



Truck Route Plan Technical Committee - Meeting #4 May 21, 2004

Meeting Minutes

I. Introductions

Chairman Captain Marsicano opened the meeting asking for introductions from the Committee members:

Committee Members

John Marsicano, Captain, HCSO, D-3
Andrew Tyrell, FDOT
Bill McCall, PGM
Adam Gormly, County Attorney's Office
Stacy Williams, Communications
Ned Baier, PGM
Scott Cottrell, Engineering Division, PW
Reggie Sanford, EPC
Calvin Thornton, City of Tampa

II. Minutes of the Last Meeting.

The Chairman stated that since a quorum was not available, the Committee could not vote to approve the minutes of the last meeting, but was later approved since a quorum was present.

III. Industrial Land Use Along I-4.

Paula Harvey, PGM, handed out a report, which was presented to the BOCC on April 13, 2004. She stated the BOCC directed her staff to advise the BOCC if they should consider designating additional industrial land use designations on the I-4 corridor for the future. She stated staff members from several different agencies including the Planning Commission and EPC as well as staff specifically from PGM Zoning, Transportation and Community Planning.

Ms. Harvey stated that in reviewing the information, the staff came up with several conclusions in the report. She stated the BOCC has not taken any action except to

receive the report and asked the report be forwarded to the Chamber of Commerce for their interest and information. She then gave a summary of each of the recommendations.

1. Both I-4 and I-75 should be considered as possible corridor locations for industrial development.
2. Hillsborough County should strive to keep entry areas into the county looking nice.
3. Standards need to be set as to the type of industry that would be welcome in the county.
4. Industrial uses should be low impact.
5. Industrial uses should not diminish the quality of life.
6. Possible air pollution should be considered in our determinations.
7. Limited water resources could be a problem for industry located in the county.
8. If high-tech or bio-technical manufacturing is desired, the Chamber of Commerce and University of South Florida need to be involved in those determinations.
9. Existing residential areas need to be buffered from industrial development.
10. Consider the best for zoning authorizations: standard district vs. planned development.
11. Are utilities available to support industrial development in these areas?
12. Are transportation facilities available to support industrial development?
13. Consider distinctions of listing permitted industrial uses vs. preferred industrial uses in zoning districts.

Ms. Harvey stated currently along I-4 there are no properties in the Comprehensive Plan that are designated for industrial development in a heavy or light character. She pointed out on the Land Use Plan Map of the Comprehensive Plan in 1989 the Planning Commission designated a small area along I-4 as industrial. She stated that once the implementation started the BOCC determined “it wasn’t such a good idea” given the character of that general area. The BOCC then directed the Planning Commission to amend the Land Use Map and remove the industrial designation, but instead it was designated as a mixed-use category. Petitions coming in for this area in their most intense form are probably going to be commercial-type developments rather than industrial. Otherwise, areas along the I-4 corridor are designated principally for residential and agricultural use. The only exception along the interstate corridors is that at the interchanges themselves irrespective of what may be in the Comprehensive Plan, there is allowability for intensity of development for interstate related uses which are restaurants, gas stations, hotels and motels.

Ms. Harvey stated the staff identified some limitations that will be “pretty hard to overcome.” The first one is based on a report by the EPC that they are significant areas of wetlands that will make it almost impossible to development a large site in an industrial fashion that will accommodate an industrial developer in a way that most

industrial developments will want to be accommodated. Those areas are designated as preservation, have to be maintained, and have to remain intact given the nature of the wetland areas located there.

The staff of the Economic Development Department did an analysis of the parcels themselves along the I-4 corridor. Unless you have parcels that were 10 acres in size at a minimum or greater then it would not be attractive for an industrial developer to locate there. The land area itself as it is currently divided is not accommodating to industrial development, as we know it. She said they made a statement contrary to that what you find along I-75 in the southern part of the county, is very large parcels of land and could easily accommodate industrial development.

The Planning Commission did note that for the areas along I-4 there is provision for mixed-use development and allows for some light industrial, but is not conducive for heavy manufacturing.

The Transportation staff noted the FDOT has commented there are difficulties at the interchanges of I-4. In fact, in the FDOT planning for widenings that have already been accomplished, they did not plan for those interchanges to accommodate a lot of industrial-type traffic. Interchanges past the fairgrounds and I-75 have not been designed to accommodate large truck traffic. There would have to be modifications made to the interchange system.

The BOCC has made an intense effort to develop Community Plans in Hillsborough County and have involved citizens in determining the types of land use they want in their community. The Thonotosassa Community Plan has no new designations made along the I-4 corridor to accommodate any type of industrial or new mixed-use type of development. Essentially, the land use pattern, which is principally agricultural and low intensity residential, and a lot of preservation land will remain intact in the Thonotosassa area. She stated it is important to know Urban Service Area Boundary vs. the Rural Service area. Eastern Hillsborough County, excluding Plant City, is essentially the rural area. The Urban Service Area Boundary does not extend out to I-4, but is taking up a great deal of South County along I-75 and was recommended to the BOCC in the final analysis as the area to look to for future industrial development in Hillsborough County.

She then opened the floor for questions. Bill McCall, PGM, asked how trucks would be able to get in and out of the south part of the county – would it be along CR 672? Ms. Harvey then explained the areas along the interstate are defined by the Plan as mixed-use that does accommodate for the light industrial type of development. The Economic Development Department noted the parcelization in this area is such because it has remained rural for such a long time and there are huge parcels of land that are available to be developed into industrial parks. The Land Use Plan map is ready to accommodate that type of development in that area.

Ned Baier requested information from the FDOT representative regarding the status of the proposed “Weigh In Motion” station proposed for a new location along I-4. He noted the station could impact truck travel on county roads that intersect I-4 nearby.

Ms. Harvey stated the citizens in that area are concerned truckers would try to avoid the station by using CR 92. Andrew Tyrell, FDOT, stated he did not have any information, but would supply it at the next meeting.

IV. “Hotspots”

Ronnie Blackshear presented a study, which identified freight “hotspots” in the county. “Hotspots” are defined as problem areas identified by the trucking industry that would impede the movement of goods such as deficient turning radii at an intersection or congestion along a certain segment of roadway that leads to an intersection. Information was used from the jurisdictions or transportation improvements from Hillsborough County, City of Tampa, City of Temple Terrace and City of Plant City identified in their CIP or TIP over the next five years as well as the Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated FDOT has produced a map, which identifies the “hotspot” locations. He then referenced the spreadsheet handed out which identified the “hotspot” locations and the correlation of TIP or CIP projects applied by the jurisdictions. He stated the spreadsheet is intended to be an ongoing process, which will change according to the current TIP program and will go before the MPO Board approximately next month.

V. Route Rating Process

Bill McCall, PGM, stated the *route rating process* evaluation criteria has been updated. He then presented a map of the surrounding area and explained the results of a mock analysis of Fishhawk Road to demonstrate the rating process.

Scott Cottrell, Public Works, explained he consulted other engineers in his department regarding the ratings and explained the following suggestions:

- Adjoining land use – do you just look for the lowest rating and multiply by the weight? Mr. McCall explained if there is a school in the area, then that would be the controlling factor. If no schools, then the dominant land use along the road is used. Mr. McCall explained he would look for driveways that come out on the road because that would have the greatest effect.
- Lane widths – lane widths is an important criteria so the weight of only “4” when compared to some other things might be low. Lane widths of 9 feet that is probably a non-starter for a truck route.
- Shoulder width – the weight of “4” is too low. If a truck has to pull over, the shoulder width has to be able to accommodate the truck. A paved shoulder is infinitely better for a trucker than a non-paved shoulder and should be figured in.
- Regional freight corridor – what is the purpose of including a weight for a road being on a regional freight corridor? Mr. McCall explained FDOT has identified those corridors as critical for the economic well being of the county.

- Bridge ratings – if a bridge is posted you don't want trucks on them. It should have a weight of "0" and should be a threshold item. A bridge that is narrow or functionally obsolete could get a "3" and a bridge that is good should get a "5". The overall weight might be low.
- Weight limits – does that refer to the road itself and for whatever reason a road has been posted for no trucks over 25 tons GVW, or over one or two ton capacity. That should be a threshold item. If the road is posted, the road should be taken off the list.
- Truck crashes, percent truck and truck volume – if a route is not currently on a truck route then the truck volume and the percent of truck crashes is going to be low already so the road will look good artificially.
- Hotspots – might need more weight. If you have several hot spots on one route, it will cause problems such as safety.
- ADT – if you have a road with a lot of traffic and a lot of cars, its level of service and its capacity perhaps should play into the decision.

Ned Baier asked Bill McCall how we show in the evaluation chart if there are funded county improvements to widen a roadway in two years. Widening a road such as Boyette Road will make it more attractive as a truck route? Mr. McCall stated if it is a funded project in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) then the Committee will look at it as though it is already widened. If it is a two-lane road and it is not in the CIP, he will consider it a two-lane road. Calvin Thornton, City of Tampa, stated the desire is to minimize auto-truck conflicts as well as the quality of life of communities. He stated the residential factor should be a major component of the process. Mr. McCall stated that is the purpose of the factor for the surrounding area. If it were residential, then that would be included in that factor.

Ned Baier stated noise is a main factor to the citizens opposing a route for trucks and recommended that noise be added to the evaluation criteria. Mr. McCall stated he has no way of measuring the noise factor other measuring the distance of house from the roads. Reggie Sanford, EPC, suggested increasing the weight factor for the adjoining land use might be a way of addressing the quality of life/noise concerns. Mr. McCall said he could come up with a weight for distance of homes from the truck route. Stacy Williams, Communications, suggested dividing the categories into residential and industrial rather than one category and give a high rating to the schools/residential areas.

VI. Truck Route Evaluation

VII. Regulated Truck Types

Bill McCall presented an article from the Florida Division of Highways. According to the article, the FDH is going to place signs on 65 miles of I-75 from Fowler to Sarasota to restrict trucks with six or more wheels from traveling in the far left hand high-speed lane. Mr. McCall stated the BOCC has asked that the Committee consider making a regulation that says that all trucks must stay in the far right-hand lane on any road that has more than two lanes. The FDOT regulation only applies to a small section of the interstate.

He also stated the problem with designating any truck with six or more wheels is a regulated truck and then you are regulating pick-up trucks with six wheels. The Committee make a recommendation to exclude all pick-up trucks. He then asked for the Sheriff's Office recommendation on how to decide on a regulated truck.

Chairman Marsicano stated when he discussed the six-wheel issue with representatives from the Sheriff's Office districts, they stated they don't see anything wrong with the current standard - that is anything over two axles. From the deputies' standpoint, it is easier to see if it is two or more axles rather than try to determine the weight of the truck.

Deputy Beck, HCSO District Three, was asked by Chairman Marsicano to address the Committee on this issue. Deputy Beck stated it is easier visually to determine by axles and easier for the citizens to determine if a vehicle is on a road illegally. Chairman Marsicano stated he would like to give a tentative recommendation from the Sheriff's Office that the standard not change based on 75% of the districts consulted.

Mr. McCall asked for information regarding the funding issue to replace all the signs in Hillsborough County. Mr. Cottrell will get with the Traffic Division of the Public Works Department and return with the information at the next meeting.

Mr. Thornton stated he was in favor of a two-tier regulatory system as presented by Ms. Joan Davis. He explained that could give the citizens some added protection from large trucks on small neighborhood roads. Chairman Marsicano stated it would be easily enforceable by posted signs and asked for advice from the County Attorney, Adam Gormly. Mr. Gormly stated there is nothing wrong with a two-tier system. It could be added to the list of recommendations to the BOCC for consideration. Mr. Cottrell expressed concern regarding the two-tier system such as a citizen who owns a "dually" would be restricted from getting to his home. He also stated a two-tier system would not strictly be an engineering decision.

Chairman Marsicano requested Mr. Cottrell invite someone from the Public Works Department come to the next meeting to address the two-tier system and give a recommendation to the Committee. Mr. Cottrell suggested the Committee consult with the Planning & Growth Management Department, the County Administrator, and the Office of Community Relations for their input on the replacing of truck route signs throughout the county.

Mr. Thornton suggested the specialized signing of neighborhoods be developed into a type of county program such as the county's "speed hump program." Chairman Marsicano said if the Committee decides to go with the specialized signing program, specific criteria would need to be developed on how a neighborhood is approved for this signing.

VIII. Members Matters of Interest

Stacy Williams, Communications, presented the Committee Work Plan she has developed and expressed concerns regarding the timeframe for the recommendations from the Committee. The public meetings will be starting in August and we need to speed up the process. Mr. McCall presented a list of confirmed meeting dates and places. Ms. Williams also stated a website is being developed.

IX. Public Input

Ms. Joan Davis, citizen, asked if it had to be one type and one type only that the County regulates. Could not the small residential streets have the restrictions of the six wheels? She stated that she lives on a street that is restricted to two or more axles, but big trucks can legally travel on her street.

Mr. Jim Long, Florida Trucking Association, stated the left-lane restriction on I-75 is on three-lane limited access roads and the emphasis is on the interstates. Safety issues are also an issue with this regulation. He doubted this type of regulation would work on county roads.

Mr. Scott Taylor, CTL Distribution, stated he agrees from a residential standpoint that you regulate trucks with six wheels. For instance, a UPS delivery truck that is not making a delivery would be regulated to a truck route. He stated Hillsborough County should restrict six wheel 26,000-pound trucks from the residential streets.

Mr. Brian Mayo stated his father has been penalized in the past for driving his dump truck to go home. He stated his father has been told to take a detour that would increase his fuel consumption as well as other unnecessary inconveniences. He wants the small guy taken into consideration on the issue.

Mr. Bob Argus gave a couple of suggestions to the rating process. He requested adding a pedestrian/bicycle rating. The northwest area of Hillsborough County has a lot of greenways trails, which often cross the truck route so they need to be factored in as well.

X. Old Business

Stacy Williams gave a more detailed presentation of the Committee Work Plan she developed. She explained the Committee is currently in Step 2, finalizing the spreadsheet and evaluating the suitability of county roads becoming truck routes, but all other issues need to be discussed and voted on. Of special note is the identification of specific issues the Committee was instructed to address by the BOCC:

1. Whether or not trucks should drive in the right hand lane only.
2. Special exemption for people who need to drive their trucks a short distance in order to get home.

XI. New Business

None.

XII. Adjourn

Next meeting is tentatively set for Thursday, May 27, to discuss and vote on the evaluation criteria.