

## 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update    Implementation Issues Breakout Group Meeting #1 Summary

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	4/24/2009	<b>Meeting Time:</b>	1 PM – 3 PM	<b>Type of Meeting:</b>	Teleconference
<b>Participants:</b>					
<p><i>Leadership Committee members:</i> Bob Ball (Florida Airports Council), Tony Carvajal (Florida Chamber of Commerce), Gordon Goodin (Florida Association of Counties), Toy Keller (Florida Ports Council), Rocky McPherson (Florida Defense Alliance), Mark Nordling (Florida Rail Association; designee for Ben Biscan), Bart Pullum (Florida Transportation Commission), Mary Lou Rajchel (Florida Trucking Association), David Roach (Florida Inland Navigation District)</p> <p><i>Observers:</i> Debra Lemke (Lee County Ports Authority), Drew Draper (Reynolds, Smith and Hill)</p> <p><i>Support Staff:</i> Brian Watts (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Huiwei Shen (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Trinity Scott (FDOT District 1), Amie Goddeau (FDOT District 4), Jeff Weidner (FDOT District 4), Teresa Jacobs (FDOT District 5), John Zielinski (FDOT District 5), Susan Van Hoose (FDOT District 7), Hal Beardall (FCRC-Consensus Center), Rafael Montalvo (FCRC-Consensus Center), Jane Mathis (Mathis and Associates), Tara Crawford (Cambridge Systematics), John Kaliski (Cambridge Systematics)</p>					
<b>Agenda:</b>					
	<b>1:00</b>	<b>Welcome and introductions</b> Review Agenda and Teleconference Protocols			Hal Beardall
	<b>1:05</b>	<b>Review Breakout Group Charge, Purpose and Process</b> Questions for clarification			Hal Beardall
	<b>1:15</b>	<b>Overview of Background on SIS Partner Coordination</b> Questions for clarification			Jane Mathis
	<b>1:35</b>	<b>Identify and Discuss Key SIS Partner Coordination Issues and Questions</b>			All Members
	<b>2:30</b>	<b>Overview of Background on SIS Integration with Regional Plans and Systems</b> Questions for clarification			
	<b>2:35</b>	<b>Identify and Discuss Key Issues and Questions on SIS Integration with Regional Plans and Systems</b>			
	<b>2:50</b>	<b>Next Steps and Schedule</b>			Hal Beardall
	<b>2:55</b>	<b>Public Comment</b>			
	<b>3:00</b>	<b>Adjourn</b>			

### **Key Discussion Comments:**

Huiwei Shen reviewed the three issue areas to be examined by the Implementation Issues Breakout Group, explaining that this group also would discuss issues referred by other groups. She reported that she has attended the other breakout group meetings, noting that no issues were formally referred and that all groups discussed partner coordination issues. She cited examples from each of the other breakout group meetings of issues that might be referred to the Implementation Group.

### ***Questions & Comments on SIS Partner Coordination Background Presentation:***

- Regarding what is now transpiring in Washington on the new Federal bill, Florida needs to have someone there.
- There are many other statutory provisions relating to public involvement that were not cited in the presentation, relating to development of the work program (e.g., coordination with MPOs, public hearings). Also there are matching requirements for non-highway SIS projects that require coordination with partners.
  - Response: The presentation addresses statutory requirements relating to statewide SIS policy implementation only. It is important to recognize that there are other public and partner coordination requirements applicable to project implementation processes.

### ***Question 1: How can we achieve improved coordination among the transportation modes on the SIS?***

- We could restructure FDOT to combine the separate modal offices at least as it relates to implementing the SIS. This would provide a way for the modes to talk to each other and to approach the SIS systematically.
- An executive committee (similar to federal level integration) could include a representative of each of the modal offices and could meet regularly.
- The Florida Transportation Commission has proposed the concept of an “intermodal commission”. This could include partners at the regional and local levels as well.
- There are really two levels here: intermodal coordination within FDOT and then FDOT coordination with external modal partners.
- What coordination is taking place now?
  - Response: On statewide policy planning such as the FTP and SIS plans, FDOT consults with partners early and continuously throughout the process. On project planning and implementation, the approach varies among districts, modes, and specific projects. There may be a need to have a process for multimodal coordination on a more regular basis rather than on a task-specific basis.
- There appears to be no formalized arrangement among agencies to look at issues together. The coordination issue relates to economic development in general and coordination among the modes is only part of a larger issue.

- FDOT has been inclusive during SIS plan development and partners were on board. A couple of rough spots need to be addressed with the modes:
  - Credibility issues such as the request to designate dray routes at Port Everglades where FDOT has given partners several different answers, when consistency is needed
  - Fire drills such as when FDOT calls stakeholders and requests information on needs, etc. to be supplied within 24 hours. The response time back from FDOT to the stakeholder following up on the disposition of that information might be up to one month.
- Question the phrasing of the question: Shouldn't it be "How can we *begin* coordination among the modes on the SIS?"
- All decisions on modal tradeoffs are related. For example, regarding freight movements, should SunRail be funded or should those SIS funds be allocated to other modes or projects? SIS decision-making needs to consider modal tradeoffs.

***Question 2: How can we improve coordination among the state, regional and local governments involved in planning and investing in the SIS?***

- Add "Federal" to the levels of government in the question. There are federal discretionary funds that go to projects of national significance; other federal funds may be available for key freight projects.
- What about a regional incentive program in which there are statewide incentives for key regional projects. Key projects of regional significance with regional funding priority would also attract federal and state funding sources. Funding from all levels would be combined to make the project feasible and all levels of government and all modes would be involved.
- Right now prioritizing projects can be a "bloody war" among levels of government. There is continuing suspicion among MPOs and TPOs as to who is trumping who. We make bitter enemies fighting within the region, and then the District or Central Office overrules regional priorities. I wonder whether anyone in the regional legislative delegation could name the top two priorities on our TPO list. In some areas, the RPCs do not have the full support of their local governments.
- We need to highlight a region that is coordinating well among levels of government and share this approach with other areas. If everyone has a chance to present his case to the arbiter then things seem to run okay, but if not everyone is getting heard then it leads to problems.
- FDOT could look at its non-metropolitan area consultative process to identify ways to work better with rural counties.
- In central Florida, the MPO Alliance consisting of 10 counties is a good forum for MPOs to deal with SIS issues. FDOT holds quarterly meetings with regional and local governments. We are creating criteria to made decisions re: SIS going forward.
- For the SIS FDOT needs to be clear in communicating that SIS funds are for interregional movements and we cannot compare regions.
- Level of Service (LOS) gets us to the table. Once at the table we can use ETDM, technical support and other resources to demonstrate the benefits of having us at the table. LOS may not be the best way but it leads into an appreciation of the knowledge we can offer and helps build relationships.

- FDOT gets the annual priorities from the MPOs and then we try to work with them to address the top priorities. Emphasis on working with them.
- Is there transparency of decision-making?
  - Response: This gets into the topic of Investment Decision Making, which is the topic of a presentation for the May meeting. It will stay at a high level.

***Question 3: How can we strengthen coordination of FDOT with partner agencies (economic, growth management, environment)?***

- We can do this through a leadership committee at the appropriate level.
- Not sure who the partners are. The players change, new ones come on board. We need to have an education component.
- Getting with partners every five years when there is an update is too long. Send the current partner list out to Leadership Committee members.
- There could be an executive committee of these partner agencies to meet together on mutual issues.
- There need to be a good reason to convene partner agencies. For example, at the end of each legislative session, there could be an update. This could also be an opportunity to see trends.
- It is important to determine the level in the agency at which coordination occurs. If you specify at the deputy level, there is specificity. If you say Secretary or designee, it is left open.

***Question 4: How can partner coordination be integrated more effectively in planning by nontraditional partners?***

- Who are these partners? Response: The term “nontraditional” partners has been defined anecdotally through partner comments on SIS implementation and in this context includes independent transportation authorities such as the Northwest Florida Transportation Corridor Authority as well as developers and economic development partners. Partners convey a need to integrate partner coordination early on projects initiated by nontraditional partners.
- Agree with this concern and it applies to military partners as well.
- Enterprise Florida works to bring new industries into Florida. FDOT can then evaluate the impacts these might have on transportation. A good example is Cecil Field.
- FDOT usually gets to the table after land use decisions are made, when we really need to be involved earlier to support land use decisions. Too often, we come in to solve a problem that already exists.

***Question 5: What other implementation policy changes related to partner coordination should be considered as part of this update?***

- The state should respond more quickly to market approaches to project development. This could be done outside the 5-year work program process, perhaps through a new freight mobility office.

***Questions & Comments on SIS Integration with Regional and Local Plans and Systems Presentation:***

- Florida needs to address economic development in neighboring areas of Alabama and Georgia. The economic impacts include the need for secondary suppliers etc. 100j-200 miles out from the new industry. If Florida does not respond to these impacts, the Mississippi or Alabama will.

*Question 1: How should the SIS respond to unique regional issues?*

- There is a new steel mill in Mobile, Alabama supplying the auto industry. Its impacts extend 40 to 100 miles. These are opportunities and they can easily be lost if we do not respond.
- We need early awareness of economic opportunities and impacts. The SIS should identify for the Secretary what requirements and opportunities there are associated with known economic opportunities and impacts.
- The same can be said of seaports. Neighboring states put money into their ports. If our ports don't respond, then the business is lost to them.
- How is Florida looking at the expansion of the Panama Canal? The Suez Canal? The possibility of an open Cuba? Other opportunities?
- FDOT should be looking at ways to work in flexibility in how we do SIS funding, such as set asides, so that SIS has funds to match and accelerate projects responding to market conditions or economic opportunities – so these projects don't have to wait to be funded.
- The state needs a plan to respond quickly to market opportunities.
- Enterprise Florida is currently updating its strategic plan and will be holding regional workshops around the state. All of us should participate in these regional meetings. I will get the schedule to staff so it can be sent out to everyone.

*Question 2: How should the SIS respond to regional visions and plans?*

- The SIS could participate in a regional incentive program in which regions would submit regional projects for state and federal funding.
- It's difficult to talk about visions when we have so much catching up to do.

*Question 3: How can SIS integration with regional and local transportation systems be improved?*

- Regional visioning was emphasized in the 2025 FTP. Regarding the role of regional visions, it states that where there are regional visions in place, projects would be consistent with that vision.
- Projects that are the outflow of regional visioning would be a priority for SIS funding. The SIS would respond, based on regional priorities.
- Isn't there a freshness date associated with these plans, i.e., can't they become obsolete over time?
  - Response: Sometimes by the time we have the funding in place, the solutions may be

different.

- Key components are a separate quicker funding response coupled with a dedicated funding source and regional priorities based on regional visions.
- We need to get the person here who can explain what they are doing at the federal level. Other [states] are getting ahead of us.
- Like the West Coast.
- Perhaps we should have this person come talk to the entire Leadership Committee. If the West Coast has an effective strategy, we need to get their ideas and see what we can do here in Florida.

*Question 4: How should support and incentives for regional visioning efforts be enhanced?*

- MPOs and local governments felt they lost influence when the state initiated the SIS. A state-supported and endorsed regional visioning process would be a way of putting locals in a better position to guide the use of SIS funds. If the state is at the table on regional visioning, it would be a positive step.

*Question 5: What other implementation policy changes related to SIS integration with regional plans and systems should be considered as part of this update?*

- We also need interregional incentives - to get regions to coordinate with each other on their regional plans.

**Public Comment:** None were offered.

**Next Steps and Schedule:**

- As soon as it is released, Rocky McPherson will alert staff, who will then send out the schedule for Enterprise Florida's upcoming regional meetings to Leadership Committee members.
- Gordon Goodin to supply name of suggested presenter to discuss what is being done at the federal level on some of these issues.
- Background paper on SIS Integration with Regional Plans and Systems will be sent out.
- Current partner list will be provided to Leadership Committee members.
- Next meeting will be following the May Leadership Committee meeting, likely later in the week of May 25 (the 25<sup>th</sup> being a holiday)
- A summary of today's meeting will be sent out for review.

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.