



HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION WORKSHOP

Summary of Workshop Comments South County Regional Services Center Ruskin

November 20, 2006

Introduction

The public workshop was held on November, 20, 2006 at the South County Regional Service Center, 410 30th St S.E, Ruskin.

The purpose of the workshop was to review and discuss the proposed roadways to be added to the Corridor Preservation Plan roads list. Corridor Preservation roads are those that are considered needed for future widening or improvement and in the County's best interest to preserve the right-of-way before the costs get too prohibitive. Participants were asked to comment on whether specific roads should be added to the map and list.

There were a total of 43 people attending the workshop, of which 12 comment sheets were submitted at the November 20 workshop. An additional 2 people were furnished mailed copies of the Corridor Preservation Plan Map.

Summary of Comments

MONDAY, November 20, 2006 – RUSKIN

Written Comments - the number in () indicates the number of comments made

- No new roads thru ELAPP lands, parks or preserves (8)
- Provide access to ELAPP lands under roads (wildlife corridors but also dikes & culverts & tunnels) (1).
- Are there buffers between ELAP land and development sites? Should there be mandatory buffers?
- Thank you for not doing 24th Street Bridge extension. (3)
- I am here primarily to address the 24th Street, Bridge. I would like to see the official document that removes this project from the CPP. I can assure you that this project in a matter of a few days stirred an environmental reaction the likes of which I haven't seen in my 30 years of scientific service in the Tampa Bay area. The LMR is the last vestige of quasi-primitive habitat left on the Bay. The County should stand by 3 decades of promises to preserve it.

US Highway 41

- 6 Lane US Hwy 41 to SR 60 (4)
- Why isn't US 41 proposed for 6 laning all the way to Hwy 60.
- 4-Lane US 41 needs to go up to 19th Ave & down to SR 674/College Ave.
- US Hwy 41 through Ruskin, from 674 to 19th Ave NW. keep as 4 lanes.
- Determine if the projects are really needed. Remove # 55 – 24th St SE to Lightfoot Rd.
- Will the MPO/transportation consider building a bridge over the RR tracks near the Causeway/ US 41 intersection. This is a MAJOR issue for commuters, especially in light of the fact that there is no commercial district in South County and most people are required to go to Tampa on a regular basis.

- US Hwy 41 in Ruskin should be (remain) 4 lanes from 19th Ave to college Ave in order to be consistent w/ Comp Plan.
- Where on the Plan is the connection bridge for Golf Blvd., which was on our Apollo Beach Community Plan. This will take local traffic off of US 41.

State Road 674

- How do improvements SR 674 east of US 301 contribute to reducing truck traffic on SR 674? The answer given was that similar improvements to east-west roads north of SR 674 would make them more appealing to trucks. The problem with that answer is that the truck traffic is increasingly going to a port south of SR 674 (Port Manatee). So improvements north of SR 674 won't help.

Gibson Drive

- Do not 6-lane Gibson Drive (4).
- Traffic light for northbound cars exiting I -75 at Gibson Drive going west.
- Why does the 6 Lanes for US 41 end at Madison Ave? Why not all the way to SR 60.
- The Community is against 6 laning Gibson Drive from I- 75 to US 41- this would be against the Gibsonton Community Plan – Don't think about it!!
- Before 6 laning Gibson Drive from US 301 to I -75 –Lithia Pinecrest Road should be 4 laned from Hwy 60 to CR 39. Boyette Road & Fishhawk Road should b 4-laned from Lithia Pinecrest Road to US 301 and
- We need a traffic light for northbound cars, existing I- 75 at Gibson Drive that which to go west. If it is impossible to turn left & go west (Wal-Mart) w/o a very wait.

Bell Shoals Road

4-Lane Bell Shoals (2)

General Comments

- 1) Has an analysis been done to determine additional level of county services required to support protected development plans.
- 2) Has a dollar figure been determined to support these additional services and where will the funding come from for these additional services (schools, libraries, police, garbage disposal, road maintenance water and sewerage)
- 3) Have developers pay their share. County departments need to communicate. Example – Corridor Plan with planning that lets developers & Land Use department.
- 4) We favor light rail & no “beltway” in non-urban service area/farmland ELAPP
- 5) Has the MPO looked at using any right of ways specifically for rapid transit?
- 6) Is there a possibility to fund 911 (addition to the current 3)
- 7) Staff should check for visibility of #'s etc. from new developments
- 8) I appreciate the opportunity to hear more about the Corridor Preservation Plan. I am also very glad to hear that you're listening to citizen input on three projects mentioned tonight:
- 9) The following roads need to be place on the list, where developers have at least room for a full 4 lane road with bike lanes and turn lanes. Leave room for sidewalks where needed.
 1. Rhodine Road–end to end
 2. Big Bend Road –end to end
 3. CR 672 and SR 674 to east county line
 4. Symmes Road – end to end
 5. Balm Riverview east to CR 672.
 6. count line Road 39, SR 60 south to end
 7. Shell Point Road

Staff Update

The 24th Street extension and bridge is no longer being recommended to be added to the Corridor Preservation Plan.