

WORKSHEET PACKET

February 23, 2009

Worksheet #1 - Draft Process Goal Statement

This worksheet contains a revised version of the process goal, assumption and principles redrafted to reflect the Leadership Committee discussion and suggestions at Meeting 1. The suggested revisions are noted in a ~~striketrough~~/underline format. Please respond with the rating that best reflects your view of its acceptability as a goal for the process, using the following scale.

- 3 = "I can support this as is" (from "Wholehearted agreement" to "I can live with this")
- 2 = "I can support this, but would like to see the following changes..."
- 1 = "I can not support this unless serious concerns are addressed as follows"

Note any additional suggestions you may have to build consensus. Please bring the completed worksheet with you on Monday, February 23. We will review the rankings, discuss member suggestions and revise the process goal statement as needed during a plenary discussion.

Please note that the process goal, assumptions and principles are intended as working documents to guide the Committee in developing its recommendations. They will not form part of the final recommendations or report of the Committee.

Revised Process Goal Statement

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~~ for updating the SIS Strategic Plan and enhancing its implementation.

Initial member comments or concerns, 1/26/09:

- 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.*

Comments or suggestions:

Worksheet #2 - Draft Process Assumptions and Principles

INSTRUCTIONS: This worksheet contains revised versions of the process assumptions and principles redrafted to reflect the Leadership Committee discussion and suggestions at Meeting 1. Please respond to each with the rating that best reflects your view of its acceptability as an assumption or principle for the process, using the following scale.

- 3 = "I can support this as is" (from "Wholehearted agreement" to "I can live with this")
- 2 = "I can support this, but would like to see the following changes..."
- 1 = "I can not support this unless serious concerns are addressed as follows"

While we will review and refine each item one at a time, you may want to read and consider all of them as a whole before rating them.

Note any additional suggestions you may have to build consensus. Please bring the completed worksheet with you on Monday, February 23. We will review the rankings, discuss member suggestions and revise the assumptions and principles as appropriate during a plenary discussion.

Please note that the process goal, assumptions and principle are intended as working documents to guide the Committee in developing its recommendations. They will not form part of the final recommendations or report of the Committee.

Revised Process Assumptions and Guiding Principles

Assumption A: The role of the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee ~~will be~~ is to develop and present consensus recommendations to the Secretary of FDOT ~~to inform the update of~~ for updating the SIS Strategic Plan and enhancing its implementation.

Acceptability Rating of Revised Draft: 3 2 1

Additional Comments or suggestions:

Initial Acceptability Rating, 1/26/09: 3 = 19 members; 2 = 7 members; 1 = 1 members

Initial member comments or concerns, 1/26/09:

- 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 as 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 (1-4), Florida Statutes, and other relevant information.

Acceptability Rating of Revised Draft: 3 2 1

Additional Comments or suggestions:

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

Initial member comments or concerns, 1/26/09:

- 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. {Please see Assumption D}*
- 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. *{Please see*

Assumptions D and E}

Assumption C: The 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee will review and build upon, but not limited to, previous statewide long-range transportation planning efforts, including the original SIS Strategic Plan, the 2025 Florida Transportation Plan, FDOT’s statewide modal plans for aviation, highways, rail, seaports and transit, statewide planning efforts for space transportation, and other partner long-range plans.

Acceptability Rating of Revised Draft: 3 2 1

Additional Comments or suggestions:

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

Initial member comments or concerns, 1/26/09:

- 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. *{Please see Assumptions D and E}*
- 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 80 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 (including impacts on economic development, growth management, community livability, environmental stewardship, and energy and climate

change), and issues related to implementation of statewide and regional visions.

Acceptability Rating of Revised Draft: 3 2 1

Additional Comments or suggestions:

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

Initial member comments or concerns, 1/26/09:

- 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~~ make recommendations about issues pertaining to but outside the scope of the SIS Strategic Plan Update. Examples may include issues pertaining to FDOT modal plans, the Florida Transportation Plan, funding for transportation programs or planning processes of other agencies or authorities. In these cases, the Committee will refer the issues or ~~conclusions~~ recommendations to the appropriate process or entity.

Acceptability Rating of Revised Draft: 3 2 1

Additional Comments or suggestions:

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

Initial member comments or concerns, 1/26/09:

- 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.

Acceptability Rating of Revised Draft: 3 2 1

Additional Comments or suggestions:

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

Initial member comments or concerns, 1/26/09:

- 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.

Acceptability Rating of Revised Draft: 3 2 1

Additional Comments or suggestions:

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

Initial member comments or concerns, 1/26/09:

- 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.

Acceptability Rating of Revised Draft: **3** **2** **1**

Additional Comments or suggestions:

Initial Acceptability Rating; 3 = 19 members; 2 = 3 members; 1 = 0 members

Initial member comments or concerns, 1/26/09:

- 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.*