

**2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee**

**Draft Summary of Meeting #2**

**District 5 Urban Office, Orlando, Florida**

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	2/23/09	<b>Meeting Time:</b>	8:00 am-5:30 pm	<b>Type of Meeting:</b>	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),  
 Javier Rodriguez (Miami-Dade Expressway Authority),  
 Tom Hindle (Florida Trucking Association),  
 Richard Kaplan (MPOAC),  
 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),  
 Sally Mann (Florida Department of Environmental Protection),  
 Laurie Macdonald (Defenders of Wildlife),  
 Janet Bowman (The Nature Conservancy),  
 Victoria Tschinkel (1000 Friends of Florida),  
 Charles Gauthier (alternate for Secretary Tom Pelham, Florida Department of Community Affairs),  
 Bart Pullum (Florida Transportation Commission),  
 Bill Cross (alternate for 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), Lisa Stone (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Terry Kraft (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Keith Brown (FDOT Systems Planning Office), Dusty Powell (FDOT Systems Planning Office), John Kaliski (Cambridge Systematics), Jane Mathis (Mathis & Associates), Sarah Adams (Cambridge Systematics)

Alternates and Observers: Jessica Grafton (HDR), John Zielinski (FDOT District 5), Mansour Khuwaja (HDR), Mark Nordling (Florida Railroad Association), Matt Ubben (Florida Trucking Association), Phillip Worth (Kittelson & Associates), Debra Lemke (Lee County Port Authority), Sally Patrenos (Florida Transportation Commission), Susan O’Rourke, P.E., Inc., Merle Bishop (Florida Chapter, American Planning Association), Cari Roth (BMO), Mickie Valente (Florida Council of 100), Teresa Jacobs (IOG at UCF), Martin Guttenplan (Renaissance Planning Group), Gary Huttman

**Topic:** 2010 Update of the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Strategic Plan

**Agenda and Table of Contents:**

Opening Remarks.....page 3 Debbie Hunt

Agenda Review.....page 3 Hal Beardall

Finalize SIS Leadership Committee process goal, Members  
principles and assumptions.....page 3

SIS Background Presentations:  
Designation Criteria.....page 6 John Kaliski

Transportation Planning, Programming,  
Funding in Florida.....page 8 Richard Glaze

Panel Discussion: Modal Perspective on SIS  
Implementation.....page 9 Panelists

Panel Discussion: Government Perspective on SIS  
Implementation.....page 12 Panelists

Presentation: Roadmap to Florida’s Future: Florida’s  
Strategic Plan for Economic Development.....page 16 Sena Black

Information on Items Requested  
by Leadership Committee.....page 17 Kathy Neill

Discussion: Preliminary Identification of  
Possible Policy Recommendations.....page 18 Members

Public Comment.....page 23 Public

Potential SIS Goals and Objectives Structure.....page 23 Kathy Neill

Review Next Steps and Assignments.....page 23 Debbie Hunt

Meeting Evaluation Survey.....page 24 Hal Beardall

Adjourn.....page 24 Debbie Hunt

## **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 asked members and others present to introduce themselves. She reminded members the first SIS Steering Committee had the task of creating the SIS policy framework and designation criteria and the task of this Leadership Committee is to review SIS implementation and recommend how to go forward. Ms. Hunt added today is a good time to think hard about the meaning of "Strategic" as applied to the SIS. Lean times create interesting discussion. Today's meeting will build on work done during the first meeting by further refining the draft principles and assumptions and then beginning development of preliminary policy recommendations. Ms. Hunt stressed this is an iterative process requiring continuity of membership. We understand some members may not be able to attend all meetings – just be sure your designee in attendance is well informed on the committee's work.

Ms. Hunt noted the videoconference from Tallahassee is limited to staff support because she believes members need to be present and involved for the process to be effective.

### **Agenda Review - Hal Beardall**

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](http://www.sisupdate.org)

Mr. Beardall drew attention to the draft Meeting One Summary in the notebook. The chair asked if members had reviewed the summary and if they had any suggested additions or edits. Hearing none, the chair asked for and received a motion and second to adopt the meeting summary as presented. The meeting summary was adopted unanimously.

### **Finalize SIS Leadership Committee process goal, principles and assumptions -- Members**

The chair noted these drafts have been revised in response to comments made at the first meeting. The revised drafts can be found under Tab 3 at the following link:

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting-022309/notebook.shtm>.

The chair then addressed the question of the Statewide Intermodal Transportation Advisory Council (SITAC) raised at the first meeting: Does the Leadership Committee replace the SITAC? Ms. Hunt replied the SITAC is not included by statute among those groups required to participate in updating the SIS Strategic Plan. This committee also does not perform the role of the SITAC, which was established to advise FDOT and the Legislature on intermodal transportation policy and funding. By statute, members of the SITAC were appointed for 2-year terms.

Question: Does the SITAC still exist? *Response: The authority for the SITAC exists until it is repealed by the Legislature. The terms of the members have expired and no new members have been appointed.*

Question: There is legislation repealing the SITAC and creating an advisory council for freight only. Can this be a discussion topic for a future meeting? *Response: Yes, we will add it as a discussion item*

*based on the outcome of the 2009 session.*

### **Revised Process Goal Statement**

Hal Beardall asked members to review the revised process goal statement and asked for comments.

Comment: We are not simply updating the Strategic SIS Plan but also improving it. Suggest we add the word "improve" so it reads: recommendations to update and improve the SIS Strategic Plan. Also, substitute "develop" for "create" so it reads: process to develop consensus recommendations. The word "strategic" is used four times; can we eliminate some of these?

### **Revised Assumption A: Acceptability Rating: 3 - 16 members; 2 - 4 members; 1 - 0 members**

Hal asked for comments from those who gave a rating of 2 to the revised assumption.

Comment: Suggest making the same revisions to this assumption as were suggested for the goal statement.

### **Revised Assumption B: Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 - 18 members; 2 - 2 members; 1 - 1 member**

Hal asked for comments from those who gave a rating of 2 or 1 to the revised assumption.

Comment: Recommend we explicitly identify the information and sources we rely on during this process of developing our recommendations. This will make our final report stronger.

Facilitator Comment: Suggest adding a new assumption, stating the Committee will explicitly identify the information and processes it relied on.

Comment: These are process assumptions and as such they just guide us. How do we handle use of our own expertise? Facilitator response: We can simply say we relied on the expertise of our members.

Comment: This assumption expands beyond the statutory requirements to consideration of "other relevant information."

Comment: We may have a great idea not consistent with current law. These new ideas should be given serious consideration.

### **Revised Assumption C: Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 - 15 members; 2 - 4 members; 1 - 1 member**

Hal asked for comments from those who gave a rating of 2 or 1 to the revised assumption.

Comment: This diverse group represents many interests and they can bring in information from these various plans. This assumption is redundant and unnecessary if we adopt new assumption on identifying the information we relied on.

Comment: Suggest deleting the words "review and" so we will just "build on" other plans.

Comment: Suggest changing "will" to "may."

Comment: Substitute "such as" for "but not limited to."

Comment: If we keep this assumption, I suggest we add “waterways” to the list of modal plans.

Comment: Instead of listing all plans, why not be more general and say “statewide, regional, and local,”

Comment: The reference to “other partner long-range plans” includes the others not listed.

The chair asked staff to re-draft Assumption C incorporating the comments and combining it with the new Assumption discussed as part of item B or with Assumption D, if feasible.

**Revised Assumption D: Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 - 16 members; 2 - 3 members; 1 - 1 member**

Hal asked for comments from those who gave a rating of 2 or 1 to the revised assumption.

Comment: Combining this assumption with C would resolve concern.

Comment: Resist listing items; try to consolidate them.

Comment: Changing “may” to “shall” would strengthen it.

Comment: Prefer “may” since we may not get to everything listed.

**Revised Assumption E: Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 - 18 members; 2 - 4 members; 1 - 0 members**

Hal asked for comments from those who gave a rating of 2 or 1 to the revised assumption.

Comment: Questions the meaning of “referring the issues to the appropriate process or entity.” Don’t we report to the FDOT Secretary?

Comment: The wording means if an issue is outside the scope of the SIS, then we would refer it to the appropriate entity.

Comment: The Florida Transportation Commission (FTC) will review and approve the draft SIS Strategic Plan and may make recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Comment: We need to clarify the roles of the FTC and FDOT.

Comment: The SIS is in the statutes and is really legislative. It depends on whom the Committee’s report is prepared for. If the report is for FDOT then the language is fine. If the report is for the public then it should go to the Legislature as well. Keep the language open.

Question: Where did the original draft assumption come from? *Response: The facilitator drafted it with FDOT. It was intended to address what would be referred, not who it would be referred to.*

**Revised Principle A: Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 - 17 members; 2 - 4 members; 1 - 0 members**

Hal asked for comments from those who gave a rating of 2 or 1 to the revised principle.

No comments were offered.

**Principle B: Initial Acceptability Rating: 3 - 23 members; 2 - 9 members; 1 - 0 members**

No comments were offered.

**Principle C: Initial Acceptability Rating; 3 - 20 members; 2 - 0 members; 1 - 1 member**

In response to a question, the chair clarified the Leadership Committee's recommendations go to the FDOT Secretary.

Comment: If by consensus vote we want our report sent to the Legislature, do these principles allow it?

Comment: This assumption has us reporting to the FDOT Secretary. Some members would stick by the charge while others would push the envelope as far as they can. For example, on the 2025 FTP, funding was not on the table initially, but we did consider it. We need to reserve the ability to refer our report beyond what it says here.

Comment: The FTC may be the entity to carry recommendations to the Legislature.

Comment: This will be a public document. As a group or as individuals can we give it out?

Comment: We report to the Secretary and beyond this report, communication with others will be up to us as a group. It will be on the Web and available to anyone.

Comment: I will talk to legislators about it. One document gives a consistent message rather than multiple opinions.

**SIS Background Presentation: Designation Criteria - John Kaliski**

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

- Regarding the role of SIS/Emerging SIS and keeping the SIS strategic: *If we reduce the size of the SIS, is there more funding available for what remains, or are funding levels reduced? With the exception of declining revenues overall, we don't expect funding for the SIS as a share of transportation funding to decline; however, SIS needs exceed available funding today.*
- Is there a conflict between keeping the SIS strategic and the issue of merging SIS and Emerging SIS? *Are we adding more to the SIS by merging the Emerging SIS? SIS and Emerging SIS are both included in the SIS Plan today and generally are treated the same. It would be simpler to just have the SIS. The question is, is there another purpose for keeping the Emerging SIS?*
- Decisions as to what is strategic and on the SIS should be made regardless of funding considerations. *Question: if SIS and Emerging SIS are treated the same, isn't this a departure from the original intent? They were not intended to be on equal footing, were they? They were designated for different purposes and the intent was to encourage more proactive planning for the Emerging SIS. Emerging SIS facilities are fully eligible for SIS funding, and for the most part they have been treated in the same manner as SIS facilities.*
- Regarding hub-to-hub connectors, *don't they exist through corridors connecting them? How is a hub-to-hub connector different from what we have? SIS connectors connect hubs to corridors. With hub-to-hub connectors, we are talking about a short connection not on the SIS between two hubs, which is important to the chain of international trips and not covered by the current criteria. Some of*

*these potential hub-to-hub connectors are located on private property and not state or public property. Some of these are drayage routes such as between Port Everglades and the FEC intermodal rail terminal, where local roads connect the seaport to rail terminal. Others might be transit, for example, the proposed Broward airport to seaport connector for passenger travel. The original emphasis of SIS was on connecting hubs to corridors. Now we are considering hub-to-hub connections.*

- *Regarding military impacts, there are no screening criteria for the SIS to consider impacts on military installations. An example is the impact of the new Panama City-Bay County Airport on Eglin Air Force Base. This is something we should discuss. Local communities must include the military commanders in the review process and consider their input but are not required to be consistent with their input. Your point is well taken and will be addressed as part of the military issues group being formed to respond to the legislative requirement to address military connectivity issues as part of the SIS update.*
- *The SIS is not working optimally to move goods through congested areas. Alternatives include transit between cities and other alternatives like high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. We need to consider these alternatives for moving people. Your comment is noted for future discussion.*
- *Regarding the Emerging SIS in rural areas where growth is occurring and will continue, we are working with these areas to develop industrial projects and identify hubs where growth is emerging. FDOT can have these locations on its radar and can proactively invest in these areas to address emerging growth. This is thinking in a forward-looking way vs. fixing problems of past growth. We need to keep the Emerging SIS. Also, the list of key industries used for designation purposes should be revised – what is currently called “Distribution” should be referred to as “Logistics.” Your comment is noted for future discussion.*
- *For planned SIS facilities, what does “financial feasibility” mean? It means the project is included in appropriate plans indicating funds will be available to implement the project. This applies to new facilities proposed for development as part of the SIS.*
- *What about SIS facilities not meeting level of service? In Putnam County there are SIS facilities not meeting LOS standards. What can the county do? We need to dig into these issues relating to LOS and growth management more deeply and will in future drafting group discussions. Many SIS facilities do not meet level of service today, and this is a concern for many local governments. However, we need to recognize the importance of preserving the function of the SIS, which in part is achieved through LOS standards.*
- *The inland port idea is a desirable alternative. Also with farm to market roads, inland ports can reshape where freight and distribution activity takes place and relieve some of the congestion in urban areas. We also should explore where it is possible to reverse the flow of traffic at peak hours to make the system we have last a little longer. One other benefit of the inland port concept is how better inland distribution could help make Florida able to continue to produce our own food. That’s a good suggestion to discuss further.*
- *An overarching goal is to be strategic in our investments. The focus has been on interregional and international. The first time around, intraregional movements were excluded. Things have changed so it worth taking another look at this policy to help deal with congestion and to help move people and goods within regions. We can’t continue to build more roads.*
- *Emerging SIS needs to be retained because these are areas of great economic development opportunity. Facilities are either strategic or not and funding should be a separate issue. We*

can't build our way out with just roads; we need to look at transit and other alternatives.

- Agree with previous comment. The existing funding structure may not be appropriate anymore; we may need to re-look at the structure. The current policies put 75 percent of state discretionary funding for new capacity to the SIS, but this shouldn't drive what is on the SIS. We need to put funding aside and consider what is strategic. We need to think about strategic priorities first, then funding.
- At our first meeting it was said Emerging SIS and SIS are treated the same. In the early history of SIS, the meaning of Emerging SIS was related to the future and was done so rural counties were not just left out. We need to look at the relationship with funding and there needs to be flexibility to address issues coming up. Emerging SIS is of value and needed for the future.

**SIS Background Presentation: Transportation Planning, Programming, Funding in Florida - Dick Glaze (by videoconference)**

Mr. Glaze introduced his presentation stating the department has over 230 fund codes and its work program instructions are over 1,000 pages long. He stated much more information on this complex issue is available at the Resources page of the SIS Update web site.

Mr. Glaze then addressed information requests at the last meeting as follows:

- More information on public and private partnerships can be found at the web address under Tab 4 in your notebook. There you will find a status report on all of the projects employing public/private partnerships.
- Information on the department's new tentative work program will be provided at a later date, once the new work program is released.
- Regarding the request for a list of all projects funded on the SIS, one option was to supply a three-inch computer printout. This option was rejected and we are looking at a more "friendly" way to present this information.
- Regarding projects relieving the SIS by shifting local traffic to other facilities, one option we are considering is to have the district secretaries review these as they come to speak with you.

Dick Glaze's full presentation can be found at [www.sisupdate.org](http://www.sisupdate.org). Following Mr. Glaze's presentation, the Chair asked for questions/comments from the members. (Responses in *italics*)

- Slide 9, state revenue sources, does it include municipalities' matching funds? *It includes only those funds flowing through the department's work program, including federal highway funds and a small amount of transit funds. Matching funds provided by local governments and private sector partnersto the department to implement a project would be included.*
- Slide 20, can you tell us how much is generated by public/private partnerships or local or military funds? *It includes funds flowing through the department's work program. If an airport partners with FDOT and FDOT implements the project, then the airport will have provided funds to FDOT and the airport matching dollars are included in the work program funding amounts. But if the airport implements the project, then the airport matching dollars are not in the numbers shown to you. We are going to manually calculate these matching amounts, because it is done differently around the*

*state.*

- Noted documentary stamp revenues are not in the Governor's budget for SCOP. Is that source gone? *The estimates for documentary stamps (tied to real estate transactions) are much lower in the last two Revenue Estimating Conferences and estimates are expected to be lower again in March's conference. The reduction in SCOP funding is based on the cumulative effect of revenue estimates and is not a reflection of the Governor's budget priorities.*
- Regarding slide 16, unfunded needs, is the MPOAC estimate of unfunded needs included in that number? *There is some overlap there. The MPOAC estimate includes SIS and non-SIS unfunded needs and is in a different base year. During the next round of MPO plan updates, we hope be able to breakout SIS facilities from MPOAC estimates.*
- How much money is collected from developments of regional impact? How much from proportionate fair share collections? *Getting those figures would be labor intensive. They are not captured that specifically. They are rolled up in other numbers and are not identified as such. We are collecting available examples from the districts.*

### **Panel Discussion: Modal Perspective on SIS Implementation - Panelists**

Hal Beardall asked each panelist to address two questions:

- What are the two or three key challenges facing your mode of transportation over the next 20 years?
- What suggestions do you have for enhancing the SIS program to address those challenges?

Hal asked members to make note of potential policy directions generated by the panelists during their discussion.

### **Mark Bontrager, Space Florida, representing the Spaceport**

#### **Key Challenges**

- Keeping ahead of the competition posed by states like Virginia. Florida's role in providing access to orbit is under pressure.
- For the standard rocket business, road limitations cause circuitous routes to get to Cape Canaveral.
- Reusable launch vehicles are the latest technology and will be launched from multiple locations around the country to support space tourism and, in the future, rapid package delivery. Cecil Field is a potential Florida site.
- Add rapid package delivery, with reusable launch vehicles. This is possible 20 years down the road

#### **Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- Improved Interstate and local road connections to the spaceport

- Explore opportunities for rocket boosters to arrive by sea.
- Flexibility to address needs of an expanded commercial space program including potential designation of commercial spaceports as SIS hubs
- Think of spaceports as hubs, like airports – with connections to multiple modes

**Bob Ball, Florida Airports Council, representing airports**

**Key Challenges**

- Funding: Most airports are user-fee based (receive limited tax dollars) and have to deal with the ups and downs of the airline industry (bankruptcies, mergers, etc.).
- Capital programs rely heavily on federal fuel taxes and federal grants based on eligibility
- Reductions in budgets negatively impact service to small cities and towns most, along with general aviation airports. All funding pies are shrinking as needs grow

**Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- As needs pie grows and funding sources are shrinking, we need to be more strategic. Set priorities based on availability of matching funding from private sector and local governments
- Clarify SIS airport designation criteria relating to 50-mile rule; determine if rule is being interpreted consistently
- Emerging SIS should be retained and better defined; be more strategic about how to get these airports ready for SIS designation

**Toy Keller, Florida Ports Council, representing seaports**

**Key Challenges**

- Developing a clear recognition of the value of seaports to Florida’s economy. International trade is Florida’s leading economic sector at \$130 Billion in 2008
- Creating an integrated transportation system designed to effectively service Florida’s market and beyond. Recognize the seaports can only control one piece of the international trade system; they must work with the state, local governments, railroads, and other owners and operators to manage trade flows.
- Increasing Florida’s market share in international trade through efficient transportation systems.

**Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- The state should develop consensus-based statewide policy guidance for seaport investments based on the economic importance of seaports, ensuring their competitiveness in the global economy

- Analyze trade flows, document markets served and define future demands and associated transportation infrastructure requirements to serve Florida's growing population and economy
- Refine SIS investment strategies to be more heavily influenced by changing trade patterns and global market conditions.
- Amend the SIS project funding eligibility criteria to provide funding for projects allowing seaports to remain competitive in global trade.

**David Roach, Florida Inland Navigation District, representing waterways**

**Key Challenges**

- Channel maintenance - keeping the waterways at passable depth
- Funding - there are no SIS funds currently invested in waterways
- Facility conversion whereby landside dockage is converted into residential or commercial development. These conversions pose a problem to movement of cargo
- Bridge crossings are obstructions to waterways

**Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- Invest in waterways. Inland waterways and shipping were the first way to move goods
- Plan for waterways as an alternative for the future. Just as railroads have had a renaissance, so will waterways
- Consider waterways to relieve congestion on the SIS. Freight can be moved by barge rather than by truck down I-95
- Don't limit capacity on waterways through obstructions or incompatible land uses.
- Coordinate with marine highways program and with MARAD to look at inland waterway movement. Address national policies constraining waterborne commerce, such as the Jones Act

**Ben Biscan, Florida Railroad Association, representing freight rail**

**Key Challenges**

- Government Re-regulation: Federal preemption, taxes, constrained hours of operation, south Florida mining restrictions, routing restriction with certain loads
- Energy: Some 44% of railroad tonnage and 21% of revenue comes from coal. We need to always consider coal - it comes from U.S. sources, it is controlled environmentally and it provides many jobs. A rapid shift away from coal would undermine the financial stability of railroads.
- Panama Canal Widening: the implications are major impacts on trainloads and truck traffic. The SIS needs to consider the potential impacts to highway and rail infrastructure. We need to plan for this change in freight flows.

### **Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- SIS needs to remain open to public/private partnerships and to private funds
- FDOT does a good job managing the SIS. Consider consolidation of SIS modes and various government functions as its own entity within FDOT

### **Bill Cross, Florida Public Transportation Association, representing regional transit systems**

#### **Key Challenges**

- Need to partner with others for funding transit
- While Florida is a donor state for highways it is much worse for transit. We need to compete nationally for federal transit funding.
- There are good reasons to put dollars into public transportation, need to get multiplier effect out of state dollars, as a state we are not able to effectively compete.

### **Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- Would like some state leadership on transit funding
- Public transportation needs to be part of the statewide transportation system going forward. We shouldn't look to the past to understand the future. The SIS Plan update should consider how transit fits.
- Also, need good land use along with transportation. We hear strong support for changing land uses but the question about SIS concurrency issues continues to come up

Hal Beardall asked if there are comments or questions for the panelists. (Responses in *italics*)

- What about inland ports. How do they fit with SIS? *The interest in inland ports points to the need to understand the changing global trade patterns, and to identify areas where a new logistics and distribution system is warranted. There's probably no one perfect spot for an inland port and the best option may be a system of inland ports. Locating the best site should be based on study and analysis of trade flows and the transportation system. There needs to be more study on trade flows*
- Regarding a coordinating public/private partnership for the transportation modes, is there nothing like this now? *There is no single entity today. One major problem is the private sector is hesitant to share information with a public entity for competitive reasons (the competition will know information normally kept secret). However, coordination needs to be enhanced and individual public/private coordination issues should be addressed. The state can look at what is best for the state as a whole and then private entities will follow. Sometimes the private sector takes the lead as well. The SIS process has been helpful in making progress with public/private partnerships.*

### **Panel Discussion: Government Perspective on SIS Implementation – Panelists**

Rafael Montalvo asked each panelist to address two questions:

- What are the two or three key challenges facing your level of government in transportation over the next 20 years?
- What suggestions do you have for enhancing the SIS program to address those challenges?

Rafael asked members to make note of potential policy directions generated by the panelists during

their discussion.

**Mayor Richard Kaplan, Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council, representing urbanized areas**

**Key Challenges:**

- The number one problem is funding for both capital and operating costs. And it is getting worse quickly as fuel tax revenues decline. Not sure MPOs can develop meaningful cost feasible plans.
- There is a lack of coordination between modes and government at all levels.
- We don't have operational organizations at the regional level to plan regional transportation
- We need more connectivity between modes – there are separate federal legislative bills for each mode and this is a disincentive to modal interconnectivity

**Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- Develop alternative funding sources
- Enhance connectivity between the modes; develop criteria for hub-to-hub connectors
- Form regional organizations to plan and operate transportation regionally
- Blend funding sources across the modes

**Gordon Goodin, Florida Association of Counties, representing counties**

**Key Challenges**

- One size fits all doesn't work for Florida. There are regional, cultural and geographic differences. We need to celebrate our diversity.
- Competition from other states. Manufacturing activity is growing in Georgia and Alabama. How can we position Florida businesses to be part of the supply chain?
- Military issues must be addressed. Army Special Ops forces are now at Eglin/Hurlburt AFB and in an emergency, these personnel have 30 minutes to report for duty.
- We need to consider agriculture and its importance in terms of Florida being in a position to supply its own food needs.

**Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- Expand focus of the SIS to include destinations of regional and national significance (military, tourist, evacuation, etc.)
- Need to be aware of regional significant projects, especially those in other states
- Connectivity to military bases must be included in the SIS

**Kathy Till, Florida League of Cities, representing cities**

## **Key Challenges**

- There is not money for local roads. More money to the SIS equals less to urban arterials. There are 412 cities and many are growing rapidly.
- Legislation placing a 3-year moratorium on collection of impact fees exacerbates the funding situation.
- Right now there is lots of local traffic on SIS roads. If the idea is to get local traffic off the SIS and onto local roads creating more capacity on the SIS for freight and through traffic, then the local traffic would need to move onto local roads. If there is no funding to add capacity to local roads, then the local traffic will stay on the SIS and increase and we will see deterioration in level of service on SIS facilities.

## **Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- We should re-think the SIS investment policy and avoid a cap on impact fees. We need to increase funding for local roads.
- Consider a new approach to concurrency.
- The SIS should include regional connectors through cities, not just outside urban areas
- Commuter rail is high priority in central Florida and needs to be a part of the SIS and be funded by the SIS.

## **Chuck Cohen, Florida Public Transportation Association, representing urban transit**

### **Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- Transit needs stable and reliable sources of funding. Nationally public transportation is providing the highest number of rides in years, at the same time our funding sources are drying up and we can't afford to run our buses and trains
- All counties in Florida experienced impacts in transit service with increased ridership but decreasing funding
- We need funding for operations. We can buy buses but then can't afford to run them; we can build a garage but cannot operate it or staff it.

### **Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- We know transit can do more to help the SIS: transit can relieve the capacity issues on some of the SIS facilities. Presently, transit is undervalued and underutilized. Transit can take care of congestion within 3-5 years rather than 20 years to build a road. SIS funds could build Park and Ride lots, HOV lanes, and signal timing to support transit system.

## **Chris Doolin, Small County Coalition, representing small counties**

### **Key Challenges**

- This process cuts across modes, geography and interests and represents a paradigm change. It is fairly new and is beginning to work. It calls for collaboration and we all have to acknowledge all of it is essential and how do we make it all work together.
- Small counties have benefited a great deal from the state and they need its help; they also need

intergovernmental coordination, time and funds.

- Limited tax bases (one penny of fuel tax in Dade Co. equals \$11.4 million whereas one penny in Lafayette Co. equals \$13,000), force small counties to deal with only today's issues and not look to tomorrow.
- Didn't he make a comment about providing for nonexistent and deteriorating infrastructure?

### **Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- The SIS needs to have flexibility along with strategic? Guidance. For example, greater ability to share funds across modes. – if there is an opportunity for economic development or connectivity/access to markets, we need to take it.
- Focus on emerging areas where there is development potential, not just growth for the sake of growth
- We should consider rural hubs like inland ports or seaports (e.g., the Port of Port St. Joe) in rural areas, including catalyst sites

### **Pat Steed, Florida Regional Councils Association, representing regions**

#### **Key Challenges**

- All the issues reported so far are all good and necessary
- Regional visions emphasize a 50-year planning horizon. Regional visions have looked at economic development, land use and transportation
- Little consideration given to land use and environment back 50 years ago and we see now what has happened
- Intermodal options are important: everyone wants one, whether rural or urban, but there are few funds to do this
- Urban congested roads are getting worse and with no funding to improve them, traffic will congest the SIS – we need to build alternatives.
- Regional connectivity is key. We see problems with LOS and this is a challenge for effective planning
- State Highway System was left behind when we shifted to the SIS.

### **Suggestions for Enhancing the SIS**

- We need to plan far enough in the future to make a difference. Regional visions are key.
- We need to plan transportation and land use together
- We need to build alternatives to address urban congested roads
- Affordability is key. We need ports, rail, transit, moving people and goods, and the state cannot afford to have LOS B on any roadway

Rafael Montalvo asked if there are comments or questions for the panelists. (Responses in *italics*)

- We need to lay out "the black swan option" – what if Florida faces a major economic, political, and geographical shift. We need to recognize Florida will go toward more compact

urbanization. Energy will be short and land use and transportation patterns will change. This may be reality 10 years from now.

- There's no question we need to prepare for the future including this issue with major urban areas. The issues faced in the next 50 years will be things we are not even talking about now. Did we talk about laptop computers in 1995? It's just the same now: how do we respond to issues in transportation many years down the road?
- This calls for being robust in what we select to fund because funding is so limited. We need to fund projects responding to the broadest array of possible futures.
- We are so lean now. We are not meeting the needs of our populace right now and we are losing economic opportunity as a result.
- We need a new funding structure; we need to get beyond the fuel tax. What about a tax based on vehicle miles traveled? What about mobility fees? We need to think outside the box for transportation funding.
- Florida is not competitive with the rest of southeast U.S. and this comes back to economic development, choosing what we want as opposed to what we get.
- Everyone needs more funding, but we are hardly getting the top priority projects on the lists, so we're not getting there now. We need to educate the public so they can help make the decision of how we are going to pay for it in the future. We cannot do it without them neither can the legislature
- Pain is an incredible motivator, so sometimes this is what it takes; pain is where we are headed so this may be what it takes to take Florida in a different direction.

**Presentation: Roadmap to Florida's Future: Florida's Strategic Plan for Economic Development - Sena Black, Enterprise Florida, Inc.**

Sena Black's presentation can be found at [www.sisupdate.org](http://www.sisupdate.org). Following Ms. Black's presentation, the Chair asked for questions/comments from the members. (Responses in *italics*)

- Did not hear you mention agriculture and how this major industry is factored in. We don't often talk about agriculture and how much it does for Florida. With a strong agricultural base we can take care of ourselves. *Agriculture is a very important area; it was not mentioned because the presentation was kept at a high level. We are now working to bring in bio-agriculture including production of clean energy sources from agricultural waste products.*
- Also, how does the plan address our military, with a range of facilities in the Gulf from Northwest Florida to Key West? *The Base Realignment and Closure process (BRAC) was a very important component of the strategic plan to retain the defense industry in Florida. Preparing for the next BRAC is also very important. Florida was successful in the last round because we prepared. The military offers new technology and this is important and part of the plan.*
- International trade is the largest economic sector in Florida. What sectors are you looking at in the plan? These are good recommendations in the plan. What are the outcomes? *The international trade community is involved and is a big part of the plan. They will be well represented in terms of panel discussions with a special focus. During the planning process we reach out to the whole constituency. We monitor implementation by going back out into the field to listening posts and asking how the plan is working and then we document changes. You can track this in the 2009 progress report of what has happened. We think it has made a difference. For example, the 12 Workforce Florida Banner*

Centers grew out of the prior Strategic Plan and have won awards. Also, the Rural Catalyst project grew out of the Strategic Plan. The Innovation Fund and Florida Opportunity Fund also grew out of the Roadmap and have led to specific initiatives. This plan is submitted to the Governor and Legislature by law.

- Would it be possible for you to share the multimodal infrastructure successes with this committee? *Yes, we will provide this information to the committee.*
- This plan has a global focus, not a domestic one. Recently, Quincy Farms went under and others as well. What are the strategies to protect our economic base in this state? *The Roadmap is strategic and there is detail in other reports. For example, we have a goal to increase college degrees in partnership with Department of Education. In aviation, the aerospace industry has expanded. Also life science industries have expanded. Clean energy is a new area we working to expand. We ask: have we made progress in creating high-wage, high value-added jobs. We have made progress there. We don't want to color the Roadmap due to today's economic situation.*
- If we are moving toward knowledge-based economic sectors requiring better-educated workforce, should we be spending more there? How will these new directions change the nature of transportation investments? *For knowledge-based industry, quality of life issues are paramount. Mass transit will be important, based on coherent growth patterns. International commerce and coherent growth of seaports, airports and infrastructure all figure in.*
- We need to be realistic about what public/private partnership can do. Capital is diminished, and only the real good companies can raise funds through bonding.

#### **Information on Items Requested by Leadership Committee - Kathy Neill**

Kathy Neill reviewed information provided in response to requests made by Leadership Committee members at the first meeting (these materials can be found at [sisupdate.org](http://sisupdate.org)):

- **Federal Stimulus** (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009) – Kathy called attention to the 2-page Florida Fast Facts and noted highways and bridges received about \$1.3 billion. On average the department receives about \$2.2 billion in federal funds for roads and bridges annually. The transit allocation is about one and one-half times the average annual amount received in federal funds.
- **Airspace reconfiguration** – Kathy called attention to a one-page paper entitled, “Military Facilities – Airspace Impact in the Gulf of Mexico and the SIS”. Kathy stated Dusty Powell of FDOT’s Systems Planning Office is present and is the expert on this topic. As the process continues, there will be briefings to keep the committee updated.
- **Level of Service and the SIS** – Kathy stated there is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation in the notebook explaining level of service and its implications for the SIS. This informational presentation is followed by three maps showing SIS highways not meeting level of service standards in 2005, and SIS highways with planned improvements not meeting level of service standards in 2015 and in 2025.
- **Growth in Travel Higher on FIHS Roads** – Kathy called attention to two charts relating to travel on the Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS). She restated the question from the first meeting as: Why has growth in travel (measured in vehicle miles traveled, or VMT) on the FIHS since 1998 been three times that of travel on non-FIHS state roads? Further analysis

showed the principal reasons relate to high growth of travel on the Turnpike (people are willing to pay a premium for a reliable, less congested trip) and high growth in truck travel, which mostly occurs on FIHS highways (interstates, etc.).

- **Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM)** - Kathy pointed out the problem statement on page 2 of the material supplied to explain the ETDM process, stating before ETDM, feedback from resource agencies on projects was not solicited until the department had expended funds on a project. With implementation of ETDM, resource agency review occurs very early in project planning before any significant funds are expended.
- **Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP)** - Kathy pointed out the map shows all counties in regional partnerships under the TRIP program, with a listing of the individual regional alliances in each FDOT district.

Following Kathy's presentation, the chair asked for questions/comments from the members. (Responses in *italics*)

- Question: Do the VMT data show the distance traveled, i.e., length of trip? *No, it is total VMT, which does not distinguish by length of trip.*
- How is level of service determined and doesn't it relate to the census of urban areas projected out 20 years? Is a change in LOS tied to the census? Will we discuss the LOS standards in a group session? *The urbanized area definition is derived from the census. Changes in LOS are tied to transportation planning boundaries. Yes, we will discuss LOS issues as part of a drafting group session. We will send you a link to our web page where we have issue papers posted on this topic.*
- Question from last meeting regarding why there is a gap on I-75 between two sections were not meeting LOS standards. The gap is at Lake City, which is a transitioning area and very close to showing up red (not meeting LOS) but not quite at that level.
- Are there criteria for TRIP fund eligibility? *Yes, the criteria are based on the region's definition of regionally significant facility network. We will provide a copy to the Committee.*

#### **Discussion: Preliminary Identification of Possible Policy Recommendations -- Members**

Rafael Montalvo asked the members to think about potential policy recommendations. These recommendations can be contradictory at this point. The intent is just to get ideas out. The facilitators would like to get a list of statements, which could lead to recommendations in the future. Such statements might begin with "FDOT should..." or "We should..." This will be an iterative process involving small groups to review and refine and add to what we have from today's discussion.

There are six categories of issues although the Committee is not limited to those. We do not need any consensus today and we will bring back these issues to develop them further. So please draw from the presentations and information you have received as well as your expertise.

#### **Category One: SIS Partner Coordination**

Rafael Montalvo asked members to look at the three issues listed along with their comments from the first meeting. He said these issues and earlier comments will continue to be part of the discussion and if a member feels strongly about one of issues listed, they should bring it forward, along with any new thoughts on potential policy recommendations.

- Encourage a re-look at level of service standards to see if they are relevant to today's priorities,

such as energy and commuter transit.

- Drawing on Issue C, coordinate with economic development organizations like Enterprise Florida as well as myregion.org and other regional visioning entities
- FDOT should initiate an integrated, intermodal transportation system plan that is multimodal (with focus on the multimodal piece).
- FDOT should pursue additional private partners for funding partnerships.
- Pursue partnerships with military forces.
- Security is a piece of this – Ports with TSA, other federal partners.
- Proactively reach out to foreign financiers for “lessons learned” in public/private partnerships.
- Consider interstate partners.
- Provide ongoing partner participation in SIS development and implementation.
- Coordinate with groups such as the Association of Neighborhoods to bring in recreational, historical and cultural interests, which will be helpful in developing policy recommendations. *(The Chair asked at what point, and noted this analysis currently is done during the Project Development and Environmental phase of a project)*
- FDOT should have a full-time federal lobbyist rather than taking what we get.

#### **Category Two: Designation of SIS Facilities**

- It would be very helpful if we had input from a company able to do a trade flow analysis based on what our future will look like with our trading partners and how trade patterns will influence the type of transportation infrastructure This goes to keeping the SIS strategic and where to put our focus.
- Get a presentation on the widening of the Panama Canal and the opening of Cuba to help inform where our focus should be, including where an inland port should be located. We need to gather this information.
- Keep the SIS strategic.
- Include “intraregional” trips as part of public transportation for commuter rail or fixed guideway in the region with some criteria for them
- We need to look at emerging markets and project transportation modes likely to be important. This is needed to inform what is strategic. Maybe dig more into Enterprise Florida information to see what they have done here.
- Develop criteria for inland ports – what about locational criteria?
- Let’s stay strategic and not drill down too much. We should set policy for inland ports and

strategic goals. Financiers and others will determine locations.

- Keep Emerging SIS in there – Strategic today and tomorrow because it will change; international trade, etc. will be different tomorrow. As population growth rates decline, there will be a sea change and goods flows will change as well.
- Redefine the Emerging SIS to incorporate these discussion points, so its meaning is clear to everyone.

### Category Three: SIS Planning and Prioritization Processes

- The level of service issue, its impact on SIS facilities and its adverse impact on local economic development projects (locals are held accountable when they have no control over SIS level of service?)
- Private partners develop projects on an accelerated timeframe as compared to public projects – for example, working from a railroad perspective. Could consider higher priority for projects having joint funding other than taxpayer dollars
- I'd agree with the above comment on public/private funding but would suggest deleting "other than taxpayer dollars".
- What about funding the maximum number of projects possible with available funds?
- I'd be concerned about funding what's fundable versus funding what's important.
- How are projects being prioritized now? *Many aspects go into prioritization decisions, for example, if only one segment of the project remains, whether there is local support, and data indicating needs. We are also committed to use available funds each year, recognizing some needed projects cost more than we can commit to it in one year. We don't ignore large projects. Balancing funds is what gets us there.*
- I am unclear of the process for getting funding for SIS projects. I manage a SIS corridor but have no idea how to get on this list. I'd like to see a more transparent process so we all know how they are being prioritized. *We need to better explain this process to the group.*
- Prioritization at the local level is dog eat dog and locals see the SIS as a runaround them. We need to stay at a high level.
- There is natural tension between strategic and being balanced. Balancing across modes and districts is not an underlying criterion. If we take a statewide systems approach based on criteria, it would impact all areas and modes. We need an integrated thinking process based on key questions: Why should we have the SIS and what should it do? Then we would have a systems approach, rather than trying to balance funding.
- I don't know how FDOT makes these decisions and are there combinations of funds? *Many think of the SIS as a grant program but it is not. But this comes back to how priorities are identified. The priorities come in and then the FDOT makes the decision of when to fund them. Yes, it's a combination of funds. Highest priority is hard to define since each region's priorities are not the priorities of another area. It is very parochial around the state – that is not a value judgment. This committee could say: here's what the policy should be.*

The facilitator commented he was hearing the prioritization process could be more inclusive and more transparent. Further development is needed on this group of issues.

- Prioritization is a significant issue. Some areas have land mass but not the population density to carry the vote on a project. We need to take geography into account. All areas are not equal and a cookie cutter approach will not work.
- We need to provide input to criteria for how prioritization decisions should be made.
- The days of lack of transparency should be gone. We should not be in the position of handling so much money and not being able to explain its decisions. My question is why are we widening any of the interstates in Florida? Why don't we try to get ahead of this mess and go a different direction?
- FDOT has done a good job of getting the input from all. And at some point the FDOT has to get down to prioritizing projects, doing the balancing with the strategy in mind.
- Criteria for setting priorities needs to stay but need to find a way to allow others to have input or to give others opportunity for input.
- The first SIS projects were 44 bottlenecks FDOT identified to the Legislature for funding. The process is not done in a back room.
- At what point are we going to go to change our behavior and how we move from place to place? Who is going to help guide the policies of the State?
- What percent of state's budget goes to transportation? *About 1/8 is the estimate.*

The chair reminded the committee it needs to keep a high-level view and step back from specific projects. She emphasized the need to focus on what is truly strategic for the state and what is necessary above everything else.

The chair acknowledged members for thinking out of the box. She said there are several significant factors in project selection and the process is complex, but it is not akin to a "smoke-filled room" approach. For instance, there is consideration of project phases - if you have completed the right-of-way acquisition phase, then you cannot stop there, you must go ahead with construction. The chair indicated the department would put materials together and explain the process more thoroughly.

#### **Category Four: SIS and Florida's Economic Competitiveness and Growth Management**

- The issues on the green sheet in this category say it all.
- We need to stay aware of the new growth management bill as it is going to make a big difference in Florida. We need this information when session is over.
- Whether it passes or not, it illustrates there is a hole on the funding structure. It will have an impact on what the SIS can fund. It will potentially change the location of development, but whether or not it passes the funding hole will still be there.
- Suspending concurrency in certain areas will have a big impact on growth, but we don't know what will come out of the legislature. We have variable levels of service out there today

changing every few miles – this system is just not working. After Session we really need to review the results.

- Referring to Issue R, we need to look at all of the modalities making us competitive, not just SIS and economic priorities. Everything is integrated – the SIS is not a standalone element.
- In towns, does LOS become an indicator of the feasibility of transit at some point?
- When safety concerns get to a point or when perishable goods are rotting in trucks caught in congestion, it's time for mass transit.
- We need to put more money into mass transit.
- We can't just continue to chase the red ink (highways not meeting LOS). It goes back to the systems approach and full integration of modes.
- If developers know where transit is planned, they will come in and create the densities needed to support it.
- There is a need for an integrated, multimodal system. We need to head in that direction. But we still need roads and we still need to fix bottlenecks. We need caution not to take this too far.
- Would it be out of line to look at this in two different ways: 1. The strategic intermodal system and 2. The safety issue of existing system
- Do the SIS needs keep increasing in absolute dollars or are they shrinking? Are the needs less in year two than they were in year one? *No, they continue to grow.*
- This should cause us to get more strategic. We need to dig into these hard questions
- What about the stimulus effect: *When you slice and dice it to the MPOs and locals, it gets smaller. Will it help? Yes. Will it catch us up? No. It is 1/7 of what we have lost since 2008.*

#### **Category Five: SIS and Florida's Communities and Environment**

- Build, maintain and/or retrofit the SIS to maintain or restore the health of the state's natural resources.
- What do we do now and what are we not doing? All projects go through extensive review and we coordinate with numerous agencies. Why do we need to have a community and environment screening process?
- Looking at wildlife corridors as far as animal movement and where they intersected with state corridors, we found consideration of the connectivity of natural systems was not being done as it should be.
- Environmental analysis on a project-by-project basis is one level. We need an emphasis on the system not just on projects. This is at the regional level, looking at the broader environmental systems.
- Running projects through ETDM has been a great thing for the natural environment. Communities have everything to do with SIS and we do need a community and environmental

screening process.

- ETDM is not being used on all projects.
- Permitting serves its purpose well, but ETDM is all about planning and locating a project. There are so many options available from 50 miles up – you can move and change when no money has been expended on the project yet. ETDM tees up the transportation project and you know what to avoid and where it can go as well. We advocate use of ETDM on all transportation projects, including the Northwest Corridor Authority.
- Even if projects don't go through ETDM, they will go through the permitting process. If someone is not doing his or her job, we need to know. FDOT needn't be doing someone else's job.
- ETDM is not done for all projects. It is not statutorily required but FDOT does it voluntarily. There is a big gap where it's not being done. The myregion effort assesses all natural areas and identifies where roads or transit fit in. This should be part of setting priorities.
- We are big advocates of ETDM. We talk about it in other states. We want to see its use enhanced and for it to have access to the latest data.
- The dialogue on this is good and the system seems to be working but there are ways to improve. We realize this is a balanced plan, and if any one element is left out it won't be balanced.
- The set of issues should stay; this is an extraordinary opportunity to update the SIS. Can we put some criteria out to require projects to go through ETDM? It is a matter of being responsible in the expenditure of funds. I think we should encourage use of ETDM.
- Can ETDM apply to transit? .

The chair proposed five breakout groups based on major areas of focus in today's discussion. Members volunteered as shown below:

- 1. Emerging SIS:** Bob Ball, Rocky McPherson, Gordon Goodin, Jason Peters, David Roach
- 2. Urban issues related to SIS:** Bill Cross, Javier Rodriquez, Kathy Till, Chuck Cohen, Charlie Gautier, Vicki Tschinkel
- 3. Trade and logistics issues:** Bart Pullum, Toy Keller, Matt Ubben (alternate for Tom Hindle)
- 4. Implementation issues (partnerships, prioritization):** David Roach, Ben Biscan, Vicki Tschinkel, Gordon Goodin, Toy Keller, Bob Ball, Rocky McPherson, Mark Bontrager, Bart Pullum, Chris Doolin
- 5. Community and environmental issues:** Janet Bowman, Charlie Gauthier, Pat Steed, Laurie McDonald, Sally Mann

The chair asked for questions or comments and noted there will be more opportunities to comment on all groups.

- Suggest it may be too soon for a group to discuss the topic of prioritization.
- What will the time commitment be for these groups? *We are thinking 2-3 teleconferences total.*
- Some of us are alternates – how can our principals volunteer? *They can volunteer by email to Debbie Hunt.*

#### **Public Comment**

Susan O'Rourke, Traffic Engineer from Stuart, Florida, offered a lengthy written comment. The Chair

read the full comment aloud to the committee. The full content can be found at [sisupdate.org](http://sisupdate.org).

The chair stated the report, "The Freight Transportation Infrastructure: Assessing the Need for Statewide Coordination" is an interim report of the Florida Senate Committee on Transportation and was handed out to all committee members to make them aware of its recommendations. She asked for any comments from members on this report.

Bob Ball encouraged members to read this report and express their views to your House or Senate member. Implementation of the SIS has been excellent and we are here to improve on it. Mr. Ball stated he does not believe the freight advisory council recommended in pending legislation is needed in light of what this committee has been tasked to do by the department.

### **Potential SIS Goals and Objectives Structure - Kathy Neill**

Kathy Neill's presentation can be found at [www.sisupdate.org](http://www.sisupdate.org).

Following Ms. Neill's presentation, the chair stated this information is looking toward the next meeting and we want your input on these options. She then asked for questions/comments from the members.

- We should start the next meeting with this material.

### **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 May 19-20, 2009 in Orlando. On the 19<sup>th</sup> the meeting will begin at 1:00 pm and on the 20<sup>th</sup> we will end by 2:00 pm. We will let you know once we have the location set. Materials will be sent out early.

The June meeting tentatively will be scheduled for the week of June 22<sup>nd</sup>. We will lock it in soon and let you know the meeting date.

### **Meeting Evaluation Survey**

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

### **Adjournment**

The chair adjourned the meeting around 5:30 pm