

Partner and Public Comments Report

Military Assessment (MA)

This report provides a comprehensive summary of comments received from 8/27/09 – 9/28/09, as follows:

- *Key themes synthesized from verbal and written comments made by partners and the public on discussion questions covered at the 12 regional workshops (these comments have been sent out previously in the three weekly reports and are included in your notebook under Tab 3).*
- *All written comments and cumulative ratings made by partners and the public on specific draft Leadership Committee recommendations and submitted on-line, by e-mail, fax or regular mail.*

Discussion Question 3: Should the SIS Plan expand designation criteria to include access roads and rail to major military installations?

Key Themes from Verbal and Written Workshop Comments

- Consider the function rather than size of military bases.
- Consider rail and transit access in addition to road access.
- Issue of policy consistency raised by proposal to add connectors to military facilities when no such proposal exists for other major traffic generators such as universities, major attractions, etc.
- Questions/comments around clarification of funding roles as it relates to military installations, access facilities, etc.
- Add military bases to the SIS.

Related Leadership Committee Recommendations and Written Comments:

MA.1 Designation of Military Access Facilities. Average rating is 3.98

- Staging areas are a must for both emergency and military emergency. Why isn't hurricane emergency given equal importance here? Does not this fit in all above--in emergency separate ability to access by air, land, sea, road given?
- Not informed enough to know what's best.
- Personally not important to me.
- The criteria needs not be based on number of personnel assigned, but on mission and importance to the military system.
- Connectivity is a local issue, not state.

- Would much rather see basic economic sector job creators (e.g., research, manufacturing, tech) identified than military.
- Designated highways for exclusive military use.
- Huge economic driver for some regions. Getting people to military/spaceport installations is important; no need to designate those areas as anything more than for destinations.
- Not just largest installations. Use and patterning with local governments should be investigated.
- Address function (and importance to public safety) in addition to just # personnel.
- Suggestions were made to have SR-16 from I-95 to US-301 as a SIS facility, which includes Camp Blanding. The Committee should be aware that an application for a scenic highway destination has been submitted for Penney Farms.
- FDOT should develop criteria collaboratively. A joint activity with FCMB and MS and FDA, etc. to develop criteria rather than just FDOT.

MA.2 Consideration of Military Access Needs. Average rating is 3.87

- Not informed enough to know what's best.
- If this means better planning for land use, then OK
- Absolutely.
- Leave that to DOD.
- Again, getting to installation is BIG.