partners in implementing the SHSP is paying off. Between 2011 and 2015, Pinellas County’s fatalities due to driver impairment dropped by 27% from 3,365 to 2,444, and serious injuries decreased 56% from 43 to 24. Furthermore, serious injuries resulting from aggressive driving, lane departures, as well as those incidents occurring at intersections and involving at-risk drivers all experienced double-digit percentage declines since 2011. Below are summary charts and a detailed scorecard on Pinellas County’s progress towards meeting the State’s five percent annual reduction goal for the identified focus areas.

- **Aggressive Driving** - A crash involving a driver who; failed to yield right-of-way, failed to keep in the proper lane, followed too closely, ran a red light, ran a stop sign, passed improperly, exceeded the posted speed limit, disregarded other road markings, operated a motor vehicle in an erratic or reckless manner, or who disregarded other traffic signage.
- **Intersection Crashes** - A crash in which the first harmful event occurs within the limits of an intersection.
- **Vulnerable Road Users** - Pedestrians, bicyclists or motorcyclists.
- **Lane Departure Crashes** - A crash where the driver’s vehicle impacted a utility pole, light support, traffic sign/signal support, tree, mailbox, guardrail, fence, ditch, culvert, concrete traffic barrier, cable barrier, bridge trail, bridge pier or support. This definition also includes any vehicle sideswipe or rollover.
- **Impaired Driving** - A crash involving a person who is suspected of drug or alcohol use or is under the influence of medication.
- **At-Risk Drivers** - A crash involving a 15-19 year old person or a person 65 years old or older.
- **Distracted Driving** - A crash resulting from the driver being distracted by electronic communication devices (cell phone, etc.), other electronic devices (navigation device, DVD player), other distraction inside the vehicle, external distraction (outside the vehicle), texting or general inattentiveness.

Figure 2 – SHSP Safety Performance Measures, Serious Injuries
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Figure 3 – SHSP Safety Performance Measures, Serious Injuries
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### Table 2 – SHSP Safety Performance Measures, Pinellas County, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN FOCUS AREAS</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>5 Year Rolling Avg.</th>
<th>5 Year % Change (2011-2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Crashes Due to Aggressive Driving</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Crashes Involving Vulnerable Users</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Departure Serious Injury Crashes</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Crashes Due to Driver Impairment</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Crashes Involving At-Risk Drivers</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Crashes Due to Distracted Driving</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Intersection Crashes</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>-41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes Due to Aggressive Driving</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes Involving Vulnerable Users</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Departure Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes Due to Driver Impairment</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes Involving At-Risk Drivers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes Due to Distracted Driving</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Intersection Crashes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pinellas County Crash Data Management System (CDMS)
Trends in Florida

Florida is the 3rd most populous state in the country with over 20 million persons according to the latest population estimates from the United States Census Bureau. Florida’s population has grown over 6% since 2011 and is projected to continue to climb well into the foreseeable future. This growth in population, along with other factors, has had a direct impact on the amount of users of the road network. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), the number of licensed drivers, and the average annual retail price of gasoline are all variables that directly impact the driving habits of Floridians. In 2015, all these factors were trending in a direction which resulted in an increase in motor vehicle usage. You will see on the following page that these trends have resulted in a higher occurrence of traffic crashes, injuries, and fatalities across the state.

Figure 6 – Population in Florida, 2011-2015

Figure 7 – Vehicle Miles Traveled in Florida, 2011-2014

Figure 8 – Licensed Drivers in Florida, 2011-2015

Figure 9 – Average Annual Price of Retail Gasoline in Florida, 2011-2015
There were 374,511 traffic crashes reported to FDHSMV in 2015, an increase of 8% from 2014. There were 2,938 deaths on Florida roads, a 19% increase from the previous year. Over the 5-year time period, crashes, injuries, and fatalities involving motor vehicles as well as those involving pedestrians and bicyclists have experienced double-digit increases since the 2011 baseline year. Based on these figures it is clear that much work still needs to be done. There must continue to be a sustained focus on taking additional steps to improve traffic safety including strengthening traffic laws, enhancing enforcement, expanding education and outreach, and continuing to develop engineering solutions, where feasible. These elements are all part of the state’s “Alert Today Alive Tomorrow” initiative – a multidisciplinary program addressing traffic issues at all levels of government.

Figure 10 – Crash Trends in Florida, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>229,214</td>
<td>182,010</td>
<td>2,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>283,370</td>
<td>198,483</td>
<td>2,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>317,259</td>
<td>211,124</td>
<td>2,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>344,478</td>
<td>225,758</td>
<td>2,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>374,511</td>
<td>243,391</td>
<td>2,938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11 – Pedestrian/Bicycle Crash Trends in Florida, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pedestrian Crashes</th>
<th>Pedestrian Fatalities</th>
<th>Bicycle Crashes</th>
<th>Bicycle Fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7,045</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>5,037</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8,280</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>6,442</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8,422</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>6,974</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8,845</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>7,086</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9,086</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>7,123</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends in Pinellas County

In 2015, a total of 28,501 motor vehicle crashes were reported in Pinellas County. Of these, 99 resulted in one or more fatalities, while 3,465 caused serious injuries. For the vast majority of crashes (20,798), there were no injuries or fatalities reported.

There were 101 traffic crash fatalities in Pinellas County in 2015—16 less fatalities than the 117 in 2014. The 15% decrease is generally consistent in the downward trend of traffic fatalities since 2011 as reflected in the graph and table below.

Reducing the number of traffic crashes remains a challenge given increases in population, VMT, the number of licensed drivers, and the declining price in the cost of a gallon of gasoline. As these numbers steadily increase, Pinellas County continues to face challenges in reducing the number and severity of traffic crashes.

Table 4 – Pinellas County Crash Trends, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Motor Vehicle Crashes</td>
<td>14,896</td>
<td>18,071</td>
<td>24,624</td>
<td>26,580</td>
<td>28,501</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Injuries</td>
<td>5,416</td>
<td>3,859</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>4,249</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fatalities</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pedestrian Crashes</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pedestrian Fatalities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bicycle Crashes</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bicycle Fatalities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Motorcycle Crashes</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Motorcycle Fatalities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pinellas County Crash Data Management System (CDMS)
WHO was involved

Among drivers, young people and males are over-represented in traffic crashes in Pinellas County. There are 734,149 licensed drivers in the county. People aged 15-19 make up 4% of the licensed drivers, yet they accounted for 9% of the crash-involved drivers. However, drivers aged 20-29 are the worst from this perspective. In 2015, they represented 14% of the licensed drivers, but 24% of all crash-involved drivers. By contrast drivers 60-69 made up 16% of the driving population, but only accounted for 10% of crash-involved drivers. Crash-involved drivers are also more likely to be males: 77% of drivers in fatal crashes were male; 50% of drivers in all crashes were male.

Traffic crashes are a leading cause of death in young people2. In Pinellas County last year, 22 people under the age of 30 died in crashes, representing 22% of all traffic deaths. The National Safety Council reports that traffic crashes are the leading cause of death among persons aged 1 to 34. Among people injured, young people are particularly impacted. There were 1,378 people under age 30 who were injured representing 33% of the total number of people injured in traffic crashes.

WHY they happened

An understanding of the causes of crashes informs infrastructure investments, enforcement activities, and educational efforts. For instance, unsafe speeds can be addressed by traffic enforcement and road design, while the tendency of motorists to drive off the road can be mitigated with guardrail or rumble strips. Similarly, having robust transit options or ride home programs, enforcement, and education could reduce the number of crashes attributable to driver impairment. Operating a vehicle in a careless or negligent manner once again was the most common cause of crashes, contributing to over 11,000 crashes in 2015. Failure to yield right-of-way, improper backing, and following too closely were also significant crash factors.

WHAT the conditions were

The “at-fault” vehicles involved in traffic crashes are mostly motorcycles, passenger cars or pickups. Of the 101 traffic fatalities, 73 (72%) involved these 3 vehicle types. There were also 36 pedestrians and 3 bicyclists who died in traffic crashes. There was 1 death to a moped rider and 1 death involving a medium/heavy truck (more than 10,000 lbs.). Almost all crashes occur in good driving conditions. Over 41% of the fatal crashes and over 68% of the non-fatal crashes occurred during daylight hours. A majority of crashes occur in good weather conditions. Over 71% of all crashes occur in “clear” weather. Road surface conditions were usually good. For fatal crashes, 91% were on dry roads and 7% were on wet roads.

WHERE they happened

Fatal crashes tend to occur between intersections as these areas experience higher speeds and do not have the same safety treatments as intersections. Last year, 67% of fatalities were classified as "non-junction", meaning that they occurred between intersections. Additionally, only 15% of fatalities occurred at an intersection.

WHEN they occurred

A fatal traffic crash is most likely to occur at night during the time period between 7:00 p.m. and 11:00 p.m. As for total crashes, the six hour time period of 12:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. had the most. In that time frame, 52% of all crashes occurred. Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays accounted for 52 of the 101 fatalities (51%). Total crashes are more evenly distributed across days of the week, although Fridays had the most (16%) and Sundays had the least (10%).

Recent Trends involving Vulnerable Users

Pedestrians: In 2015, there were 36 pedestrians killed and 302 seriously injured in traffic crashes in Pinellas County. On average, a pedestrian was killed every 10 days and was seriously injured every 1.2 days. Pedestrian deaths accounted for 35% of all traffic fatalities and the intersection of East Bay Drive at Starkey Road was the most dangerous with 15 pedestrian crashes from 2011-2015.

Bicyclists: In 2015, there were 3 bicyclists killed and 231 seriously injured in traffic crashes in Pinellas County. Since 2011, bicycle fatalities and injuries have decreased by 107% and 27%, respectively. These figures are the lowest recorded over the 5-year timeframe. The intersections with the most bicycle crashes were; U.S. 19 at 62nd Avenue and 49th Street at Park Boulevard which experienced 12 crashes each.

Motorcyclists: In 2015, there were 26 motorcyclists killed and 382 seriously injured in motor vehicle traffic crashes—50% of the 762 motorcyclists killed in 2011. Motorcyclists accounted for 25% of all traffic fatalities and 8% of all people injured. The most dangerous intersection was the I-275 interchange at the Roosevelt Boulevard interchange with 19 crashes. However, this intersection was followed closely by the intersection of U.S. 19 at Curlew Road and U.S. 19 at Tampa Road (18 and 15).

2 www.cdc.gov/injury/wisqars/overview/key_data.html.
Key Contributing Factors

Driver Impairment: 23% of all traffic fatalities in 2015 in Pinellas County involved a person who was impaired by drugs or alcohol. Of particular note is the intersection of U.S. 19 and Tampa Road which had the highest number of crashes and injuries involving impaired drivers from 2011 thru 2015.

Aggressive Driving: 33% of all traffic fatalities in 2015 in Pinellas County were due to aggressive driving.

Roadway Lane Departure: Roadway lane departure crashes occur when a driver does not maintain vehicle position within a lane and either crosses into oncoming traffic or runs off the road into a tree, utility pole, down an embankment, or into a body of water. Roadway lane departures accounted for 11% of the traffic fatalities in Pinellas County. These departures often relate to a combination of factors such as speeding, driver distraction, and driver impairment.

Low-Light Conditions: Pedestrian activity in Pinellas County occurs at various times during the day and night. Data shows that almost two-thirds (65%) of the pedestrians killed in traffic crashes were walking along or across roads that were illuminated from overhead streetlights. It is critical that pedestrians and drivers operate with care in low-light conditions(3,9),(995,992), that pedestrians take reasonable steps to be visible, and local governments should work towards providing adequate lighting in high-conflict areas.

Driver Distraction: 11% of all traffic crashes and 8% of fatalities were due to distracted driving.
High Crash Intersections and Segments

Historically, traffic crash frequency has been the preferred approach to analyze and measure the safety of an intersection and/or road segment in Pinellas County. While crash frequency is one of the simplest forms of crash data analysis, it does have limitations when comparing roadways that carry high volumes of traffic to roadways that have much less capacity, and thus smaller numbers of crashes. For the 2016 Traffic Crash Trends and Conditions Report a different methodology was used. Crash rates were calculated for all intersection and roadway segments within the Forward Pinellas Transportation Planning Inventory (TPI) network database. Crash rates were calculated by adding the number of crashes of the individual intersections or roadway segments and dividing the sum of the entering traffic volumes, converted to million vehicles entering (for intersections) or million vehicle miles traveled (for roadway segments). This metric is considered a more reliable measure of the relative safety of an intersection or segment because it incorporates exposure data into the calculation which allows for a more effective comparison of varying locations throughout the transportation system.

During 2015, the intersection with the greatest crash rate was Gulf-to-Bay Boulevard (S. R. 60) & Belcher Road, followed by U.S. Highway 19 & Tampa Road. For the same time period, the road segment with the highest crash rate was Live Oak Street from Alt. 19 to Safford Avenue, followed by Court Street from Chestnut Street to Oak Avenue. Collision diagrams for the Gulf-to-Bay Boulevard (S. R. 60) & Belcher Road and the U.S. Highway 19 & Tampa Road intersections were evaluated to determine the dominant crash type. For both intersections rear end collisions accounted 30% and 58% respectively, for all collisions that occurred at these intersections. It is important to note that even though U.S. Highway 19 is grade-separated through the Drew Street area, this intersection is still experiencing a high rate of traffic crashes because of the high number of at-grade conflict points below the overpass.

Future reports should consider new additional analyses such as a comparison of intersections based on crash severity, and a comparison of crash rates among intersections with similar operating characteristics. These additional analyses will further aid transportation planners, engineers, and officials in effectively identifying hazardous locations, and securing funding to fix them. Below is a listing of the Top 10 intersections and segments based on crash rate.

Table 5 – Top 10 Intersections by Crash Rate in Pinellas County, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Main Route</th>
<th>Minor Route</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>No. of Crashes</th>
<th>Total Intersection AADT</th>
<th>Intersection Crash Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.R. 60</td>
<td>Belcher Road</td>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>73,904</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>U.S. Highway 19</td>
<td>Tampa Road</td>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>107,523</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54th Ave. S.</td>
<td>31st Street South</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36,492</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alternate 19</td>
<td>Curlew Road</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34,241</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>66th St. N. (S.R. 693)</td>
<td>38th Avenue North</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62,396</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>U.S. Highway 19</td>
<td>Drew Street</td>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>116,958</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U.S. Highway 19</td>
<td>Curlew Road</td>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>115,750</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>U.S. Highway 19</td>
<td>Alderman Road</td>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86,758</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gandy Boulevard</td>
<td>4th Street North</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75,125</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alternate 19</td>
<td>Rosery Road</td>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44,215</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fort Harrison Avenue</td>
<td>Chestnut Street</td>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32,776</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pinellas County Crash Data Management System (CDMS)
Table 6 – Top 10 Road Segments by Crash Rate, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Roadway Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Segment Length (miles)</th>
<th>Posted Speed Limit</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>No. of Crashes</th>
<th>Segment Crash Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Live Oak Street</td>
<td>from Alt. 19 to Safford Ave.</td>
<td>Pinellas County</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>114.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Court Street</td>
<td>from Chestnut St. to Oak Ave.</td>
<td>FDOT</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>108.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Belcher Road</td>
<td>from Publix entry to S.R. 60</td>
<td>Pinellas County</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24,710</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28th Street N.</td>
<td>from Scherer Dr. to Roosevelt Blvd.</td>
<td>Pinellas County</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13,816</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Central Ave.</td>
<td>from 4th St. N. to 3rd St. N.</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,548</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tarpon Ave.</td>
<td>from Shopping Center to U.S. 19</td>
<td>Tarpon Springs</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>43rd St. N.</td>
<td>from 79th Ave. N. to Park Blvd.</td>
<td>Pinellas Park</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3,617</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>28th St. N.</td>
<td>from Central Ave. to 1st Ave. N.</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22nd Ave. S.</td>
<td>from I-275 to 31st S.</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15,301</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Enterprise Rd.</td>
<td>from U.S. 19 to Village Dr.</td>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11,864</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pinellas County Crash Data Management System (CDMS)

Figure 16 – Collision Diagram: S.R. 60 @ Belcher Road, 2015

Figure 17 – Collision Diagram: US 19 @ Tampa Road, 2015
Safety along Gulf Boulevard

Since the early 2000’s, Gulf Boulevard has been selected for specialized traffic safety treatments and programs due to its close proximity to the beaches, high rates of pedestrian and bicycle activity, and high concentration of tourist-oriented uses. The crash data analyzed for this corridor is used to uncover any crash trends that may be happening along this popular stretch of roadway. Several safety initiatives, including the WalkWise Key to Safety cards and the Gulf Boulevard Beautification Program, have been instituted in this area with the goal of reducing pedestrian crashes, injuries, and fatalities. The WalkWise Key to Safety card is an insert the same size as a room key which allows hotels along Gulf Boulevard to distribute them to guests during check-in. The goal of this insert is to educate and inform tourists regarding pedestrian safety through the WalkWise tips. The tips include:

- Walk without distraction – wait to text or talk on cell phones
- Always follow the Walk/DON’T Walk signals – use pedestrian push buttons at crossings
- Look left, right and left again before crossing
- Know your surroundings
- Wear bright colors – be seen night and day
- Impaired walking can be dangerous
- Stay on sidewalks – walk facing traffic and use crosswalks
- Expect the unexpected – walk defensively

The Gulf Boulevard Beautification Program encompasses 11 beach communities and includes a manual that provides guidance on strategies to make the corridor consistent with common amenities and streetscape improvements.

An analysis of the crash data for Gulf Boulevard shows that crashes, injuries, and fatalities have all risen over the last 5 years, with total crashes increasing by 50% since 2011. Furthermore, there were 99 crashes and 11 fatalities involving pedestrians over the same time period. These figures underscore the need to implement additional initiatives to improve safety along this corridor.

Forward Pinellas is working to “Enhance Beach Community Access” as part of its Strategic Planning and Operations Topics Emphasis Area initiative. During the public outreach and engagement phase, several comments and concerns related to traffic safety were voiced by the public. This has led to staff incorporating the development of a Vision Zero approach for Gulf Boulevard. Vision Zero is a community commitment to reduce the loss of life and major injuries on roadways to zero. This approach uses a data-driven and coordinated framework to design safer streets, educate the public, evaluate what works, and enforce effective traffic safety laws that create streets that are safe for everyone – people on foot, in cars, using public transit, and on bikes. Vision Zero puts the safety of human life above all else and the intent is to gather a multi-agency coalition to apply this concept to Gulf Boulevard.

Figure 13 – Crash Trends on Gulf Blvd., 2011-2015

Figure 14 – Vulnerable User Crash Trends on Gulf Blvd., 2011-2015

Source: Pinellas County Crash Data Management System (CDMS)
Pedestrian Fatality Benchmark against other Urbanized Florida Counties

The majority of Florida’s urbanized areas developed post-World War II which resulted in suburban-style development patterns with small and somewhat dispersed centers of commercial, industrial, and residential uses. These separated centers of activity were connected by a network of surface streets that were originally designed for local motor vehicle travel but these streets have been adapted over time to accommodate a greater number of motor vehicles with longer and longer trip lengths.

Florida’s urban areas also have a high number of pedestrians that commonly share the street network with increasing numbers of motor vehicles. This inherent conflict has led to Florida having an infamous reputation of being the most dangerous state for pedestrian travel. For instance, Smart Growth America published Dangerous by Design in 2014 which ranked the country’s largest metropolitan areas by their share of traffic deaths involving pedestrians. Unfortunately, four of the top five most dangerous places to walk were located in Florida. Specifically, Orlando-Kissimmee, Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, Jacksonville, and the Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach metropolitan areas scored the highest according to the Smart Growth America Pedestrian Danger Index (PDI). The PDI is a metric that gives an indication of the likelihood of a person on foot being hit by a vehicle and killed.

The information contained below summarizes the pedestrian fatalities per capita for similar urbanized counties in Florida. Regrettably, Pinellas County’s pedestrian fatality rate is the highest amongst urbanized counties and 80% above the national average from 2011-2015. If the County’s rate could be brought down to the national average, a significant number of lives could be saved each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urbanized County in Florida</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas County</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade County</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward County</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National (Average)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

This report has demonstrated a number of meaningful trends relating to motor vehicle crashes in Pinellas County. The information should inform transportation decision-making and, ultimately, lead to a safer, more efficient transportation system.

Some problem areas noted in this and past reports have already been improved or are in the process of being addressed. For example, Pinellas County is conducting a Project Development & Environmental Study (PD&E) of the Belcher Road corridor from Druid Road to Drew Street, which includes the intersection of Gulf-to-Bay Boulevard, to identify improvements that will reduce the number of crashes, injuries, and fatalities that are occurring along this road segment. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) partnered with Forward Pinellas and the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA) on the US 19 Safe Access to Transit Study which focused on identifying strategies to improve the safety and accessibility of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. The study identified short-term improvements and long-term strategies that will be utilized in future FDOT design plans and safety initiatives along the US 19 corridor. Furthermore, Pinellas County, the City of St. Petersburg and other local governments continue to install rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFB’s) at intersections and trail crossings to increase bicyclist, pedestrian, and motorist safety. Currently, there are approximately 221 RRFB’s installed across Pinellas County. Lastly, the Forward Pinellas 2040 LRTP includes an annual set aside of between $1-$5 million dollars for projects that will improve roadway management, operations, and safety conditions. In future years, it is recommended that Forward Pinellas analyze the impact of these improvements. The evaluation of past and future crash data at these locations will further aid in implementing appropriate and effective mitigation strategies to reduce crashes.

There are many additional locations that will require further study to see if physical improvement could be implemented to improve safety. Several intersections along corridors such as East Bay Drive and Ulmerton Road continue to be problematic due to the sheer frequency of crashes. Due to jurisdictional boundaries at these locations, state and local officials, engineers, and staff will need to coordinate targeted safety improvements and reach agreements before any improvements can occur.

Data and analysis on other attributes are included within the report, providing additional information to identify trends and/or areas of concern. Future versions of this report may consider a more detailed analysis of the circumstances of fatal and incapacitating crashes and the characteristics of individuals involved. In particular, age-related factors and impacts should be further explored. An improved understanding of these factors would help the community to better focus its efforts on reducing serious traffic injuries and their impact on our community, which is one of the primary purposes of this report.

By identifying potentially problematic locations, this report continues to advance initiatives, programs, and projects that improve safety on our roadways. It is expected that transportation planners, engineers, and local government officials together will use this information to determine locations that need attention, and seek funding for necessary physical improvements or other means (enforcement, education) to improve safety.
2016 TRAFFIC CRASH TRENDS AND CONDITIONS REPORT

PINELLAS COUNTY
TRAFFIC CRASHES 2015
28,501 traffic crashes
4,426 people injured
101 deaths

+7%

+4%

+92% increase since 2011

+6%

+2%

+3%

-37%

101 TRAFFIC DEATHS IN PINELLAS COUNTY

4,426 INJURIES IN PINELLAS COUNTY

28,501 CRASHES IN PINELLAS COUNTY

-15%

TRAFFIC DEATHS IN PINELLAS COUNTY

FHWA SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injuries</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries - Non-Motorized Users</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities of Non-Motorized Users</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries per Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</td>
<td>46.96</td>
<td>45.43</td>
<td>41.87</td>
<td>41.63</td>
<td>42.35</td>
<td>41.19</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities per Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEEN DRIVING (AGES 15-19)

+63%

Over the past 5 years, the number of crashes involving drivers age 15 to 19 has dramatically increased from 1,616 to 3,128

BICYCLE FATALITIES

-107%

There were 3 bicyclist fatalities in 2015, which is the lowest number over the past 5 years

CONTRIBUTING ACTIONS

Operating a motor vehicle in a careless or negligent manner accounts for a high percentage of motor vehicle crashes

-15%

represents

41% of the total

PEDESTRIAN FATALITIES

65%

occurred at mid-block, at night on roads that were illuminated

LIVE OAK ST

MOST DANGEROUS INTERSECTION

The intersection of Gulf-to-Bay Blvd. and Belcher Rd. in Clearwater had an intersection crash rate of 5.23 crashes per million entering vehicles

MOST DANGEROUS ROAD SEGMENT

The segment of Live Oak St. from Alt. 19 to Safford Ave. in Tarpon Springs had a segment crash rate of 77.42 crashes per million entering vehicles

TOTAL ECONOMIC IMPACT OF CRASHES, INJURIES, AND FATALITIES IN PINELLAS COUNTY IN 2015

$1,540,835,100

SUMMARY

The Federal Highway Administration issuance of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for MPO Coordination and Planning Area Reform has led to a broad regional discussion in which two forums agreed to a plan of action – the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority (TBARTA) and the Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area (TMA) Leadership Group. On August 26, 2016 the TBARTA Board made a unanimous motion to pursue independent research involving all MPOs under TBARTA's umbrella and on September 2, 2016 the TMA supported independent research as well as a collaborative workshop process. Staff members of TBARTA, the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, and the MPOs have worked together to craft a research scope of work that reflects comments and suggestions received from elected officials and board members. The draft scope outlines a process that incorporates collaborative workshops and concurrent research that will be designed to establish goals, measures of success, and intended outcomes at the onset while producing desired deliverables for final comment as a basis for developing recommendations at the conclusion of the research. The scope of work and its final report is not intended to be used as a final outcome; rather, it is intended to be a research guide that will inform, educate, and provide options on the regional transportation planning process. Support for the scope is needed from MPO Boards and County Commissions to solicit funding from the Florida Department of Transportation and/or Florida Legislature.

The Tampa Bay TMA Leadership Group will be discussing this scope at its November 4, 2016 meeting. Staff will update the Board at the meeting on any adjustments to the scope recommended by the TMA Leadership Group.

ATTACHMENT(S): Draft Scope: MPO Regional Coordination Structure Research and Best Practices for the Tampa Bay Region

ACTION: Board to authorize staff to seek funding necessary to proceed with implementation of the scope
INTRODUCTION

There is a history of regional coordination and cooperation related to transportation planning and coordination responsibilities among Citrus, Hernando, Pasco, Pinellas, Hillsborough, Polk, Manatee, and Sarasota counties (hereinafter “Tampa Bay”) - at times conducted by entities with different responsibilities and often very different visions of the geographic area to be embraced, as well as short and long-term goals.

Several coordination mechanisms have been developed and previously implemented that provide varying levels of regional integration and coordination of transportation planning activities, with mixed results. Due to changing demographics, population growth and commuting patterns, there is interest in examining the regional dynamics of Tampa Bay transportation issues, and explore the potential for updating the regional transportation planning coordination structure.

Current Stakeholder Agencies and Entities include:

- Florida Department of Transportation, District Seven
- Florida Department of Transportation, District One
- Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority (TBARTA)
- Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TBRPC)
- Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area (TMA) Leadership Group
- TBARTA MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee (CCC)
- Hernando/Citrus MPO; Pasco MPO; Pinellas MPO; Hillsborough MPO; Polk TPO; and, Sarasota/Manatee MPO
- Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority; Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority; Pasco County Public Transportation; Hernando County Transit; Citrus County Transit; Sarasota County Area Transit; Manatee County Area Transit; and Citrus Connection (Polk County)

The purpose of the proposed research is to define what successful regional coordination means for Tampa Bay, identify the barriers to its execution through available empirical evidence, and to develop several potential alternative implementable scenarios based on an examination of nation-wide best practices for regional transportation planning. The overarching goal of the research is to outline the framework for improving regional coordination and responsibility in Tampa Bay, with effective mechanisms for providing consistent, relevant information to elected officials as well as the general public. In addition, the draft “Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform” (herein referred to as “NPRM”) has provisions for proposes imposing federal requirements for strengthened regional alignment and potential mergers of MPOs within the greater Tampa Bay region. The research will provide information to elected officials to assist in making future decisions on the MPO planning process for Tampa Bay.

OVERALL APPROACH

TBARTA and the TMA Leadership Group have agreed on a two-pronged approach to identifying and evaluating the regional transportation planning process: research and collaborative workshops. These approaches would be conducted concurrently.

1 Does not include Polk or Sarasota Counties.
Both research and collaboration are anticipated to occur in two separate, but interrelated phases. In the first phase of research, “Summarize Existing Conditions,” the existing framework in which regional transportation coordination and planning are conducted in Tampa Bay will be examined and outlined. Concurrently, the first collaborative workshop (hereinafter “Workshop 1”) will be held and focus on gathering input from Stakeholder Agencies and Entities, as well as select elected officials, on how regional coordination and planning success should be defined, what the (perceived) key issues are, the core values and principles (e.g. environment, social equity, economic development, etc.) in the process, and the top transportation planning priorities for Tampa Bay.

The findings from Workshop 1 will inform the second phase of research, “Case Studies and Best Practices,” which will consider other urbanized areas of the country that are similar in size and complexity to Tampa Bay, highlighting key findings that align with what participants have defined as “success.” In the second workshop (hereinafter “Workshop 2”), participants will review the second phase research findings, provide feedback on potential opportunities identified, and identify follow-up recommendations for consideration by the various public agencies involved in the regional process, as well as the Bay Area Legislative Delegation (BALD).

The collaborative workshops are expected to play a strong role in helping partner agencies understand both the existing regional structure, and the potential implications of different approaches. To streamline information gathering and the evaluation process, available electronic collaboration tools such as polling and common-access white boards will be utilized. Both workshop(s) will be open to the public, and the final research product will be open for a 45-day public comment period.

Each phase of research and collaborative workshop will be summarized in a technical memorandum, and the final document will outline how the opportunities for coordination suggested from the final workshop connect with Existing Conditions and Best Practices from the research.

**PROJECT STEPS**
The following steps outline the development of options for consideration by appropriate parties:

1. **Workshop 1: Values, Issues and Guiding Principles**
   The first workshop will kick-off with creating the Problem Statement, Project Goals, and review the tentative timeline for research tasks. The initial session will be led by an impartial facilitator and will bring together people from private and public agencies/organizations who plan, operate, fund and implement transportation facilities and mobility services.

   Issues that need to be discussed may include: how do we define successful regional coordination; the level of analysis (e.g. focusing at the three-county TMA level [Hillsborough, Pasco, Pinellas], and more general information at TBARTA level); the role of FDOT; how an additional multi-county MPO in the Tampa Bay region might operate under existing state statutes and governance requirements; structural issues in the MPO and regional planning processes; which peers we look at; the role of the Florida Legislature in this process; Federal law requires modal authorities to be represented on MPOs (Florida law says they “may”) – THEA, TIA, Ports, Transit Agencies, etc.; discussion and descriptions of existing agencies, including roles, responsibilities and legal status under Florida Statutes, etc.

   Another outcome of the first workshop will be to define guiding principles that will serve to help frame the evaluation of other regional mechanisms in place in various parts of the country, and their applicability to Tampa Bay.
2. **Research Phase 1: Existing Conditions**  
   The manner in which transportation planning is currently conducted within the Tampa Bay Region, with a particular emphasis on the entities currently involved with regional transportation planning will be researched. The research will examine such factors and processes as:

   - Socioeconomic, geographic and other demographic characteristics of the area,
   - Travel markets within the Tampa Bay Region as related to travel characteristics of the area, including travel sheds, commuter sheds, etc.
   - The existing urbanized area (UZA) structure within the Tampa Bay Region, including:
     - Size/character
     - Proximity to other UZAs
     - Potential growth, based on available information in LRTPs, including the areas expected to become urbanized within 20 years (MPA area)
   - Existing Coordination - document existing regional planning processes, including formal and informal structures, products and other outcomes.
   - Identify a comprehensive list of key participants in the Tampa Bay Region:
     - Public sector - including agencies, citizen/advocacy groups, etc.
     - Private sector - including industry groups/associations, private nonprofits, etc.
   - Analysis of existing and future projected cross-county commuting patterns for jobs, including both percentage of work force and actual numbers commuting between counties for all purposes. Identification of sub regions within the larger Tampa Bay Region that have unique issues that need to be addressed on a more local level and how they fit into a regional planning model.
   - The governance structure of selected states MPOs operate in, such as the relative strength of counties, cities, and MPOs within the particular states in comparison to Florida. This research will help measure the success of particular models, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and develop an understanding of the lessons learned. The structure of local governments has also had a profound effect on the manner in which governments function and the type of services provided.
   - Existing funding sources for, and uses of transportation projects and transportation planning within each county and each MPO, with details on the benefits and drawbacks of unique strategies, how those revenue mechanisms may function or be received in different regional settings, and any additional local revenue mechanisms in place (e.g. motor fuel taxes, mobility and impact fees, sales taxes, dues, assessments, etc.).

**Deliverable 2: Memorandum – Existing Conditions**

3. **Research Phase 2 – Case Studies and Best Practices in Regional Transportation Planning**  
   Once existing conditions have been identified, and feedback gathered on values, issues and principles, the next step should be to conduct research on best practices in regional transportation coordination nationwide, with a specific focus on regions that have generated more discretionary revenues than their peers, such as through federal New Starts or TIGER Grants, and new funding sources. This will provide a baseline for comparing coordination efforts and outcomes in Tampa.
Bay. Additionally, other areas that have similar characteristics, such as population density, land area, and governance structure should be identified and analyzed in a set of selective case studies. Taken together, the case studies and best practices should form the basis for discussion of opportunities and an application of lessons learned in Workshop 2.

Case Studies should include:

- Research on the creation of each MPO process and whether regional planning issues are handled within an MPO or through some other organization. Areas that are suggested to consider would be Chicago, Dallas-Ft. Worth, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Puget Sound, the San Francisco Bay area, and Orlando,
- Consideration of the mission, roles and responsibilities of regional planning entities in the comparison regions, including the role of the MPO in the regional planning process relative to related subject areas such as regional economic development, a regional land use vision, and their relationship to the design, construction and operations of transportation facilities and services,
- Examination of Florida law regarding MPOs and how a particular structure might fit in with those laws or require changes,
- Identify and assess information on regional participation and travel between regional activity centers such as employment centers; professional sports; airports; retail centers; other regional attractors to determine traffic flows and related issues within the region; and,
- Information on regional MPO structures, including:
  - Concept diagram
  - Responsibilities
  - Background on how and why it was formed
  - Apportionment plans and issues
  - Governmental roles
  - Funding strategies and issues, including the costs associated with merging organizations, as well as the ratio of and relationship between federal, state or local appropriations and grant funds attained.

Deliverable 3: Memorandum – Best Practices Findings and Case Studies

4. Workshop 2 (Final)
A second workshop will be conducted to review the research findings, draw responses from participants, incorporate current federal requirements, and build consensus on options for moving forward with a preferred coordination framework or structure, as well as the mechanisms needed for implementation, new interlocal agreements, apportionment plan development, etc. The three memoranda described below will form the basis of the review:

Memorandum – Values, Issues and Guiding Principles
Memorandum – Existing Conditions
Memorandum – Best Practices Findings and Case Studies

5. Final Report and Executive Summary
Upon completion of all tasks and steps, a final report assembling the findings from Project Steps 1 through 3, as well as the options examined and identified in Step 4 will be provided. Presentations should be given to the stakeholders identified through the collaborative process. To solicit additional feedback, presentations may also be given throughout the research process.
6. Next Steps

Upon completion, distribution and presentations of the final report, Letters of Support should be requested from each county and MPO, as well as other affected organizations, for implementing preferred courses of action moving forward for which widespread support has developed.
SUMMARY

The Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) is requesting that Forward Pinellas request FDOT to consider bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities and access in all phases of the Tampa Bay Express (TBX) project.

ATTACHMENT(S): None

ACTION: Board, in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, take necessary action to communicate this advisory committee request to FDOT
SUMMARY

Fiscal Year 2016 was a Forward Pinellas transition year. It marked the first full fiscal year operating under the unification of the Pinellas Planning Council (PPC) and Pinellas County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). During this year, the PPC/MPO continued its policy, functional and administrative integration activities, which entailed considerable transition regarding staffing roles and responsibilities, communication protocols and policy implementation. In that context, the 2016 budget was a best reasoned estimate of how the newly created single organization with new leadership would fulfill its mission, roles and responsibilities.

Within that context, a brief year-end overview of the budget and outcomes is presented for review. A copy of the budget summary through the end of the fiscal year, along with the approved FY 17 budget, is attached for reference.

Revenues – Total revenues received were $2,127,675 as compared to budgeted revenues of $2,597,330 – a margin of nearly $500,000 below budget. That difference is mainly due to a delay in the MPO reimbursing the PPC for staff salaries and benefits for the final quarter of FY 16, and will be resolved pending completion of the audit this month.

- Tax Revenue totaled $974,216 to date, $2,664 below the $976,880 budgeted, but this does not yet reflect September’s distribution. Our final tax distribution for the year will be adjusted slightly with final revenues, and will be included in our report to the board with the audit. Additionally, we are required to budget at 95 percent of calculated ad valorem tax revenues, but typically receive about 97 percent each year.
- Interest revenue was budgeted this year at $1,150, but came in at $628.
- Other Income revenue was $3,596, less than the $20,000 budgeted, which was optimistic in retrospect. This reflects charges for local assistance contract work completing planning and grant work for the cities of Madeira Beach and Gulfport.

Expenditures – Total expenditures were $2,126,573. When compared to the adopted budget showing expenditures of $2,575,700, it provides an unexpended margin of $449,127. Lower than projected expenditures reflect “gearing up” toward a fully functional unified planning and programming agency with new shared responsibilities for land use and transportation. Staff has spent a significant portion of the last year putting mechanisms into place to carry out the unified agency’s mission and strategic policy direction, leading toward move local government technical assistance, such as through the Waterborne Transportation Technical Forum. The Payroll and Benefits line item was about $270,000 under budget due to staff retirements and postponement of filling budgeted positions pending realignment of office functions and responsibilities. In addition, Intergovernmental Charges from Pinellas County have been unpredictable and came in substantially less than expected as of year-end. The County’s Office of Management and Budget has informed Forward Pinellas that an invoice will be forthcoming, but the timing and amount remain uncertain despite repeated requests for clarification.

A few line items came in slightly above anticipated expenditures. These include Contractual Support Services to account for additional audit expenditures due to changes within the Florida Retirement System and additional communications consulting services related to functionality of the new web site.
Unexpended line items related to Equipment & Furnishings were postponed until FY 17 and will support office modifications to create additional conference room meeting space.

Upon conclusion of the external audit in January verifying exact numbers calculated on an accrual basis and budget experience during the first six months of FY16, we will prepare a mid-year budget report, adjust the Fund Balance accounts, and identify any recommended budget amendments at that time for the Board’s consideration.

Additional Comments – We must also file a Public Depository Annual Report with the State’s Chief Financial Officer each year (completed and copy attached).

ATTACHMENT(S):
- Unaudited FY16 Year-End Budget Report
- Public Depository Annual Report
- FY 17 Adopted Budget

ACTION: Board receive and discuss budget report and take action as deemed appropriate
## SUMMARY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August, 2016 Balance</td>
<td>588,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2016 Revenues</td>
<td>43,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2016 Expenditures</td>
<td>(215,632)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>416,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accrual Entries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>42,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>(10,183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Expenses</td>
<td>(17,434)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Accruals</td>
<td>14,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>430,804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Account Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>2,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Pool</td>
<td>98,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>430,804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>September, 2016</th>
<th>Year-to-Date</th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Revenue</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>974,216</td>
<td>976,880</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>42,822</td>
<td>1,149,235</td>
<td>1,599,300</td>
<td>450,085</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,596</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>16,404</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>43,147</td>
<td>2,127,675</td>
<td>2,597,330</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>September, 2016</th>
<th>Year-to-Date</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>136,218</td>
<td>1,399,822</td>
<td>1,618,000</td>
<td>228,178</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>49,450</td>
<td>488,342</td>
<td>530,000</td>
<td>41,658</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Support Services</td>
<td>3,913</td>
<td>64,238</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>12,367</td>
<td>68,987</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>31,013</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip. &amp; Furn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Notice</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,138</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>9,862</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/Reproduction</td>
<td>(420)</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>12,597</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>4,752</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Appraiser/Tax Collector</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28,050</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet O&amp;M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,251</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>86,749</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference &amp; Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6,859</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,250</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Hearings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3,133</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenditures</td>
<td>10,232</td>
<td>10,232</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% of Expenditures</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>7,117</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>215,632</td>
<td>2,126,573</td>
<td>2,575,700</td>
<td>449,128</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MPO Salaries (PR#s 18, 19)

- 60,412

### MPO Benefits (PR#s 18, 19)

- 24,042
PUBLIC DEPOSITOR ANNUAL REPORT TO THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For the Period Ended September 30, 2016

Public Depositor (PD) Information

PD’s Full Legal Name: Forward Pinellas in its role as the Pinellas Planning Council

PD’s Mailing Address: 310 Court Street – 2nd floor Clearwater, Fl., 33756-5137

PD’s Federal Employer Identification Number (FEIN): 59-2956030

WE ASSERT that we are an official custodian of moneys that meet the definition of a public deposit as defined in Chapter 280, Florida Statutes and that such moneys are placed in Qualified Public Depositories (QPDs) unless exempt under the laws of this state. We acknowledge our responsibility for any research or defense required to support such assertion.

WE VERIFY that we have:

(1) Performed an annual confirmation of all open public deposit accounts as of the close of business on September 30 for each QPD. All discrepancies found in the confirmation process were reconciled before November 30. Information confirmed included the following:

   a. FEIN of the QPD.
   b. Name on the deposit account record.
   c. FEIN on the deposit account record.
   d. Account number.
   e. Account type.
   f. Actual account balance on deposit.

(2) Confirmed that a current Public Deposit Identification and Acknowledgment Form has been completed for each public deposit account and is in our possession.

(3) Provided as part of this report a separate listing of QPDs at which we have open public deposit accounts. This filing has been completed in the report format prescribed by the Chief Financial Officer, State of Florida for this year.

Under penalties of perjury, I attest that I am authorized to sign on behalf of the Public Depositor identified above, and also declare that I have read the information provided on this Public Depositor Annual Report to the Chief Financial Officer and that the facts stated in it are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Authorized Signature for Public Depositor: [Signature]

Date: 11/3/16

Printed Name and Title: Whit Blanton, Executive Director

Phone: (727) 464-8250 Fax: (727) 464-8212

Suncom: [_____] [_____] [_____] Email: wblanton@co.pinellas.fl.us

DFS-J1-1009
REV. 09/03
List of Qualified Public Depositories for Forward Pinellas in its role as the Pinellas Planning Council
Public Depositor's Full Legal Name

Listed below are the FEIN and name for all Qualified Public Depositories at which we have open public deposit accounts, including accounts with zero balances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEIN of Qualified Public Depository</th>
<th>Name of Qualified Public Depository</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63-0371391</td>
<td>Regions Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION ADOPTING FINAL MILLAGES FOR
FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017
PINEarlAS COUNTY – MUNICIPAL SERVICE TAXING UNITS & DEPENDENT SPECIAL DISTRICTS

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners, as taxing authority for the Pinellas County Emergency Medical Services, Pinellas Planning Council, Municipal Service Taxing Unit, the Public Library Cooperative-Municipal Service Taxing Unit, the Palm Harbor Community Services District, the Feather Sound Community Services District, East Lake Library Services, East Lake Recreation Services and as governing body of the Pinellas County Fire Protection Authority and as the taxing authority for each of the following Fire Protection Districts: Belleair Bluffs, Clearwater, Dunedin, Gandy, High Point, Largo, Pinellas Park, Safety Harbor, Seminole, South Pasadena, Tarpon Springs, and Tierra Verde has adopted tentative millages to be levied upon property under its jurisdiction and tentative budgets in accordance with the fiscal policy of the Board of County Commissioners and Florida Statutes at a public hearing on September 14, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners has determined that the final millages and final budgets are at the lowest possible level in accordance with sound fiscal policy; and

WHEREAS, notice of the public hearing to adopt the final millages has been published, and the Board has conducted a public hearing on the adoption of the final millages pursuant to the requirements of Chapters 129 and 200, Florida Statutes, and other applicable provisions of Florida Law.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners as taxing authority for the following Tax Districts, in public hearing duly assembled this 27th day of September 2016, that the Board of County Commissioners hereby adopts the final millage rates for the following Tax Districts, including each of the percentage increases in property taxes, as established pursuant to said hearing for the fiscal year 2016-2017 as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mills</th>
<th>Rolled-back Rate</th>
<th>Percentage Increase in Property Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>0.9158</td>
<td>0.8574</td>
<td>6.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas Planning Council</td>
<td>0.0150</td>
<td>0.0150</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Services Taxing Unit</td>
<td>2.0857</td>
<td>1.9804</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library Cooperative MSTU</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.4746</td>
<td>5.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Harbor Community Services</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.4720</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feather Sound Community Services</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.4609</td>
<td>8.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Library Services</td>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td>0.2403</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Recreation Services</td>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td>0.2403</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Districts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleair Bluffs</td>
<td>1.7320</td>
<td>1.6400</td>
<td>5.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>3.2092</td>
<td>3.0119</td>
<td>6.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>2.9222</td>
<td>2.7643</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandy</td>
<td>2.2977</td>
<td>2.2100</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Point</td>
<td>2.6700</td>
<td>2.5049</td>
<td>6.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>3.6609</td>
<td>3.3838</td>
<td>5.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas Park</td>
<td>3.1976</td>
<td>2.9258</td>
<td>9.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Harbor</td>
<td>2.8118</td>
<td>2.6392</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>1.9581</td>
<td>1.8341</td>
<td>6.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pasadena</td>
<td>0.9137</td>
<td>0.8758</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarpon Springs</td>
<td>2.3745</td>
<td>2.2931</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra Verde</td>
<td>1.9118</td>
<td>1.8199</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commissioner Long offered the foregoing Resolution and moved its adoption, which was seconded by Commissioner Gerard, and upon roll call the vote was:
NAYS: None.
ABSENT AND NOT VOTING: Morroni.
RESOLUTION ADOPTING FINAL BUDGETS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017
PINELLAS COUNTY – MUNICIPAL SERVICE TAXING UNITS & DEPENDENT SPECIAL DISTRICTS

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners, as taxing authority for the Pinellas County Emergency Medical Services, Pinellas Planning Council, Municipal Service Taxing Unit, the Public Library Cooperative-Municipal Service Taxing Unit, the Palm Harbor Community Services District, the Feather Sound Community Services District, East Lake Library Services, East Lake Recreation Services and as governing body of the Pinellas County Fire Protection Authority and as the taxing authority for each of the following Fire Protection Districts: Belleair Bluffs, Clearwater, Dunedin, Gandy, High Point, Largo, Pinellas Park, Safety Harbor, Seminole, South Pasadena, Tarpon Springs, and Tierra Verde has adopted tentative millages to be levied upon property under its jurisdiction and tentative budgets in accordance with the fiscal policy of the Board of County Commissioners and Florida Statutes at a public hearing on September 14, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners has determined that the final budgets based upon said final millages are at the lowest possible level in accordance with sound fiscal policy; and

WHEREAS, notice of the public hearing to adopt the final budgets has been published, and the Board has conducted a public hearing on the adoption of the final budgets pursuant to the requirements of Chapters 129 and 200, Florida Statutes, and other applicable provisions of Florida Law.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners as taxing authority for the following Tax Districts, in public hearing duly assembled this 27th day of September, 2016, that the Board of County Commissioners hereby adopts each of the final budgets as established pursuant to said hearing for the fiscal year 2016-2017 as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Final Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>141,738,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas Planning Council</td>
<td>3,220,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Service Taxing Unit</td>
<td>71,367,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library Cooperative MSTU</td>
<td>5,023,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Harbor Community Services</td>
<td>2,004,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feather Sound Community Services</td>
<td>328,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Library Services</td>
<td>691,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Recreation Services</td>
<td>690,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Districts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleair Bluffs</td>
<td>860,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>5,850,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>1,613,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandy</td>
<td>257,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Point</td>
<td>3,528,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>3,429,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas Park</td>
<td>981,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Harbor</td>
<td>414,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>7,666,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pasadena</td>
<td>540,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarpon Springs</td>
<td>599,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra Verde</td>
<td>2,301,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commissioner Long offered the foregoing Resolution and moved its adoption, which was seconded by Commissioner Gerard, and upon roll call the vote was:

NAYS: None.
ABSENT AND NOT VOTING: Morroni.
SUMMARY

Forward Pinellas, in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, is required to appoint a representative and alternate to the Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC) no later than December 31 of each year. Councilmember Doreen Caudell is the current representative, with Commissioner John Tornga as the alternate. Both have expressed an interest in continuing in their roles for 2017.

ACTION: Board, in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, appoint a representative and alternate to the MPOAC for 2017

ATTACHMENT(S): None
6J. Establishment of Nominating Committee for
2017 Election of Officers

SUMMARY

As prescribed in its Operating Procedures, each year at the regular meeting in November, the Board shall decide how it wishes to select its officers for the following year. In the past the Board used a nominating committee to recommend the officers for the next year. In September the Operating Procedures were amended to allow the Board the option of directly electing its officers from the entire Board membership in lieu of convening a nominating committee.

If a nominating committee is preferred, the Board shall establish the committee at the November meeting. At the regular meeting in December the nominating committee shall recommend officers for approval by the Board. With a nominating committee, any Board member may still express their interest in serving as an officer, or may recommend other members for an officer position before the nominating committee makes its official recommendations.

The term of membership for several Board members expires in December, making those members ineligible to hold office. A list of members eligible to hold office is attached. New officers shall take office in January.

ATTACHMENT(S): Listing of Board Members Eligible to Serve as Officers in 2017

ACTION: Board to establish a Nominating Committee or elect officers from entire Board membership
BOARD MEMBER ROSTER

Board members eligible to serve as officers for 2017 are listed below. Current officers are identified.

- James Kennedy, City of St. Petersburg Councilmember – Chairman
- John Morroni, Pinellas County Commissioner – Vice-Chairman
- Joanne “Cookie” Kennedy, City of Indian Rocks Beach Commissioner, representing beach communities – Secretary
- Doreen Caudell, City of Clearwater Councilmember – Treasurer
- Sandra Bradbury, City of Pinellas Park Mayor
- Dave Eggers, Pinellas County Commissioner
- Lari Johnson, City of South Pasadena Commissioner, representing inland communities effective January 2017
- Darden Rice, City of St. Petersburg Councilmember
- Karen Williams Seel, Pinellas County Commissioner
- Michael Smith, City of Largo Commissioner
- John Tornga, City of Dunedin Commissioner

Board members whose terms end December 2016 and who are ineligible to serve are listed below:

- Julie Ward Bujalski, City of Dunedin Mayor, representing the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority
- Cliff Merz, City of Safety Harbor Commissioner, representing Oldsmar, Safety Harbor and Tarpon Springs
- Tom Shelly, Town of Belleair Commissioner, representing inland communities
The Executive Director will update the Board members on the following items:

**DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

1. SPOTlight Update
2. USDOT MPOwerment Roundtable

**ATTACHMENT(S):** USDOT MPOwerment Roundtable Invitation

**ACTION:** None required; information items only
The U.S. Department of Transportation invites you to participate in a

“MPOwerment”
Roundtable Discussion

Featuring

David Howard
Associate Administrator for
Policy and Government Affairs
Federal Highway Administration

and special guest speakers

Wednesday, November 30, 2016
9:00 AM – 3:00 PM EST

Hosted by the Atlanta Regional Commission
Loudermilk Conference Center
40 Courtland Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

The United States Department of Transportation’s “MPOwerment” Initiative focuses on empowering Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to effectively meet the challenges of the increased importance of a regional perspective in our transportation planning process. During the roundtable
discussion, participants – which include MPO executive directors, local elected officials, transportation executives, and MPO board members – will engage in an interactive dialogue on the opportunity for expanding regional planning and investments that will ultimately strengthen the economic growth and vitality for citizens in communities across the country. We hope to focus on the successes and opportunities for regional cooperation and coordination already underway.

Please register for this event by Wednesday, November 23: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MPOwermentRoundtableAtlantaGA

If you have any questions, please reach out to us at MPOwerment@dot.gov.
Staff and/or Board members will provide information and updates on the following items:

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

   (http://www.fleng.org/seminars.cfm?event_id=736)
B. Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council Regional Transportation Summit, February 16, 2017
C. Notice of Proposed Rule Making Response Letters from Pinellas County Board of
   County Commissioners and Hillsborough MPO
D. Correspondence, Fatalities Map and Draft PAC Action Sheet
E. CPA Actions and Tier I Countywide Plan Map Amendments
F. Summary of Public Outreach and Stakeholder Meetings
G. Holiday Gathering December 14th
H. Committee Vacancies
I. Other

ATTACHMENT(S):

- Letter from Pinellas County BCC RE: Notice of Proposed Rule Making
- Letter from Hillsborough MPO RE: Notice of Proposed Rule Making
- Letter from Hillsborough MPO to FDOT RE Cross Bay Bridge Trail Connections
- Letter from Forward Pinellas to St. Pete Beach in Support of Central Ave BRT
- Fatalities Map
- Draft PAC Action Sheet
- Holiday Gathering Invite
October 18, 2016

Gregory G. Nadeau, Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
1200 New Jersey Ave SE
Washington, DC 20590

RE: Docket Number FHWA-2016-0016-0547

Dear Administrator Nadeau:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. The Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners supports the implementation of the rule. The Board supports stronger regional coordination to better serve the citizens of the Tampa Bay Area. As a peninsula, Pinellas County is uniquely connected to our neighboring counties. Citizens, businesses and visitors travel across County lines on a daily basis and do not see political boundaries. Local governments should do our best to make sure the Public has a seamless transportation experience without uncoordinated and conflicting transportation systems.

Pinellas County is currently pursuing options to further regional cooperation and coordination in advance of federal action. The County has been a leader in seeking to integrate our transportation planning with other functions, such as land use. The Pinellas Planning Council recently merged with the Pinellas MPO to create Forward Pinellas. The Board will aim to preserve this integration as a part of the regional landscape. The County is exploring the best structure for regional coordination while still preserving this achievement and the voices of our 24 municipalities.

The Board looks forward to continuing to work with the US Department of Transportation (USDOT) to increase regional cooperation and strongly encourages the Department to finalize the proposed rule. The USDOT should also continue to incentivize regional cooperation through funding and competitive grant programs.

Sincerely,

Charlie Justice
Chairman, Pinellas County Commission

cc: Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners
    Mark S. Woodard, Pinellas County Administrator
    Whit Blanton, Executive Director Forward Pinellas
October 24, 2016

Mr. Gregory G. Nadeau, Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

RE: Docket Number FHWA-2016-0016-0547 Scoping Comments - Fiscal Impacts

Dear Mr. Nadeau,

We support the effort of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to strengthen regional transportation planning in metropolitan areas that continue to grow and merge. It is in this context that we offer for your consideration the following comments regarding potential fiscal impacts of the MPO Coordination and Planning Area Reform notice of proposed rulemaking:

- **Higher overhead costs.** County governments in Florida are large organizations with many responsibilities. Many MPOs, including the Hillsborough MPO, are housed in county buildings and participate in countywide programs for health insurance and retirement funds, among other employment benefit programs. This significantly defray the Hillsborough MPO’s overhead costs. To create a stand-alone organization, independent from any county in the region, may generate between $60,000 and $90,000 in additional annual expenses just in the cost of office space, plus other expenses.

- **Diminished federal planning grants to the Tampa Bay region.** By agreement among Florida’s 27 MPOs, federal grant funding for metropolitan transportation planning in Florida is distributed such that each MPO receives a base amount, while the remaining federal funds are divided proportionately based upon population figures. If the Tampa Bay region were to reduce its existing MPOs, the ‘base’ funding for professional planning staff could be reduced by between $350,000 and $1,750,000.
amounting to a significant regional loss of professional capacity and expertise. Even if a statewide reduction in the total number of MPOs causes more funding to be allocated based upon population, it is unlikely to make up the difference.

- **Opportunity cost of drafting plans for arbitrary geographic areas.** About one-quarter of the Hillsborough MPO’s approximately $2 million annual budget is allocated toward the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), the five-year Transportation Improvement Program, and performance metrics. If the FHWA rule were to be approved in its current form, these documents would have to be prepared for a geographic area that does not match the boundaries of any local government, and which is subject to change following each decennial census. Cities to our north, south, and east are already served by other MPOs. The planning-area boundaries should be drawn by the local governments rather than by the US Census Bureau, allowing for MPO plans and performance metrics to meaningfully align with local zoning, budgeting, public works, and public transit decision-making.

It is unclear whether drafting one LRTP for the multi-county contiguous urbanized areas of West Central Florida would be more, or less, expensive than the current practice of drafting county-level LRTPs, which are then connected by a regionwide vision document. The Hillsborough MPO is the largest MPO in the region, and spent approximately $500,000 on its last LRTP, the Imagine 2040 Transportation Plan. If the five smaller MPOs all spent a similar amount, the total cost would amount to $3 million. For comparative purposes, the Tampa Bay Regional Transportation Authority’s 2009 Master Plan for the eight-county region, which included a regionwide technical analysis and public involvement program comparable to a LRTP, cost nearly $5 million.

These comments in no way imply that the Hillsborough MPO opposes stronger regional planning. On the contrary, the Hillsborough MPO has gone on record supporting an independent study of best practices in regional transportation planning. Further, we have called for collaborative regionwide stakeholder workshops in Tampa Bay, to better define successful metropolitan planning, review national best-practices and identify how to improve transportation planning in the region.

The comments above have been offered in response to FHWA’s request for information on the fiscal impacts of the proposed rule. We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to working with the FDOT in the implementation of the final rule.

Sincerely,

Beth Alden
MPO Director
October 4, 2016

Debbie Hunt, Director
Transportation Development
Florida Department of Transportation, District Seven
11201 N. Malcolm McKinley Drive
Tampa, FL 33612

RE: Cross-Bay Bridge Trail Connections

Dear Debbie,

At its September 14, 2016 meeting, the Hillsborough MPO Bicycle/ Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) reviewed a letter from Forward Pinellas and moved that the MPO should request a study of the feasibility of adding a multi-use trail to the Howard Frankland Bridge as part of FDOT's bridge reconstruction project. The motion also included consideration for the Gandy Bridge as an alternate route.

This motion was supported by the Hillsborough MPO Board at its October 4 meeting. MPO members discussed the BPAC's request and expressed support for the creation of new trail connections between Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties. The MPO's recent update to the Tampa-Hillsborough Greenways & Trails Master Plan identifies many cross-border connection opportunities, and developing and strengthening those connections is vital to an integrated regional greenway network. Board members have also suggested that the availability of trail connections on either side of the cross-bay bridge should be factor in assessing trailbridge feasibility and alignment.

With these considerations in mind, the MPO Board approved a motion requesting that FDOT assess the feasibility of multi-use trail facilities on both the Howard Frankland Bridge and Gandy Bridge corridors.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. Please let me know if you have any questions or suggestions regarding how to move forward.

Sincerely,

Beth Alden, AICP
MPO Director

CC: Whit Blanton, Forward Pinellas Director
Roger Roscoe, FDOT District 7 Government Liaison
MPO Board
October 21, 2016

Mayor Deborah Schechner and City Commission
City of St. Pete Beach
155 Corey Avenue
St. Pete Beach, Florida 33706

RE: Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project

Dear Mayor Schechner and City Commission,

I write to you today concerning the City of St. Pete Beach’s consideration of the request from the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA) for support of the Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project. We are fortunate to have a community like St. Pete Beach in Pinellas County – one where retail, hotels, residents and government are all working alongside each other to create one of the best beach destinations in the country. While those factors alone make St. Pete Beach an ideal destination for rapid transit, I would also encourage you to consider the benefits this project will bring to St. Pete Beach and other Pinellas County communities.

As shown in PSTA’s technical analysis, the population, destinations and traffic conditions make a St. Pete Beach – St. Petersburg rapid transit connection more likely to succeed, providing a solid return on investment that will guide similar improvements in the future. The planned service will provide an improved travel option for residents, workers and visitors to reach destinations within St. Pete Beach, downtown St. Petersburg and at key stops along the route. It will support the City’s planned redevelopment efforts by reducing demand for parking and providing a convenient alternative for those who are unable or choose not to drive. The Central Avenue BRT also presents an opportunity to attract new transit riders, as BRT ridership often includes people who were not transit users prior to the service.

This project is the highest transit project on the Forward Pinellas multimodal project priority list, and our organization is committed to this project’s success and funding. Our board recognizes the challenges local governments face in deciding whether to fund good public transportation projects like this with competing demands on available revenues. Meeting our county’s transportation needs takes partnerships that depend on collaborative planning, deep community engagement, and financial contributions from different sources. The Central Avenue BRT project is just such a multi-agency partnership. We pledge to work with the City of St. Pete Beach and other partners to explore viable funding and service scenarios to make this emerging transit success story a reality.

As you consider your support for the project, our Board’s beach communities’ representative, Commissioner Joanne “Cookie” Kennedy, and Whit Blanton, our executive director, stand ready to assist in helping build necessary support for this project. Thank you for your consideration of this project. We look forward to working with you to share in successful outcomes for all of Pinellas County.

Sincerely,

Jim Kennedy
Chair

cc: Forward Pinellas Board
Brad Miller, CEO of PSTA
Commissioner Cookie Kennedy, Forward Pinellas Representative
YEAR 2016 (thru October 31st)

Locations of Reported TRAFFIC FATALITIES

- **PEDESTRIAN** (includes other small modes)
- **BICYCLE**
- **MOTORCYCLE**
- **AUTO-VEHICLE**
- **MEDICAL** (traffic related but medical condition caused death)
- **OTHER** (traffic related but no crash report imminent)

*NOTE: Graphic not an official representation, based upon initial reporting, subject to change upon verification.*
PINELLAS COUNTY

INITIAL REPORTING

of Traffic Fatalities thru October 31, 2016

96 FATALITIES INCLUDEING MEDICALS

93 FATALITIES EXCLUDING MEDICALS

89 CRASHES (fatal) INCLUDING MEDICALS

86 CRASHES (fatal) EXCLUDING MEDICALS

2 OTHER TRAFFIC RELATED FATALITIES BUT NO IMMINENT CRASH REPORT

37 AUTO-VEHICLE FATALITIES

40%

30 AUTO-VEHICLE CRASHES (fatal)

VULNERABLE ROAD USERS

19 MOTORCYCLE FATALITIES

20% of all traffic fatalities

19 MOTORCYCLE CRASHES (fatal)

2 BICYCLE FATALITIES

2% of all traffic fatalities

2 BICYCLE CRASHES (fatal)

35 PEDESTRIAN FATALITIES

38% of all traffic fatalities (includes other small modes)

35 PEDESTRIAN CRASHES (fatal)

56 VULNERABLE USER FATALITIES

56 VULNERABLE USER CRASHES (fatal)

60% Vulnerable/total fatalities

(medical crashes not included)

NOTE

Table not an official representation, based upon initial reporting, subject to change upon verification.

Forward Pinellas
**PAC AGENDA – SUMMARY AGENDA ACTION SHEET**  
**DATE: OCTOBER 31, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS</strong></td>
<td>The meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. **MINUTES OF REGULAR PAC MEETING OF OCTOBER 3, 2016** | Motion: Lauren Matzke  
Second: Michelle Orton | 11-0 |
| 3. **REVIEW OF FORWARD PINELLAS AGENDA FOR NOVEMBER 9, 2016 MEETING**  
**PUBLIC HEARINGS**  
Subthreshold Countywide Plan Map Amendments  
None  
Regular Countywide Plan Map Amendments  
None | Motion: Dean Neal  
Second: Valerie Brookens | 11-0 |
| **REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS** | | |
| A. **Countywide Plan Map 2016 Annual Update** | Motion: Dean Neal  
Second: Valerie Brookens | 11-0 |
| B. **CPA Actions and Tier I Countywide Plan Map Amendments October 2016** | None; informational item only | |
| 4. **PLANNING TOPICS OF INTEREST** | | |
| A. West Bay Drive Trail Head Project  
B. North US 19 Corridor market/Economic and Land Use Analysis | A. Valerie Brookens, City of Largo, presented the plans for the West Bay Drive Trail Head area and answered members’ questions.  
B. Caroline Lanford, Pinellas County, presented information on the initiatives being undertaken regarding the US 19 North corridor. She outlined the scope and timeframes related to the Market/Economic and Land Use Analysis being completed. Questions were answered and website information was given where additional information can be found. | |
| 5. **OTHER PAC BUSINESS/PAC DISCUSSION AND UPCOMING AGENDA** | | |
| A. Pinellas SPOTlight Emphasis Areas Update  
B. PAC Appointments and Officer Elections for 2017 | A. It was noted that the Forward Pinellas technical forum on waterborne transportation has been rescheduled to November 3, 2016 at Madeira Beach City Hall from 9:30 a.m. – Noon.  
B. Members were advised that letters have been sent out requesting updated appointment information from each local government and agency represented on the committee. Election of 2017 officers will occur next month.  
Marcie Stenmark, PAC Chair, announced there would be a PAC Happy Hour at Crooked Thumb in Safety Harbor on Thursday, November 17th at 5:30 p.m. | |
Respectfully Submitted,

PAC Chairman

Date
Chairman Jim Kennedy
invites you to join us for a

**Holiday Gathering**

Immediately following the December 14<sup>th</sup> Forward Pinellas meeting at

O’Keefe’s

1219 S. Fort Harrison Ave
Clearwater

**Appetizers will be provided**
SUMMARY

This information is presented in order to better, and more systematically, apprise the Forward Pinellas Board of final action(s) by the Board of County Commissioners, in its role as the Countywide Planning Authority (CPA) on matters that have been previously considered. This summary also includes the Tier I Countywide Plan Map Amendments that have been administratively reviewed by Forward Pinellas staff.

CPA Actions from October 11, 2016:

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Regular Plan Map Amendment:

- Case CW 16-23, a City of Clearwater case located at 3400 Gulf to Bay Boulevard. The Board approved the amendment from Public/Semi-Public, Preservation and Recreation/Open Space to Public/Semi-Public, Retail and Services, Preservation, Recreation/Open Space and Residential Low Medium (vote 6-0).

REGULAR AGENDA

Map Adjustment – City of Safety Harbor was officially accepted by the Board (vote 6-0).

Tier I Countywide Plan Map Amendments October 2016:

- FLUM 16-6, City of Clearwater satisfies the Tier I provisions of Section 6.1.2.1 of the Countywide Rules and a copy of the review notice was provided to the Board.

ACTION: None required; informational item only
SUMMARY

Each month the Board will be informed of any meetings staff members are actively participating in that involve citizens, business groups or other agencies. The goal of this item is to provide a more comprehensive view of the conversations that Forward Pinellas staff are a part of, and the ways in which they act as resources for the wider community.

ATTACHMENT(S): Public Outreach and Stakeholders Meetings Summary

ACTION: None required; informational item only
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Staff members in attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2016</td>
<td>City of Dunedin</td>
<td>City of Dunedin Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss safety treatments and complete streets concepts for Skinner Blvd.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton and Rodney Chatman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/2016</td>
<td>City of Treasure Island</td>
<td>Treasure Island City Hall</td>
<td>Met with Treasure Island city leaders to discuss regional transit issues.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Planning &amp; Project</td>
<td>County Public Works</td>
<td>Meeting with county staff from the public works traffic division to coordinate projects.</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/5/2016</td>
<td>Transportation Planning &amp; Project</td>
<td>County Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Coordination Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2016</td>
<td>Board of County Commissioners</td>
<td>County Commission Assembly Room</td>
<td>Presenting to the Board of County Commissioners about regional transportation issues.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2016</td>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation</td>
<td>FDOT District 7 Offices</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Technical Review Team. Regular meetings to coordinate on technical matters to the FDOT District 7 MPOs, including the maintenance of the regional travel demand model.</td>
<td>Chelsea Favero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2016</td>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation</td>
<td>FDOT District 7 Offices</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Transportation Applications Group. Quarterly meetings of regional planners and engineers to discuss new projects, emerging technologies, and innovative planning important to the Tampa Bay region.</td>
<td>Chelsea Favero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets Workshop</td>
<td>Pinellas County Planning Department Conference Room</td>
<td>Meeting with local governments to give guidance on Complete Streets application process.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton, Chelsea Favero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Details</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2016</td>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)</td>
<td>FDOT District 7 Offices, Tampa - Complete Streets technical forum for local governments to learn about the program and ask questions.</td>
<td>Sarah Perch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2016</td>
<td>Forward Pinellas</td>
<td>Forward Pinellas Offices - Complete Streets technical forum for local governments to learn about the program and ask questions.</td>
<td>Chelsea Favero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2016</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority (TBARTA)</td>
<td>TBARTA offices - Monthly coordination meeting with staff directors from the Chairs Coordinating Committee.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton, Chelsea Favero, Hilary Lehman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2016</td>
<td>MPOs of the Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area (TMA)</td>
<td>Teleconference - Tampa Bay Transportation Management Area staff directors coordination meeting. This is a monthly coordination meeting with the staff directors.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton, Chelsea Favero, Hilary Lehman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/2016</td>
<td>City of Safety Harbor</td>
<td>Safety Harbor City Hall - Presenting to the City of Safety Harbor on regional transportation issues.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/2016</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TRBRPC)</td>
<td>TBRPC Offices - Transportation Summit Planning Meeting</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/2016</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>City Hall - St. Pete Complete Streets Committee</td>
<td>Al Bartolotta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/2016</td>
<td>City of Oldsmar</td>
<td>Oldsmar City Hall - Meeting with Oldsmar city leadership to discuss countywide transportation issues.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/2016</td>
<td>FDOT</td>
<td>FDOT District 7 Offices - Meeting to hear consultant presentations on the Regional Travel Demand Model surveying effort.</td>
<td>Chelsea Favero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/2016</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>City Hall - Mayor's Bicycle Ped. Advisory Com.</td>
<td>Al Bartolotta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2016</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Network to End Hunger</td>
<td>USF, Tampa - Sixth Annual TBNEH Conference</td>
<td>Al Bartolotta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/2016</td>
<td>Pinellas Park City Hall</td>
<td>Presenting to the City of Pinellas Park on regional transportation issues.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/2016</td>
<td>Clearwater Regional Chamber Offices</td>
<td>Transportation Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/2016</td>
<td>Indian Rocks Beach Civic Auditorium</td>
<td>Monthly BIG-C meeting</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2016</td>
<td>Planning Department offices</td>
<td>Planning meeting to kick off the second Pinellas County economic symposium.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton, Rodney Chatman, Hilary Lehman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2016</td>
<td>HART Office</td>
<td>PSTA-HART joint executive committee meeting</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/2016</td>
<td>PSTA</td>
<td>PSTA Transit Riders Advisory Committee (TRAC) presentation on SR 60 Multimodal Implementation Strategies</td>
<td>Sarah Ward, Sarah Perch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/2016</td>
<td>St Petersburg Area Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Forward Pinellas update at monthly Transportation Task Force meeting</td>
<td>Sarah Perch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Staff members in attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/2016,</td>
<td>PSTA</td>
<td>PSTA offices</td>
<td>PSTA St. Petersburg Circulator two-day study</td>
<td>Sarah Perch, Whit Blanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3/2016</td>
<td>Forward Pinellas</td>
<td>Madeira Beach City Hall</td>
<td>Waterborne Transportation Technical Forum. The forum is designed to educate ferry/water taxi operators and local government representatives on the regulatory processes that are required to implement or expand waterborne transportation.</td>
<td>Rodney Chatman, Alicia Parinello, Linda Fisher, Hilary Lehman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3/2016</td>
<td>Forward Pinellas/ Pinellas County</td>
<td>Planning Conference Rm</td>
<td>Prioritization of County Projects for Next Penny</td>
<td>Al Bartolotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3/2016</td>
<td>Forward Pinellas</td>
<td>Madeira Beach City Hall</td>
<td>Waterborne Transportation Technical Forum</td>
<td>Rodney Chatman, Alicia Parinello, Linda Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/2016</td>
<td>Tampa Bay TMA Leadership Group</td>
<td>PSTA Offices</td>
<td>Comprised of representatives of each MPO, the TMA Leadership Group recommended approval of regional transportation and multi-use trail priority projects, and engaged in a discussion of regional transportation governance options.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton, Chelsea Favero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/2016</td>
<td>City of St. Petersburg</td>
<td>City of St. Petersburg Offices</td>
<td>Baseball Forever Coordination Meeting. Meeting with interested parties from Baseball Forever Coalition to discuss transportation and the Tampa Bay region.</td>
<td>Chelsea Favero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2016</td>
<td>FDOT</td>
<td>FDOT Offices</td>
<td>Meeting to select a consultant to lead the regional travel demand survey effort.</td>
<td>Chelsea Favero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT, PSTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Organizer(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/2016</td>
<td>Indian Rocks Beach</td>
<td>Meeting with Indian Rocks Beach city leadership to discuss countywide transportation issues.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2016</td>
<td>Clearwater City Council</td>
<td>Meeting with Clearwater city leadership to discuss countywide transportation issues.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2016</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TBRPC)</td>
<td>TBRPC Open House</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
<td>City of South Pasadena</td>
<td>Meeting with South Pasadena city leadership to discuss countywide transportation issues.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
<td>Clearwater Community Development Board</td>
<td>Linkage between land use/transportation and updated Countywide Rules.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
<td>Madeira Beach / FDOT</td>
<td>Meeting with Madeira Beach and FDOT to discuss beach access issues.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/2016</td>
<td>Bike/Walk Tampa Bay</td>
<td>Bike/Walk Tampa Bay Board Meeting</td>
<td>Whit Blanton, Marc Hanger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/2016</td>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Technical Review Team. Regular meetings to coordinate on technical matters to the FDOT District 7 MPOs, including the maintenance of the regional travel demand model.</td>
<td>Chelsea Favero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2016</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority (TBARTA)</td>
<td>Monthly coordination meeting with staff directors from the Chairs Coordinating Committee.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton, Sarah Ward, Chelsea Favero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
<td>Pinellas County Planning Department</td>
<td>Meeting with Tampa Hillsborough Expressway Authority to discuss regional transportation and coordination opportunities.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton, Sarah Ward, Chelsea Favero, Rodney Chatman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
<td>Tampa Hillsborough Expressway Authority (THEA) Staff-level meeting to discuss partnership opportunities with THEA in Pinellas County</td>
<td>Whit Blanton, Sarah Ward, Chelsea Favero, Rodney Chatman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
<td>US Department of Transportation Loudermilk Conference Center, Atlanta Participating in an &quot;MPOwerment&quot; Roundtable Discussion about empowering MPOs to effectively meet the challenges of a regional perspective in the planning process.</td>
<td>Whit Blanton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

- **Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)**

  The BPAC currently has one opening. Camille Soleil has emailed her resignation from the committee effective November 1st. This opening is for the St. Petersburg area to include St. Petersburg, Gulfport, South Pasadena and Tierra Verde.

- **Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)**

  The CAC currently has two openings. The City of Largo has supplied us with a recommended candidate and the recommendation is expected to come before the Board in January. The Beaches representative position remains open.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**  
BPAC Membership Listing  
CAC Membership Listing included with 4C

**ACTION:**  None Required – Information Only

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**  None Required – Information Only