

2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Implementation Issues Breakout Group Meeting #3 Summary

Meeting Date:	6/03/2009	Meeting Time:	2 PM – 4 PM	Type of Meeting:	Teleconference
Participants:					
<p><i>Leadership Committee members:</i> Bob Ball (Florida Airports Council), Gordon Goodin (Florida Association of Counties), Toy Keller (Florida Ports Council), Rocky McPherson (Florida Defense Alliance), Sally Patrenos (alternate for Bart Pullum, Florida Transportation Commission), Tom Hindle (Florida Trucking Association),</p> <p><i>Observers:</i> Mary Lou Rajchel (Florida Trucking Association), Jason Alderman (FDOT District 3), Barney Bennette (FDOT District 2), Peter Maas (FDOT District 7), Mike Plagens (Reynolds, Smith and Hill), Jeff Weidner (FDOT District 4), John Zielisnksi (District 5).</p> <p><i>Support Staff:</i> Brian Watts (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Huiwei Shen (FDOT Office of Policy Planning), Rafael Montalvo (FCRC-Consensus Center), Jane Mathis (Mathis and Associates), Sarah Adams (Cambridge Systematics), John Kaliski (Cambridge Systematics)</p>					
Agenda:					
	2:00	Welcome and introductions Review Agenda and Teleconference Protocols			Rafael Montalvo
	2:05	Review summary of second meeting (May 20) policy discussion			Rafael Montalvo
	2:10	Identify and discuss potential draft policy recommendations for further discussion in two implementation issue areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIS Partner Coordination • SIS Integration with Regional Visions, Plans, System 			All Members
	2:45	Identify and discuss key questions, issues and possible approaches related to SIS Investment Decision-Making in three categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritization process • Funding Eligibility and Flexibility • Funding Partnerships 			All Members
	3:50	Next Steps and Schedule			Rafael Montalvo
	3:55	Public Comment			Members of Public
	4:00	Adjourn			Rafael Montalvo

Key Discussion Comments:

Rafael Montalvo, facilitator, welcomed those present and reviewed teleconference protocols. He asked if there were any suggested changes to the summary of the second meeting and there were none.

Rafael stated the objective of today's meeting is to review and refine draft recommendations in the areas of partner coordination and SIS integration with regional plans and systems. He suggested that the bulk of the time would be used to develop recommendations in the area of investment decision-making.

Rafael asked members to review the draft recommendations for SIS partner coordination.

Question 1: How can coordination be improved among transportation modes on SIS?

Draft Recommendations:

- A. To improve coordination of SIS transportation modes within FDOT modal offices, (seaport/waterways, aviation/space, rail, transit, highways) the updated SIS Strategic Plan should:
- Encourage FDOT to consider potential organizational or other enhancements to better integrate SIS modal planning, and
 - Strengthen the role of the SIS Strategic Plan as an integrating framework for the individual modal plans.

Member Comments:

- The second bullet should be a lead in to A. and not a part of the recommendation. Then have the first bullet be the only bullet.
 - 'Encourage' is a weak statement, maybe suggest they 'consider', it needs to be more proactive... 'to develop an integrated modal planning process.' Within FDOT, the modal offices function independently and need integration as it relates to SIS.
 - 'Structural organizational and programmatic changes that would enhance integration of SIS intermodal planning'; make this a recommendation, not just an encouragement.
- B. To improve coordination among FDOT and external modal partners in SIS implementation going forward, FDOT should consider ways to bring modal partners together periodically for SIS updates and to provide input to FDOT on SIS issues of common interest.

Member Comments:

- FDOT 'should establish' ways instead of 'should consider.'
- The Trade and Logistics breakout group recommended a freight stakeholders advisory group - can this be incorporated here?
- This is a perfect place for an oversight body for goods and people movement.

- Isn't this what SIS is designed to do today?
- This came as a result of partners expressing interest in needing more coordination on SIS issues.
- This coordination needs to be ongoing to follow changes in trends within the industry.
- Should we distinguish between all SIS modal partners and just freight partners?
- The SITAC was the original advisory body on the SIS; would hesitate creating a separate body.
- May be cumbersome to have multiple groups; may be benefit in one group with possible subcommittees on particular issues.
- Create a new 'C' to advise on freight from a technical advisory perspective.
- Does 'partners' include military bases? It is a big issue right now with OTTED and others.
- There will be more discussion related to military at the June Leadership Committee meeting.
- We will look collectively at how to integrate the partners especially as it relates to a specific body.
- We may want to be clearer that we are talking about a technical advisory committee, not a policy-setting group.

Question 2: How can we achieve improved coordination among state, regional, and local government agencies involved in planning and investing in the SIS?

Draft Recommendations:

- C. FDOT should emphasize proactive outreach and briefings on the SIS to new elected and appointed officials at all levels of government to promote understanding of SIS policies and benefits.

Member Comments

- Concerned about the level of effort required to reach out to so many entities like cities, counties, etc.
- As an elected official, it would be helpful to have this.
- Make sure this includes new members of the Florida Legislature.
- We can clarify that the intent is to offer opportunities for SIS briefings at every level. Whether people take this offer is up to them.

- D. Identify best practices around the state and encourage/support communication and implementation of these best practices. Equally important, identify and make efforts to resolve existing barriers to coordination.

Member Comments:

- Should we include best practices from around the country as well -- not just identify best

practices within the state?

- Are we talking about evaluating best practices rather than implementing them?
- We are including implementation.
- Maybe add the words 'as appropriate'

Question 3: How can we strengthen coordination of FDOT with partner agencies (economic development, growth management, environment)?

Draft Recommendations:

E. To strengthen coordination among key partner agencies, FDOT should:

- Brief new management teams in partner agencies on the SIS on an ongoing basis.
- Work with the Governor's Office and partner agencies to ensure coordination is ongoing, meaningful, and occurs at appropriate levels in all agencies.

Member Comments:

- How do we do this? If there is not a structure to facilitate it, it will be just a recommendation. Need commitment at a higher level within these agencies.
- We need a 'strike team' that explains all the ramifications of legislative proposals.
- Would this be multi-agency?
- Almost all agencies have prohibitions against lobbying and practically, such a strike team probably wouldn't become reality because of this.
- You might be able to do this by just providing information and not engaging in lobbying.

Question 4: How can partner coordination be integrated more effectively in planning by nontraditional partners?

Draft Recommendations:

F. To integrate coordination in planning by nontraditional partners (e.g., developers, economic development orgs) FDOT should:

- Determine how established planning processes apply to projects initiated by nontraditional partners.
- Work with nontraditional partners, as appropriate, to ensure early involvement of FDOT and other partners to plan strategic investments and evaluate impacts.

Member Comments:

- Is military a nontraditional partner?

- No, military was not mentioned as a nontraditional partner by those partners concerned about this issue.
- This seems to be reactive. Should FDOT be more proactive on projects of regional/statewide significance? They would have a role with these partners to develop projects at this level. If the state had a strategy for projects of statewide/national significance, we would be ready to receive federal funds for these types of projects.
- It might be good to have a matrix to define the different types of partners and where they fit in (e.g., nontraditional partners, traditional partners, key partners).

Rafael asked if there were any additional comments on partner coordination recommendations. There were none. He initiated discussion of draft recommendations on SIS Integration with Regional Plans and Systems.

Question 5: How should the SIS respond to unique regional issues?

Question 7: How can SIS integration with regional and local transportation systems be improved? (Addressed together)

Draft Recommendations:

G. To respond to unique regional issues and improve SIS integration with regional and local systems, FDOT should:

- Strengthen communication and consideration of regional issues in areas where SIS facilities are located or are planned to be located.
- Emphasize early awareness of regional/local economic opportunities and have flexibility to respond to these opportunities.

Member Comments:

- 'Outreach' is not stated in this recommendation and yet we need an outreach program to know what the issues are early on.
- Unfortunately when we respond, the problem is acknowledged but there's no money to fix it.
- An awareness of the available resources needs to be acknowledged in this process.
- Remember SIS funding is 'new' capacity dollars. This planning process is to plan for the future -- there are no dollars available now but there may be in the future.
- We shouldn't make a commitment that can't be kept.
- Knowing what SIS dollars can and cannot do is critical to the discussion with regional partners.

Question 6: How should the SIS respond to regional visions and plans?

Draft Recommendations:

H. To respond to regional visions the updated SIS Strategic Plan should:

- Build upon the 2025 Florida Transportation Plan's guidance regarding development of regional visions to guide transportation decision-making.
- Encourage FDOT to work with partners at all levels of government to incentivize and fund key regional projects (in all modes) included in regional visions and plans.

Member Comments:

- This recommendation should reference the 'current' FTP instead of '2025' plan.
- How do you reconcile the two plans?
- Maybe recommending the 2025 FTP is more than we need? Suggest we look at what is in FTP guidance and reference those ideas that we want to reemphasize instead of the plan.
- Instead of 'build upon' say: 'follow the guidance in the FTP.'
- This bullet could go away and be replaced with the actual guidance out of the 2025 FTP.
- Maybe we should reference the upcoming federal transportation authorization, since this may create an opportunity to raise level of importance for regional/statewide projects.
- Instead of 'projects in all modes' we should say 'intermodal projects.'

Question 8: How should support and incentives for regional visioning efforts be enhanced?

Draft Recommendations:

- I. To enhance support and incentives for regional visioning efforts, the updated SIS Strategic Plan should:
 - Endorse and facilitate development of regional visions.
 - Encourage FDOT to work with partners to enhance technical/financial support and incentives for development and adoption of long-range visions in all areas of the state integrating transportation, land use, economic development, community and environmental decisions.

Member Comments:

- Everything in this plan should be doing something to enhance intermodalism in the state.
- The other non-transportation components such as land use and economic development need to be integrated into the decisions, and we need to understand what happens for each part.
- Rather than being involved in enhancing regional visions, FDOT would be involved in the statewide picture of how Florida will be better prepared to move people and goods.
- Is the transportation network driving where development goes? Maybe we don't do a good job of educating people about the transportation network.

- The SIS is a slice but doesn't own the whole visioning process. Maybe we want to encourage regional coordination in whatever form it occurs. The outcomes we want are good regional coordination and good regional projects.
- The goal is not incentivizing regional visions but providing a network to respond to the visions.
- We need to further define this with the full Leadership Committee.
- Need to better understand how SIS relates to these regional visions.
- Maybe take out the word 'how' in Question 8 and change to 'should', so it reads: Should support and incentives for regional visioning efforts be enhanced?
- A key reason transportation is invited to the table in regional visioning initiatives is it enables regional/local partners to have access to the engineering, planning, etc. to better understand the network. It helps keep the facilities to their intended use.
- FDOT may need to develop well-crafted incentives for funding to be more strategic. Incentives are good but should not be tied to visioning.
- We can bring all issues related to regional visions to the full committee.

Rafael read the three recommendations referred by other breakout groups and it was agreed that these would be discussed by the full committee along with issues discussed by this group.

Note: The Emerging SIS and The Community and Environment (C & E) groups referred the following recommendations related to regional visions for integration with this group's recommendations:

- J. Encourage integrated planning for regions with multiple Emerging SIS facilities (Emerging SIS).
- K. 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 (C & E).
- L. 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 (C & E).

Rafael reviewed key questions, key issues and potential approaches to SIS investment decision-making. He asked members to consider what needs to happen in this area, starting with the project prioritization process.

Key Questions on SIS Investment Decision-Making:

1. How can we make the process for identifying and prioritizing SIS investments more effective? Should we recommend changes to the project prioritization process?

2. Should we recommend changes to refine the eligibility criteria for all modes?
3. Should we create more flexibility in the use of SIS funds?
4. Should we clarify policies for projects on which there are private sector/public funding partnerships?

Key Issues on Investment Decision-Making:

- Desire for greater transparency
- Increased opportunities for partner input and coordination
- Enhancing coordination with modal, MPO and private sector planning cycles
- Reevaluation of SIS funding eligibility criteria
- Development of multimodal cost-feasible plan
- Policies for public/private partnerships including role of partner funding in setting priorities
- Potential need for greater flexibility in use of SIS funds

Potential Approaches for Investment Decision-Making Issues

1. Potential enhancements to project prioritization processes to provide greater transparency and understanding, enable multimodal tradeoffs, and better reflect the policy framework in the SIS Strategic Plan. (Source: Leadership Committee Partner Reports, Partner Interviews/Briefings, FDOT Interviews)
2. Enhance prioritization process to evaluate across modes and also to consider regional needs, which are just as “strategically” important to the overall economic health of the state as interstate and interregional movements. (Source: Leadership Committee)
3. Need to reevaluate SIS funding eligibility criteria to increase consistency across non-highway modes (e.g., passenger terminals, seaport berths). (Source: Leadership Committee Partner Interviews and Briefings, FDOT Interviews)
4. Need to clarify policies for use of public funds for projects on facilities owned by the private sector and for how availability of partner matching funds should affect priorities. (Source: Leadership Committee Partner Interviews, FDOT Interviews)
5. Opportunities for greater flexibility in use of SIS funds, including potential for using SIS funding “off system” to improve the performance of the SIS and support innovative solutions to constrained facilities. (Source: Leadership Committee Partner Reports, Partner Interviews/Briefings, FDOT Interviews)
6. Flexibility in use of SIS funds should be available consistent with criteria ensuring candidate projects:
 - Promote state goals related to economic development, the environment and growth management;
 - Enhance the performance of a SIS or Emerging SIS facility; and

- Do not negatively impact established SIS project priorities.

Prioritization Process

Member Comments:

- How is the process done now? *Different process for each mode involving a combination of top-down (state) and bottom-up (regional and local) input, followed by integration of the modal priorities at the state level.*
- Why do we want to change the process? *Many partners expressed concern that the process wasn't very transparent or easily understood.*
- Prior Governor asked for agencies to identify facilities of critical statewide concern and those facilities that support transportation's critical functions such as intermodal connectedness and economic competitiveness became the SIS. We need to get back to that original stated purpose. In the last few years, it may have gotten less strategic. Priorities should follow those high standards the SIS had.
- The goals are clear. FDOT should identify the problems they've encountered in order for us to identify what might need to be changed now.
- We've lost our original focus of the SIS mission trying to be balanced and fair; this is a good time to reevaluate this. Need to focus on keeping it strategic.
- New federal transportation bill will potentially bring changes to how the process works.
- Would like to hear what FDOT would recommend regarding any changes to the process to make it work better.
- Do we consider the current goals and objectives as the overall direction of the process?
- At the next full committee meeting we will discuss the original goals and objectives of the SIS. We can ask FDOT for any issues they want to bring to the table.
- FDOT will work on their recommended changes to the process for the full group.

Funding Eligibility and Flexibility

Member Comments:

- Is this the place to address military connectors? Where does it fit?
- There are two different sets of criteria: designation criteria (FDOT uses to determine what facilities are on the SIS) and eligibility criteria (FDOT uses to determine what types of projects to fund for each mode on the SIS).

- Are the military connectors located outside the military bases?
- Yes, all are outside the bases. Wasn't there a reference to national security in the original SIS report?
- Original goals talked about national security issues but specific criteria were not created; however there is a legislative mandate that they be considered in the update.
- SIS funds are used for capacity improvements on roads. Partner concerns were that capacity is not considered the same way among other modes. For example, seaport berths or airport terminals add capacity to hubs but are not eligible today.

Rafael suggested in light of time constraints that staff recast the six potential approaches for investment decision-making as draft recommendations for the group's review. He asked if members had any reservations about this course of action or if these approaches raised any red flags with members. The sense of the group was this is a good approach.

Rafael asked if there were any volunteers among those members present to serve as the reporter for this group back to the full Leadership Committee. Sally Patrenos volunteered to serve as reporter.

Public Comment: None were offered.

Next Steps and Schedule:

- Draft recommendations for partner coordination and SIS integration with regional plans and systems will be revised per today's suggestions from members and will be circulated to members for their review.
- The "potential approaches" for investment decision-making will be recast as draft recommendations for members to review.
- Sally Patrenos will report back to the full Leadership Committee at the June 22-23 meeting on draft recommendations from this group.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.