

2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee

Draft Summary of Meeting #1

Meeting Date:	1/26-27/09	Meeting Time:	1:00 pm, Day 1 8:00 am, Day 2	Type of Meeting:	In-person
----------------------	------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------

Participants: Members: Debbie Hunt (FDOT Assistant Secretary), Chair;
 Noranne Downs (FDOT-District 5 Secretary), Vice-Chair;
 Bob Ball (Florida Airports Council),
 Kathy Till (Florida League of Cities),
 Gordon Goodin (Florida Association of Counties),
 Jason Peters (FDOT-D3),
 Mayra Diaz (Miami-Dade Expressway Authority),
 Mary Lou Rajchel (Florida Trucking Association),
 Richard Kaplan (MPOAC),
 Jim Barr (Ryder Corp),
 Ben Biscan (Florida Rail Association),
 Pat Steed (Florida Regional Councils Association),
 Jim Poole (Enterprise Florida’s Rural Issues Working Group),
 Toy Keller (Florida Ports Council),
 Chris Doolin (Small County Coalition),
 Mark Bontrager (Space Florida),
 Todd Pokrywa (Association of Florida Community Developers),
 Tony Carvajal (Florida Chamber of Commerce),
 Chris Stahl (Florida Department of Environmental Protection),
 Laurie Macdonald (Defenders of Wildlife),
 Janet Bowman (The Nature Conservancy),
 Victoria Tschinkel (1000 Friends of Florida),
 Charles Gauthier (Florida Department of Community Affairs),
 Bart Pullum (Florida Transportation Commission),
 Joe Giulietti (Florida Public Transportation Association),
 Chuck Cohen (Florida Public Transportation Association),
 David Roach (Florida Inland Navigation District)

Staff: Kathy Neill (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Brian Watts (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Terry Kraft (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Keith Brown (FDOT Systems Planning Office), John Kaliski (Cambridge Systematics), Jane Mathis (Mathis & Associates), Sarah Adams (Cambridge Systematics), and Mary Frasca (Cambridge Systematics)

Topic:	Update of the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Strategic Plan	
Agenda:	<p>DAY ONE</p> <p>Opening Remarks.....page 3 Debbie Hunt</p> <p>Introductions and Review of Committee Members’ Expectations.....page 3 Members</p> <p>Agenda and Materials Review.....page 4 Hal Beardall</p> <p>A Look Back: Review of the Development and Implementation of the SIS.....page 4 Terry Kraft</p> <p>2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update: Requirements and Expectations.....page 5 Kathy Neill</p> <p>Review of the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Process and Schedule.....page 5 Brian Watts</p> <p>Overview of Proposed Meeting Guidelines and Consensus Building Process and Schedule.....page 5 Hal Beardall</p> <p>Review and Refinement of the Proposed SIS Leadership Committee Process Goal Statement; draft Assumptions/Guiding Principles; and Key Roles and Responsibilities.....page 6 Hal Beardall</p> <p>Government in the Sunshine – Provisions and the Committee Process.....page 10 Bob Burdick</p> <p>Public Comment.....page 10 Public</p> <p>Review Schedule for Day Two.....page 10 Hal Beardall</p> <p>DAY TWO</p> <p>Review Agenda for Day Two.....page 10 Hal Beardall</p> <p>A Look Ahead: Long Range Trends in Florida.....page 11 Kathy Neill</p> <p>A Look at Today: SIS Accomplishments and Challenges.....page 11 John Kaliski</p> <p>Identifying Potential Undesirable Future in Florida.....page 13 Members</p> <p>Identification of Desired Successful Future.....page 13 Members</p> <p>Initial Discussion of Key Issues for the Update Process.....page 15 Rafael Montalvo</p> <p>Public Comment.....page 16 Public</p> <p>Review Next Steps and Assignments.....page 16 Hal Beardall</p> <p>Meeting Evaluation Survey.....page 17 Hal Beardall</p> <p>Adjournment.....page 17 Debbie Hunt</p>	

Summary of Meeting Content

Opening Remarks - Debbie Hunt

Debbie Hunt, FDOT Assistant Secretary for Intermodal Systems Development and Chair of the Leadership Committee, welcomed everyone and thanked the members for agreeing to serve. She briefly outlined the task of updating the SIS Strategic Plan and how important the members' participation will be in this process.

Introductions and Review of Committee Members' Expectations - Members

The chair asked members to introduce themselves, identify the perspective they represent, and offer a brief statement on their expectations for the committee. *The members present are listed on page 1.*

The following is a list of expectations identified by the members:

- Help make Florida all it can be.
- Work together as partners to do this.
- A system serving passengers and freight well.
- Moving towards sustainability of climate and environment.
- Strategy to maintain commerce and have vibrant communities.
- Balance in moving people and goods; promote intermodalism.
- Intersection of transportation, land use and natural systems; climate change.
- Inland waterway issues should be considered.
- Transportation and development integration.
- Ensuring SIS maintains its integrity, while considering needs of military and rural areas.
- How can toll agencies support the SIS?
- Ensuring we move people and commerce in urban areas so benefits trickle down; economic development in rural areas; evacuation concerns; based in reality and considering rural perspective. Targeted focus.
- Looking at growth in space 'business' - important to think strategically to compete with other states.
- Protecting natural systems and impacts of transportation.
- Process providing input to Washington.
- Growth in public transportation - make sure SIS encourages and continues growth.
- SIS importance from regional perspective - benefits and process coordination.
- Continue multimodalism.
- Impact of SIS on rural areas; catalyst site planning coordination.
- While we plan, we haven't been able to fund to meet needs.
- There is need to expand transportation, but we need to work together early in the process on environmental matters.
- Protection of local roads - make sure we consider dedicated funding source for local roads, and fund them. Commuter rail as part of the SIS.
- Funding is a primary concern; can't fund SIS to exclusion of other parts of Florida's transportation system; military issues need to be addressed.
- Trucking issues should be considered.

Agenda and Materials Review - Hal Beardall

The chair introduced the meeting facilitator, Hal Beardall with the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium - Consensus Center. She indicated Mr. Beardall will provide facilitation support to the Leadership Committee during the meeting process. Ms. Hunt asked Mr. Beardall to review the agenda and the supporting materials in the members' notebook. Notebook materials can be found at the following link: www.sisupdate.org

A Look Back: Review of the Development and Implementation of the SIS - Terry Kraft

Terry Kraft's presentation can be found at www.sisupdate.org. Following Mr. Kraft's presentation, the chair asked for questions/comments from the members. (Responses are in *italics*)

- What about new data and/or existing data? *We are open to looking at new data or looking at old data differently. For example, we are open to getting the new data for inland ports.*
- It would be good to hear from those working on the Critical Lands and Waters Identification Project (CLIP) and the Cooperative Conservation Blueprint (CCB) being worked on by the Century Commission, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and others. Is this possible? *Yes they would be good to hear from and to determine what data are being used, etc. We hope to combine these presentations with a discussion of enterprise SIS, the system FDOT is creating to store and display SIS-related data for all modes.*
- Are maps or lists available of SIS facilities where level of service is currently deficient? *A statewide map showing congested corridors not meeting level of service standards will be in a presentation tomorrow. More detail can be provided at future meetings at your pleasure.*
- What money has been collected for proportionate fair share since 2005? Where are the deficiencies and where has money been collected? *Some of this information will be touched on in day 2 presentations. More information can be brought back at future meetings if desired.*
- Will we be reviewing funding to date? What has been constructed to date? What public-private partnerships have been formed to date and what is their current status? *A high level summary of investments and example projects will be covered tomorrow, and more information can be shared at future meetings if desired.*
- Concerning connectors to SIS hub facilities, are air routes included as connectors for airports? *No because they have not been needed previously. The SIS is currently a surface transportation system. Airspace connectors or corridors may be an issue we need to bring to the table during this process.*
- Many transportation funding and planning bills are not designed for multimodal transportation and still reflect compartmentalized approaches, yet we are trying to create a multimodal system. Is the SIS process going to address this issue, particularly with the federal transportation authorization occurring at the same time? *Florida tends to be out in front of other states on multimodal planning approaches. A presentation or discussion on the federal authorization could be provided if desired.*
- You say there is not a lot of difference between SIS and Emerging SIS. What funding has been allocated to SIS versus Emerging SIS projects? Also, what total funding is going to transportation and at what levels? *A high level summary of SIS funding issues will be presented tomorrow with more to come at the next meeting. The comment regarding the limited difference between SIS and Emerging SIS reflects two factors: (1) both types of facilities are fully eligible for SIS funding; and (2) the same level of*

service standards apply to both sets of facilities. The Emerging SIS was set up in part to encourage smart planning for facilities likely to grow in importance in the future, but there is no real difference between SIS and Emerging SIS implementation to date. Many district staff perceive the Emerging SIS category adds complexity to the process. We may need to discuss this issue during this process.

- There has been discussion on a major reconfiguration on airspace and service in North Florida around Eglin Air Force Base, which will have an impact on SIS airports in this area and unintended consequences if we are not proactive. Also, what is the impact on air? Shipping lanes with the new aircraft coming and new weapons? Will all this impact our ability to get goods to many places? *This is an issue not just for the military but will impact all air service in Northwest Florida. We will provide a briefing at the next meeting.*

2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update: Requirements and Expectations - Kathy Neill

Kathy Neill's presentation can be found at www.sisupdate.org. There were no questions/comments from the members.

Review of the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Process and Schedule - Brian Watts

Brian Watts' presentation can be found at www.sisupdate.org. Following Mr. Watts' presentation, the chair asked for questions/comments from the members. (Responses are in *italics*)

- There has been a lot of concern on where funding was allocated. We would like a recap on success and failures of the SIS. Will we get to hear from staff as to the good and bad? *We will have this presentation tomorrow. Please let us know if you would like additional information.*
- The Florida Transportation Commission reviews major transportation policies and will review the updated SIS Strategic Plan at the appropriate time - likely at the November meeting. *Noted.*
- Is the Federal Highway Administration involved in any way in this process? *No, but we will keep them informed. FHWA has participated in a briefing session on the SIS Update process and has been invited to this and future meetings. We will reach out to FHWA going forward and invite their participation as a member of this committee.*

Should we give more attention to the federal authorization and to obtaining program funding instead of earmarks? *FDOT monitoring and providing input to the authorization process.*

Overview of the Proposed Meeting Guidelines and Consensus Building Process and Schedule - Hal Beardall (these materials can be found at www.sisupdate.org)

Mr. Beardall asked the committee members to review the proposed meeting guidelines, including the participants' role, the facilitators' role, guidelines for brainstorming, the name stacking process and the acceptability rating scale. He emphasized the need to listen to others and to be focused and concise in participation. Mr. Beardall urged participants to communicate with their constituencies and bring their thoughts back to future meetings.

Mr. Beardall asked the committee members to review the draft consensus-building guidelines. He stated consensus is a process, an attitude and an outcome. Consensus processes have the potential of producing better quality, more informed and better-supported outcomes. He proposed final decisions of the committee require a supermajority of at least 75 percent favorable vote of all members present

and voting.

As part of the guidelines, members would agree to refrain from public statements prejudging the outcome of the committee's consensus process. Only the chair may speak for the committee as a whole.

Mr. Beardall then asked for questions/comments from members. (Responses are in *italics*)

- Please clarify the relationship between this Leadership Committee and the Statewide Intermodal Transportation Advisory Council (SITAC)? *The SITAC is a different entity and is not meeting any longer because all prior appointments have expired. Three former SITAC members sit on this committee.*
- Does the SITAC still exist? What about the statutory requirement? We could recommend legislation to make the law reflect the actual process for this committee. *The appointments to the SITAC were for a set term and those terms have expired. No one has been appointed since the terms of the original appointees expired. We have requested a legal opinion from our general counsel on this. Once we have the opinion we can discuss further.*

The chair proposed adoption of the draft meeting guidelines and the draft consensus-building guidelines, a motion was made and seconded, The guidelines were adopted by unanimous vote of the members present.

Review and Refinement of the Proposed SIS Leadership Committee Process Goal Statement, draft Assumptions/Guiding Principles; and Key Roles and Responsibilities - Hal Beardall (these materials can be found at www.sisupdate.org)

Draft Process Goal Statement

Mr. Beardall asked the committee members to review the draft goal statement for the update process. The draft goal statement offered for review and discussion:

The goal of the 2010 Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee process is to create consensus recommendations to inform and guide the update of the SIS Strategic Plan.

Mr. Beardall asked members for comments or concerns:

- Should we add to this goal statement by recommending to the legislature improvements to the SIS process? Should we include some language with recommendations to how the process works? *We will consider this.*

Draft Assumptions and Guiding Principles

Mr. Beardall asked the committee members to review the draft process assumptions. Mr. Beardall then asked members to review and rank, as an initial acceptability rating, the process assumptions and principles with a 3, 2, or 1 by a show of hands and to note any additional suggestions, rewording, or concerns they might have. A ranking of 3 indicates "I can support as is", a 2 indicates "I can support this, but would like to see the following changes...", and a 1 indicates "I cannot support this unless serious concern(s) are addressed as follows..." Committee members rated the draft process assumptions as initially written as follows (some members abstained from voting):

Assumption A: The role of the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee will be to develop and present consensus recommendations to the Secretary of FDOT to inform the update of the SIS Strategic Plan.

Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 – 19 members; 2 – 7 members; 1 – 1 members

- There is an issue with SITAC. Obviously the legislature wanted input of SITAC but since it is not active, there a concern. We should insert “the legislature and the secretary” into this assumption. *We are obtaining a legal opinion on the SITAC.*
- We need clarification as to creation of the Leadership Committee and the relationship to the SITAC identified in statute. Is the Leadership Committee taking over this role? Is this what is required by statute? *The legal opinion we have sought should provide us with a solid answer.*
- The statute says the department will meet with MPOs and regional entities. Is the Leadership Committee going to do this, or are they just providing input to the secretary? *This is part of the department’s statutory responsibility. We have a Public and Partner Involvement Plan for the SIS Update developed to meet and exceed the statutory requirements. This plan will involve state, regional and local partners, as well at the public, throughout in the update process.*
- What does the phrase “to inform the update” mean? Recommend we delete the phrase and re-word it to say, “for updating the SIS Strategic Plan.” Also, we need to change “will be” to “is”. *Yes, let’s reword this assumption.*

Assumption B: Recommendations of the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee will be developed consistent with the elements set forth in s. 339.64, Florida Statutes.

Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 – 18 members; 2 – 8 members; 1 – 1 member

- Clarification is needed for subsection 5 of the statutes concerning the SITAC requirement. This assumption should only reference subsections 1 through 4.
- This assumption is too limiting the way it’s written; it should include the elements and “other information as relevant.” For example, some issues not identified in statute could be covered. Instead suggest we say will be developed “to include relevant information as necessary for the...”
- Many of these statements are building on the old and not the new. The statute itself does not include impact on the natural state or community impacts. I can live with these assumptions, but they could be better. There are many emerging issues reflecting new trends. *Let us know where you would like updated language.*
- We are limiting ourselves. Should we allow only the secretary to recommend changes to the legislature to address emerging issues?
- This assumption does not specify how far outside you want us to get with our experience. It puts emphasis on the limited statutory language and not on the broader issues. It needs to be clear exactly what you want from us to be effective.
- The work of this body will be used to inform some of the policy decisions of the FTP. It seems there should be clarification of the statute. The statute says the SIS will be updated subsequent to

the FTP and it seems it should occur prior to the FTP.

Assumption C: The 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee will review and build upon previous statewide long-range transportation planning efforts, including the original SIS Strategic Plan, the 2025 Florida Transportation Plan, and FDOT's statewide modal plans for aviation, highways, rail, seaports and transit.

Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 - 18 members; 2 - 6 members; 1 - 2 members

- Using the terms "building on the previous" shows we are doing things the same old way. This is not good. We need to be more fluid, innovative and creative in developing this plan. We cannot just take the hand being dealt; we have to be more proactive.
- We do not want to be limited to what has always been done. We also need to be more specific to define 'space' in addition to 'aviation'.
- Remember there is not enough time to start over and it is wise to build on what we have done.
- Also keep in mind, the first SIS process was a massive undertaking and we had to achieve 85 percent consensus. I understand you want to look at it this time in a totally fresh light but you have to understand what would be required, this is a great basis to start with.
- I do not want to start over but I do want to be sure to consider new things.
- I did not see any outcome to this assumption. Did I misread it? *The following principles will help identify the outcomes desired by the group.*
- Just as a reminder from those who participated in the original SIS Strategic Plan: we have nothing over the rest of you. This is a good starting point for us all to update this plan. We will get there!

Assumption D: In developing its recommendations, the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee may review issues related to the effectiveness of the current SIS Strategic Plan and its implementation, issues affecting transportation statewide (including current and future mobility needs) and issues related to the impacts of transportation decisions.

Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 - 19 members; 2 - 5 members; 1 - 0 members

- Be sure to specify inclusively (and not exclusively) to include weighty societal issues like reliance on oil, climate change, etc.
- Unleash innovative and forward thinking on issues.
- Add implementation of regional visions.

Assumption E: The 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee may identify, discuss and reach conclusions about issues outside the scope of the SIS Strategic Plan Update. Examples may include issues pertaining to FDOT modal plans, the 2025 Florida Transportation Plan or planning processes of other agencies. In these cases, the Committee will refer the issues or conclusions to the appropriate process or entity.

Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 – 14 members; 2 – 9 members; 1 – 2 members

- With the large task we already have, we need to be careful what we are tasking the committee to do. *We intended to just refer these related issues to those appropriate groups, not for this committee to try to resolve all issues.*
- The phrase “reach conclusions” should be eliminated.
- The phrase “issues pertaining to the SIS” may need to be inserted so what we are doing is what the statute intended.
- Does this include statewide expressway authorities? I think it should.
- We should stick to what is really transportation and not try to redo other areas not pertaining to this group.
- A phrase for funding for transportation programs would be good. We need to capture the picture of transportation needs at all levels.
- I echo this because what makes SIS unique is the funding going along with it. It should be the assumptions indicating whether funding is adequate, etc.
- We are all aware of the money issue so we do not need to dwell on this given the economic situation.

Principle A: The 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee will seek to develop as much consensus as practicable among members and their constituencies on the content of an updated SIS Strategic Plan.

Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 – 20 members; 2 – 5 members; 1 – 1 member

- This principle is really unnecessary. It states the obvious.
- The phrase “as much consensus as practicable” doesn’t make sense: either you have consensus or you do not. Recommend deleting this phrase.
- It seems at some point we need to rank these. *This exercise is an acceptability rating, not a ranking.*
- I would like to see the principle be more proactive: “the committee will develop...” Also we should define what consensus is, is it 75 percent or 80 percent? *Consensus in the guidelines we have is defined as 75 percent vote of those members present and voting.*

Principle B: The 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee as appropriate, will consider the consensus reports of ad hoc drafting work groups (appointed as needed and charged by the Chair and Committee to develop draft recommendations on specific issues) in shaping the Committee’s final consensus recommendations.

Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 – 26 members; 2 – 5 members; 1 – 1 member

- We will use consensus of the drafting groups. We should always capture and reflect the material of each group so they are available to us to show consensus. We want a transparent process to do

this.

- Will minority views be captured and reflected in those consensus reports of ad hoc groups? I think they should be. *The consensus guidelines commit the committee to report on views held by at least 50 percent but less than 75 percent of members present and voting. The committee may at any time agree to represent positions held by less than 50 percent of members.*

Principle C: The 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee will present its final recommendations on updating the SIS to the Secretary of FDOT by September 2009.

Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 – 19 members; 2 – 3 members; 1 – 0 members

- Should we also be providing our recommendations to the legislature? *We need to wait on the legal ruling to determine whether to include the legislature.*

Key Roles and Responsibilities

The facilitators reviewed the draft roles and responsibilities in the notebook. Mr. Beardall noted the roles for chair, vice chair, and the members and their designees. He asked for questions or comments.

- Can designees vote? *No, according to the draft consensus guidelines.*
- Should we identify ourselves if we are serving as an alternate? *Yes, we should know; but make your designee the member if you will not be able to make it on a regular basis.*

Mr. Beardall stated the assumptions and principles will be re-drafted in response to comments provided by members and will be brought back at the next meeting

Government in the Sunshine – Bob Burdick

The Chair introduced Bob Burdick with FDOT's Office of the General Counsel to explain "Florida's Government in the Sunshine Law" to the committee. Mr. Burdick explained this committee is subject to provisions of the "Government in the Sunshine Law." He described the requirements of the law and when this law applies to the committee. He then fielded questions from committee members.

Public Comment

The chair asked the audience for public comment. There were none presented on day one.

Review Schedule for Evening and Day Two – Hal Beardall

Mr. Beardall asked members to please remember to turn in their issues worksheets if they had not already done so.

DAY TWO

Review Agenda for Day Two

The Chair explained over one-third of the members have conflicts for the planned February meeting dates of the 12th and 13th and the meeting will need to be rescheduled. A new calendar for the last two weeks in February was distributed. She stated the next meeting will include two panel discussions on SIS implementation. The first will be a panel of all the SIS modes and the second will be a panel of all

levels of government – cities, counties, state agencies, RPCs, MPOs, representing all areas of the state geographically so the committee hears what has occurred around the state.

A member asked for meetings be limited to one day if possible. The chair responded efforts would be made to accommodate.

Mr. Beardall introduced Rafael Montalvo also of the FCRC – Consensus Center, who will be facilitating today along with him.

Mr. Beardall reviewed the agenda for today.

A Look Ahead: Long Range Trends in Florida – Kathy Neill

Kathy Neill's presentation can be found at www.sisupdate.org. Following Ms. Neill's presentation, the Chair asked for questions/comments from the members. (Responses in *italics*)

- What are the main reasons why vehicle miles traveled (VMT) on the Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS) has increased at three times the rate of VMT on other State Highway System (SHS) roads? *Ms. Neill stated the department will look into the reasons.*
- Why was there a steep decline from 2001 to 2002 on slide 30 (shows percent change in annual VMT since 1998)? *This chart shows the percent change from year to year. The reason for the spike in the percentage increase in 2001 was due to a change in methodology for estimating VMT on rural minor collectors and local roads, which increased the total VMT reported.*
- Did 9/11 have anything to do with causing the spike in 2001 since people were not flying? *The spike in percent of annual change was largely due to a change in data collection methodology capturing better data on rural minor collectors and local roads.*
- Regarding slide 25 (Existing System Cannot Meet Demand, showing congested corridors 2005), does the department factor in the potential for Emerging SIS roads developing into SIS facilities and taking some of the pressure (trips) off SIS facilities? *When we use the term "SIS" we mean both Emerging SIS and SIS. Part of what we are looking at is the role of the SIS to move interregional, interstate and international trips. Today the SIS also is being for local trips. One goal is to figure out ways to take these local trips off the SIS and move them to local roads in order to reduce demand on the SIS and free up capacity for the intended use of the SIS.*
- The Emerging SIS was created for rural areas of the state where facilities did not meet SIS criteria and investment was needed as well – it created an element of hope. Emerging SIS facilities are important to the future.
- Can FDOT identify the percentage of trips on SIS facilities which are local in nature and then estimate the cost of improvements needed to other facilities to accommodate those local trips and move them off the SIS? *We will provide more information on this question, to the extent available.*
- There will be intended and unintended consequences of the federal stimulus package. Are we moving too soon on the SIS update process given we do not know the status of the federal bill yet? *No, we will keep moving along and adjust as needed. The next meeting will have a presentation on the federal stimulus package.*
- We need a chart showing total funds, then how these funds are broken down for the SIS, non-SIS,

etc., to see how we all fit in to the total picture. *We will present this information at the next meeting.*

- There is a need to look at bordering states like Georgia and Alabama and what they are doing for rural areas. *Yes, we will try to look into it.*

A Look at Today: SIS Accomplishments and Challenges - John Kaliski

John Kaliski's presentation can be found at www.sisupdate.org. Following Mr. Kaliski's presentation, the Chair asked for questions/comments from the members. (Responses in *italics*)

When referencing slide 3 and sources consulted, Mr. Kaliski asked partners to let the department know of any reports referencing the SIS not included in the List of Partner Reports under Tab 10.

- Could we get a list of all projects funded with SIS funds (after funding cuts)? *With funding cuts underway, this analysis may be difficult to do precisely for the next work program. We will bring this information as soon as it is available.*
- Could we get a breakdown showing total investment in SIS vs. Emerging SIS, and to show these by individual mode? *We will provide this information at the next meeting.*
- Do the capacity investments slides include matching amounts? *They reflect only state funds. Matching ratios vary by mode; matching rates and dollars will be made available.*
- Where are state funds invested off the SIS on facilities relieving the SIS and free up SIS capacity? This data would probably be difficult to provide but is important to acknowledge. *We will try to get the information, but it is not well-defined category and we may not be able to capture all projects in this category.*
- Can we get information on the amount of identified needs and then what of those needs have been accomplished? The bottom line being: are we keeping up with needs or are we getting more behind? *No, we are not keeping up, and yes, we are falling further behind. We will provide unfunded needs numbers at next meeting, if possible. District offices can be helpful in providing data on backlogs. In conjunction with Central Florida's How Shall We Grow initiative, District 5 provided maps showing projected constrained facilities in 2050. Individual districts can provide data on backlogs if members go to them.*
- Can we recommend new funding sources such as mobility fees? *The department is not in a position to recommend additional revenue sources. We understand committee members may wish to provide recommendations on funding for consideration in the 2060 FTP update, as the Rail Stakeholders Advisory Committee chose to do.*
- Most of the SIS investment projects listed in the notebook under Tab 9 are highway projects. This focus only results in burning more gas, and motor fuel taxes will be a declining source of transportation revenue in the future. Transit is largely ignored. Mayor Kaplan has authored a paper on this topic and would like to have it distributed to the members. *Yes, we will distribute Mayor Kaplan's paper to all of the members. Also note the connectors are funded as part of the list of highway projects, and highways are likely to remain the spine of the transportation system.*
- One idea is to use local government bonding power to accelerate construction of roads instead of waiting to construct a project until all the funding is available in cash. There is opportunity for

partnerships here. We may want to take this concept to the Legislature. It is a matter of cost vs. benefit.

- What are the state's economic priorities and how does SIS planning link into those priorities (slide 19)? How do the planning processes work together? We are not sure what Florida's economic goals are and would like more information. *Enterprise Florida is not here today, but good information can be found on their website. Their statewide plan for economic development currently is being updated. Enterprise Florida will be invited to discuss the Strategic Plan for Economic Development at the next meeting.*
- There is a difference between supporting emerging economic centers and encouraging growth. Transportation should *support* economic growth but not *encourage* growth. Perhaps more information on the state's economic goals would clarify this issue.

Identifying Potential Undesirable Future in Florida -- Members

Hal Beardall asked members to offer a one-sentence answer to the question, "What is a potential but undesirable future for Florida's Strategic Intermodal System? Where do we not want to go? If we don't do something, this is what will happen?"

The following are member responses to Mr. Beardall's question:

- If we don't do anything, we will lose economic competitiveness.
- We have massive budget deficits and don't support any of our services. People don't want to come here and we lose population.
- Planning without funding follow-up, resulting in lack of implementation
- Not addressing something needing to be addressed - we've missed the mark.
- Florida's transportation network fails to meet its greenhouse gas goals requirements.
- Florida's transportation system doesn't take into account global warming and its potential impact on Florida.
- We will lose federal funding.
- All growth is placed on the back of businesses as we grow.
- Florida is no longer the best place to live work and play.
- We try to homogenize Florida.
- Florida loses its investment in natural habitat and fails to complete its natural resource goals.
- We don't come up with a better way of handling transit. There will be no direct connect between airports and seaports and highways
- Gridlock has doubled commuting times turns traffic into a mass that cannot move.
- Don't build brand-new 1950's system.
- Don't lose the sense of urgency - look also at short and mid-term cycles of improvements.
- Transportation consumes the bulk of family time.
- Economic divide between urban and rural becomes even greater.
- Florida is unprepared for the widening of the Panama Canal and the potential opening of Cuba and as a result we miss the opportunities, and our economy suffers as a result.
- Don't balkanize urban and rural areas, don't block those trying to take advantage of economic opportunities, and don't ignore demographic trends.
- Lose to other states and to international competition access to space.

Identification of Desired Successful Future - Members

Hal Beardall stated now we know where we don't want to go, considering the presentation on long-range trends, let's take a few minutes to discuss where do we want to go? He asked members to consider if everything went right, what would the SIS look like in the year 2030? He asked members to answer one of the following questions:

1. It's 2030. You have been asked to write a guest newspaper column on the stellar accomplishments of or development in the transportation system in Florida over the last 20 years. What would be the headline? What would you say?
2. What would you like people to be saying about the transportation system in Florida and how it is serving the transportation needs in 2030? What will the state be doing in 2030 differently from what it is doing today?

The following are member responses to these questions:

- Literacy rates soar as people read while commuting (on the railroad).
- FDOT doesn't know what to do with all the money it has in the bank.
- Florida is recognized as nation's leader in transportation efficiency.
- Two people from Apopka think alike!
- Transportation system promotes compact growth in urban and rural areas.
- Florida captures its entire import market internally with state of the art transportation systems and shuts out competing states.
- Port of Port St. Joe celebrates 20 years of success.
- Rural areas thrive economically.
- Human and wildlife road mortality drops precipitously due to construction and retrofitting of ecologically sound roads.
- Per capita VMT and hours traveled decline while economic development thrives.
- Florida picks up 10 more House seats as the U.S. population views Florida as great place to live.
- Florida continues its role as number one tourist spot worldwide.
- Greenhouse emissions drop dramatically in Florida as commuters take advantage of statewide commuter rail system.
- Florida is viewed as a leader in accommodating vehicles requiring electricity.
- Using personalized jets will be replacing cars.
- Florida leads the nation in meeting transportation needs while maximizing quality of life.
- Florida sets example for the world in how to connect people, markets and ideas across the globe.
- It is easy for Florida residents to connect opportunities, markets, and clusters within a few hours point-to-point.

Hal Beardall then asked members to if there are any general themes they can identify to characterize the desired future for the Strategic Intermodal System?

The following are member responses to the question:

- We found a way to pay for all of this.
- Transportation systems as a way of connecting aspects of society.
- Changing use of time.
- Transportation is important to quality of life.
- All of the ideas based on growth and investment - we have to find ways of making positive

change.

- Efficient transportation equals economic growth and development.
- It a matter of quality, not quantity.
- Positive, forward looking aspect – there is still opportunity for us. We are not a declining state. We all perceive opportunity.
- We found a way to deal with the highway capacity issues we are projecting for the next twenty years – able to move successfully.
- Transportation involves supply and demand. We have been looking at supply, but also have to look at demand management strategies using technology.
- Access to transportation meeting demands and needs statewide.
- Dualities – growth and quality of life, urban and rural needs. Place for everything.

Initial Discussion of Key Issues for the Update Process – Rafael Montalvo

Rafael Montalvo initiated discussion of key issues by referencing the potential issues worksheet each member was asked to complete and turn in yesterday. This worksheet can be found at www.sisupdate.org. Members were asked to rate each issue using a five-point scale from very important to less important, based on answering the following question: How important is this issue for the committee to explore in depth given the limited time available to the committee?

The results of member ratings of the 26 potential issues have been tallied and averaged, and member comments were aggregated and reported in a summary worksheet handed out this morning (the complete summary worksheet providing all member ratings and comments can be found at www.sisupdate.org).

Category I – SIS Partner Coordination. This category contains three potential issues. Most members gave all three issues a rating of 3 or better and the average ratings for all three issues ranged from 4.0 to 4.2. Mr. Montalvo asked for suggestions of additional partner coordination issues and none were offered. In addition to the comments made on the worksheet, the following comments were offered:

- Coordination of SIS planning with other agencies such as Department of Environmental Protection, Department of Community Affairs, Enterprise Florida, etc., should be encouraged at high levels in each agency and transportation issues should get high priority attention and be addressed efficiently without bogging down. All of these agencies need to be engaged in this committee process to update the SIS as well and be at the table.
- Could we get clarification on what planning processes FDOT relies on to plan for the SIS, such as Enterprise Florida, the water management districts, etc.? *This can be a topic for a future meeting.*
- Suggestion made to add Federal Highway Administration as a member of the committee. *We will contact them and invite them to join us.*
- What about a panel of the Districts so members can have their perspectives on needs, etc., even one or two districts would be good. *Travel and time constraints will figure in here and we will work on this. In the meantime, input from the District 5 and 3 committee members will be informative.*
- How are projects (e.g., identifying new corridors) from regional transportation authorities and other planning authorities selected and what is their relationship with the SIS? *This will be clarified in a future meeting.*

Category II – Designation of SIS Facilities. This category contains eight potential issues. The

average ratings for all eight issues ranged from 3.6 to 4.2. In addition to the comments made on the worksheet, the following comments were offered:

- On issue D, relating to the role of the SIS, the key question should be: How can we make the SIS more strategic?
- On issue F, relating to clarifying the relationship between the SIS and the Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS), if we look at merging/combining the SIS and FIHS we need to consider currently there are engineering criteria and standards associated with the FIHS and the SIS currently does not have engineering standards.

Category III - SIS Planning and Prioritization Processes. This category contains seven potential issues. The average ratings for all eight issues ranged from 3.8 to 4.6. In addition to the comments made on the worksheet, the following comments were offered:

- On issue L, relating to reevaluating SIS eligibility criteria for non-highway modes, the point was made to include transit as well.
- The system must be flexible in order to go after federal funds.

Category IV - SIS and Florida's Economic Competitiveness and Growth Management. This category contains four potential issues. The average ratings for all four issues ranges from 3.6 to 4.1. In addition to the comments made on the worksheet, the following comments were offered:

- Had concerns re: understanding these issues and think more clarification is needed.

Category V - SIS and Florida's Communities and Environment. This category contains four issues. The average rating for all four issues ranged from 3.0 to 4.2. In addition to the comments made on the worksheet, the following comments were offered:

- Could we get more information on the community and environment (C and E) screening criteria and on Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM)? All members should be up to speed on these processes for future discussion. Additionally, ETDM was not at the start of the process - and therefore should move it up.
- ETDM is not statutorily required of everyone. For instance, the U.S. 98 Corridor Authority did not use it. ETDM is not optimally used.
- Issue V related to the community and environment screening process is not well understood. What is this tool?

Category VI - SIS Funding. This category contains one issue. The average rating for the one issue was 4.3. In addition to the comments made on the worksheet, the following comments were offered:

- Concern about how fast technology changes. Every five years might not be often enough to revisit the Plan. Perhaps we should update more often in order not to miss any opportunities; how can we keep up to speed?
- In 2007 the Florida Transportation Commission held a meeting of the modes and one proposal coming from the meeting was the creation of an Intermodal Commission - we can discuss the idea.

Mr. Montalvo asked for reactions to the potential issues list overall, whether there is a general comfort level with it, and suggested members continue to ponder these for the next meeting.

Public Comment

Susan O'Rourke, Traffic Engineer from Stuart, Florida, offered brief comments. She focused on SIS Level of Service (LOS) standards and stated the current LOS policy has underlying problems. She expressed the need to further explore what "congestion" means in the context of SIS facilities. She further emphasized that level of service policy is critical to the implementation of the SIS. LOS policy prohibits the achievement of critical goals outlined by the Leadership Committee and causes actions in direct conflict to other key goals.

Review Next Steps and Assignments

The chair reported, based on the fewest conflicts on the calendars members turned in, the next meeting will be held on February 23rd. The meeting will be a full one-day meeting and will be held at a central Florida location. Materials will be sent out early.

Members wishing to volunteer for one of the panel discussions are advised to send an email to Brian Watts.

Meeting Evaluation Survey

Hal Beardall reminded members to turn in their meeting evaluation sheet before leaving.

Adjournment

The chair adjourned the meeting shortly after 11:30 a.m.