

**2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee
Draft Summary of Meeting #3
Buena Vista Palace Hotel, Orlando, Florida**

Meeting Date:	5/19-20/09	Meeting Time:	1:00 - 5:30 pm 8:00 – 11:45 am	Type of Meeting:	In-person
----------------------	------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------

Participants: Members: Debbie Hunt (FDOT Assistant Secretary), Chair;
Noranne Downs (FDOT-District 5 Secretary), Vice-Chair;
Debra Lemke (alternate for Bob Ball, Florida Airports Council),
Kathy Till (Florida League of Cities),
Jason Peters (FDOT-D3),
Martin Knopp (Federal Highway Administration),
Richard Kaplan (MPOAC),
Ben Biscan (Florida Rail Association),
Pat Steed (Florida Regional Councils Association),
Jim Poole (Enterprise Florida’s Rural Issues Working Group) [Gina Reynolds alternate, Day 1],
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 Foundation),
Bridget Merrill (alternate for John Adams, Enterprise Florida, Inc.)
Sally Mann (Florida Department of Environmental Protection),
Laurie Macdonald (Defenders of Wildlife),
Janet Bowman (The Nature Conservancy),
Tim Jackson (alternate for Victoria Tschinkel, 1000 Friends of Florida),
Charles Gauthier (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),
Tom Hindle (Florida Trucking Association).

Staff: Kathy Neill (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Brian Watts (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Huiwei Shen, (FDOT Office of Policy Planning, Lead Technical Advisor, Implementation Issues Breakout Group), Ed Coven (FDOT Transit Office, Lead Technical Advisor, Urban Issues Breakout Group), George Sirianni (FDOT Systems Planning Office, Lead Technical Advisor, Emerging SIS Breakout Group), Peter McGilvray (FDOT Environmental Management Office, Lead Technical Advisor, Community and Environment Breakout Group), Meredith Dahlrose (FDOT Seaports Office, Lead Technical Advisor, Trade and Logistics Breakout Group), Paula San Gregorio (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); and Facilitators Hal Beardall and Rafael Montalvo.

Observers: John Zielinski (FDOT District 5), Teresa Jacobs (FDOT District 5), Mary Lou Rajchel (Florida Trucking Association), Matt Ubben (Florida Trucking Association), Phillip Worth (Kittelson & Associates), Sally Patrenos (Florida Transportation Commission), , Lee Ann Jacobs (Federal Highway Administration), Karen Brunelle (Federal Highway Administration), Mark Nordling (Florida Railroad Association), Tiffany Honder (Osceola County), Susan Sadighi (FDOT District 5), Alex Bell (Renaissance Planning Group), Steve Tyndal (Port Manatee), Susan Ditta (Space Coast TPO, Brevard County), Ram Kancharla (Port of Tampa), David Grovdahl (Metroplan Orlando), David Stubbs (JAXPORT), Mark Morton (Glades County Economic Development Council), Virginia Wittington (Metroplan Orlando), Bob Romig (Romig Global, LLC).

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

Agenda and Table of Contents:	DAY ONE		
	Opening Remarks.....	page 2	Debbie Hunt
	Agenda Review.....	page 3	Hal Beardall
	Update on 2009 Legislative Session.....	page 3	Brad Thoburn
	Finalize SIS Leadership Committee process goal, principles and assumptions.....	page 4	Members
	Overview of Current SIS Goals and Objectives.....	page 5	Kathy Neill
	Overview of SIS Investment Decision-Making Process.....	page 6	Kathy Neill
	Review of Public and Partner Outreach for the 2010 SIS Update.....	page 7	Huiwei Shen
	Emerging SIS Breakout Group Report on Potential Policy Recommendations.....	page 7	Rocky McPherson
	Community and Environment Issues Breakout Group Report on Potential Policy Recommendations.....	page 10	Bridget Merrill
	Public Comment.....	page 13	Members of Public
	Review Schedule for Day 2.....	page 14	Hal Beardall
	DAY TWO		
	Agenda Review.....	page 14	Hal Beardall
	Urban Issues Breakout Group Report on Potential Policy Recommendations.....	page 14	Kathy Till
	Trade and Logistics Issues Breakout Group Report on Potential Policy Recommendations.....	page 17	Bridget Merrill
	Implementation Issues Breakout Group Report on Key Issues.....	page 19	Huiwei Shen
	Review and Discussion of Designation Policy Issues.....	page 21	John Kaliski
	Proposed Outline for Committee Report.....	page 21	Brian Watts
	Public Comment.....	page 22	Members of Public
	Review Next Steps and Assignments.....	page 22	Hal Beardall
Adjourn Plenary Session		Chair	

Summary of Meeting Content

DAY ONE

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 welcomed Martin Knopp, the new member representing the Federal Highway Administration.

The Chair thanked members for their time and input on the breakout group teleconferences during a busy legislative agenda. She added their participation in the breakout groups helped move the ball forward and set the stage for discussions during today’s meeting. Today we will build on our work in the two previous meetings and

the breakout group teleconferences. She stated following a series of updates and overviews requested by committee members at the last meeting, members will focus later this afternoon and most of tomorrow morning on reviewing and discussing the potential policy recommendations started in the breakout groups. She reminded members this is an iterative process and their ongoing participation is key in moving forward from a common understanding of the issues we need to address to a developing policy recommendations to address those issues.

Agenda Review – Hal Beardall

Ms. Hunt asked the facilitator to review the agenda and the supporting materials in the members' notebook. Notebook materials can be found at the following link: www.sisupdate.org

The facilitator drew attention to the draft Meeting Two 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. The meeting summary can be found at the following link under Tab 1: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting%2D051909/>

Update on 2009 Legislative Session – Brad Thoburn

The Chair introduced Brad Thoburn, FDOT State Transportation Development Administrator, to provide members with an update on the recently concluded 2009 Legislative Session and the federal stimulus package.

Federal Stimulus (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009): Mr. Thoburn reported over 700 projects have been funded with federal stimulus funds. To date 74 percent of the funds are obligated and the goal is to obligate 100 percent of the stimulus funds by June 29th. Florida started off slower due to a focus on preparation work and acquiring budget approvals and now is above the national average for the share of funds obligated for transportation projects. He reported that Florida is competitive with California in competing for the \$8 billion in discretionary funds for high-speed rail. One challenge facing Florida as we let these projects to bid is if the bids come in low, as many expect due to the state of the economy, then there may be funds to re-obligate quickly to avoid federal redistribution of those funds. More detail on federal stimulus projects can be found at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/economicstimulus>

2009 Legislative Session: Mr. Thoburn reported the Legislature swept \$160 million in transportation funds -- \$40 million from the Turnpike Enterprise and \$120 million from the State Transportation Trust Fund. The omnibus transportation bill, HB 1021, was enacted and contains many important provisions for FDOT and other transportation interests. Mr. Thoburn cited one provision directing FDOT to conduct a study examining transportation alternatives for the I-95 corridor and submit a report by June 30, 2010. He cited other provisions relating to airport land use compatibility; exempting port-related development within three miles of port from DRI review, change in methodology for backlog calculations by local governments, and changes to public/private partnership tax issues, which will enable projects such as the Jacksonville Outer Beltway and other projects to move forward, In the area of growth management, Mr. Thoburn reported SB 360 was enacted, revising the 2005 growth management legislation. The bill defines and establishes legislatively created transportation concurrency exception areas and exemptions from DRI review in dense land areas, applying to urban service areas in counties with more than 1,000 persons per square mile. The implication for the SIS is that in these areas, local governments would set levels of service on SIS facilities, removing FDOT's ability to be involved in the consultation process for establishing TCEAs and developing mitigation plans to protect the SIS. The new legislation also directs FDOT and the Department of Community Affairs to develop a methodology for a uniform statewide mobility fee by December 2009.

Federal Reauthorization: Mr. Thoburn stated that SAFETEA-LU, the current federal transportation legislation, expires September 30, 2009. Congress may extend SAFETEA-LU while it debates the new authorization bills in the House and Senate. Florida would like to see the final legislation minimize member "high priority" projects, address long-term funding for transportation, create funding equity for donor states like Florida, maximize funding flexibility, and expand, not constrict, the ability for public/private funding partnerships and innovative

financing.

Following Mr. Thoburn's presentation, the facilitator asked for comments or questions on the information presented. (Responses in *italics*)

- Stimulus funding decisions have not been consistent in all areas of the state. Regarding high-speed rail, the concern is securing operating funds over the long-term. This is a real concern with Tri-Rail, which may have to cut back on service due to shortages in operating funds.
- Will the new federal legislation reflect the climate change and energy emphasis of the new administration? *It is too soon to tell. Many elements are on separate tracks at this point, but the final authorization bill will likely reflect those priorities.*
- Will the \$160 million sweep negatively affect Florida's maintenance of effort certification required for the federal stimulus bill? *This has not been fully vetted yet. We are working through the issues now.*

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 second meeting. The revised drafts can be found under Tab 4 at the following link:

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting%2D051909/>

The facilitator stated the goal as finalizing the draft process goal, principles and assumptions today. He reminded members this is "your guidance for you" and will not be part of the final report. The changes noted in the worksheet reflect discussion from the last meeting. He asked that each member go through and rate each statement.

Revised Process Goal Statement. Acceptability Rating: 3–23 members; 2-1 member; 1-none. Revised Assumption A. Acceptability Rating: 3-24 members; 2-2 members 1-none

Mr. Montalvo asked for comments from the member who gave a rating of 2 to the revised process goal.

- It says both "enhance and improve" implementation. What does enhance mean in the context of implementation? I'm not comfortable with this wording. "Support" is a better word in this context.
- It implies "proactive" and I like it as it stands.
- What about "recommend" its implementation?
- I don't think "recommend" is the right word.
- Okay, can we take out the words "enhance" and "enhancing" from the process goal and Assumption A?
- Change goal to "...develop consensus recommendations regarding updates and improvements to the SIS Strategic Plan and its implementation."

Revised Assumption B, Acceptability Rating: 3 – 25 members; 2 – none; 1 – none

Assumption B had no revisions and members rated it acceptable as presented.

New Assumption C. Acceptability Rating: 3 – 17 members; 2 – 8 members; 1 – none

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

- The last part of this statement makes no sense. We need to transpose “process” and “information” and delete “it” for it to read correctly.
- Delete the word “explicitly.”
- Change “on” to “upon.”
- This does not get at other recommendations we might want to make from areas not covered by the statute – if we want to mention something outside our charge.
- Doesn’t Assumption F do that?
- Yes, I’m okay with that.

Revised Assumption D. Acceptability Rating: 3 – 22 members; 2 – 2 members; 1 – none

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

- After “original SIS Strategic Plan” insert “and.”
- Before “other statewide” insert “as well as.”

Revised Assumption E. Acceptability Rating: 3 – 25 members; 2 – none; 1 – none

Assumption E had no revisions and members rated it acceptable as presented.

Assumption F. Acceptability Rating: 3 – 24 members; 2 – none; 1 – none

Assumption F had no revisions and members rated it acceptable as presented.

Principle A. Acceptability Rating: 3 – 25 members; 2 – none; 1 – none

Principle A had no revisions and members rated it acceptable as presented.

Principle B. Acceptability Rating: 3 – 25 members; 2 – none; 1 – none

Principle B had no revisions and members rated it acceptable as presented.

Principle C. Acceptability Rating; 3 – 24 members; 2 – none 1 – none

Principle C had no revisions and members rated it acceptable as presented.

The Chair asked for and received a motion and second to adopt the process goal, assumptions and principles as revised. The process goal, assumptions, and principles were adopted unanimously.

Overview of Current SIS Goals and Objectives – Kathy Neill

The Chair called for an overview of the goals and objectives in the SIS Strategic Plan, noting that Kathy Neill reviewed these at the end of the second meeting. This is the framework the committee is working under. The facilitator reminded the members that several of the breakout groups asked for this overview.

Ms. Neill reviewed the goal areas in the SIS Strategic Plan as well as the comparable goals in the 2025 Florida Transportation Plan.

The facilitator asked members to think about where their recommendations would fit under the current goal

structure or how goals and objectives may need to be modified to reflect potential policy recommendations. (Responses in *italics*)

- If we have issues with any of the current SIS goals and objectives, we will have opportunities to address them, correct? *Yes, you will have multiple opportunities to discuss any recommended changes to SIS goals and objectives.*

Overview of SIS Investment Decision-Making Process – Kathy Neill

Ms. Neill's presentation can be found under Tab 6 at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting%2D051909/>. Following the presentation, the Chair asked for questions/comments from the members. (Responses in *italics*)

- On slide 10 we see distinct modal plans. How are these plans connected to merge into a single multimodal plan or is there a higher level plan to merge all of them? *The SIS Strategic Plan is the higher-level plan you refer to. The intent of plan updates is to bring in the other modes to a greater extent and create links from plan to plan. We are moving in the direction you suggest and ultimately the modal plans do need to tie into one plan. However, each statewide modal plan addresses both SIS and non-SIS facilities and deals with mode-specific issues, so we see value in continuing to have separate modal plans.*
- We need to look to the future and how the modes will become more interrelated. We need to look at how the modes will change and how they will impact each other. We also need greater flexibility to respond quickly to changes. Can we address this through the Implementation Issues Breakout Group? *The ability to respond quickly is a challenge for FDOT. It may be an issue we can address now and then also address in the 2060 FTP process next year.*
- What operational value do the SIS goals and objectives have? For example, if there is a new emphasis on transit, how would it affect the decision-making factors? Should the goals have more detail and reflect funding priorities? *The Strategic Investment Tool (SIT) uses performance indicators reflecting the goal areas and we can augment the SIT factors to reflect new goal emphasis in the future.*
- The SIT tool is used for highways now and I am wondering how would it be used for other modes like transit – how would FDOT do that? *Today, local transit is not on the SIS. We do have commuter rail on the SIS such as TriRail. The SIT tool is not the primary tool used for decision support on commuter rail today. We would look at factors such as local support, project readiness, etc. For example in Orlando area, FDOT is working with partners on various transit alternatives. FDOT supports and assists with feasibility studies, working with partners like CSX and the various counties involved – ultimately it depends on which project rises to the top with funding support of the local and regional partners. In this case it has been the Central Florida Commuter Rail or SunRail project rising to the top as the priority project to pursue.*
- We now have 6 years of experience with SIS on the highway side. A SIS highway is 4-lane with a minimum speed of 50 mph. This standard conflicts with communities, especially small cities. We need to balance the SIS needs with those of the small towns it goes through. Not all SIS highways currently meet the standard. *The SIS moves goods at high speeds and this sometimes conflicts with community needs and values. You have identified an issue we need to address.*
- If we want to move passengers on rail statewide, which plan would it come from? It is a statewide issue. *It would come first from the statewide Rail System Plan and then move forward into the Florida Transportation Plan and the SIS Strategic Plan. The recently adopted 2009 Florida Rail System Plan calls for a statewide intercity passenger rail system. High-speed rail is state-driven policy and was included in the SIS Strategic Plan initially and then was dropped per state policy direction.*

Review of Public and Partner Outreach for the 2010 SIS Update – Huiwei Shen

Huiwei Shen's full presentation can be found at Tab 7 at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting%2D051909/>. Following the presentation, the Chair asked for questions/comments from the members. (Responses in *italics*)

- Has the location of the Orlando workshop been identified yet? *Yes, it will be held in the Metroplan Orlando boardroom. I recommend holding an event in Northwest Orange County, closer to Lake and Volusia counties and I offer the city of Apopka as the host. Kathy Till is the contact person for planning such an event.*
- On slide 12, regarding the comment "SIS and funding for rail lines to promote goods movement to relieve road congestion," I agree that rail will relieve corridors like I-95 and I-10, but greater use of rail will increase congestions at rail sites. All impacts need to be considered and addressed.
- Is this the same process we used before? Are we improving on it? *We have learned from experience and we have many "lessons learned" that we are implementing.*
- Are you planning to videotape the regional workshop content and post it on the web site for folks who cannot attend one? *We had not planned to, but this is a good idea and we will look into it further. We are planning to hold a webinar to try to reach those who cannot attend a workshop for one reason or another.*
- Will the presentations be the same at each regional workshop? *The identical plenary presentation will be given at each workshop. The brief presentations given at the workstations relating to proposed SIS Update policies will also be similar at each workshop. The workstation relating to regional/district issues will be unique to each area.*

Emerging SIS Breakout Group Report on Potential Policy Recommendations – Rocky McPherson

Before starting his presentation, Mr. McPherson called the members' attention to the one-page flyer under Tab 7 providing the dates and locations of upcoming Enterprise Florida regional forums being held in conjunction with the update of its strategic plan. He encouraged members to attend if possible.

The facilitator introduced Rocky McPherson (Leadership Committee member) as the presenter for the Emerging SIS Issues Breakout Group. Mr. McPherson presented an overview of the breakout group meetings and presented the full group with the recommendations draft by the breakout group. The full presentation can be found under Tab 8 at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting%2D051909/>. At the conclusion of the presentation, the facilitator asked for questions of clarification on the presentation and then asked for comment on each draft recommendation presented. The Facilitator stated this discussion is preliminary; pointing out this is the first time the committee is discussing these draft recommendations. There will be no ratings asked for yet. (Responses in *italics*)

Questions for clarification:

- Concerning regional visions, do we qualify what the term "regional vision" means? *No and we probably need to. Now they are distinct structures in each region.*
- What is the meaning in Statement B of "partner input"? *It is not a requirement for funding; rather it is input from all partners including those who are potential recipients of Emerging SIS projects on relative priorities. It is an opportunity for partners to have a say in the process of determining the relative priority for Emerging SIS projects each year.*

Comments on Draft Recommendations A - E:

Recommendation A. Maintain separate designation criteria and policies for the Emerging SIS.

- No comments.

Recommendation B. Continue policy of making Emerging SIS facilities eligible for SIS funding, with a reasonable allocation of funding between SIS and Emerging SIS determined each year by the Secretary based on relative priorities, including partner input.

- How does this affect funding top priorities, especially in the context of scarce resources?
- This may be a good time to do this, because it makes us focus on what are truly the priorities.
- Concerned about “reasonable allocation.” Does it mean you must fund these projects? Does it mean you fund a lower priority item just because it’s in the Emerging SIS, rather than a critical priority elsewhere? We should be funding those projects that give us the biggest bang for the buck.
- Our recommendation is not looking at allocations to Emerging SIS and full SIS independent of priorities. What gets funded is the priority. Don’t need that level of rigidity.
- Reasonable allocation is in the current policy. We added “including partner input.”
- Regarding “partner input,” there is an element of interest and buy-in from this process that makes all of us want to stay involved. There should be on-going dialogue. This should be an on-going, accessible process.
- If we are going to get a true plan for the state that everybody buys into, we need regional planning councils, MPOs, everyone, to understand this is the plan. Need standards that everyone understands.
- Do we really have that? That also may be evolving, and that is why DCA, DEP, Enterprise Florida are all at the table. We’re making collective decisions – not in our own silos.
- Rural economic development initiative (REDI) brings about 20 agencies together monthly. The point is to move an agenda statewide, we need coordination – we need to emphasize this.
- Statewide, if we are going to move an agenda it needs to be coordinated.
- Emerging SIS was set up in the beginning to allow projects that have great return on investment (ROI), but would never have made it onto the system otherwise, in competition with the facilities that are already on the system.

Recommendation C. Designate Emerging SIS facilities based on criteria that primarily reflect statewide policy objectives, including the following considerations:

1. Maximizing the use of existing facilities, including identifying new roles for underutilized facilities where possible;
 2. Supporting regional visions for future growth and development;
 3. Economic development (including Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern);
 4. Intermodal transportation needs that support national defense goals; and
 5. Intermodal transportation needs that support statewide emergency evacuation and response that have not been previously identified by considerations 1 thru 4.
- Re: Item 1 – What determines the maximum use of the facility. Local level of service, multi-modal

uses? *All discussed, but no definition agreed-upon.*

- Re: Item 1 “new roles” -- new uses for existing facilities? *Yes.*
- C and D refer to regional visions. Should be “adopted regional visions.” Visions can be somewhat ephemeral. We are in a period of experimentation with regard to visioning, but don’t have standards for them. They ought to mean something and have standards. Logical candidate may be the Strategic Regional Policy Plans developed by regional planning councils (RPC).
- Need to refine a bit further. Not every RPC may be enlightened. And given that we have many visioning processes underway, would hate to limit to just legally recognized visions. Maybe “super-regions” are the answer. We need to discuss this further.
- What is happening in many of the regional visions is that for the first time we are talking about inter-connections between transportation, land use and the economy, and we are reflecting the values of the region. Also asking people to think beyond the comprehensive plan to fifty years in the future. Problem is there isn’t a set process. It would be great to think we could have adopted visions, but would hate to think we wouldn’t be using this great dialogue.
- Also, projects and visions may be in competition.

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

- As mentioned earlier, what is the definition of regional visions?
- Does “encourage” mean that the Department should be funding this activity? *Yes, it is a generic statement and means “provide the resources needed to do this” -- statewide resources – let’s kick it around.*
- This is more of a global process – really “encourage proactive planning and intergovernmental coordination.” Not a goal, because someone has to take up the charge. Someone needs to say we collectively need to do this. Maybe the Governor’s office to all agencies. It is a hodge-podge now.
- Along the same lines, in the Panhandle for example, activities going on the areas of aviation and seaports – they (and we) need to better understand each other’s activities. Everyone should be working together through proactive planning and visioning.

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

- Don’t want to limit the integration to regions, but encourage for any area with multiple Emerging SIS facilities such as sub-regions.

Other Issues

- Potential need to create criteria for Emerging SIS commercial spaceports.
- Potential to develop a third category of facilities identified as “proposed” for both the SIS and Emerging SIS. This category of facilities would not be eligible for funding but could be subject to proactive planning and coordination by FDOT and her sister agencies and partners.

General Comments and Questions and What’s Missing?

- Where do we put projects that we see developing over time but don't exist today?
- There is a category today called "Planned Add Facilities" – either SIS or Emerging SIS. The requirement for designating as a "Planned Add" facility is that the facility would meet the criteria within 3 years of operation, enjoy partner consensus, and be financially feasible.
- There was some discussion of "Proposed" as a category, for projects that don't quite reach that level. FDOT may want to look at this concept in more detail.
- Example of commuter rail – didn't have specific criteria for that. We should consider whether this kind of project should be eligible for funding.
- Where is the "Planned Facilities" documentation – in the SIS Plan itself? *Yes*
- When did "Planned Facilities" become part of the SIS? *The original Steering Committee identified a small number of facilities such as the Miami Intermodal Center, and left it to the Department to identify criteria in the future.*
- "Planned Facilities" originally were the connectors to hubs or other modes. Need a category for projects currently having no connection to other facilities or hubs, but that could be supported based on projections. *Some of the original planned facilities were those types of connectors or new multmodal terminals. Other types of planned facilities include new hubs or corridors, such as the new airport in Panama City, and a couple of new corridors such as the Wekiva Parkway and 9B in Jacksonville.*
- What is an "emerging commercial spaceport"? *Jacksonville, Cecil Field is an example. These are popping up all over the country, with FAA licensing. What kind of cargo or loads they will serve remains to be seen. Important to think about how these fit.*

Community and Environment Breakout Group Report on Potential Policy Recommendations – Bridget Merrill and Peter McGilvray

The facilitator introduced Bridget Merrill (Leadership Committee member) and Peter McGilvray as the presenters for the Community and Environment Issues Breakout Group. Ms. Merrill explained that two new tools have been added subsequent to adoption of the original SIS Strategic Plan and Peter McGilvray will cover those: The Critical Lands and Waters Project (CLIP) and the Cooperative Conservation Blueprint (CCB). Mr. Merrill then presented an overview of the breakout group meetings and presented the full group with the recommendations draft by the breakout group. The full presentation can be found under Tab 8 at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting%2D051909/>. At the conclusion of the presentation, the facilitator asked for questions of clarification on the presentation and then asked for comment on each draft recommendation presented. The Facilitator stated this discussion is preliminary; pointing out this is the first time the committee is discussing these draft recommendations. There will be no ratings asked for yet. (Responses in *italics*)

Questions for clarification

- Airports develop master plans for 5-, 10- and 20-year periods. Did you consider master planning processes in your discussion of Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM)? *Only in the sense of how to coordinate the two processes.*

Comments on Draft Recommendations A – F:

Recommendation A. Continue to apply the SIS community and environmental screening process to all facilities proposed for SIS or Emerging SIS designation, regardless of mode or ownership.

- Will this process work for new types of projects that might be created through the SIS, e.g, hub to hub connectors?
- Is it the feeling that the existing Community and Environment (C&E) screening process works well now? Statement A suggests that, but the note suggests revisions are needed. What kinds of changes are you talking about? *The group just wanted to look at this again in more detail – they ran short on time at the end. They wanted to look at how to incorporate new data such as CLIP and CCB, for example.*
- From the perspective of an environmental group trying to keep informed about what is going on, ETDM makes a huge difference. If not used, projects tend to get to the PD&E stage before problems are identified, and by then problems are much harder to address.
- Possible revisions – what facilities need to go through the process, and which don't, do you require them to in order to get SIS funding?
- Suggest some wording that does not mandate “regardless of mode or ownership.” ETDM does not apply to all SIS facilities (e.g., rail). *Note that the C&E process is applied to all SIS modes today.*
- If we are talking about existing projects, screening has worked well. Not sure there is anything in here that would facilitate a transit project, which considers for example the benefits of a transit project that saves large amounts of dollars compared to the road it would replace.
- How does the Chamber feel about “regardless of mode or ownership”? *More information is needed.*
- For the future, greenhouse gas emissions may be a criterion. May help address transit.
- May be a smorgasbord of process choices, depending on the type of project.

Recommendation B. Apply the Efficient Transportation Decision-Making (ETDM) process to help evaluate all SIS projects, regardless of their mode or ownership.

Note: Staff exploring whether this would require legislative change, or whether agreeing to participate in ETDM could become a condition for SIS designation and/or use of SIS funding.

- Regarding A & B: “Regardless of mode or ownership.” Railroads are unique in that they enjoy federal preemption. Mandating railroads to go through screening or ETDM may be inconsistent with this. Would not want this to restrict the ability to do rail projects.
- ETDM was not developed to create a whole new set of regulations – rather it was created to streamline the old permitting process that let you get to the end before identifying a problem. ETDM is not a new burden.
- ETDM identifies fatal flaws in a project early.
- ETDM was not intended to be another permit layer, but to be a way to share information early. It is important to consider that we are trying to get at new projects – new airports, roads, ports, etc.
- Take out “all.” Substitute “as appropriate” or “subject to federal laws.”
- “As appropriate” would have to include any project breaking new ground.

Recommendation C. Strengthen linkages among planning and environmental processes to ensure early and ongoing partner coordination, leverage data and resources, and provide for sequentially more detailed consideration of community and environmental issues at all stages of SIS designation, planning, investment

decision-making, and project development. Processes that should be integrated include:

1. SIS community and environmental screening process for designation;
2. The Efficient Transportation Decision-Making (ETDM) process;
3. Project development and environmental review processes; and
4. The permitting process.

- Sounds like a lot of duplication. Want to be sure we protect the environment and if we need it all to protect the environment, fine. We need to be sure. Do we do all this now? *Yes, we do.*
- We need to understand it and be able to say to our constituencies that it is needed.
- Better to do this on the front end – it costs less, causes less tension, and goes more smoothly.
- Whether you do it at the front end or back end, is there duplication?
- The point of integrating was to minimize duplication. Integration avoids duplication.
- Emphasis is also on strengthening linkages, which is part of the integration process.
- Local government comprehensive planning is missing from this list.
- The problem exists already – this doesn't add anything. Trying to get the process to work faster and more smoothly. I'm led to believe this is a better process.
- Would like to see a pairing between this process and the permitting process, to see where there is duplication. There is a difference between a planning document and permitting. Important to address.
- Can we see an outline of how this was done before, compared to how it is done under ETDM? It is like night and day – drastic improvement. Don't know if ETDM has been uniformly implemented in all states.
- We were one of two states to go first. Senator Graham put in Federal law.
- District 5 uses ETDM; it does work, and work well. Commitment is key, so that agencies don't change their mind after going through it. Definitely an improvement.

Recommendation D. Consider air quality, energy, and climate changes issues in the SIS designation, planning, and investment decisions.

- Since this is the primary investment tool for state projects, should be considering Governors executive order regarding climate change and greenhouse gasses.
- Be sure to review the whole menu of recommendations regarding transportation that was in the Governor's Action Team report.

Recommendation E. Continue to encourage development of long-range regional visions for integrating transportation, land use, economic development, community and environmental decisions, and use of these visions as guidance to SIS planning and investment decisions.

- Once again mentioning regional visioning – same comments as in the earlier discussion.

Recommendation F. Develop guidelines for determining whether a regional vision has sufficient local

government support to be considered as input to SIS or other transportation decision-making processes.

- Is this saying that there is currently not sufficient local government support? *We need some way to indicate the level of local support, whether it is adoption or some other way – to show that the vision is more than just ideas.*
- Recommendation F may go in the wrong direction – concern about “guidelines.” Can become murkier rather than clear.
- In E and F, not sure what “sufficient” means. How do you determine?
- If all involved in the regional visioning process, would it be offensive to have to prove they are supportive? Are there instances out there?
- The make-up of regional visioning groups varies – in some cases not all local governments are involved. The question is which ones have full buy-in of the region.
- There are examples of regional visions that don’t have all local governments on-board.
- Original intent was this: If you are looking at a major widening, do it as part of a look at land use, community design, environmental resources, and economic development. Not to keep you from developing the project.
- Not always conflict or legitimacy is the problem. It can be just a question of which direction a community is going. For example Polk County is part of three regions: myregion, Tampa Bay, and Heartland. Saying one is legitimate over others is a problem for an area.
- What are the geographic parameters that would constitute a regional vision? RPCs? Agencies and their regions? What do we want them to be?
- Intent of regional visioning is for communities seeing themselves as having commonalities and seeing themselves as a region, to come together. It has nothing to do with RPCs.
- An important element from the 2025 FTP is that these groups come together from the bottom up. The idea is to help good SIS projects move forward and not create barriers.
- Where multiple visions overlap, goal ought to be to make them work together to provide statewide continuity. Goal is not to create artificially separate regions.

General Comments and Questions and What’s Missing?

- How will CLIP and CCB be integrated? Supportive, but potential for another layer that would complicate matters, depending on how they are used.
- Would like to see CLIP and CCB used as additional information, not as a decision-making process.
- Both are part of future decision-making, just not fully developed yet.

Public Comment:

The Chair stressed the importance of public comment and the value it adds to the process. She also mentioned the other ways to provide comment into the update process (through comment forms and online). She asked for public comment from anyone in the meeting.

- No public comments were given at the meeting.

Review Schedule for Day Two

The facilitator briefly covered the schedule for Day Two, noting that two of the five breakout groups have reported with three to go tomorrow, followed by breakout group meetings.

Adjourn for the day

The chair adjourned the meeting around 5:30 pm

DAY TWO

Review of Agenda – Hal Beardall

The facilitator welcomed the members and reviewed the agenda for Day Two.

Urban Issues Breakout Group Report – Kathy Till

The facilitator introduced Kathy Till (Leadership Committee member) as the presenter for the Urban Issues Breakout Group. Commissioner Till presented an overview of the breakout group meetings and presented the full group with the recommendations draft by the breakout group. The full presentation can be found under Tab 8 at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting%2D051909/> At the conclusion of the presentation, the facilitator asked for questions of clarification on the presentation and then asked for comment on each draft recommendation presented. (Responses in *italics*)

Questions for clarification:

- Draft recommendation D says a lot, is this meant to begin to create what kind of decisions SIS should play off of?
- The last two issues keep coming up, flexibility in connector criteria and especially criteria hub to hub connectors. These need to be added as a priority.
- Are we suggesting separate funding transit? Does this mean intra-regional transit would be funded with New Starts funding but inter-regional transit would stay on the SIS? *Yes, that was the intent of this recommendation.*

Comments on Draft Recommendations A – E:

Recommendation A: Recognize as part of SIS planning and implementation the importance of transportation investments within a region, especially in urban areas, to the prosperity and competitiveness of Florida's economy.

- Is this directed to the state or to the local community? *Response: It was intended to go to both.*
- What is our expectation if it is local or regional, what are we trying to say, what is the character of the local participation?
- When there is a SIS investment in any region, it's good for the whole state economy. For example, Central Florida commuter rail.
- Why does the SIS focus just on intra-regional movements when there are areas of the state that have congestion within the urban area that need the funding just as much?
- The discussion has focused around all of these things. A project that has significance regionally is also significant statewide.
- An inter-regional system could support the intra-regional network.

- We have seen a slide that shows how the state is becoming an entire urban region. We are now starting to see a blur of the concept intra- and inter-regional. Soon it will be all one urbanized state. We need to refresh on how the projections of population have grown.
- It depends on the price tag of the project and who's on board with it. We could get started on the commuter rail sooner with local support than adding lanes to I-4.

Recommendation B: Invest in transit capital projects through the separate Transit New Starts program, and provide sustainable funding for this program.

- Does a facility come off the SIS if it is paid with New Start funding? *Response: No, typically transit has not been on the SIS. The types of projects we would fund with New Starts would not have been on the SIS. They would be in their own category with their own funding.*
- Intra-regional transit does not belong on the SIS. Is this what this statement is saying? *Response: The discussion has been to retain the SIS structure focusing on inter-regional and let intra-regional have its own funding. Urban transit would be under New Starts program while intercity rail is part of the SIS. Based on other recommendations coming from the Urban Issues group, commuter rail could be eligible for SIS or New Starts.*
- Does pulling transit out of SIS give greater emphasis to it or put it to the side? Do these statements help us support transit or not?
- The whole issue is where transit falls; pulling it out would make it not eligible for this pot of funding.
- Tri-Rail used to be inter-regional but now it's intra-regional. The same is true with Tampa and Orlando. How do you determine which is intra- and inter- and whether one is on the SIS and the other not. You can't do one area different than another.
- The Urban group did not intend to take transit off of the SIS and only have it funded with New Starts. We may need to clarify the recommendation. *Response: To clarify, these recommendations don't take transit off the SIS; transit is not on the SIS now. They clarify that commuter rail is eligible on SIS and recommend that urban transit continue to be funded through the New Starts program.*
- We're here to look at the last five years and how we have moved forward. This is a strategic intermodal system. Additional investment in highways in the urban areas is not the way to go but transit is. This is where the strategic investment of the state should be going.
- The big policy direction a few years ago was that FDOT shouldn't continue to spend in a thousand different ways but focus on a system that is about connecting the regions and the intermodal facilities. We've learned a lot, now we need to decide whether it should still be about this or be changed/expanded and how to fund the updated option.

Recommendations C: Provide flexibility to use SIS funds to invest in parallel reliever systems (e.g., local/regional roads and transit projects) to relieve congestion on SIS facilities in cases in which the reliever project would remove local trips from the SIS facility and improve the performance of the SIS facility at a lower cost than adding capacity to the SIS facility.

- This is a good statement.
- In regards to relieving SIS facilities, are these considered constrained facilities and are we developing criteria for constrained facilities? *Response: There are times there is a constrained facility and nothing else can be done to relieve that facility so using transit on the constrained system was one way to help relieve the pressure on these facilities.*

- The group was also thinking about those facilities not constrained yet. If we had the opportunity, we could have a lower system to keep the current facilities from being constrained. This is where we wanted flexibility.
- In looking at reliever systems, you have to look at constrained systems or those that have the possibility to become that. If you fund a reliever system, this may open up an opportunity for the system to become constrained again. These facilities should meet a certain criteria so they don't keep becoming constrained.
- This is true although it's not just transit but also other modes. Yes any project would have to have criteria to show how it is lowering the congestion or improving operation. These could be key short distance projects.
- The discussion in the small group was not just on transit but on 'off' SIS relievers. The funds were not available to solve other problems but it was available for the commuter rail. We wanted to have the flexibility; otherwise the highway system bogs down.
- We should support communities that get ahead of the curve, and begin to address these issues before the facility becomes constrained. However, in the Tampa area they are taking down houses to make room for interstate expansion.
- Can we use SIS funds for non-SIS projects now? *Response: No, with the exception of proportionate fare share funding for mitigation of development impacts, which can be used on SIS or off-SIS facilities. In some limited cases FDOT has used SIS funding to advance a collection of projects including transit accommodations, such as the I-95 Express and I-595 initiatives.*
- Is there something we have identified as an area that the SIS would include instead of parallel reliever system? It seems like broad potential and needs to have a closer look at it and its relationship to all other facilities.
- We need to look at why SIS was created and determine whether the problem is a regional issue rather than a statewide issue.
- It wasn't intended to add additional facilities to the system, but once a project becomes a facility on the SIS, we need to look at the most cost effective project. It is only an alternative for a specific SIS facility.
- If using SIS funds on a non-SIS project benefits the SIS and is strategic and there is no other alternative maybe we should use the SIS funds for this.
- Is this for Emerging SIS? *Response: Not necessarily*
- Can SIS money be used for these types of projects without a statutory change? *Response: Only if the facility is a state owned facility; otherwise there would need to be a legislative change.*
- Need to be careful with this issue with diversion of funds from SIS projects. *Response: In context of growth management, we may try to make improvement in local roads instead of investments on the SIS facility. For example, there are cases in which we use proportionate fair share mitigation funding on a reliever system to help take congestion off the SIS.*

Recommendation D: Support development of coordinated, regional transportation and land use strategies that ensure a balanced mix of land uses adjacent to SIS facilities and support the emphasis of the SIS on statewide and interregional needs by reducing the number of local trips on the SIS. Provide multiple transportation and land use strategies that reflect the unique needs of urban, transitioning, and rural areas.

- This gets to what regional visions should mean. This is the kind of regional vision that SIS decision-making should play off of.

- In South Florida, we are such a large region; we are split between Districts 4 and 6. Does this recommendation suggest we should reexamine the structure of FDOT districts? Current split has created conflicts.

Recommendation E: Support potential changes to urban growth management policies to link development approval to multimodal measures of mobility rather than to highway level of service. These mobility measures should consider impacts on both intraurban mobility and statewide mobility using the SIS.

- No additional comments

Trade and Logistics Issues Breakout Group Report – Bridget Merrill

The facilitator introduced Bridget Merrill (Leadership Committee member) as the presenter for the Trade and Logistics Issues Breakout Group. Ms. Merrill presented an overview of the breakout group meetings and presented the full group with the recommendations draft by the breakout group. The full presentation can be found under Tab 8 at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting%2D051909/> At the conclusion of the presentation, the facilitator asked for questions of clarification on the presentation and then asked for comment on each draft recommendation presented. (Responses in *italics*)

Questions for clarification:

- Just wanted to point out that the volume of international freight in dollars is continuing to rise. It was \$114 million in 2007 and rose to \$130 million in 2008 and that in a recession. We need to consider accommodating the opportunities available.

Comment on Draft Recommendations A – C:

Recommendation A: The SIS Strategic Plan should develop strategies to:

- Better coordinate freight mobility and investment decisions across all modes, including the identification of freight projects of statewide significance that could be priorities for state and federal funding; and
- Enable freight investments to respond to market conditions.

- Can you clarify what ‘respond to market conditions’ means? *Response: This can be further clarified when the recommendations are revised.*
- Currently how much state and federal funding is provided for freight projects? *There is not an easy way to break SIS funding out specifically for freight because it’s not captured that way. There are other funding programs like 311 that are freight oriented. The other modes are not so easy. There are expectations of dedicated funding for freight in the federal authorization so having projects identified and ready to advance would be helpful.*

Recommendation B: Understanding the market will determine the future development of intermodal infrastructure, FDOT should:

- Work with industry to identify, through a trade flow analysis, the markets driving the future distribution of goods to guide investment in key freight hubs, corridors, and connectors on the SIS as well as links between the SIS and regional and local facilities needed to complete the supply chain; and
- Allow for flexibility to respond to changing market opportunities.
- Responding to market conditions is very critical when we talk about a trade flow analysis. This is to make sure we are a head of the curve especially with the opening of the Panama Canal.
- Is there an established freight advisory committee? *Response: No, some districts have created one but there is no statewide council as the federal government has recommended.*

- What do we envision from a trade flow analysis? Would it have an impact on where money is now spent? What is ultimate goal?
- Things are changing so drastically. Trucks bring everything to us. What will the freight picture look like in the future? We need to look ahead to see what kind of distribution centers are going to be needed.
- Don't know if this statement is strong enough.
- Agreed, this is one of the issues in SIS program. Part of the problem is the 5 year Work Program because there is no flexibility to respond to an opportunity that came up during the five years. Our breakout group also talked about the fact that the Feds may have a separate freight program apart from regular authorization. This would be projects that Florida has already identified. At this point, we would probably be competing with other states that have a freight plan. We need to be prepared with a freight mobility plan so the state is in the position to act on the funds, but also have the flexibility to elevate to a higher level in the state if necessary.
- The 5 year work program may be an issue as we expand on the freight movement. Being able to respond to changing conditions in the future, especially with the Panama Canal, we can set up for the future of freight movement.
- Often heard of having the flexibility to respond to changing conditions, was there any discussion on the legislative perspective on this? The problem is the legislature sees uncommitted funds so they take it. How can we be flexible without it being vulnerable for sweeping?
- Public private partnership is a possible solution. The 5 year work program doesn't work with the short time frame so you'll lose out. You can't have money left over or others will take it. We need a separate allocation for this or you will have trouble getting private support because private industry doesn't operate in this manner. Perhaps we could 'box' some money each year for unanticipated opportunities, and agree to commit it after 6 months to make sure we don't lose it.

Recommendation C: To support the strategic nature of the SIS, FDOT should:

- Consider using current designation criteria for existing freight hubs to determine designation of future freight terminals such as intermodal logistic centers, inland ports, and freight villages as necessary; and
- Encourage flexibility in eligibility of funding criteria that consider the entire supply chain.
- How much is FDOT involved in where inland logistics centers? *Response: Not in picking the site but in the feasibility studies. It depends on the location. The Winter Haven ILC was initiated by a private company and the SIS became involved when it entered into the DRI process and became a potential planned add facility. In the case of the proposed South Florida inland port, FDOT has been working with multiple partners on a feasibility study.*
- Once in the DRI process then it is considered in the SIS planning process – FDOT is not involved in the exploration phase.
- If the state gets involved where the private business was already involved, then they run the risk of the private sector moving on without them. If we wait too long then the planning already finished by private sector. You are potentially competing with private industry.
- Are these statements strong enough?
- We need to clarify flexibility.

Implementation Issues Breakout Group Report – Huiwei Shen

The facilitator introduced Huiwei Shen (FDOT Technical Lead) as the presenter for the Implementation Issues Breakout Group. Ms. Shen presented an overview of the breakout group meeting and the key issues discussed so far. Ms. Shen indicated that this group anticipates receiving issues from the other breakout groups and will develop policy recommendations based on this input. The full presentation can be found under Tab 8 at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting%2D051909/>. At the conclusion of the presentation, the facilitator asked for comments on the presentation. (Responses in *italics*)

- Emphasis on stretching funding through efficiencies – but still not close to addressing all our needs with the limited funds – still a huge gap between needs and funds – when do we address this gap?
- We need clarify role of modal offices? Modal offices focus on specific modes to bring expertise to each mode’s issues – Districts are slightly different in organization to meet needs in their districts.
- Someone does oversee all modal offices at state level – again Districts are structured to support modal offices.
- Page 5 of the summary – surprised to see transportation authorities as non-traditional partners – isn’t there an ongoing communication with FDOT?
- FTC has oversight of many authorities too – and there is ongoing coordination with Central and District offices.
- Would like more information on the relationship with and growth of transportation authorities.
- First item on page 4 of the summary, concerning enhancing coordination. What areas need improvement? What is not working?
- Northwest Florida Emerging SIS facilities may need more coordination.
- This group may need to delve into what would benefit from improved coordination.
- This group appears to be listening to other groups and has begun to pick up on integration of modes and the supply chain – they will need to flesh out the initial observations.
- What do we mean by implementation of the SIS? It is a set of criteria and thresholds. Is it about how new facilities get on the system? For those that are on the SIS, what is an appropriate investment? Third, priorities among the facilities? Implementation may involve balancing those.
- There is a flexibility issue of what needs to move faster than the five year work program policy and how to address the regional visioning.
- How do you set the priorities and then turn around and fund them? How do you define a “strategic” system?
- How would you define and determine a new opportunity as a higher priority than previously identified need not yet addressed?
- You need to consider the opportunity and risk – too much flexibility can be a risk. What is the outcome we want as opposed to order of the list?
- It is the outcome we need to look at. We need to look strategically forward rather than backward to anticipate and position Florida for shifts. We may need to look at issues differently for future appropriate growth and preserving the environment – not just look at existing corridors.
- At the same time, we need to look at what kind of balance there should be between new opportunities and

already identified opportunities.

- We need to look at what is strategic, not just what can be funded.
- If the money is not there then it will not be funded. We still have to consider funding and what can be funded. If regions are doing land use planning based on a project and it is then removed as a priority it puts locals in a difficult position.
- How do will these recommendations impact what we already have prioritized to date?
- What will we use as criteria to help identify what is strategic?
- The question we need to consider is how often do we re-evaluate and re-prioritize? Something that was strategic last year, may be not strategic the next? Cannot change this every year.
- The MPO process focuses on continuing projects already underway.
- The next FTP update will look out 50 years into the future.
- Clarification – we are looking at non-traditional partners – where is economic development being considered beyond just looking at flow of freight? Where do we consider impact of transportation on economic development or vice versa?
- That factor may need more emphasis or priority – what weight should it carry?
- For example, Jaxport – there are both transportation and economic development implications. There are issues of accommodating the transportation system to move goods. They are just looking at the transportation system then looking at backlog. At what point do we say a project has an economic development benefit that moves it up the list?
- We have come along way in the last 15 years with economic development entities working with transportation planning entities. There is a good working relationship particularly in rural areas to address issues faced now by urban areas. It's like a large vessel that takes time to shift direction – we should recognize the recent effort to cooperate.
- We need to be thinking about how you tie transportation and economic development together. Transportation funding is not at past levels but what other opportunities for transportation funding need to be considered to meet infrastructure needs?
- The MPOAC tried to establish a transportation revenue study commission to look at the issue.
- Not sure how many on this committee understand the MPO process but plans must be cost feasible. However these cost feasible plans can be based on future assumptions that may not come true.
- This committee needs a strong statement on funding. We need to be clear on the priorities we envision for the state. Also related to those priorities, we need a statement that these priorities need to be funded.
- Task of this committee must identify an economic strategy. FDOT does not, will not, have enough funding to take advantage of all economic opportunities.

Review and Discussion of Designation Policy Issues – John Kaliski

The Chair introduced John Kaliski, with Cambridge Systematics, to give a presentation on Designation Policy Issues. The full presentation can be found at Tab 9 at the following link:

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting%2D051909/>. Following the presentation, the facilitator asked for comments or questions concerning the information presented. (Responses in *italics*)

- Regarding Slide 5, everyone has different definition of regional. We need to look at efficiencies of the system to try to get partners to agree on what the regions are. There are a lot of inefficiencies because of the overlap of regions. There are many groups working on the same function.
- Regarding RACEC on slide 8, was this a policy decision made as part of SIS or was it legislative directed? *Response: There was some legislative direction through the Rural Economic Development Initiative (REDI) and the RACECs, which all state agencies are required to consider. However the SIS Strategic Plan and 2025 FTP had goals of looking at economically distressed areas. As we think through the highway criteria if it is based only on volumes it probably would not serve rural areas. This looks at the state through the bigger picture. Any decisions about future planning for these facilities would be in the context of regional visions for the rural areas.*
- Slide 11 (inserted), the Urban Issues breakout group looked at transit more broadly than just rail. We don't want to limit the discussion to just rail transit. To limit this to rail only and not to urban areas does an injustice and doesn't focus on what we should do. *Agreed, this map came from rail system plan and is a good starting point. The map just suggests that interregional rail should be looked at. A good question for the group would be what language could be used that is "technology neutral" (not limited to rail).*
- Can we get a copy of the slides not provided in the notebooks? *Response: Yes, they were not available at the time of printing but they will be provided to all members.*
- The legislature thought it would be ideal to do a study on the districts and regions to determine the best way to represent regions in the state. The conclusion was it would be too expensive and not make sense. The regions work well wearing multiple hats. We get together to make sure the issues are being discussed. If everyone has a seat and are aware then we can implement these ideas. It's confusing to explain but seems to be working.
- Regarding the SIS and Emerging SIS Passenger Rail Corridors map, several terminals are shown as "planned drop"? Is this correct? *Response: No, it is just a legend error and will be corrected.*
- Who represents BRAC? *Response: Rocky McPherson with Enterprise Florida.*

Proposed Outline for Committee Report – Brian Watts

The Chair introduced Brian Watts, FDOT SIS Strategic Plan Update Project Manager, to provide an overview of the proposed outline for the Leadership Committee report. The full presentation can be found at Tab 10 at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting%2D051909/>. Following the presentation, the facilitator asked for comments or questions concerning the information presented on the Committee report outline. (Responses in *italics*)

- What about potential additions to SIS policies related to transit? How will this be addressed in this outline?
- Please identify the resource tools the committee looked at as sources in appendices.
- Regarding Section 4, the recommendations for passenger rail and community and environment go beyond just screening and criteria. This should be changed to urban issues.
- Section 5; consider whether the grouping should consider the implementation step that you are trying to get to. What is it related to? How is it funded? What about setting priorities?
- Section 2, needs to address funding, in addition to partner coordination, designation, funding,

competitiveness, and growth management.

- We need themes to relate to the things we are trying to get out of this report.
- Is it the intent that the committee will not get into the detail of the criteria? *Response: Yes that is the intent, we not going into the smallest level of detail.*
- Do you envision the plan update to be a document similar to the original report? Will we have both documents to look at or a freshly comprehensive report? Will we continue to need the original report? *Response: We intend to have a report that encompasses all items necessary. It should appropriately tie the past to the future.*
- In section 5; please add urban issues in the list.

Public Comment

The Chair stressed the importance of public comment and the value it adds to the process. She also mentioned the other ways to provide comment into the update process (through comment forms and online). She asked for public comment from anyone in the meeting.

- No public comments were given at the meeting.

Review Next Steps

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting will be June 22-23, 2009 in Orlando. The meeting on Monday, June 22 will start at 1:00pm. The August meeting will be rescheduled.

The Chair announced that four Breakout Groups will meet at 12:30pm to discuss the feedback from the full Leadership Committee members on the individual topics. The Implementation Group will meet at 1:30pm.

The facilitator reminded members to turn in their meeting evaluation forms before breaking for lunch.

The full group adjourned at 11:45am.

Meeting summaries for each breakout group meeting after the full group meeting will be available at www.sisupdate.org