

2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update 2nd Emerging SIS Breakout Group Meeting Summary

Meeting Date:	4/27/2009	Meeting Time:	10 AM -12 PM	Type of Meeting:	Teleconference
Participants:	<p><u>Leadership Committee members:</u> Bob Ball (Florida Airports Council), Rocky McPherson (Florida Defense Alliance), Mark Nordling (Florida Rail Association; designee for Ben Biscan), David Roach (Florida Inland Navigation District)</p> <p><u>Observers:</u> Debra Lemke (Lee County Ports Authority)</p> <p><u>Support Staff:</u> George Sirianni (FDOT Systems Planning Office), Kathy Neill (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Brian Watts (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Huiwei Shen (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Amie Goddeau (FDOT District 4), John Zielinski (FDOT District 5), Peter Maas (FDOT District 7), Barbara Davis (Florida Turnpike Enterprise), Hal Beardall (FCRC-Consensus Center), Sarah Adams (Cambridge Systematics), Matthew Click (Cambridge Systematics), John Kaliski (Cambridge Systematics)</p>				
Agenda:	<p>10:00 Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>Review Agenda and Teleconference Protocols</p> <p>10:10 Review Draft Summary of First Teleconference</p> <p>Questions for clarification</p> <p>10:15 Review and Refine Initial Draft Policy Statements</p> <p>Questions for clarification</p> <p>11:00 Review and Discuss Emerging SIS Designation Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overview of current Emerging SIS Designation Criteria ○ Identify potential policy changes to the designation criteria for full Leadership Committee to consider as part of the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan update <p>11:25 Review and Discuss SIS Goals and Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overview of current SIS Goals & Objectives ○ Identify potential policy changes to the goals and objectives for full Leadership Committee to consider as part of the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan update <p>11:50 Next Steps and Schedule</p> <p>12:00 Adjourn</p>				<p>Hal Beardall</p> <p>Hal Beardall</p> <p>Hal Beardall John Kaliski</p> <p>All Members</p> <p>All Members</p>

Key Discussion Comments:

Questions & Comments on Initial Draft Policy Statements

Question 1: Is there a continued need for separate designation criteria and policies? Or should we fully integrate those facilities designated as Emerging SIS into the SIS?

Draft Recommendations:

- A. Maintain separate designation criteria and policies for the Emerging SIS.
 - The group agrees with draft recommendation A.
- B. Continue policy of making Emerging SIS facilities eligible for SIS funding, with a reasonable allocation of funding between SIS and Emerging SIS determined each year by the Secretary based on relative priorities, including partner input.
 - The group agrees with draft recommendation B in general but wants to engage the full Leadership Committee in a discussion of what a “reasonable allocation” is and how it would be defined.

Question 2: If we retain a separate Emerging SIS category, should the designation emphasize policy objectives, such as connections to economically distressed areas, rather than minimum size thresholds?

Draft Recommendations:

- C. Designate Emerging SIS facilities based on criteria that primarily reflect statewide policy objectives, including the following considerations:
 - 1. maximizing the use of existing facilities, *including identifying new roles for underutilized facilities where possible(?)*;
 - General consensus for this draft recommendation. Clarification was requested to explain what is meant by “maximize.” Staff said this was intended to be consistent with the 2025 FTP objective of consider maximizing existing facilities before creating new Emerging SIS facilities.
 - Agree with concept of determining how certain facilities may serve niche markets.
 - 2. supporting regional visions for future growth and development;
 - The group agrees with this statement.
 - 3. economic development (including Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern);
 - The group agrees with this statement.

4. national defense and military transportation needs; and
 - Suggest that we add the word “intermodal” to clarify that the intent is not to meet all military transportation needs.
5. statewide emergency evacuation and response needs (*note to breakout group: the concept suggested was using emergency evacuation as a supporting factor to reinforce designation of Emerging SIS facilities meeting other objectives. Given the large number of highways identified as emergency evacuation routes by state, regional, or local governments, using this alone as a designation criteria may not be consistent with the goal of maintaining a ‘strategic’ system*).
 - Suggest that we add the word “intermodal” to clarify that the intent is not to meet all emergency response and evacuation needs.
 - This statement should be forwarded to the full Leadership Committee for consideration.
 - Should support the concept for emergency evacuation. These are critical routes in times of emergency.
 - These facilities have many needs but it seems to be getting away from the intermodal concept.
 - These facilities are key to that concept, can we just add ‘intermodal’ to the recommendation.
 - Is adding the word “intermodal” a limitation to those facilities that are Emerging SIS?
 - No, this definition brings in more than roads.
 - Is there a qualifier for this recommendation to be specific to the emergency route issue?
 - Statement 5 is probably duplicative of statements 1-4 in terms of what would be designated. Number 5 would be helpful when these facilities don’t fit in anywhere else.
 - Should be forwarded to full Leadership Committee for consideration.
 - NOTE: Staff will bring back options for implementing these statements. This language also could be used as guidance below for planning and setting priorities among Emerging SIS investments. Suggest that we revisit after reviewing the existing Emerging SIS designation criteria

Question 3: *If we retain a separate Emerging SIS category, how should we encourage proactive planning for the future of these facilities?*

- ***How can Emerging SIS investments support statewide and regional economic development***

goals, while also addressing environmental stewardship and community livability concerns?

- *Should strategies differ among urban, transitioning, and economically distressed areas?*

Draft Recommendations:

D. Encourage proactive planning and intergovernmental coordination regarding future investments in Emerging SIS facilities anticipated to help accomplish statewide policy objectives and achieve regional visions.

- The group felt the recommendation captures the issue well and accomplishes the intent of the original comment. Other comments included:
 - MPOs develop Long Range Transportation Plans. FDOT uses these plans as guidance. This process considers those projects that aren't feasible now but may be later.
 - This recommendation helps the rural areas that don't have MPOs to do the long range planning even before funding is available.

E. Encourage integrated planning for regions with multiple Emerging SIS facilities.

- The group agreed with this concept and felt it may help regions plan together and assist with economic development. There was some discussion about how regions are defined and a request for more information on this issue. Additional comments below:
 - Some Emerging SIS facilities show up on the map in areas that may not necessarily plan as a region. This concept should encourage these regions to plan together.
 - Why are we defining regions based on Enterprise Florida regions as opposed to FDOT districts?
 - To provide for better integration of economic development and transportation planning.
 - The key question is who is responsible for working the issues around these facilities? It might help to clarify how regions are defined.
 - Why don't we use the Districts and put this question to the full Leadership Committee?
 - Many things have changed concerning regions since original SIS, discussion by full group would help clarify.

Other Issues

- Potential for identifying 'proposed' SIS facilities to support early planning.

- This would be a planning tool, not a commitment to fund at this point. From a long range planning perspective, it would help FDOT know what might be coming in the future.
- Try merging this concept into an existing policy statement.
- This would not be directed at just Emerging SIS facilities, it should be recommended for all SIS facilities.
- Potential need to create criteria for Emerging SIS commercial spaceports.
 - To be discussed as part of the review of existing criteria.
- Potential revisions to Emerging SIS waterway criteria (Port of Miami River example) (referred to Trade and Logistics breakout group).
 - Informational only; no discussion took place.
- Potential need to create designation criteria for inland ports or truck freight terminals (including those used in emergency operations) (referred to Trade and Logistics group).
 - Informational only; no discussion took place.
- Potential need for enhanced state agency coordination (referred to Implementation Issues breakout group).
 - Informational only; no discussion took place.
- Potential need for technical assistance to local governments to facilitate proactive planning (referred to Implementation Issues breakout group).
 - This would encourage proactive planning especially in areas that don't have resources to do so.
- Potential need to create SIS committees or more defined SIS planning processes at the MPO level (referred to Implementation Issues breakout group).
 - This was more about the multimodal planning process. Not all MPOs are on the same level of planning for all the modes.
 - Need to modify wording to be more specific on the last two bullets.

SIS Designation Criteria Updates

Criteria were presented as adopted by the Secretary last July. The criteria have not changed since the original Committee met, except for some the new criteria for general aviation airports added by the 2007 Legislature. The full criteria document was sent to the breakout group because during the full Leadership Committee meeting other groups will be discussing other parts of the criteria and it will be

helpful for all members to have reviewed the full list. The discussion focused on Emerging SIS criteria.

In general, the Emerging SIS breakout group members did not feel they had the working knowledge to make recommendations on how to adjust the criteria. They asked FDOT staff to make presentations to them by mode as to the impacts that the various criteria have had to date. A general discussion on certain aspects of criteria took place and is documented below.

- How do these criteria encompass military installations? Is there a way to capture these facilities as SIS hubs?
 - FDOT has a military issues team that is working through this issue.
- The military issue needs to be discussed in concert with the outcome of the military issues team.
- Do we want to retain our current structure of the criteria of having minimum size and economic activity or does statement C above mean we may no longer need minimum size thresholds moving into the future? Should we consider this by mode and determine if there are issues within each mode?
 - It would be helpful to get input from FDOT on how these criteria have been working or not working with recommendations on how to remedy if necessary. The people with the best ideas are the FDOT staff working in the modal areas. They should come to the meeting and say the following criteria have led to the following decisions or stopped the following projects. I don't think the committee has the expertise but we could respond to FDOT presentations.
 - The expertise lies with FDOT not necessarily the Leadership Committee.
 - The full groups should provide input for criteria.
- Staff will begin to look at Emerging SIS criteria for spaceports moving into the future recognizing that there is potential for a growing network into the future.
- Seaport criteria use three measures today, cruise passengers, freight tonnage and number of TEUs. The Seaport System Plan working group is working on updates to the thresholds for cruise passengers.
- Seaport economic connectivity criteria can be updated to reflect earlier comments regarding military needs and the broader statements under statement C.
- Emerging SIS passenger terminals are currently 50,000 for all 3 categories. Is this OK or should this vary by facility type? This is also being worked on by the Urban Issues Group.
 - Maybe we should consider a smaller radius for Amtrak versus other terminals due to the new focus on commuter rail?
 - Or updating the Emerging SIS passenger rail economic connectivity criteria to include proximity to tourists and colleges. This could be revised based on comments.

- Where would SunRail fit in to this discussion?
 - The Urban Issues Group is looking into the SIS passenger rail threshold and setting one for SIS and one for Emerging SIS.
 - Because they are on CSX they will be on the list but will all the stations come on to the SIS or will they be on the Emerging SIS?
 - Forecasted ridership was being used to make that determination and it seems they would be on the SIS.
 - Would they be planned SIS for now and become SIS or Emerging SIS in the future when ridership data is available?
 - Currently they are evaluated on forecasts and then altered based on ridership but that may change when we update criteria.
- Staff will work with the Florida Rail Association to see how we can simplify the Emerging SIS freight rail corridors criteria.
- Emerging SIS waterway criteria were revisited last year to separate by shallow draft or deep draft.
- Emerging SIS highways have the most complex criteria and reflect the committee trying to accomplish many policy goals at the same time including service to the rural markets. Staff may look to simplify the existing two step process. Internal FDOT team will be bringing alternatives to the full Leadership Committee at a later date.
- There was criteria for exclusive busways but not used practically. Staff will work with the Leadership Committee to update criteria and bring back to the group.
 - With regards to exclusive busways and truckways, we don't have exclusive truckways today but do we want to consider highways with a high truck percentage (30 to 40%) somehow or somewhere?
 - This should be captured by 20% truck threshold.as an Emerging SIS highway corridor
 - In some cases, but not if the facility is not a State Highway.

SIS Goals and Objectives

The Emerging SIS breakout group said they needed to study this further before making any recommendations with regards to SIS Goals and Objectives. A brief conversation took place which is documented below.

- Are they (SIS Goals and Objectives) listed in any rank order?
 - Ranking was discussed by the initial Steering Committee. Safety is a top priority for all aspects of transportation. The committee said that mobility and economic competitiveness are also

important for setting priorities. So they are not ranked but they are listed in an intentional order.

- The SIS Investment Tool aids the FDOT in making SIS investments and is based on the 5 SIS goals. If SIS goals and objectives change, this tool will have to be updated.
- Will there be a discussion on this at the next Leadership Committee meeting?
 - Most likely the detailed discussion on goals and objectives will be at the June meeting.
- It would be helpful to present the goals and objectives first so that all discussion is in context to them.
- There may be potential changes to these goals and we must be prepared to discuss them more at the next meeting.

Action Items:

- Next meeting will be full Leadership Committee on May 19-20.
- Staff will develop refined language for policy statements.
- Staff will develop 10 minute presentation for Rocky to give to Leadership Committee to include issues they would like brought forward to the full Leadership Committee for consideration.
- Staff will develop suggested changes to Emerging SIS Designation Criteria based on experience. To include a presentation to the breakout group to show “logic” of change.
- All groups will provide input on goals and objectives at the next meeting.