

2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee

Draft Summary of Meeting #4

FDOT District 5 Urban Office, Orlando, Florida

Meeting Date:	6/22-23/09	Meeting Time:	1:00pm – 6:00pm 8:00am – 3:00pm	Type of Meeting:	In-person
----------------------	------------	----------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------

Participants: Members: Debbie Hunt (FDOT Assistant Secretary), Chair
Noranne Downs (FDOT-District 5 Secretary), Vice-Chair
Bob Ball (Florida Airports Council) [Debra Lemke, designee on Day 2]
Kathy Till (Florida League of Cities)
Jason Peters (FDOT-D3)
Martin Knopp (Federal Highway Administration)
Javier Rodriguez (TEAMFL)
Richard Kaplan (MPOAC) [Howard Glassman, designee on Day 2]
Rocky McPherson (Florida Defense Alliance)
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)
Todd Pokrywa (Association of Florida Community Developers)
Tony Carvajal (Florida Chamber of Commerce)
Bridget Merrill (designee for John Adams, Enterprise Florida, Inc.)
Chris Stahl (designee for Sally Mann, Florida Department of Environmental Protection)
Laurie Macdonald (Defenders of Wildlife)
Janet Bowman (The Nature Conservancy)
Charles Gauthier (Florida Department of Community Affairs)
Keisha Rice (designee for Dale Brill Office of Tourism, Trade, and Economic Development)
Bart Pullum (Florida Transportation Commission)
Bill Cross (designee for Joe Giulietti, Florida Public Transportation Association)
Wes Watson (designee for Chuck Cohen, Florida Public Transportation Association)
Matt Ubben (designee for Tom Hindle, Florida Trucking Association)
David Roach (Florida Inland Navigation District)

Staff: Kathy Neill (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Brian Watts (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), George Sirianni (FDOT Systems Planning Office), 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), Sally Patrenos (Florida Transportation Commission), Harry Barley (Metroplan Orlando), Louis Rotundo (Rotundo Associates), Debra Lemke (Florida Airports Council), Alex Trauger (Metroplan Orlando), Virginia Whittington (Metroplan Orlando)

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
	Overview of Proposed Leadership Committee Report Outline.....	page 3	Brian Watts
	Purposes and Goals of the SIS – What is the Purpose of SIS?.....	page 3	Terry Kraft
	System Designation.....	page 5	John Kaliski/Members
	Military Assessment.....	page 10	Rocky McPherson/Members
	Finance Strategy.....	page 12	Kathy Neill/Members
	Public Comment.....	page 13	Members of Public
	Review Schedule for Day 2.....	page 13	Hal Beardall
	DAY TWO		
	Agenda Review.....	page 14	Hal Beardall
	Implementation Issues Breakout Group Report.....	page 14	Sally Patrenos
	Needs Assessment.....	page 15	Pat Steed/John Kaliski/Members
	Prioritization Process.....	page 25	John Kaliski/Members
	Implementation.....	page 29	John Kaliski/Members
Public Comment.....	page 33	Members of Public	
Review Next Steps and Assignments.....	page 33	Hal Beardall	

Summary of Meeting Content

DAY ONE

Opening Remarks – Debbie Hunt

Debbie Hunt, FDOT Assistant Secretary for Intermodal Systems Development and Chair of the SIS Leadership Committee, welcomed everyone and thanked the members for their ongoing service. She specifically thanked the Implementation Issues Breakout Group for their willingness to continue to meet between the last meeting and this one to complete the development of their recommendations. She pointed out that there is no legislative update beyond what was presented at the last meeting because FDOT is reviewing the specifics of how the new legislation will impact agency programs. In particular, FDOT and FDCA are working together to determine how to implement the growth management changes in SB 360. She stated this update is planned for the August meeting. She indicated that questions have arisen about the overarching purpose of the SIS. There is time at the beginning of the meeting to review and discuss how the original SIS Steering Committee approached the issue and how FDOT is currently approaching it. Finally, a major focus of this meeting is consensus-testing and refining the current drafts of the recommendations.

She indicated the draft recommendations presented over the next two days have been organized into the five elements required by statute to be included in the SIS Strategic Plan. She stated the members will review each of these recommendations and then staff will revise them based on the comments received during this meeting.

Agenda Review – Rafael Montalvo

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

The facilitator drew attention to the draft Meeting Three 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 under Tab 1 and at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting-062209/>.

The facilitator reviewed the meeting materials under each Tab in the notebook and asked for any questions on the materials or agenda. The chair asked for a motion to adopt the agenda. The agenda was adopted unanimously.

Overview of Proposed Leadership Committee Report Outline – Brian Watts

The Chair introduced Brian Watts, FDOT project manager for the SIS Strategic Plan Update, and asked him to provide an overview of the proposed Leadership Committee report outline. The outline can be found under Tab 3 and at: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting-062209/>. Following Mr. Watts' overview, the facilitator asked members if they were comfortable with this approach. The facilitator asked for comments or questions. (Response in *italics*)

- What is the timeline for the completion of the SIS cost feasible plan? We may be late in the game as it relates to federal funding. Is our work timely? *This process is ahead of the curve nationally in shifting toward a multimodal approach. We are monitoring the federal authorization but the timing of a new bill or extension of the existing bill is not clear. We will be prepared to provide input when there is opportunity to do so.*
- How is the SIS impacted in the future work program in light of funding reductions? *The SIS program will move forward depending on funding available. State funding is down by \$9.3 billion since 2006, which has a significant impact on SIS as well as all state-funded projects. We follow statutory guidelines to determine how to reduce funding in all areas.*
- Would like to know the impact on SIS projects and other modes? *We will get back to group with specific numbers tomorrow – impacts were across the board. There was \$171 million lost from the sweep. Kathy Neill will speak more to this later today in her presentation on Funding Issues.*
- There was \$85 million reduction from public transportation funds, mostly due to SunRail funding not being approved and reduction in the statutorily required 15 percent allocation to public transportation.

The facilitator asked if there were any reservations on the proposed outline. None were raised.

The facilitator asked members to think about the overarching themes for the Leadership Committee report over the rest of the meeting and help staff identify what these overarching themes might be.

Purpose and Goals of the SIS – What is the purpose of the SIS? – Terry Kraft

The chair introduced Terry Kraft with the Office of Policy Planning. The facilitator pointed out to members the purpose of Mr. Kraft's presentation was to review the original philosophy of the SIS, so this committee can determine if its recommendations are consistent or whether they want to recommend changes to the original purpose and goals. This information identifies what the original SIS Steering Committee felt was strategic. Mr. Kraft's presentation can be found under Tab 4 at: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting-062209/>. The facilitator asked members for questions of clarification. (Response in *italics*)

- Regarding Slide 13, what did you mean by ‘Emerging SIS became eligible for SIS funding’? I thought SIS and Emerging SIS were treated the same. *The original intent was for ‘Emerging SIS’ to be treated separately from the SIS. It became part of the SIS with the adoption of the SIS Strategic Plan in 2005, based on additional partner input.*
- What was the reason for creating the Emerging SIS? *Early on it was acknowledged some parts of Florida such as the northwest region the Florida would not have many facilities meeting the SIS thresholds today, but would be likely to grow in the future. The idea was to include facilities meeting lower “Emerging SIS” thresholds so they had a chance to grow and become part of the SIS in the future.*
- Regarding Slide 6, is this an overarching theme? *This slide documents the key trends reviewed by the Committee in 2002. We could consider a similar summary list for this report. .*
- For 2025 FTP, what was population growth rate? *An estimated 1000 new residents per day net increase back then. About 700 – 800 net increase per day now.*

The facilitator directed the members to the green sheets in Tab 4, SIS Goal and Principle Statements (excerpt from the Final Report of the original SIS Steering Committee). He explained the purpose of reviewing this information is to remind or inform members of what the original SIS Steering Committee decided and what this Committee is being asked to update. He asked members to provide comment on the overall SIS goal and principles.

- May need to discuss the specific recommendations first before reviewing overall goals. *We are raising these statements now to get initial reactions, and then we will come back to them later.*
- Add concept of ‘diversity’ to economic competitiveness and prosperity.
- What do you mean by “implications” of the draft recommendations? *Some recommendations would broaden the SIS while others would narrow it -- these recommendations could have funding implications as well.*
- Agree with the diversification comment. Also we need to identify what the markets may be in the future. Need to identify a global perspective to understand where we stand in the system of global trade.
- There is talk at the federal level regarding rewriting whether funding goes to states or more to the regional or urban levels. This plan needs to reflect that potential funding mechanism, which may impact the share of funding the state receives as part of the reauthorization process.
- We shouldn’t base the plan on ‘what if’ since we don’t know where the reauthorization will end up. We should focus as we have been and then adjust as needed. We need to be prepared and aware of what is happening at the federal level.
- Need to recognize the possibility and address in the plan in a subtle manner.
- Are there performance measures being collected on the SIS? Is FDOT tracking delay, etc. on different modes? *There is a draft performance report for the SIS we are using to paint a bigger picture of system performance rather than to make specific decisions. We haven’t built a structure for making performance-based decisions on the SIS.*
- Recommend using the approach in current law for allocating funding and adjusting when and if it is changed.
- There are many mechanisms in place today that send federal funds straight to regional entities such as airports, etc.
- Is FDOT looking for more flexibility in the process if funds come available? *No, this is a statewide strategic*

plan, so we must be clear that the money is going where it needs to go.

- The goals stated here are what was important before. Are we limited to these from the 2002 report? *No, the Committee may expand or revise as is appropriate now.*
- We need to be more proactive in Washington, D.C. to influence policy-making.
- We need to get the implementation moving along so it doesn't take so long for the Environmental Impact Statement process. I like the goals and principles here but concern is with the length it takes to implement – implementation delays limit the effectiveness of the goals and principles.
- As a matter of information, the Florida Transportation Commission has performance measures for the SIS.
- Is system integration broadened beyond transportation under the definition of strategic (e.g., regional stewardship initiatives)?

At the conclusion of the discussion, the facilitator framed four key questions:

- What is strategic?
- Should SIS be more inclusive or more focused?
- What is interregional – has it changed over time?
- Off-system investments – how might they affect SIS performance?

The Chair commented the Committee needs to have a realistic view of the SIS and what it should be, noting not everything can be put into the melting pot of the SIS. She reminded members the focus should be what is strategic to the State.

System Designation – John Kaliski/Facilitator/Members

The chair introduced John Kaliski with Cambridge Systematics to review the recommendations for System Designation. These draft recommendations can be found under Tab 5 at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting-062209/>. Following the presentation of the draft recommendations, the facilitator asked members for clarification comments and then to rate the six recommendations for System Designation. (Responses in *italics*).

- What is the split of funding between SIS and Emerging SIS – think this speaks to strategic? *An average of 4-5% goes to Emerging SIS. This varies by mode with a higher percentage allocated to some modes like aviation.*
- Has past practice relating to Emerging SIS been strategic? – *The feedback from the breakout group and other partners has been that retaining Emerging SIS with separate criteria has been of value.*
- These draft recommendations have no reference to funding and are strictly related to criteria.

Recommendations:

- A. The SIS Strategic Plan should maintain separate designation criteria and policies for the Emerging SIS. (*Emerging SIS breakout group*)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 25	2 – 0	1 – 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- No comments

B. The SIS Strategic Plan should clarify SIS designation criteria to affirm the eligibility of two types of transit systems for SIS designation:

- Commuter rail and other transit systems connecting multiple urban areas within a single economic region and providing an alternative to SIS highway corridors; and
- 'Hub-to-hub' transit systems directly connecting two SIS hubs and primarily supporting parts of international, interstate, or interregional trips.

(Urban Issues breakout group with staff edits based on discussion at last meeting)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 13	2 – 9	1 – 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Use different word than 'affirm.'
- In first bullet, should we breakout commuter rail and other transit systems into separate bullets?
- This bullet was trying to clarify transit systems in the future; it was added in an attempt to be inclusive of emerging transit technologies.
- Second point may be in conflict with language to the effect that reliever systems (if that is what is referred to here) will not be designated as part of the SIS.
- What is the definition of "other systems?" *It refers to other technologies that may perform the same function as commuter rail.*
- What is the need for this recommendation? Has there been a problem in the past? What is definition of other transit system? *Initial SIS Strategic Plan designated TriRail based on its integration with Amtrak's interregional service. This was trying to have more inclusive language so commuter rail systems around the state could be included as others are developed in the future, because they might not be just like Tri Rail. Amtrak is treated as interregional rail; this is dealing with commuter rail within a region. At this point, high speed rail is also eligible.*
- We need to be careful about how far we dilute the SIS, and make sure that what is intended by a statement is clear and understood.
- An example of "other transit systems" might be the Miami-Dade exclusive busway that takes you to the Miami-Dade Metro Rail system, which then takes you to TriRail to connect to West Palm Beach.
- Regarding hub-to-hub: the public transportation community has long thought the omission of hub to hub transit connectors was a major oversight. This is the primary way that public transportation can be a part of the SIS. Poster child for this might be the connector between the Miami Airport and the Port of Miami. It is eligible under current statute, but these connectors need to be reflected in the designation criteria.

C. The SIS Strategic Plan should develop new designation criteria for SIS highways to:

- Designate as part of the SIS those state highways providing connectivity between major urbanized areas and economic clusters in Florida and other states, including economic centers located in Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern;
- Choose among potential highways providing this connectivity based on considerations including directness of the connection, degree of access control, traffic volumes, and designation as part of other federal or state strategic systems such as the National Highway System, the Strategic Highway Network, and the state emergency evacuation network; and
- Enable the combination of the SIS highway and the Florida Intrastate Highway System into a single statewide highway network.

(staff based on discussion at last meeting)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 5	2 – 15	1 – 0
-------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Is there a reason this statement about connectivity is limited to highways? Shouldn't it apply to all modes? *This particular recommendation is specific to highways, but the same thought is in Recommendation D for rail.*
- Would like to know how much this recommendation would expand the SIS highway component by adding the FIHS. This seems an example of expanding the SIS? To what extent are the FIHS and SIS currently the same? *About 95 percent overlap right now. Actually, right now there are more highways on SIS than on FIHS, because of the number of SIS facilities in rural areas of critical economic concern. This recommendation would streamline the designation process and get back to the function of the highways.*
- Is this an area where we might want to expand the SIS? What impact would this have on the SIS, as far as funding, etc? *Depending on how the criteria are written, this could mean a slight expansion of the SIS, or a slight decrease in it. We also would suggest some discussion of sunseting the FIHS before you endorse this statement.*
- Would want to see some examples and see what we are really talking about. Looks like one of those situations where you might have unintended consequences. I can't support this until I have a better sense of this. Does this include U.S. highways (As specific examples consider US 41 and SR 40)? *Possibly, but this statement needs to be considered in conjunction with the community and environment screening criteria. Is the overall direction okay? If so, staff will bring you more detail as to how it might look.*
- What does first bullet mean? *This concept looks at the major urbanized areas based on population and economic centers as related the transportation dependent industries. It would support designating highways based on connectivity between these centers.*
- Would like to hear more about economic connectivity between urban areas. *We will work more on this concept. This is a placeholder for a number of issues. We can bring a presentation to the next meeting about what it means vis-à-vis designation criteria.*
- In first go-around in 02, the assumption was made that in order for something to be strategic, it had to be interregional. It sounds as if this group is starting to question that. Not so much a strategic interregional systems as a strategic intermodal system.

- D.** The SIS Strategic Plan should update designation criteria for SIS freight rail terminals and corridors to:
- Reflect industry standards for assessing the role of different types of terminals;
 - Give greater emphasis to access to markets and system connectivity;
 - Enable flexibility to adapt to new types of terminals (e.g., inland ports, integrated logistics centers, and freight villages); and
 - Incorporate key system elements required for intermodal connectivity (e.g., drayage routes between seaports and freight rail terminals)
- (Trade and Logistics group with staff edits based on discussion at last meeting)*

Initial Acceptability:

3 - 23	2 - 4	1 - 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- “Terminals” is used loosely in bullet two, then used more specifically, then loosened up again. Shouldn’t we be consistent? Need to clearly define what is intended by each. *Staff will work on terminology.*
 - How would this expand the system? *Staff will bring an analysis to the next meeting.*
 - What is a freight village? This seems to be mode specific, and maybe should be expanded to say ‘intermodal’?
- E.** The SIS Strategic Plan should provide additional flexibility in intermodal connector designation to address unique needs of different types of hubs (staff based on discussion at last meeting)

Initial Acceptability:

3 - 16	2 - 11	1 - 0
--------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Need to define it, need to understand it, need to better understand the implications of this one.
 - Challenge is to clearly define, yet still allow some flexibility.
 - Agree, this is a very vague statement, need to be more explicit in the types of hubs this is talking about.
 - Need example of a unique need of a hub.
 - What about people mover connectors? There is interest in other modes – needs clarification.
- F.** FDOT should continue its current practice of applying the SIS community and environmental screening process to all facilities proposed for SIS or Emerging SIS designation to guide choices among potential facilities for designation and to flag potential issues for consideration in future investment decisions. FDOT should work with resource agencies to ensure the most appropriate data are included in this process, and to ensure this process informs designation decisions in an efficient manner. (C&E breakout group with staff edits based on discussion at last meeting).

Initial Acceptability:

Suggestions for improvement:

- Concern that Environmental Impact Statements are still taking four years. ETDM is killing us on moving projects forward.
- ETDM is meant to ensure that if there are major flaws in a project, it doesn't go forward.
- That is the concept, but in reality it doesn't work that way.
- What is the current process for applying the community and environment screening criteria? *There are examples in the notebook. This process was developed by the initial steering committee. The C&E screening is part of the initial designation process. It is intended to flag potential community and environmental issues and look at alternatives. It is done in 10 days or so using GIS, and reviewed by Central Office and the Districts. With this we know as early as possible that there are issues that need special care. It is currently required for SIS facilities only but is applied to Emerging SIS also.*
- If this is current practice, why do we need this statement? *Current practice is for SIS only and this would clarify that it applies for the Emerging SIS too.*
- Suggest taking out.
- Are we doubling up on efforts with ETDM by doing this screening? Are we complicating things by trying to clarify things?
- Is this conversation separate from the ETDM conversation? *Yes, this is a separate decision-making process – the C&E screening process addresses designation while ETDM addresses projects and investments. The sense of the Breakout Group was that the C&E screening process and ETDM could link and be streamlined so that information from the C&E screening process could be carried forward into ETDM and not require duplication.*
- ETDM was prompted by the Federal legislation that called for streamlining – the very purpose is to flag issues early, rather than letting them emerge later after significant investments.

Members offered overall comments on System Designation.

- Why do we continue to use Enterprise Florida Regions rather than FDOT Districts for SIS? I thought there was concurrence in the Implementation group to use FDOT Districts. *The original Steering Committee wanted to maximize integration of SIS with economic development efforts, so they recommended using the Enterprise Florida regions for designation. The idea offered at the last meeting to use Enterprise Florida regions for designation and FDOT districts for implementation. Not sure there was clear direction to change from how it was currently being approached.*
- MPO process focuses on urban areas. Why aren't MPO urbanized areas somehow used in the SIS process? They include over 90% of the state's population.
- You have the population, but the areas relevant to travel aren't necessarily defined by MPO areas.
- I'd like to see data that explores this question. I think a great deal of travel revolves around the MPO urbanized areas.

- This discussion falls in line with discussions about how you set the priorities. Ongoing issues in the urbanized areas, emerging issues in the rural and undeveloped areas.
- What we are doing with the SIS is recognizing the freight terminals serving those urbanized areas – to and from urban areas. A lot of the travel associated with the urbanized areas is related to those terminals.
- When the 2010 census comes around, the Feds may change the definition of urbanized area.
- The connections between urbanized areas and regions are important to the SIS.

Military Assessment – Rocky McPherson/Facilitator/Members

The chair introduced Rocky McPherson with Enterprise Florida (Leadership Committee member) who briefly presented the background paper on military issues. This paper can be found under Tab 6 at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting-062209/>. Gordon Goodin representing Florida Association of Counties (also a Leadership Committee member) provided examples of this application of military issues in Florida. Following the presentation of the paper, the facilitator asked members to rate the two recommendations for Military Assessment.

Recommendations:

- A. FDOT should identify and designate as SIS or Emerging SIS facilities the roadway and/or rail facilities linking SIS highway or rail corridors to the state’s largest or most strategic military bases, based on criteria to be developed by FDOT in consultation with the Florida Defense Alliance and other partners (staff based on discussion at last meeting)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 17	2 – 6	1 – 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- It is not necessarily FDOT’s responsibility to identify military connectivity needs.
- “FDOT should?” – by the time FDOT knows military needs, it may be after the fact.
- There are communications with FDOT, OTTED, etc. We have a running list of current issues and know the impact of these issues.
- When U.S. Department of Defense makes a decision we want to be able to respond and having the SIS ready to help with this response is important. This is part of making sure the tools are available when these issues come up.
- I don’t want to diminish the importance of the issue, but we need to acknowledge military coordination is something our state does well. We need to make sure this coordination happens because our military role is unique. I agree there is also a federal responsibility here as well.
- Would there be shared funding with federal government?
- There is currently legislation going through Congress, which may allow expenditure of federal funds in communities growing because of military relocations.
- There are advantages to having the military in a community. In terms of handling NEPA quickly, we

need to look at options that would not get traction without the military.

- Could this recommendation lead to the upgrading of roads that don't need it? *There are no examples of this occurring. I don't think there is extra money for this. Many bases want less access but they take existing roads and make them better.*
- Need to name the 'other partners.'
- Include discussion of enhanced-use leases.
- Do we have good relationship with base commanders? Are you including these as 'other partners'? *Yes, we have a good relationship with higher levels. We also meet with economic development offices to work on any issues. OEA (Office of Economic Adjustment) has traditionally just funded studies, but now may be about to fund implementation – these are all 'other partners.'*
- With military bases collectively as economic generators ranking third in the state, why reference only largest and most important bases, and not all?
- This is worded as if the SIS is the end-all. Would prefer to word in a way that recognizes that the SIS is an important factor. When it gets important enough, this isn't the only pot of money.
- In Escambia, we working with military bases to forward both military and environmental issues, and growth management goals.
- Does the background paper consider the Florida National Guard? *Yes, but the economic data have yet to be added; will be added soon.*
- We need to include military bases. Why aren't bases already included? Would be curious to know what the largest and most important bases are. *There are 20 major bases – NAS Pensacola, Eglin AFB, NAS Jacksonville are examples. Orlando presence in simulation. MacDill, two central operations commands. US Southern Command in Miami. U.S. Coast Guard was not included because it is under Department of the Treasury, not Department of Defense. Aviation-related industries growing at Cecil, a former base. Most major bases are already very close to being well connected. There are a few places where you need additional connections.*

B. FDOT should ensure military issues receive greater consideration in SIS planning and implementation decisions (staff based on discussion at last meeting)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 7	2 – 15	1 – 2
-------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- This is a broad statement to say 'military issues.' We know mobilization is a big factor so rail is important.
- Suggest rewording to say: FDOT should ensure consideration of economic value and national security implications in SIS planning and implementation decisions.
- More clearly define "military issues."
- We are really talking about economic development in Florida; however, we all compete for economic development and this comes from another source. We shouldn't give greater consideration to a

military facility when other transportation projects are waiting to be finished.

- The intent is to say to military issues should get ‘greater consideration’ than what they are getting now. This needs to be clarified.
- Concern about how strong this statement seems to be. Base may not be located near any other SIS facility, but the state would be compelled to give it priority.
- Clarification would probably result in higher ratings.

Finance Strategy – Kathy Neill/Facilitator/Members

The chair introduced Kathy Neill, Director of the FDOT Office of Policy Planning, to make a presentation on current funding issues. Ms. Neill’s presentation can be found under Tab 7 at the following link: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting-062209/>. Following the presentation, the facilitator asked for questions/comments and then asked members to rate the one recommendation for Finance Strategy. (Responses in *italics*)

- Should we continue to measure in VMT or in gas tax revenues or show how they are declining? *VMT trends track pretty close to gas sales but this will probably change in the future.*
- Can you explain the estimate of unfunded needs? *For non-highway modes, we used what different modes gave us. Highway needs were identified through the MPO process, expressway authorities, etc. Those projects not in the cost-feasible plan are considered unfunded. MPO processes have long range planning estimates using two planning horizons: 2015 and 2030. The estimate shown here is out of date because it was developed in 2006, prior to the significant cost increases and work program reductions, and because we are continually developing better information for non-highway modes.*
- What is 100% of discretionary funding? *Don’t have a specific number today but it includes everything that doesn’t go to safety, preservation, and maintenance. The 75% target was what the original plan asked us to move toward. We have not reached that level as of now. We will put together this information for the next meeting.*

Recommendations:

- A. FDOT should invest in urban transit capital projects (both new systems and extensions of existing systems) through the separate Transit New Starts program, and provide sustainable funding for this program. FDOT should coordinate SIS and New Starts funding decisions to facilitate commuter rail and intercity transit development, and to ensure SIS passenger rail systems and terminals are integrated with regional and local transit systems. (Urban Issues breakout group with staff edits based on discussion at last meeting)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 4	2 – 20	1 – 1
-------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- It’s a way of investing what we have; the problem is we don’t have it to invest. I am looking for more and not seeing it. What is the status of the New Starts? *This program is very close to having no funding at this point. Funding from documentary stamps is way down so the majority of funding is gone for now.*
- This is not a starting point for these recommendations just the only one that came out of the breakout

groups. This goes with other statements the urban group presented.

- If you take this with the designation statement earlier (hub-to-hub), it means that some types of transit would be eligible for SIS and this would cover others.
- If this is a local issue then how is that intermodal? If it is intermodal then why wouldn't it show up under rail or other modes?
- The point of the breakout group was to show the importance of funding transit connecting into SIS facilities, as an integrated solution.
- This recommendation shows support for separate system to make it an integrated system.
- And to provide alternatives also.
- What is 'sustainable funding'?
- The purpose of this was to provide a connection for the end trip.
- Would like to see all finance statements talked about at the same time so there is perspective.
- FDOT would not be a primary partner on commuter rail -- this has to do with shared partnership not just FDOT running transit.
- Is this rail only? What about buses? This is a little too specific. Yes, it could be buses, etc. Perhaps a little too narrow as worded.
- We don't know enough and need to consider all statements together on this topic.
- I don't know what I don't know and am uncomfortable – there's a lot to bubble up.
- Chair would like to wait to finish the discussion on this when the recommendations are more complete.
- Suggest reading through the current SIS plan to determine where we need to start with this discussion.
- The yellow pages from 2005 SIS Strategic Plan (Tab 7) – we ought to look at these pages carefully. We need to take time in this area to develop what we want to say.

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. The chair asked members to keep plugging in with their members and partners so they know what is going on they are aware of the issues.

- No public comments were given at the meeting.

Review Schedule for Day Two

The facilitator briefly covered the schedule for Day Two stating the meeting starts at 8:00 am. He also asked members to review draft recommendations to be covered on Day Two.

Adjourn for the day

The chair adjourned the meeting around 5:45 pm.

DAY TWO

Review of Agenda – Hal Beardall

The facilitator welcomed the members and reviewed the slightly revised agenda for Day Two. The Implementation Issues Breakout Group presentation was moved up to be first on the agenda. The overview of transportation authorities was provided in the members' notebooks. The review of SIS prioritization goals and factors was moved to the section on prioritization process to be discussed as time permitted.

Implementation Issues Breakout Group Report – Sally Patrenos

The chair introduced Sally Patrenos (Leadership Committee member designee) as the presenter for the Implementation Issues Breakout Group. Ms. Patrenos presented an overview of the breakout group meetings and presented the group's draft recommendations. The presentation can be found under Tab 8 at: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting-062209/>. 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*)

- What is meant by greater flexibility to accelerate projects? *For example, if a big industry locates here, how can we accommodate the transportation needs without affecting established priorities? We struggled with how to find a way to set aside funds for upcoming projects. We haven't found a way to not specify money without it being taken. We need to find a way to provide funding for projects that generate economic impact and jobs for the future; we need flexibility without vulnerability.*
- What about willing buyers, how do you put an economic opportunity ahead of an established statewide project? *We didn't really come to a conclusion on this; it's a policy decision that needs to take place. If we use the SIS to keep us economically competitive, then if there is a better opportunity today than five years ago, then we need the flexibility to take advantage of it.*
- We talked about the possibility of establishing a fund like OTTED uses.
- If there was specific legislative language to respond to these needs, would this decrease the vulnerability of losing the money? *Not necessarily, we do follow the specific language on the trust fund but this doesn't always keep the funds safe.*
- Legislative guidance might help though. In areas where we have guidance it may help maintain the funds. If there was statutory language to set aside funds for economic development opportunities, it might help.
- We should look into creating an outreach program such as the MPO Institute. It exists for this purpose and this process should be considered.
- There are several activities going on to keep local elected and appointed officials informed and connected.
- How much of the flexibility did you talk about would come up during the middle of the year? *We wanted the flexibility to respond to both short-term needs and plan for long-term opportunities such as the opening up of Cuba. Also to be proactive and better position ourselves to take advantage of other opportunities -- global changes to make us more competitive. If we don't we may be left in the dirt.*

- How do you keep going with established SIS priorities but keep moving with upcoming opportunities?
- What about the military issue of some going through the enhanced use lease process but not having to pay for right of way. We need flexibility here.
- What is meant by a ‘technical advisory committee’? *The group didn’t specify the size but saw it as a representation of stakeholders. Not the SITAC, but also including all the transportation modes to provide technical input and advice on how to enhance the process.*
- On slide 13, the word ‘perception,’ what does this mean? *It’s only perceived by the person who is making the perception. We need to look across modes to see that facilities are being funded similarly. For example, airport aprons and seaport berths are similar in function, yet one is eligible for SIS funds and other is not. There is a difference between designation criteria and eligibility criteria. Designation criteria determine what facilities are on the SIS. Eligibility criteria guide funding investment decisions. Under Tab 9 are the project eligibility guidelines and these are the basis for work program decisions year to year. This committee could give big picture guidance for the next 5 years.*

Following the comment period, Ms. Patrenos informed the group that the white pages behind Tab 8 was a review of transportation authorities in Florida. This document was provided to the members for their information. She asked members to see her during the break if they had any questions concerning transportation authorities.

Needs Assessment – Pat Steed/John Kaliski/Facilitator/Members

The facilitator introduced the section on Needs Assessment. He indicated the recommendations in this section were split into 4 subsections. The discussion began with the second subsection on regional visioning. The facilitator introduced Pat Steed to review the discussion paper on regional visions. Ms. Steed directed the members to the purple sheets behind Tab 9 and offered thoughts based on her experience with regional visioning initiatives. This paper can also be found at: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting-062209/>. Following the review of the regional visioning paper, the facilitator asked members for comments and questions. (Responses in *italics*).

How do SIS investment needs relate to regional visions?

- The visioning process is good for identifying issues but not good to deliver the product. How do we move from inspiration to operation? Is there accountability for making something happen out of the visioning process?
- There is a disconnection that we talk around. I could see down the road federal requirements requiring a level of land use planning not required in Florida right now. We need to think about this. There is a piece missing because MPO process doesn’t do the visioning.
- Regional visions fill a void in that they integrate transportation, land use, environmental and economic development planning. FDOT is a partner in all these visions. The visions are 50 years and so long-term that you don’t need detailed planning – planning this far out is where you can really change things. Then you move into the shorter term..
- What is the role of the regional vision? These recommendations talk about integrating? How should it evolve and should they become more operational? *These are not recommendations for the group unless they pull them forward.*
- The regional vision is not a thought process in Central Florida but a way to move forward. It is important for districts to help prioritize projects and balance environment at the same time.
- This is an overarching theme to identify the role of regional visions.

- The regional planning council does so much, it is a huge help to small counties in the regional visioning process.
- Concerning the lead organization, are there more effective results from a particular lead organization? Is there accountability? *It depends on how you identify yourself as a region. As well as who takes the lead, this will depend on how it will work. Many times it depends on who has the money and the passion to make it happen. It will be different in every area of the state and each area has to find what works for them.*
- MPOs do participate in regional visioning as well. MPOs are forming regional partnerships in several areas of the state. Some MPOs have merged some of their operations to develop and address regional needs and plans. This has worked well in most areas.
- There is recognition by the committee of efficiencies in the regional visioning activities. The second bullet references developing guidelines for accepting adopted visions. This may help get counties to buy into regions.
- You need bottom up and top down planning and then find where they mesh. The FTP is a shared state vision and it ties to local visions.
- Some of these regional visioning efforts come about when local governments can't agree on planning for the future. This will be a tightrope the staff should consider as we go forward. It's not always pretty.
- Briefing the management teams is important; agencies need to know this.
- We need to see the broader picture – how all of this fits together.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the chair appointed a group to review the potential recommendations on regional visioning and come back to the full Committee. The group consisted of: Charlie Gauthier, Bridget Merrill, Pat Steed, Gordon Goodin, and Noranne Downs.

The chair introduced John Kaliski with Cambridge Systematics to review the recommendations for Needs Assessment in the other three subsections: *How are SIS investment needs identified? What types of projects are eligible for SIS funding? and How are SIS investment needs evaluated?* These draft recommendations can be found under Tab 9 at: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting-062209/>. Following the presentation of the draft recommendations, the facilitator asked members to rate the 14 recommendations for Needs Assessment.

Recommendations:

How are SIS investment needs identified?

- A. FDOT should identify potential improvements to SIS facilities to address statewide policy objectives, including the following considerations:
- maximizing the use of existing facilities, including identifying new roles for underutilized facilities where possible;
 - supporting regional visions for future growth and development;
 - supporting statewide economic development (including Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern);
 - facilitating intermodal transportation to support national defense goals; and
 - facilitating intermodal transportation supports statewide emergency evacuation and response
(Emerging SIS breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 15	2 – 7	1 – 1
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Concern about integrating implementation objectives for environment. We need a bullet supporting statewide growth management and environmental objectives.
- The last two bullets appear to support adding facilities to the SIS, not necessarily improving the SIS. This may be a separate topic, perhaps in the area of designation. *The intent was when the SIS also serves as an emergency evacuation route or supports national defense needs, then these needs are an additional consideration.*
- May need to add clarifying language.
- There is a lack of private entities in these bullets. For example, a private railroad is planning a large intermodal center in close proximity to an inland port project, so we need to consider private ventures as well. Add: Coordinate with and consider private investments.
- The mission of SIS is to facilitate efficient movement of people and goods; we need to be reminded of this.
- Should a project fulfilling more than one objective carry more weight? We shouldn't wait for it to bubble up but be more proactive to look for projects.
- Do we need to refer to 'facilities' or just the system as a whole? Suggest delete 'facilities'.
- Is this statement contradictory to considering off-SIS facilities to support the SIS system?

B. FDOT should 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. FDOT should identify potential SIS investment needs to would support the movement of people and goods through urban areas, while also supporting urban growth strategies. Regional and local partners should have primary responsibility for urban and other intraregional mobility needs. The 2060 FTP should consider to how to develop strong urban mobility strategies to complement the statewide emphasis of the SIS. (Urban Issues breakout group with staff edits based on discussion at last meeting)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 1	2 – 20	1 – 2
-------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Need partnership captured here, suggest “together with its partners”.
- Delete ‘especially in urban areas.’ This recommendation should apply everywhere not just urban areas.
- Need to support partnerships in the urban areas.
- Delete ‘would’ in second sentence.
- Suggest delete ‘to how to develop strong’ in third sentence.
- Concerned about the intraregional language, it excludes the travel within a region. The first sentence does not cover the concern. Investment in intraregional facilities can be as strategic as interregional

facilities. We need to call out importance of intraregional facilities.

- SIS should not be just interregional.
- Do away with the word intraregional, to free up the ability to make regional investments as needed.
- Facilities can be strategic, intermodal, and systematic without being interregional; we are getting hung up on this concept. *“Interregional” was intended to cover interregional trips not just facilities that physically extend from one region to another. Certain facilities within a region may be carrying interregional trips. This is defined by trips rather than location.*
- We need to look at what is strategic for the state and how this ties into the discussion. Regional projects may or may not be strategic for the state.
- What is considered significant to the state as a whole or to the state in regions? We never came to a conclusion on this.
- How does this relate to the revised SB 360? There is a bigger picture that FDOT and DCA are still trying to figure out the context. *Next meeting we will have more guidance on this.*
- The statute does call out statewide and interregional as it relates to SIS.
- Need to address the future strategic needs of the state.
- Never saw SIS as either/or. It’s basically what is good for the state.
- The urban group talked about level of service and the difficulties it’s creating.
- Last sentence...leave out ‘how to’

C. Transportation agencies should support development of coordinated, regional transportation and land use strategies to ensure a balanced mix of land uses adjacent to SIS facilities and to support the emphasis of the SIS on statewide needs by reducing the number of local trips on the SIS. FDOT should work with the Department of Community Affairs and regional and local partners to provide multiple transportation and land use strategies reflecting the unique needs of urban, transitioning, and rural areas. (Urban Issues breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 10	2 – 11	1 – 0
--------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- What is a ‘balanced mix of land uses’? *No specific definition, The group talked about the ‘compatible land use’ but wanted to use a different word to describe land use and the need to balance both transportation (SIS) and development needs when planning for the future..*
- Is this in the purview of this SIS committee to tell DCA and transportation planning organizations how to work with locals?
- Add ‘FDOT and other’ at the beginning.
- Impact of transportation decisions on our daily lives – this is important to coordinate.

- Also need to avoid impacts of land use decisions on transportation facilities.
- Some transportation agencies have impediments to prevent them from doing this; should these be removed?
- Suggest delete ‘ensure a balanced mix of land uses adjacent to SIS facilities and to support the emphasis of the SIS on statewide needs by reducing the number of local trips on the SIS’ and add instead ‘preserve the functionality of the SIS’.
- Is this about regional visioning? Adding flesh to the bone?
- All for coordinating, just don’t think it’s this committee’s responsibility to direct non-transportation agencies to do anything.
- Like the change of language to emphasize the SIS.

D. FDOT should encourage proactive planning and intergovernmental coordination regarding future investments in Emerging SIS facilities anticipated to help accomplish statewide policy objectives and achieve regional visions. (Emerging SIS breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 - 22	2 - 3	1 - 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Is this not already happening – encouraging proactive coordination? Does it really need to be called out? *This coordination is occurring in some places. The breakout group concluded the need for proactive coordination should be stated again.*
- Should the wording be for ‘SIS and Emerging SIS’? *The intent is to reaffirm the proactive investment on Emerging SIS,*
- There is a need for rural interests to understand they need to be engaged, involved, and proactive.
- Called out here to be sure rural issues are considered – urban areas have the means for addressing the issues.

E. FDOT should better coordinate freight mobility and investment decisions across all modes, including the identification of freight projects of statewide significance as potential priorities for state and federal funding. (Trade and Logistics breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 - 16	2 - 7	1 - 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Don’t understand ‘better communicate.’
- Replace ‘better coordinate’ with ‘facilitate.’

F. FDOT should obtain periodic input from modal, economic development, and private sector partners on market conditions and opportunities and associated SIS investment opportunities, including:

- Regular coordination with modal partner master and strategic plans; and

- 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. *(Trade and Logistics breakout group with staff edits based on discussion at last meeting)*

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 11	2 – 12	1 – 0
--------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- This should be ‘continuing input’ rather than ‘periodic input.’
- There are more sources of economic information than those stated here.
- For Recommendations F and G – modal partners in F and regional partners in G – are these the same groups or are we trying to draw a distinction? We should include government partners as well. *The partner list under Tab 11 may help clarify the types of partners being referred to.*
- Suggest broadening Recommendation F to include all partners.
- Should we combine Recommendations F and G – put all partners together to support development of SIS projects?
- Take out identifier from input, also change ‘regular’ to ‘ongoing’ in first bullet.
- Suggest deleting ‘periodic’ and inserting ‘and coordinate’ after ‘input.’
- Maybe combine here and push accelerate to the implementation.

- G.** FDOT should work with regional and local partners to identify and accelerate SIS projects to respond to regional economic development opportunities, as appropriate. This coordination should help facilitate early awareness of economic development opportunities, enhance understanding of funding partnerships and constraints, and identify strategies to respond to these opportunities. *(Implementation issues breakout group)*

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 7	2 – 15	1 – 0
-------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Need to seek cooperation among partners because this doesn’t always happen.
- Assumes regional and local partners get along but they don’t always. We need to seek cooperation among the regional partners.
- What does ‘early awareness’ mean? Facilitate early awareness of economic development projects? Is this in broader terms or for specific projects? Private interests may be flying under the radar and ask for confidentiality before the final deal is revealed. *This had to do with getting transportation partners earlier in the process for planning purposes where possible; it was not intended to change the need for confidentiality on particular deals.*
- Need to be sure we reach out to other sources of input – coordinate with OTTED on their funds.

- Concern about combining Recommendations F and G. FDOT is not an economic development entity even though SIS can be a vehicle for aiding economic development. That's why this group came up with this recommendation calling for this coordination. We need to be positioning ourselves and preparing for the future so we are ready when the future gets here. This was speaking to a larger body that would give input to the FDOT.
- Recommendation G gets to the technical approach and we would lose the idea of a larger body if we combine.
- We are talking about a macro and micro approach -- these are two different things.
- Keep approach of consultative body and the difference between macro and micro body.

What types of projects are eligible for SIS funding?

- H.** FDOT should provide flexibility to use SIS funds to invest in parallel reliever systems (e.g., local/regional roads, transit projects, and general aviation reliever airports) 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.
- FDOT should develop criteria to determine which SIS facilities are 'constrained' and whether investing in parallel reliever systems is a more cost-effective option.
 - FDOT should consider the need for statutory changes to use SIS funding on local roads not part of the SIS or the state highway system, but meeting these criteria.
- (Urban Issues breakout group with staff edits based on discussion at the last meeting)*

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 12	2 – 7	1 – 3
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- What is a parallel reliever system? Are these facilities that are qualified to be on the SIS? Unless this is a defined category eligible to be on the SIS then we might be opening up the system too much.
- Could other FDOT funds be used for this purpose? *Yes, such as TRIP, Transit New Starts, and small county programs.*
- These are not SIS facilities. The intent is not designate these as part of the SIS, but to make SIS funding eligible if the improvement would improve SIS performance at a lower cost than adding capacity to the SIS.
- Why is there a need for statutory change? *Concern was raised as to whether roads not on the state system are eligible for state funds.*
- Some of these roads may alternatively be eligible for federal funds.
- SIS funds should provide flexibility to FDOT as to where they are allowed to spend money not the other way around.
- We see SIS facilities that are not cost feasible to widen. There may be other improvements on a non-SIS facility that will improve capacity on the SIS facility more cost effectively
- Have serious reservations about this statement.

- Concerned about opening a huge can of worms – undermines the “strategic” nature of the SIS.
- Last bullet about statutory change – very dangerous in the current political environment.
- FDOT could make a priority of projects that relieve the SIS with other available funds.
- From local perspective, TRIP is not working because of the high match, Much of the funding for local roads was taken away to support the SIS. There is not a lot of other money to support local roads that could cost-effectively address mobility. This is not expanding the SIS but focusing the dollars on the most cost-effective way to improve the performance of the SIS.
- This is a broad statement, not sure what the impact will be on the existing system.
- Why doesn't FDOT work on fixing the local funding problems instead of breaking a program that is working?
- Doing this just gives FDOT flexibility to get more bang for the buck.
- We need a very clear statement on funding. Dismantling SIS would not work. Many local sources are disappearing.
- Need a strong intermodal system and need to recognize the loss of funds to meet needs. This is the advisory committee for SIS; shifting policy here is not the way to go, we should support alternatives.
- You don't want to create unintended consequences. We need to consider innovative options; this determines the amount of money available. We need to have flexibility for addressing in the most effective manner.
- You can't continue to do what you've always done and expect to get a different result. We've already acknowledged the system is at capacity. We need to relieve the SIS facilities, keep it strategic, and look for ways to make it better.
- Did the breakout group talk about the consequences of allowing parallel facilities to be funded? Also, what would be done to ensure that the alternative doesn't become a problem? We are trying to preserve SIS facilities. What are others doing to preserve their facilities?
- This is about funding which may require a paradigm shift; we can't do it the same way.

I. FDOT should reevaluate SIS funding eligibility criteria to increase consistency across non-highway modes and to consider the needs of the entire supply chain (e.g., potential funding for airport terminals, seaport berths). (Trade and Logistics breakout group and Implementation issues breakout group, with staff edits)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 15	2 – 5	1 – 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- What is meant by “increased consistency” across modes? *They're trying to put non-highway modes on a more even playing field. Comparable treatment for analogous facilities.*

- Do we have to establish criteria to increase consistency? Are we comparing apples and oranges in the different modes?
- Looking at inconsistency in how SIS hubs are treated.

J. FDOT should enable greater differentiation in intermodal connector standards and funding eligibility to recognize the different roles and functions played by different types of connectors (Staff based on discussion during various breakout groups)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 4	2 – 14	1 – 0
-------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Not sure what this recommendation means. Needs clarification. *There may be a need for difference in how connectors are treated. Recognizing there are different strategies on how these connectors operate depending on the facility to which they are connecting. For example, some connectors are intended to be high-speed, high capacity for freight purposes. Others, in urban areas, are more for ingress and egress with pedestrian accommodations, etc.*

K. The SIS Strategic Plan should clarify policies regarding the use of public funds for projects on facilities owned by the private sector, including the requirement for public benefits to outweigh public costs (Implementation issues breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 8	2 – 14	1 – 0
-------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- “Clarify” – what is the issue we are trying to address? *FDOT can use SIS dollars on SIS facilities even if privately owned since 2004. Current practice is to do so if the public benefit outweighs the public cost. There has been request to clarify how this process works.*
- This is reiteration of what is in the statute. The state retains an equity interest.
- How do we measure the public benefits and costs? This may be a wider public policy discussion on a statewide basis.
- What do we mean by ‘outweigh’? What is the measure here? Is this better left to FDOT and the FTC for implementation? *Staff can bring examples to the next meeting.*
- Does ETDM apply to rail or not? *It does apply except when there’s preemption.*

How are SIS investment needs evaluated?

L. FDOT should 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. (Urban Issues breakout group; may need modification based on implementation of SB 360)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 8	2 – 13	1 – 0
-------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- What exactly have the measures been? Are they established?
- Multimodal levels of service have been adopted in many urban areas for purposes of planning. We need to consider mobility on a broader basis than just highways.
- Suggest removing “urban” and consider for all areas.
- If you strike “urban” – what does that mean for rural areas?
- Need more explanation of what you mean by “development.”
- May need to adjust language once FDOT and DCA have had a chance to look at revised SB 360.
- Let’s revise first and then discuss it again.
- SB 360 is important but even if it did not exist you would still need to do this. Don’t lose the concept.

M. FDOT should apply the Efficient Transportation Decision-Making (ETDM) process to help evaluate all major projects on all SIS modes using state funding, such as those involving new right of way, with recognition of unique modal processes and constraints, such as federal preemption on certain types of rail projects. (C&E Breakout Group with staff edits based on discussion at the last meeting)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 11	2 – 11	1 – 0
--------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- How is the word ‘major’ being used here? Concern it does not include enough.
- It refers to new right-of-way, new capacity.
- Is ETDM used now? Is this statement necessary?
- Concern is that it is not used currently for non-FDOT sponsored projects that receive SIS funds.
- As we specify each of these processes are we specifying new layers of oversight – need one review not three or four.
- This emphasizes lack of duplication and seamlessness.
- How does ETDM integrate with the federal permitting processes? Need a better explanation how it integrates with existing processes.

N. FDOT should consider air quality, energy, and climate change impacts in SIS planning and investment decisions. (C&E breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 15	2 -6	1 – 1
--------	------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Would like to see this language stay.
- Climate change includes reducing greenhouse gases and locational concerns.
- How does FDOT implement this?
- FDOT is already incorporating climate change concerns and strategies.
- Does this require local government or partners to document additional information for funding projects? We don't want that.
- FDOT addresses this by trying to reduce congestion, delays and maximizing efficiency through ITS and relieving bottlenecks. They also are trying to reduce vehicle miles traveled. This is part of working at the national level and connecting with other communities.
- Will this policy cause a change for how entities apply and document requests?
- What will it look like for FDOT to consider these things?
- Is this recommendation necessary? This is part of our business practice now.
- Agree, this is already happening, it's redundant.
- Do we have to consider whether or not to keep investing in facilities that may be adversely affected by climate change (e.g., rising sea level)?
- Hope we can keep this one and put it in the project prioritization too – climate change and energy consumption will be very important issues in the next ten years.

Project Prioritization Process – John Kaliski/Facilitator/Members

The chair introduced John Kaliski with Cambridge Systematics to review the recommendations for Project Prioritization Process. These draft recommendations can be found under Tab 10 at: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting-062209/>. Following the presentation of the draft recommendations, the facilitator asked members to rate the five recommendations for Project Prioritization Process.

- A. FDOT should continue its 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. FDOT should seek partner input regarding the relative priorities between SIS and Emerging SIS as part of this annual process. (Emerging SIS breakout group with staff edits based on discussion at last meeting.)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 11	2 – 9	1 – 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- What does 'reasonable allocation' mean? *This is existing policy and the breakout group wanted to affirm this policy. They also wanted to make a reference to partner input. The final sentence was*

added by staff in response to requests for clarification in where partner input was desired.

- Suggest ‘reasonable allocation’ followed by an annual discussion between partners rather than the language in the second sentence.
- It has been FDOT policy since the original plan to get away from a fixed percentage and recognize important needs on the Emerging SIS.
- The second sentence is almost a separate statement. Who are the partners we will seek input from, and will they specifically be providing input on the relative priorities between SIS and Emerging SIS? This sets up an inherent conflict.
- How is this different than what we do now?
- This can cause a disconnect in working toward projects in a specific year. FDOT is very familiar with local priorities; all factored into decisions that FDOT makes.
- In first sentence, insert ‘SIS’ in front of priorities and strike ‘between’ after funding.
- Suggest reword “FDOT should seek partner input regarding relative SIS (inclusive of Emerging SIS) priorities as part of the annual process.”
- Object to this language, there is a risk of all of the funds going to the Emerging SIS.
- FDOT has to make tough choices when making priority decisions.
- In favor of it being inclusive – local governments know what their priorities are. If their priority is an Emerging SIS facility, then that should be fine.
- Need to flesh out who is relating to whom, relative to what.
- Strike last sentence, add “based on priorities and partner input” to the end of the first sentence.
- Delete “between” and replace with “for.”

B. FDOT should make the SIS project prioritization process more transparent and understandable, ensuring it reflects the goals and objectives of the SIS Strategic Plan. (Implementation issues breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 17	2 – 3	1 - 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- What does “more transparent and an understandable” mean? Or is it education?
- Make officials more aware of the SIS process.
- Previous feedback to the effect of needing increased feedback from partners. This is an appropriate place for that comment.
- This group has repeatedly heard that MPOs and the districts have priorities yet it’s still unclear how the prioritization process works at the state level. There is a disconnect between the bottom up and top down process. It’s a bigger discussion about the strategic nature of the SIS program and how we

are going to position Florida to respond to the global economy.

- There are inconsistencies on how priorities come about, more so with the non-highway modes.
- Take out ‘reflects goals and objectives.’ Everything in the plan should reflect goals and objectives.
- Understand that projects bubble-up from the MPOs but does FDOT ever document a discussion to the effect “This year the SIS projects were these, because...” A discussion that demonstrates how project selections fit with the objectives in the plan? *Yes, FDOT produces a period report on projects funded through the SIS. We could explore how to add the sense of a ‘story’ to these statements.*
- On SIS projects, one of the challenges is that they are very high dollar so the emphasis moves around the state to achieve balance.
- It’s not that the priority decisions are incorrect, but that it’s hard to tell what they are and how they fit together. How do you tell the story in a way that makes sense in the big picture?
- Telling the story over time is the challenge.
- Putting in percent terms would help with the “year to year” problem.

C. FDOT should enhance the SIS prioritization process to evaluate project opportunities across modes and also to consider unique regional needs and opportunities. (Implementation issues breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 11	2 – 11	1 – 0
--------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- The word ‘enhance’ is not a good word, not descriptive enough.
- Make it more direct.
- Strike “FDOT should enhance.” Start with “The SIS prioritization process should...”
- Change to ‘FDOT should evaluate project...’ and so on.

D. The SIS Strategic Plan should clarify policies for how availability of partner matching funds should affect priorities. (Implementation issues breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 11	2 – 8	1 – 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Not sure what this is saying. Doesn’t the availability of partner funds already affect priorities? *Partners ask how the availability of partner matching funds affects priorities, and whether the plan could give more direction on this topic. The availability of matching funds is a good thing because it leverages funding, but some partners have asked whether matching funds elevate lower priority projects ahead of higher priority ones.*
- Transit requires a 50/50 match but there is no match for the other modes.

- Just to clarify, there are match requirements for other modes.
- Rail has a required match too.
- As we address priorities we need to remain consistent.
- Be careful how matching funds issue is addressed. Projects shouldn't necessarily leapfrog in priority because of matching funds.
- Agree with caution on matching funds influencing priorities.
- Keep in mind the need to match Federally earmarked funds which we have risked losing because action hasn't been taken as quickly as it should. That shouldn't happen. The availability of those funds should be taken into account. We should never let money go back to Washington.
- Keep in mind that the investment policy supplements the arterial program.

E. FDOT should provide greater flexibility in the use of SIS funds to accelerate projects promoting state goals related to economic competitiveness, environment stewardship and growth management. When projects are accelerated, negative impacts on established SIS priorities should be avoided. (Implementation issues breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 - 7	2 - 11	1 - 2
-------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Rejected for the second one, it was more inclusive.
- Agree, I have a logic issue with this, the second avoided this concern.
- If a project SIS is to promote economic competitiveness and another project is prioritized over it then there is conflict in the prioritization criteria.
- If you start putting money in a box, it will be taken away.
- Like this one because of the last sentence 'without negative impact to current program.'
- If you don't have a prioritization process in place, you won't ever build a project, because you won't have a process to agree on what to do. If you don't have some stability, we will spend an awful lot of money designing, buying right-of-way etc., only to find that the project is no longer a priority. That is why the law states the first 3 years of the work program are a commitment.
- We should recommend that there be some set aside funds.
- Can we add to first statement the goals related to economic competitiveness and changing market conditions?
- Most private enterprises generally plan in the 2-3 year range and won't get on a 5-year work list.

-or-

FDOT should allow for flexibility to respond to changing market conditions through funding available

for unanticipated economic opportunities (*Trade and Logistics breakout group*)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 12	2 – 9	1 – 1
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- “Changing economic conditions” is better wording.
- Add the last sentence from the first option to the second option.
- Add “changing market conditions” to the first statement.
- Matter of emphasis. As we look at possibly responding with flexibility, it is really important to see the interrelationship of transportation and some of the other things we are looking at – environmental and growth management considerations.

At the conclusion of these recommendations, the facilitator asked members to review and rate the prioritization factors (provided in tab...) as homework for the next meeting.

Implementation – John Kaliski/Facilitator/Members

The chair introduced John Kaliski with Cambridge Systematics to review the draft recommendations for Implementation. These draft recommendations can be found under Tab 11 at: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/strategicplan/update/meeting-062209/>. Following the presentation of the draft recommendations, the facilitator asked members for clarification comments and then to rate the eight recommendations for Implementation. (Responses in *italics*).

Recommendations:

- A. FDOT should strengthen the role of the SIS Strategic Plan as an integrating framework for the statewide modal plans covering airports, spaceports, seaports, waterways, rail and highways. FDOT should implement structural and programmatic changes as necessary to enhance and integrate SIS intermodal planning. (*Implementation issues breakout group*)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 16	2 – 5	1 – 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- This should include military bases, Department of Defense, base commanders, OTTED.
- What is definition of ‘structural and programmatic changes’?
- This was more about coordination and integration among the modal offices and plans to translate it into SIS process, different from today.
- If we tell them to communicate internally, do we need to tell them how?
- Are you saying FDOT should reorganize?
- Not necessarily but a way to communicate across silos because the modes don’t always talk to each other. Also a way to integrate the planning process as it relates to SIS.

- Right now FDOT has modal offices and plans – what would be a process to ensure that there is coordination among those offices and plans, translated into a SIS outcome? My understanding is that this is not going on now.
- This recommendation is not in plain language. “FDOT should reorganize to fully integrate modal planning.”

B. FDOT should establish an ongoing statewide technical advisory committee to provide periodic input on SIS designation and implementation issues. This committee should comprise all SIS modes as well as representatives of state, regional, and local agencies and other statewide interests. (Implementation issues breakout group; combined with recommendation from Trade and Logistics breakout group regarding a potential statewide freight advisory committee)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 10	2 – 11	1 – 0
--------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Isn’t this suggesting what this group is here today? Virtually the same people in this room.
- What the group was looking for was an ongoing technical advisory group that would not supplant this group on a five-year schedule, but that could provide technical input, advice, on an ongoing basis to assist implementation. More implementation-oriented than policy-oriented.
- The logistics breakout group used the term ‘freight advisory committee’ - having international trade experts, economic development at the table.
- Example: the reallocation of airspace, which will be completed before this committee meets again in five years.
- Slightly different emphasis in another recommendation. This would be a group to really brainstorm and talk about how the state will respond to upcoming opportunities – opening of Cuba, widening of Panama Canal, etc.
- Issues addressed in HB 1065 (wildlife and impacts on flight patterns) – would those have been addressed by a technical advisory group? Is that kind of group what is being proposed here? *Yes, that is too detailed an issue for a policy group.*
- Thinking about the number of times that we have had to revise the work program – how would this group have fit into that? Seems a bit unrealistic.
- Still not sure what you would be asking this technical committee that you are not already asking the Department. We do have experts in each of the technical areas who stay plugged in.
- One of the MPOs; perceptions of the SIS program is that it has involved centralization of decision-making. Worried that this is another statewide level of decision-making over a process we already perceive to be too statewide.
- Rail has an advisory committee and uses it as a resource, not a decision making body. It only meets once or twice a year; don’t see it as a governing body but as a resource. FDOT does know railroads, but knowing how to run them and make money is a different question.
- Maybe better to call this just an “advisory committee.”

- If you are moving quickly, do you have to engage this committee?
- If the committee were already on-board with the priorities, the department could move quickly.
- As we discussed before, while economic competitiveness is part of the mission of the SIS, we do have other resources that could be brought to bear? If there is a fund set-aside for urgent economic development opportunities, perhaps that group could make recommendations.
- If you don't have a committee, and you allow funds for unexpected opportunities, you wind up pushing projects back and changing priorities anyway, but without the input.

C. FDOT should emphasize proactive outreach to promote understanding of SIS policies and benefits, especially to newly elected and appointed officials at all levels of government. Note: Organizations such as the Florida League of Cities and Florida Association of Counties may be enlisted to assist with this outreach. (Implementation issues breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 14	2 – 5	1 – 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Worry about committing FDOT to constantly educate new people coming in.
- Suggest reword “FDOT should reach out to promote understanding...”
- During the legislative session is the time to be doing all of that. To some degree it is already being done.
- Overlap between Recommendation D & E. Perhaps redraft as outreach with bullets.
- Maybe include SIS in the ‘new official’ orientation. Just connect with the person doing outreach at the League of Cities and Association of Counties.
- During session is not a good time for outreach, the best time is when people are in their offices.
- We feel it’s important to reach out to partners year around but not during session.
- It’s better to take a proactive approach rather than waiting for the officials to come to FDOT.
- From a district perspective, we do feel it is important. Think about refreshers.
- If you want local officials and even some state representatives to buy in, it is better to be proactive.
- When committee assignments come out, when you have new base commanders, these are good times to reach out. You can get a lot of folks at one time.

D. FDOT should develop a clearinghouse of intergovernmental coordination best practices from around the state and nation, encouraging appropriate implementation among state, regional and local government partners. (Implementation issues breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 13	2 – 3	1 – 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- In simple terms, what does this mean?
- “Appropriate” means to encourage implementation of best practices, but not to suggest that there is only one solution.
- A lot of best practices around state, this would give a place to find these.
- Many people want to do good coordination, but they don’t know how. This provides them someplace to go.
- A little too broad, this is a big challenge, what size do we want to take on this.
- Doesn’t AASHTO do this already? *In different forms but not together in one place.*
- Concern about encouraging appropriate implementation. Don’t want to be accused of being “too encouraging.”
- Number of clipping services that we could aggregate for those that eat up that sort of thing. The rest of us can absorb by osmosis.
- Would go back to comments about Recommendation C and E. This is an outreach recommendation – combine. If we have 100 recommendations, people will stop reading.

E. FDOT should brief new management teams in partner agencies on the SIS on an ongoing basis, and work with the Governor’s Office to create a meaningful structure for continuing interagency coordination on how the SIS relates to other statewide priorities. Note: Coordination would include information and dialogue on the ramifications of pending federal and state legislation at appropriate times. (Implementation issues breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 17	2 – 2	1 – 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Should merge Recommendations C and E.

F. Non-traditional partners (such as developers and economic development organizations) should work through established planning processes to advance potential SIS projects. FDOT should facilitate the involvement of the military, environmental and community partners, and other interests in helping shape potential SIS projects identified by non-traditional partners. (Implementation issues breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 7	2 – 11	1 – 0
-------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- With non-traditional partners, transportation authorities might be a good fit.
- Agree with including transportation authorities.
- Add “private” by “developers.”

- Need to know what happens to the rest of the projects.
- Why are transportation authorities “non-traditional” partners?
- Use “all partners.”
- For clarification, my first reaction to the first sentence is that the public sector is telling the private sector what to do.
- Second sentence, last part is redundant.

G. FDOT should help strengthen communication and consideration of regional issues in areas in which SIS facilities are located or planned to be located, including the integration of SIS facilities with regional and local systems. (Implementation issues breakout group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 10	2 – 6	1 – 0
--------	-------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- Is this really necessary?

H. FDOT should work with resource agencies and other partners to 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. The following processes should be integrated:

- SIS community and environmental screening process for designation;
- the Efficient Transportation Decision-Making (ETDM) for evaluating potential projects;
- context-sensitive solutions for design decisions;
- project development and environmental review processes; and
- the permitting process.

(C&E Breakout Group)

Initial Acceptability:

3 – 10	2 – 10	1 – 0
--------	--------	-------

Suggestions for improvement:

- All of these are covered in the ETDM process already. If that is the case, is this really needed?
- ETDM as currently set up does not include all of these. Trying to integrate all of these into one streamlined process. “Seamlessness.”

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 facilitator told members staff will work with the chair on the finance issue and get back with members. Also, those named to work on the regional visioning recommendations will provide them to the full group once completed.

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting will be August 20-21, 2009 in Tampa. The meeting on Thursday, August 20 will start at 1:00pm. The final meeting will be October 1-2, 2009 in Orlando. In the meantime, staff will convene a few teleconferences to continue to work through revising the recommendations with the members.

The facilitator reminded members to turn in their meeting evaluation forms before leaving.

The meeting adjourned at ~2:15pm.