

# Public and Partner Comments on Workshop Discussion Questions from 8/27/09 – 9/28/09

This comprehensive report includes all verbal and written comments received during the period from August 27, 2009 through September 28, 2009 on discussion questions covered at the 12 regional workshops and sent previously in the three weekly reports, as well as any comments submitted subsequent to the week three report.

Number	Discussion Questions	Page Number
<b>System Designation and Military Assessment</b>		
1	What is the appropriate size of the SIS – should it stay as it is, increase, or decrease?	3
2	Should separate designation criteria and policies be retained for the Emerging SIS, or should these facilities be combined into the SIS?	10
3	Should the SIS Plan expand designation criteria to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Commuter rail and other fixed-guideway systems (e.g., busways) connecting multiple urbanized areas with a single region?</li> <li>– Hub-to-hub connectors (e.g., airport-to-seaport people movers)?</li> <li>– Integrated logistics centers?</li> <li>– Intermodal freight drayage routes (e.g., seaport to rail terminal)?</li> <li>– Emerging SIS spaceports?</li> <li>– Access roads and rail to major military installations?</li> <li>– Other types of facilities not included today?</li> </ul>	16
4	What other changes would you suggest regarding the SIS designation criteria and process?	26
<b>Needs Assessment</b>		
1	What changes would you suggest to the adopted SIS goals shown below? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A safer and more secure transportation system for residents, businesses, and visitors</li> <li>2. Effective preservation and management of Florida’s transportation facilities and services</li> <li>3. Increased mobility for people and for freight and efficient operations of Florida’s transportation system.</li> <li>4. Enhanced economic competitiveness and economic diversification.</li> <li>5. Enriched quality of life and responsible environmental stewardship.</li> </ol>	31
2	What changes are needed in the eligibility of different types of modal projects for SIS funding?	37



<b>Number</b>	<b>Discussion Questions</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
<b>Prioritization</b>		
3	What factors should be used to establish SIS priorities on a statewide basis?	41
<b>Finance Strategy</b>		
4	What suggestions do you have about the SIS investment strategy and potential funding sources?	46
<b>Implementation</b>		
5	How should FDOT better communicate and coordinate SIS decisions with public and private sector partners at all levels?	51
6	What other changes would you suggest regarding SIS implementation?	55



---

## System Designation and Military Assessment

---

### **Discussion Question 1: What is the appropriate size of the SIS – should it stay as it is, increase, or decrease?**

#### **Verbal Workshop Comments:**

##### **General**

- Basic motive of the SIS is flawed, it comes from the assumption that the way we have been planning transportation for years seems to be wrong and too broad. It assumes that we need to focus in on what we prioritize, what is most important and we then may ignore other more regional things that may be just as important.
- There is a reason why designation was planned this way.
- The original designation process was based on needs. I think the scope needs to be broadened to the regional level.
- The size should be increased in the sense of increasing integration of modes. It improves what you have already. Suggest we include more airports.
- Decrease size of the SIS if we don't have any more money – otherwise you have a system that would be under funded.
- If you enlarge it, you will have to ask what is more important. You will run into the same problem as the SIS and Emerging SIS. You will need to prioritize due to the decreasing funds. Then the question will be “Are we expanding, improving, or maintaining?”
- How is the SIS being coordinated with Heartland 2060 and How Show Will We Grow?
- Where does the Florida Emergency Plan fit into this? Have we spoken clearly about our objectives as well as the emergency management teams?
- Connectors will have to increase, due to the congestion shown on the “bleeding maps”. There will have to be alternate connectors designated to move around.
- Are we talking miles or dollars? Would we increase SIS in urban areas? It should be the same approximate size otherwise.
- Does the size of the SIS affect funding? Is there additional funding that will go along with the SIS or are we spreading the same amount of funding over a larger area?
- How does anyone know if the SIS is the right size? Ultimately, if the right facilities have been identified to enhance the flow of products and we have also identified Emerging facilities to create synergy and we have not allowed for projects to be added that do not demonstrate any of that, then it is the right size. But how do we know? The designation aspect is a multiple level situation.

- Will the future SIS include the boundaries beyond the State of Florida? For instance, the Gulf & northern boundary of Florida. Will the future system allow connectivity to facilities outside these boundaries?
- The current facilities should be left on; the system should be bigger and include more in Southwest Florida.
- I think it's too small.
- Why should we expand the SIS if we don't have the funds to meet current needs? We are already comparing needs to those that are cost feasible based on revenues.
- What difference does it make? If there is no money or limited money what does it matter?
- It behooves me to get as many things designated to SIS to get as many projects funded as possible when funds are diverted to the SIS.
- We are looking for a 30 or 40 year window. It doesn't have to get fixed today. We will feel the impact many years down the road.
- When will the SIS Strategic Plan be adopted, and who adopts it? *Response: The DOT Secretary will adopt the updated Plan in January 2010.*
- The number of ports and airports are sufficient where they are today. Those work fairly smoothly today.
- What is the importance of the 'size' of the SIS? The question is, is the system strategic in nature? Does it address the most important facilities? The SIS started out as a place to focus the limited funding we have on the most important needs.
- Is SIS too large or too small? The current facilities are accommodating 99 percent of the demand. Can the Pareto Principle be used - 80 percent of business comes from 20 percent of the clients? The question would be what 20 percent of the airports would handle 80 percent of the business. The same question for the seaports.
- We need to reorganize - not stay as is or get larger.
- Place more emphasis on more non-highway modes.
- We have to use statistics.
- The problem is at FDOT in Tallahassee. The state is unbalanced. We are the economic engine for the state. Tallahassee does not like Miami.
- The size will be determined by the money available. There has been some discussion on restricting the size based on money shortfalls.
- How much dilution is occurring? What is the effectiveness of adding projects and facilities? Are these changes making a difference?

- What is the process for eligibility? What happens if there is a circumstance for waiting for evaluation that dictates changing the system? Do we have to wait for 5 years?
- The statement “Keeping it the size it is” doesn’t help Northwest Florida. Where the new circumstances of growth are going to occur are in the new areas, so we should keep growing.
- Can you define intermodal connector? What do you see as an intermodal connector? *The District 3 map in packet displays the intermodal connectors in this area.*
- Is size of SIS determined by growth needs? Looking for “right now” not future.
- If you expand the SIS, will this increase competition for limited SIS dollars?
- Designate a “backbone” system of highest priority – based on level of service, safety, and evacuation.
- The more we grow, the more the system will grow.
- Solve the most critical problems before we expand the system.
- Rephrase to – where should the funding resources be focused -- Increase SIS focusing dollars on existing hubs/corridors with current criteria; more loose criteria will reflect changing future.

### Highways

- Isn’t it redundant to have SIS highways so close together, like US 1 and Turnpike? Is there a way to remove a SIS designation?
- Grow the SIS only if you can protect it. There is no point in adding more highways if you don’t protect them so they continue to function as they do now.
- What is the advantage or disadvantage of getting rid of FIHS – no sense when 95% are on the SIS?
- Are there any roads in the area that would be affected if FIHS is eliminated?
- LOS -- is level E a failure for a rural roadway? Reevaluation of the LOS criteria might be a good idea.
- Freight rail and passenger rail systems need to be increased in the future. Highways have some questionability for future growth.
- We need to focus on highways, look at existing needs, and not forget highways. We also need to look at other modes. We need a mobility measure.
- There is a strategic need to connect to Alabama.
- How does SIS deal with evacuation of coastal areas? Does SIS provide sufficient capacity for evacuation?
- Evacuation needs should be a priority for designation.



## Passenger Rail

- Look at more fixed guideway systems, high speed rail, and access to military installations. Go beyond that and include all intermodal systems, but where do you stop before you designate everything?
- 7 or 10 years ago we didn't have the problems we have today. Is transit going to be included in the SIS? Funding for operation, not just vehicles, needs to be addressed. By the year 2060 – I won't be here – but we're going to have the need for a lot better transit system. The funding pie has to change.
- You have to consider the ridership. If rail worked properly, people would use it.
- We need to focus on the commuters' needs. Like extending rail to Homestead.
- Why is there no rail service for the west side of the [Southeast] region? People would use rail if available.

## Freight Rail

- Ease up truck traffic in this area and increase rail, need for additional freight corridors to ease burden – should increase number of rail facilities
- Down side of increased rail traffic – will create more congestion at rail crossings
- Redistribute freight traffic more evenly across more corridors
- I-4 Crosstown Connector will help address the freight distribution burden

## Aviation

- Has to increase because we did not mention changing aviation. Aviation will have the greatest impact in 2060.
- In 1800s steamships were main mode, then last century was locomotives, this century is aviation and car. In light of this, the SIS should increase to put more interest in aviation such as electric airplanes, passenger size. For example when personal airplanes become more prominent and you own your own grass runway you would want to be connected to the local highway. These connections will be important.
- The impact of our region as it relates to the Caribbean basin and Florida can provide better commerce – that means aviation.
- 22 of 800 airports have commercial service. In 1930 there were more destinations than there are today via air service. Because they would land anywhere if you paid for them to do it. We should weave this thinking in.
- If a person flies into a hub – they could drive or they could fly in a smaller plane.
- Craig Field/St. Augustine – emerging – future predictions, one may be bigger in future, not just emerging.

## **Pedestrian**

- The pedestrian is the beginning and ending of all movement, especially critical if we talk about high speed rail. There is concern there is no representation of pedestrian interests on the committee. Urge bike and pedestrian participation in the plan.

## **Seaports**

- There is some concern the resources going to Port St. Joe are taking away from Port of Pensacola.

## **Written Comments from Workshops and Other Sources:**

### **General**

- Increase miles or \$? Increase SIS in urban areas. Same approximate size otherwise.
- Enlarge to accommodate growth.
- Too vague. No criteria for measuring or evaluating.
- Increase with planned modes and proper prioritization being sensitive to the growth and sustainability of the community affected.
- Need to look at corridor improvements as a package that result in SIS improvements (i.e., parallel roads, transit, diversion of certain types of trips such as truck to rail, etc.); size in the relation to the above is OK.
- Increase to include more facilities within the Southwest Florida region particularly with regard to intermodal facilities i.e., airports and rail.
- Refine priorities, but increase the number of facilities included for consideration.
- Increase to allow for added freight which could allow growth of manufacturing in Florida.
- Stay as is, but evaluate often.
- It should at least remain the same size if not increase in size (# of facilities increasing).
- Stay as is: You already have your priorities and you need to stick with them. Expanding the system to include additional areas you cannot fund will not work. The only expansion should be to accommodate the military. A nation needs to be able to access its bases.
- Increase.
- Can't respond about the size but would expect that it should constantly evolve to meet emerging requirements. That said there should be a constant process of identification and evaluation of new requirements. By using the term "strategic" it explains that it should.
- It should be expanded to include proposed solutions to failing portions of the existing network. Logical connections in the network need to be added regardless of criteria eligibility.

- It appears that most of the criteria now applied are based on national values of people or goods moved. Would it not be appropriate to use criteria based on Florida values. This way Florida a facility would be compared to other local facilities and not have to meet some national value. This would also tighten up the guidelines as they would be Florida specific and should reduce the number of facilities that need to be added as exceptions to the rules. Under the existing approach, it would be reasonable to exclude an airport because it does not handle 0.25 percent of the nation's traffic, but if it is the only airport within 100 miles, or serves a population of 50,000 or more, it should qualify as regionally significant and be part of the SIS.
- Decrease. We can't afford what we have now.
- Decrease--system should be sized to the revenue available (up to 110% of revenue); similar to current state system--don't add to it without taking something off! This would allow something to be added if a similar \$ needed project is removed.
- It should be increased, but in regards to specific sections of it. I am specifically addressing the railroad component, which needs to be strengthened, improved and most of all expanded. Overall perhaps the SIS should be rearranged rather than increased or decreased as a whole project. We should have fewer highways and more railroads.
- Currently, it is at the correct size.
- Leave it!
- The appropriate size of the SIS should increase.
- As it is.
- Should be about the same to be "strategic" or reduced based on the reality of cost feasibility.
- SIS should decrease in size. Emerging/Supporting SIS should increase to include major regional facilities connecting different urban areas in the same region. In general there are too many airports and seaports designated, especially when compared to transit facilities.
- Stay as is--at least for now. Can be increased or decreased as conditions change.
- Grow as needed. For now it is okay. May be smart to have a "common sense" network. (i.e., are the "end points" sound? 98 in Walton County is SIS, 98 in Destin is not...doesn't make sense).
- Stay; however, the money should be spent on failing or near failing roadways. Designation should also follow this methodology.
- For the most part the SIS should remain as it is and designation criteria should be strictly adhered to prevent every bus stop, train station, private airport, and municipal dock from becoming a SIS hub. The word Strategic should be defined in the strictest terms and used to deny most requests for addition to the SIS. While intermodal is also a key component of the SIS it should be noted that bike and foot trails and bus/bike connectors may be intermodal by definition, they are not strategic which is the main purpose of the SIS.
- This depends on what facilities meet the criteria. If more facilities meet the criteria then the SIS should be expanded.

- Prioritization and allocation of funding using the SIS system is a real benefit especially during these times of constrained resources. Considering the very large backlog (presented at the workshop as \$60 billion) of work requirements on the existing SIS, I would recommend it stay the same size.
- Stay flexible not dogmatic. There needs to be a place for facilities that do not meet exact thresholds. Increase.
- The size should increase; however, funding should be considered.
- Grow as required but with focus on maintaining what we have.
- It should increase as population and needs require.
- Expand SIS. Existing exclusive criteria unfairly, and counter productivity, exclude more rural counties and the residential counties that provide workers to port, airports, and industrial centers.
- Increase
- Should not decrease size of SIS
- It is too ambitious now--scale it back to truly strategic. Definitely do not add transit to this fixed pie. And focus on the larger ports and airports--not those handling 99%. Maybe set it at 75-80%.
- It is probably overly large, given constrained funding for the foreseeable future. Therefore, better to refocus on truly strategic modes and links. Definitely don't add new elements.

### **Highways**

- In reviewing the map, it appears that all the major highways have a SIS or Emerging SIS designation.
- No increase in road capacity for [District] 1; yes for SW FL [District] 1.
- Increase -Include all: US Highways, Roads which are parallel and relieve SIS Roads and Facilities, University and College Districts as SIS Hubs.
- Increase--support growth in areas of the State that would otherwise be limited. Need to look into the future, particularly the I-75 corridor, since the I-95 corridor, specifically in S. Florida has reached its capacity.
- With the sunset of FIHS the SIS should be re-evaluated to economically feasible facilities.

### **Passenger Rail**

- It should increase to accommodate the upcoming rail projects and SB360 requirements.

### **Aviation**

- Increase by integration (e.g., rail & General Aviation airports).
- Increase the SIS--more emphasis should be placed on integrating airports into the SIS.

## **Pedestrian**

- Increase to include bike/pedestrian elements so multi-modal really is multi-modal. Otherwise, not sure about adding or subtracting specific facilities.

## **Discussion Question 2: Should separate designation criteria and policies be retained for the Emerging SIS, or should these facilities be combined into the SIS?**

### **Verbal Workshop Comments:**

- If you have standards for SIS, why do you need to split it up? SIS should compete with comparable Emerging SIS. For example Tallahassee should not compete with Orlando. Tallahassee should compete with Lake City or Pensacola.
- If funding covers both, there should not be two designations, just a SIS.
- How is the money split for SIS and Emerging SIS?
- Why are there two designations? What is the purpose?
- Why not have only a SIS?
- Are the SIS and the Emerging SIS treated differently by DOT?
- The SIS was created to be strategic...to make all modes of transportation as smooth as possible. When you look at a state as diverse as Florida, you have to plan strategically for Emerging SIS. A certain amount of fiscal responsibility must be in place on the system to consider developing areas.
- What is the difference in SIS and Emerging SIS?
- Keep the two designations only if the same amount of attention is paid to both.
- See value in having Emerging SIS facilities for planning and plans for funding.
- If merged, would that lower your threshold for qualifying to be on SIS?
- Define “emerging” – facility must meet threshold. Emerging = rural
- What if we make changes to parallel routes, shouldn't that be eligible for SIS funding. SIS & Emerging SIS –two different items.
- Funding for SIS (SIS and Emerging) is limited. If you decrease the threshold to put all Emerging SIS on the SIS, the more diluted the funding pot becomes.
- If you keep thresholds static – 20 yrs in the future the threshold will not mean anything. (Could use functional classification to adjust accordingly.)
- There is some value in recognizing Emerging versus SIS. For example, Winter Haven logistic center would be penalized. And it may have significant regional importance in future.

- For potential facilities that may have regional significance.
- Suggest we keep SIS versus Emerging separate to monitor performance and funding.
- If they are not treated any differently, why give them different names.
- Are Emerging facilities like a stepchild?
- They should be combined in the SIS, example US 17 in Volusia County.
- If you look at them the same, why are they separate? Think they should be separate, because the influence over SIS is greater than that over Emerging SIS. Is there a reason to say it is Emerging SIS? Is Emerging SIS a historical relic, mainly to broaden the coverage?
- If you say it may never grow up to be on the SIS that is not planning. Emerging SIS should be separate.
- Emerging SIS should be different due to funding shortfall, to help with prioritization.
- A reason to combine is it is easier to understand especially with the elected officials.
- If a MPO says we have an Emerging SIS and a top priority; is it less important as some of the other projects that are SIS. However, we do look at some characteristics and priorities.
- It seems there needs to be a different designation if it benefits the state as a whole instead of just the urban area. If you look at the future corridors, if you don't see any SIS facilities, you might have a designation problem.
- We need to look long term for Emerging SIS, do not establish criteria based only on today's needs. The system needs to be what we truly believe is a vision of what we need 50 to 70 years from now to move people and goods. Criteria need to reflect flexibility not just quantitative data.
- The Emerging SIS system seems to be designated based on today's use. Should be showing connectivity to Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern. Should be looking out to the future more.
- Need to keep Emerging SIS. Southwest Florida is taken care of with roads, however, the intermodal focus is lacking.
- Need a broader Emerging SIS to allow other facilities to be developed. Need to look at needs for the future not what is only occurring today.
- What percentage of existing SIS funding is on the Emerging SIS? *Response: About 5% of FDOT SIS investments to date have been spent on Emerging SIS. This percentage varies by mode.*
- Airport designations need to be clarified – for example, the Kissimmee airport.
- Legislature removed LOS as a criterion. We need to talk about the true SIS, the one we need and can afford.

- Density of traffic needs to be considered. Statistics on fatalities must be considered. Safety program comes off the top.
- A lot of people do not know that there are separate criteria for the Emerging SIS. It is a good thing that there are separate criteria.
- I like the Emerging SIS. The local government still has a little control over it for our local needs.
- Separate out Emerging SIS from the SIS, and use a different level of service for Emerging SIS.
- If you sunset the FIHS how do you then pick up those FIHS facilities that are not on SIS today? We don't want to drop any of the current FIHS facilities.
- For Emerging SIS – What is the designation difference like Tallahassee Regional Airport? It has some traffic, but not size and capacity of MIA.
- Can Emerging SIS become SIS? Yes, one could be designated as SIS, but does not have to be. Both on SIS, and treated the same for funding.
- There has been some discussion that FDOT might change Emerging SIS because some folks think Emerging SIS is not on the SIS.
- Is there a difference between SIS and FIHS? Yes, 95% of it is the same; there has been some confusion that is why they want to sunset the FIHS.
- You say sunset FIHS; what does it mean? *Response: There is a law now for FIHS, but it will be allowed to expire*
- We should combine them. There is no reason to keep them separate if money is the same.
- Emerging SIS is same as the SIS. There is no funding distinction.
- There is concern about giving money to a private toll road. Not as concerned about private rail.
- There have been discussions about toll roads as related to the Northwest Florida Transportation Corridor Authority (NFTCA) – are toll roads precluded from being on the SIS? *Response: There is nothing that precludes it or any projects from being on the SIS for that agency. If it meets criteria it will be on the SIS.*
- I would recommend just calling it SIS, unless there is a greater level of funding for SIS?
- Keep separate but create for Emerging SIS a dedicated funding source. For example, 1/3 of SIS funds go to Emerging SIS and 2/3 to SIS.
- When the highway facility meets the criteria, does it just come on? *Yes. We do check it every year through the designation process and also if a partner calls it to our attention earlier through a designation change request.*
- What about the criteria for each mode? *There are volumes thresholds.*

- Are you coordinating between the SIS airport and seaports? *Yes. The Committee is working on that. That is what the SIS is all about – the dialogue.*
- Is there a difference in prioritization/ranking and funding between the SIS and Emerging SIS?
- Isn't it cheaper to construct Emerging SIS projects than SIS? *The answer generally is yes. You can do more on Emerging SIS facilities than you often can do with the same funding on more congested SIS facilities.*
- It would be better and advantageous to separate Emerging SIS and SIS into two pots of funding. So District can compete individually for SIS and Emerging SIS funds.
- What about using LOS vs. AADT because District 3 cannot compete with other Districts when it comes to volumes. The District does have LOS needs and LOS shows is more needs based.
- The SIS focuses on longer distance trips. What is more long distance: going through Miami-Dade or going through District 3?
- We need to look at new corridors and well as LOS.
- I like the Emerging SIS and SIS kept separately.
- Develop the criteria to evaluate the SIS.
- Concern of widening SR-79 and not connecting it to Alabama, but there is a concern about the smaller towns on SR-79.
- Do you have date of completion between Vernon and Bonifay on SR-79?
- When do Emerging SIS facilities become SIS facilities?
- Are we going to change the name of the Emerging SIS? We need more proactive planning. You look at the 2060 plan.
- Combine.
- Access to the money – combine it into one.
- General consensus – combine.
- Difficulty of combining is it doesn't recognize some major facilities that give you bigger bang for dollar for larger needs while other facilities get excluded and get no chance to compete for funding – therefore Emerging SIS gives some priority to smaller facilities. Don't help only the big get bigger.

### **Written Comments from Workshops and Other Sources:**

- Separate.
- Designation criteria should be different, design and operation should be the same.

- Need pros and cons.
- Yes, based on micro-needs with macro visioning towards SIS.
- Yes, broaden the Emerging facilities to include more long term, strategic facilities.
- I think they should stay separate. It gives the local government time to address land use and transportation/economic development changes.
- NO. Combined into the SIS for flexible responses to changing economic and demographic conditions.
- Combined; one priority overlay.
- Combine.
- Yes.
- Should be separate but need a new name for "Emerging SIS."
- Separate designation is fine however I would like to see more allowances for funding eligibility for Emerging facilities. For example, it would seem logical for land acquisition to be an allowable project to be funded through SIS for Emerging facilities.
- Do not combine Emerging SIS and SIS.
- Separate.
- Once they make the cut they should be treated similarly.
- Retain the Emerging SIS designation--it is important to "fill the holes" in the SIS network, but by having SIS component and SIS Emerging designations a funding priority can be assigned based on usage.
- Keep them separate. Priority funding should go to the SIS first and the Emerging SIS second. Emerging SIS should not be granted based on future projections but on the actual criteria set forth in the SIS Plan. Once a hub reaches the criteria, then, and only then, should they be designated as emerging or full SIS status. Technically the high-speed rail should not be on the SIS because it does not exist except in theory. However, once it is built or construction underway, then it should be designated.
- Keep as separate.
- Separate but call it Class I SIS and Class II SIS.
- Rename and keep separate--if something comes off SIS because of funding could go into this "secondary" list.
- Yes. Funding and deadlines for the Emerging SIS should follow separate criteria.
- Alternatives: SIS-A, SIS-B, SIS-1, SIS-2, SIS-Blue, SIS-Orange

- You did not cover the implication of changing the Criteria! Does it matter? Emerging SIS is as good as any other name. "Almost SIS", "Baby SIS", "Toddler SIS", AH! How about "Wannabe SIS"?
- I believe the separate designation criteria should be maintained.
- Separate designation.
- Should continue to separate the Emerging SIS in a category of its own. Should have a policy dedicated to develop the Emerging SIS.
- A name change for Emerging SIS is in order. People typically believe that Emerging SIS facilities are competing to become SIS. Perhaps "Supporting SIS" or a similar equivalent would be less confusing.
- Separate for now. Can be folded in when they become SIS (and if).
- Design criteria should be the same. If it's strategic for the road system (Emerging or otherwise) then plan accordingly.
- Yes, but Emerging should be truly a separate category with a funding allotment
- Yes, leave the current procedures and criteria in place.
- Yes they should remain. The SIS facilities are the most important facilities. The Emerging criteria allows lesser but still regionally significant facilities to be considered in SIS.
- No-facilities should be combined into SIS. Emerging SIS facilities may be recognized but with no benefit.
- Yes. Higher threshold may limit or drop of some important smaller projects.
- The designation for SIS and Emerging SIS should be SIS. Currently having separate designations causes confusion in which local governments adopt lower LOS standards for Emerging SIS facilities.
- They should be treated the same. Plan for and develop emerging SIS corridors now.
- Keep it as is--so as to recognize Fledgling operations.
- Designate everything SIS: It's the money that counts.
- Emerging SIS should be retained separately to allow opportunity for those excluded by SIS criteria
- It all depends on funding. I would say combine it a certain % of SIS would be allocated toward emerging roads.
- In some cases the emerging SIS is more critical than SIS designation. There should only be one designation criteria.
- Yes--keep as is

- Seems like the status quo makes sense.
- The status quo seems to be working OK.

**Discussion Question 3: Should the SIS Plan expand designation criteria to include:**

- **Commuter rail and other fixed-guideway systems (e.g., busways) connecting multiple urbanized areas with a single region?**
- **Hub-to-hub connectors (e.g., airport-to-seaport people movers)?**
- **Integrated logistics centers?**
- **Intermodal freight drayage routes (e.g., seaport to rail terminal)?**
- **Emerging SIS spaceports?**
- **Access roads and rail to major military installations?**
- **Other types of facilities not included today?**

**Verbal Workshop Comments:**

**General**

- May not be a bad thing to expand but they will have to compete with the unfunded needs on the current SIS system.
- With the changes that you are suggesting here, are you looking to change the way you work with local governments?
- Capital dollars to improve what already exists or capital dollars to build new facilities?
- Strategic industries, universities, other key industries have been identified by Enterprise Florida – they have special consideration and should be addressed in SIS.
- What about power line facilities? *There has been discussion about co-locating with highway corridors, but not for just connection to power facilities.*
- Consider negative impact on local facilities of SIS facilities.
- There is a lot up there. How do you prioritize?

**Highways**

- Please explain the sunset of the FIHS. Is it correct to say the SIS will take the place of FIHS?
- How should the SIS operate, what are we trying to get at? Connectors and connectivity do feed into this. Perhaps you could look at major highway facilities that lead into smaller areas. Can you promote longer trips to stay in the through lane? You need to encourage fewer stops; such as the dedicated through lane on the Greenway.
- As far as fuel, are you taking into consideration what fuel requirements will be in 2060?

- The focus on intercity is about the same as concurrency for roadways, it pushes things out as opposed to concentrating on intra-city.
- FIHS – agree to sunset.
- When the state went to the SIS, a lot of state eligible funded roads went away. We cut the network down. There are a lot of SIS facilities in South Florida, but it seems like the criteria is moving to connecting the urban areas; the cost is skyrocketing and there might not be anything left. The network should be reduced.
- What is the advantage for STRAHNET to change to SIS? *STRAHNET wouldn't change to SIS. It would be used to determine which military access facilities would be designated. We are designating for the function of the bases and considering impact to communities.*
- What about Gulf Coast Parkway?

### Passenger Rail

- You are not dealing with regionally significant projects, like transit? Commuter rail would be part of the SIS, local transit would not.
- You cannot make the commuter rail efficient if the local transit does not effectively support the commuter rail.
- First I would like to say that I'm glad FDOT is looking at integrated transportation systems; however rail projects continue to be overlooked. The notice says- connecting airports, seaports, and major roadway connections. In all 5 regional 5-year workplan meetings, rail was overwhelmingly supported by the public for transit and transportation. I know we need roads and road upgrades, but we need to plan for the future and Rail is the Future!
- Whether it's intercity or intra-city we want to make sure that passenger rail would be eligible for funding as a SIS facility (e.g. Lakeland)
- Designate Miami airport to Miami Intermodal Center.
- Support for SD.3 for congestion relief (commuter rail and fixed guideway systems)
- Tampa rail planned to connect major employment centers – the Census determination may not fit Tampa (e.g. connecting multiple urbanized areas)
- Exclusive use facilities may be designated we just have not done this so far
- Don't limit to just connecting cities, may also be larger communities that need to be identified.
- Perhaps connection to regional centers (e.g. USF and downtown Tampa are both in the city of Tampa)
- When we refer to commuter rail we mean minimal station spacing.
- Intermodal centers would be considered a hub.

- If you are going to take someone out of their car you better have another car at the other end for them. Rail plus one.
- High speed rail makes sense but not to go 90 miles.
- If you are not dealing door to door, forget it, especially when it's hot and muggy.
- Hub to hub is a city pair – the most obvious hubs are airports. When you talk hub to hub, think about 2060 – 100 x 100 airports.
- The concept of commuter rail connecting cities is a misnomer. If we had some sort of transit area inside the system, it should be included as well to complete the trip.
- Is light rail the same as commuter rail? Fail to see why connectivity to other systems is necessary for light rail.
- Hub-to-hub connectors are very important to transit particularly with potential commuter rail in the future.
- What are short/long term plans for high speed rail as it relates SIS?
- Is leadership committee working with CSX and other rail owners to plan for high speed rail?
- Questions on designation of passenger rail as SIS– it would be similar to seaport or spaceport;
- High speed rail is eligible.
- Interested in not only light rail, affordable mode of transportation system, public/private partnership with greyhound. Would like to make sure that the rail is considered for SIS in Collier, Lee & Charlotte counties.
- How does this designation address high speed rail?
- RE: Hub to hub and commuter rail – I would hate to see the funding for highway miles taken away for those designations.
- Concern re how the commuter rail criteria is implemented given differences in definitions between urbanized areas and metropolitan area.
- Any diversion to transit should include the operating funding source to sustain transit.
- Rail and transit were not included in the FIHS, which were only highways. Has any consideration been given to including operational funding in SIS? *Response: the policy to date has been that preservation and operations should be the responsibility of the facility owners.*
- Are there also criteria for passenger rail? Yes
- What about the extension of the Tri Rail commuter rail line? What about the “last mile” concept of completing the trip? The context of passenger rail needs to be expanded. Need to meet volume. That is a good issue for Leadership Committee to discuss.

- I would suggest collapsing freight and passenger rails. You are leading into inconsistent corridors. It would be a simpler system. Most freight rail is interstate/long distance. Your recommendation this is the tons and passenger? That concept would simplify your designation issues. For example, like you might in Orlando when converting freight rail to passenger rail. It needs to be long term and strategic.
- Verify the magnitude of ridership for the difference between a commuter rail hub and a commuter rail terminal that is just on the system. *Response: The distinction in this case would not be based on ridership, but on the function of the station. All commuter rail stations would be part of the designated system, but only those that connect to other regions or modes would be considered SIS hubs with designated intermodal connectors.*
- Do you include transit on the SIS? *We look at regional transit, but not local transit. This is funded separately through New Starts.*
- What about bringing Amtrak to the state? Has there been any discussion on lobbying for them to the state. *Answer: Yes.*
- Is there any place in the state that it is self-sufficient? *Answer: There is almost nothing that is self-sufficient. In fact, all modes are subsidized including highways, rail, Tri-rail is all subsidized. Our success is measured by having modal options.*
- Why is the Amtrak line in Northwest Florida going to Alabama but nowhere else? *Answer: That is just existing CSX rail line on the map. There is no current service, just the tracks.*
- Is it a one-way corridor? *Answer: Many rail corridors are single tracked but have sidings for trains to pass one another.*
- Negative impact on some areas (Marion Co., etc) of increased freight traffic to accommodate commuter rail traffic on another corridor (Orlando). Are these impacts being considered?
- Where are the commuter rail systems in District 3? I don't want any commuter rail in D3.
- Concerned about adding passenger rail service in this area. We have not taken anything off the system in this area.
- Would SunRail (Orlando commuter rail) be eligible to be on SIS? *Yes, with the proposed criteria.*

### Freight Rail

- Why isn't CSX shown as a freight corridor? The active rail line is on the Emerging SIS. Already qualifies for SIS funding. Not likely to drop off.
- Rail committed to moving people and goods in southwest Florida.
- Have been told that highways need to be toll roads, but usually roads to ILC are not toll roads. Any procedure or recommendations on whether toll roads on SIS facilities?
- Why the change from tons to units for intermodal rail?

- Is the freight calculator that Cambridge Systematics produced the only one being used as an investment calculator? There may be a potential conflict of interest using railroad data from CSX and other railroads.
- Focus on ability to move trucks from Jacksonville to S. Florida and economic benefit. Need to look system-wide but keeping personal prospective.
- Consider passenger rail and overlay with freight. Should the lines be designated freight and commuter? Should the line in N. Florida be freight due to consumers in Texas?
- Is there anything in the planning when you start combining freight rail and passenger rail in the future there to identify any conflicts? Is there anything in the planning to separate freight and passenger rail?
- Burlington Northern and Salt Lake City-run passenger and freight rail next to each other – good partnership
- Rail connections to seaports need to be included. *Response: these connectors are already eligible for designation.*
- In favor of the issue on freight movement.
- I would suggest looking at an emerging rail line from SR-20 for US 231 to SR-79. It would be a new line as a partnership between state and private industry.
- What is the process for selection of intermodal freight terminals/facilities? There are a few in the state, but not in this 16 county region.

### **Aviation**

- If there is going to one hub that grows, it will not be railroad stations or bus terminals – it will be airports.
- Only one general aviation reliever airport listed, do you see the need for more in the future?
- There seems to be an emphasis on hubs at airports, has there been any type of discussion of the SIS aiding the Emerging SIS airports to expand general aviation? For instance, the Emerging SIS airports around Orlando Airport, can there be any funding or considerations into this.
- Aviation – every facility could be an evacuation route or staging facility. The major staging facility was Lakeland due to an emergency– this is an example of making the system work; reliever system in an emergency.
- Need to look at airport criteria to identify those connectors.

### **Pedestrian/Bicycle**

- Are bicycle trails a part of the SIS?
- The East Central Florida Rail Trail will be a regional loop that will traverse 4 different counties. It is a major state facility, so it is hard to draw the line. Should give it some recognition and thought to the



importance and elevating. Maybe they are not strategic intermodal items (cost wise) but there could be a cost benefit on a regional basis; if they are identified as regionally significant. They talk about corridor planning maybe it would be appropriate to look at other types of facilities and perhaps they could qualify for other types of funds in moving people through the corridor. Maybe talk to DEP and see what other type of large systems may be coming on. If we are planning for the future, with gas prices increasing, some of the trails may seem more attractive.

- No bike/pedestrian planning, representation. Would also encourage bike/pedestrian that represents the entire state on the Leadership Committee.

## Military

- Wouldn't it be better to look at function instead of size when looking at military bases? If a large base trains pilots as opposed to a smaller base that trains ground troops. The purpose of the interstates is to move military in an emergency.
- Look at what the military base does as opposed to its size.
- The SIS should increase from the standpoint of military installations. The current SIS has to get larger due to the number of military bases in Florida.
- Military access – how is this funded currently?
- How willing has the military been in participating with integrating their facilities? Are they willing and able partners?
- Why did we consider stopping the military threshold at 0.25 percent of U.S. total and not add all of the installations? If the base would close it would impact the community, but being on the SIS will not help the community at all.
- “STRAHNET” is another mystery system. The Districts should work with locals to update the STRAHNET map.
- Any reason why Homestead military base is not included?
- Can you track that the new bases that may be added are not going to be closed.
- Military – Do you know if Avon Park Range is planned to be connected to the SIS?
- HQ for fire suppression for US forest service also working on military storage/movement in the Immokalee area.
- ‘Major military installations’ is not a system it is a destination. Is it still relevant?
- With military designations does that add more federal funding or does it distract from the other facilities? *Response: It is the connectors that are designated, not the bases. This would involve adding additional 58 miles of highway network.*
- Is the military putting up some funding for SIS improvements to access the bases?
- There are no south Florida bases? Homestead is important.

- What military personnel did you talk to? *Response: The Florida Defense Alliance is on the Leadership Committee and has been supportive of these proposed criteria.*
- It should be noted that most of those bases are on top of each other and should be considered as one project. The military bases are not equitable by geography.
- How many people at military bases and how does it affect mass transit? *Response: The SIS does not address local mass transit.*
- How did this get on to the radar screen? Specific military interest specifically in the legislation. The military is changing how they are using the bases. The state wanted us to address this change as the bases are having a growing impact to local communities.
- I find this ridiculous. It seems to be out of the Cold War. We should be focusing on getting traffic off the interstate by focusing on passenger traffic. To be fair, the military is using bases for emergencies and hurricane relief, and are huge economic generators for communities.
- We are not just looking at transit for military access? *Response: It is mostly roadway network based on the proposed criteria, although rail could be designated as well.*
- Every military base should be included on system not just those with more than 0.25% of the national total.
- Will a military access facility have to meet the LOS standards? *We would not be adding this as a traditional connector only as military access facility.*
- All three MPOs have requested putting military bases on the SIS. There are so few on system. Why not Whiting Field? It has air traffic volume. *Answer: Whiting Field does not meet the proposed criteria. It only has less than .125% or about 2,500 personnel on base. It is the ground traffic not air traffic we use when looking at the SIS.*
- Why not Duke field even though it is on SR 85? *Duke Field was not recognized by the Florida Defense Alliance as a major military installation.*
- Why are military bases not considered as hubs? *Military bases do not move people and goods.*
- What about the airpark on Whiting Field? *As for airport, it would have to be an identified as a commercial service airport and meet the size or economic connectivity criteria.*
- The original intent of legislation was to stimulate commerce. We have equated this to moving people and goods. We have gotten away for commerce and so military bases have to be on as hubs.

### Spaceports

- Spaceports would seem to be more important than military bases...how are those strategic to transportation? *Response: only the connections to the military bases would be included, not the bases themselves. The rationale is the importance of the bases to the state and the nation*
- As far as spaceports, we should only have NASA.
- What are emerging spaceports?

- In your comments for SD.9 – spaceport criteria needed for existing [SIS] as well as Emerging [SIS] in comments, but handout doesn't reflect that - criteria may call for changes in existing [SIS] as well as Emerging [SIS].
- Observation that spaceport criteria is in flux at this time.

### Seaports

- Is there emerging corridor for Port of Port St. Joe? *Answer: Yes, there is a rail corridor designated as a planned Emerging SIS connector.*
- Consideration should be given to ferry routes.

### Connectors

- Look at hub to hub options.
- Be more flexible when looking at hub connectors.
- Be more flexible on connectors due to intermodal aspect of facilities and deal with each hub.

### Written Comments from Workshops and Other Sources:

- Possible intracoastal waterway cities and ports.
- Water taxis, hovercraft.
- Economic activity centers?
- Yes. The SIS should work as an integrated transportation system.
- Yes to all, but only as work with regions and metro areas and only as balance with uses and needs and priorities. NOTE: Be sure to include the difference between light rail and commuter rail.
- "Last mile" plans and resources for pedestrians and other non-motorists to be able to utilize transit, rail, and even ports and airports. While they be local projects, they are vital to making transportation options beyond SOVs work. Even SOV use can benefit when parking problems are an issue, among other things.
- It should only include those that are critical.
- Focus should include all aspect of rail (e.g., if there is a rail [high speed] from urban area to urban area, then some consideration must be given to hub-to-hub as well as facilitating local trips that connect to a large rail system.
- In order to solve the problem with funding roads you need to invest in rail.
- Once the overall mission statement for the SIS has been finalized, any mode that directly contributes or impacts the mission should be evaluated.

- Yes, all connected and interconnected portions of the SIS network need to be included. The network will not work with unfunded holes in it.
- No for commuter rail and other fixed guideways, etc. These are local systems and are not strategic by definition.
- Yes [on hub to hub] as long as both are designated as SIS hubs.
- Yes [on integrated logistics centers]. These are strategic by definition. As well as intermodal.
- Yes [on intermodal freight drayage routes]. If between designated SIS or emerging SIS hubs.
- Yes [on emerging SIS spaceports]. But only when these commercial spaceports actually exist and meet specific criteria and show that they are actually performing in a strategic manner. I do not see these activities generating much traffic on the connectors whether for passengers or cargo.
- Yes [on military access roads and rail]. As long as they are designated on the SIS. Not every rail yard or military installation will fit the definition.
- No [on other types of facilities]. I do not see other types of facilities meeting SIS standards so let's not expand the definition. The system is degraded enough now.
- Yes to all.
- Yes - See #1 above (Increase -Include all: US Highways, Roads which are parallel and relieve SIS Roads and Facilities, University and College Districts as SIS Hubs)
- No [commuter rail]
- No [hub to hub]
- Yes [integrated logistics centers]
- No [intermodal freight drayage routes]. That's an internal port issue.
- No [emerging SIS spaceports]. When we have operating spaceports, then we'll talk.
- No [military access roads]
- No [other]
- Support looking at overall transportation/economic viability relationship. The newly designated areas have to come with a cost to improve connections/operations. They then should convene with highway and existing SIS facilities to determine "Final SIS."
- And I would put emphasis on the hub-to-hub connectors also in order to reach "greener" goals within the overall project (Discourage the use of cars and use more eco-friendly fuels for hub-to-hub connectors.).

- Access roads: Do not know enough to have an opinion. General comment: Parking facilities that would serve SIS facilities and promote use of transportation hubs and intermodal-interregional corridors.
- Commuter rail: Only the high capacity commuter rail & metro rail.
- With so much emphasis on regionalism, transit systems connecting multiple urbanized areas (even when in a single region) should be designated.
- It should be expanded/reduced to create a complete network from destination (hub) to designation (hub) that makes sense. Connections to other states.
- Military bases; Hub-to-Hub-water, rail and roadway.
- The Responsible Growth Management Coalition (RGMC) of Ft. Myers is pleased to submit this letter in support of the MPO's TIGER Grant to purchase the right of way and real estate of the CSX railroad. Only if this can be placed into the public domain, can the future of public transit be assured in Southwest Florida.
- I do not agree with expanding the designation criteria. And if there had to be some expansion the only one that I would support would be "Access roads and rail to major military installations"
- The rule limiting only two connection roads is being applied with no flexibility to look at a whole system of connecting roads that function as one system. The J/A South Connector is on the system but the North Connector that will connect I-95 with the J/A Cargo Terminal is not on the system.
- Funding cannot support all facilities
- The FDOT would be wise to step back from large multimodal systems that do not pay for themselves. Tri-rail and the MIC may be important, but that is like planning to expand your home when the roof is leaking.
- Cruise passenger thresholds
- Access roads/rail to military installations
- These facility types support the SIS, but are not necessarily SIS themselves.
- In general, this level of expansion would reduce the strategic nature of the SIS, splitting the fixed pie into even smaller slices. The focus should remain inter-regional and commuter rail is not that.
- Most of the above should state the SIS on a slippery slope away from truly strategic, inter-city facilities. This should be resisted.

## **Discussion Question 4: What other changes would you suggest regarding the SIS designation criteria and process?**

### **Verbal Workshop Comments:**

- To go along with flexibility in connectors, FDOT should allow more than one connector for a hub. In some cases, there are more ways to get from point A to point B. Be more flexible.
- How many agencies other than FDOT are involved when looking at SIS designations? Are there plans for future partnerships?
- Since protective growth is an issue in Florida, how do you address growth and economic trends?
- Why was SIS developed – what was FDOT looking to accomplish?
- Emphasis statewide on what would be significant to all.
- How could transportation help that? Defining the state's interest and meeting the needs.
- Was there a sense that things left outside of the SIS would be left to other people?
- A leadership and support role; the SIS is the leader/coordinator.
- TRIP was developed to promote the regional entities – facilities not on the SIS but very important to the region.
- What about other areas that are Emerging areas, e.g. around the spaceport?
- Need to consider Mega-Regions as we plan transportation network. Only Mega Region in Florida is in this area.
- Current criteria reward investments of the past. How do we incorporate planned facilities into the system?
- Southwest Florida's only option for goods movement is truck. Highways are not on the SIS plan, Immokalee airport is not either.
- Finance should be a designation factor. SIS is in major areas, self-fulfilling prophecy that funds are going to SIS/major urban areas, rural areas are being left out
- Do you find it difficult to justify using public funds on private facilities such as CSX?
- Are there representatives from all Districts and Turnpike on the SIS committee? Does the SIS committee have equal representation? Heartland area potentially not represented.
- [Leadership Committee member] complimented FDOT for getting the review and update underway. Member also commented on 'where we need to go': a lot has changed since this was originated five years ago. We need to focus more on transit which was 'left out' previously, and consider passenger hubs, inter-modal solutions, and use of SIS funds off the system to make it work over better overall. This is an open forum and I want to encourage all to voice your comments. I assure you that your



comments are been noted, as I've already gotten my first e-mail from FDOT with comments made at the workshops that have already taken place. They are doing a statewide tour. FDOT has really reached out all round the state and I compliment them on the great job they have done on that.

- On dedicated funding source for Tri-Rail, audience member offered a petition for interested supporters to sign, as individuals and on behalf of groups.
- I think you should separate traffic demand levels for rail terminal from bus terminals.
- In the rural areas, particularly in the west part of the state, you have SIS designation controlling the capacity of the system. The SIS system is almost the only access to the county. Any thought to looking to those areas where the SIS has a different impact to the economy of the county? In one of those counties there is only one road through the county and a road that has a very high volume of truck traffic which is very important, but this becomes an impediment to them. They don't have parallel routes available. It hurts their ability to grow.
- Seaport cruise passenger threshold is only 500,000. I don't know where you put this on the SIS but I think you should be putting hundreds of millions of trips on the transit numbers. How do you compare the two?
- [Leadership Committee member] This is my second go round on the SIS leadership committee. Thank you for being here today and giving your input in this update. It is very vital. This is an interesting scenario that we are trying to create. Florida has many needs and very limited resources. We have to allocate the resources the best way we can. Remember that this is a statewide plan that has to be approved by everyone, so we have to meet everyone's needs. Thank you again for being here.
- Highway is the exception for the through traffic because it is hard to separate the local trips, but there are other initiatives to address this such as increasing carpooling, doing improvements off the SIS.
- Is there or what is the standards for designation? – There are on the brochure. Yes, there are criteria thresholds that need to be met.
- Give our geography – end of the line to rail corridors, we do not have the through traffic, but they are just as important to the through movement. Why is [local] CSX [line] not designated as SIS?
- Why if it does not meet criteria today, but soon will, we do not plan and protect it for tomorrow? We can change designation at anytime we don't have to wait for 5 years
- Is there any discussion on using highway funds for passenger rail? There has been discussion of using a corridor approach at the Leadership Committee level. Where is that vision to use rail to replace lane widening?
- Is there special prioritization for multimodal – for rail? That is more in the implementation discussion.
- Why is there no discussion on hurricane evacuation discussion? I am focusing on Miami Dade, but it is a statewide issue. Response: The Leadership Committee is grappling with that issue. The important evacuation routes are captured here. The SIS designation is not based on emergency evacuation potential because that would result in designation of nearly every road in the state.

- You stress safety as part of the SIS? *Response: Yes, in the context of regional mobility and strategic in nature.*
- Why is the Miami River not on the SIS? It meets most of the criteria. We have a new mobility plan completed. *Response: If it doesn't meet the criteria it will not be designated. It needs to meet all the criteria. We will review the updated plan.*
- It seems that there are funding issues here for rail, how do you address commuter rail services funding and use?
- Are you including airport traffic, such as truck traffic and rail traffic in you discussions? *Response: Yes.*
- What about local smaller commercial freight airports? *Response: For designation an airport has to be a commercial airport and meet criteria and thresholds.*
- The local governments have Level of Service in their plans, which are included and integrated with FIHS standards. My suggestion is that now is a good time to address these standards considering the new SB 360 legislation and direction.
- What about the relationship between FLL and MIA? What can FDOT do to bring them together?
- There needs to be more rail systems at the airports for connectivity.
- Is high-speed rail service incorporated into this plan? *Designation: Yes. As soon as high-speed rail plans including the technology is finalized it will be put on the SIS.*
- In the tracks just west of Biscayne Blvd, in some places there is only one track. When will it be doubled tracked? Do you have your checkbook? Is it a checkbook problem or other? *Response: There are concerns about spending public funds to private industry. There are many concerns like that. One purpose of the SIS is to identify these situations.*
- I would also suggest looking at rail from Homestead to MIA.
- We need more options for increased mobility.
- We need direct rail traffic for MIA to the port of Miami? Are you talking about doing this now, not just 20 years from now? *Response: Yes.*
- Is there any discussion about closing down – ports specifically the Pensacola? *Answer: There has been no specific discussion of removing any facilities. Just general discussion on the right size of SIS.*
- There is some argument locally about the ports creating jobs. Is that why you include them? *Answer: the SIS helps move freight and goods. We have been getting away from just highways and looking at other modes.*
- Are there any specifics on dredging projects for this area? *There was a project with SIS money at Port of Pensacola, but there was not money available for match.*
- Can private facilities be on the SIS? *Yes.*

- Are they still looking at more criteria? We have the potential for having facilities beyond the state lines. Need other criteria to look at future or potential SIS. Not just existing congestion. *Response – we do look at other states, no plan to have qualitative criteria.*
- Add universities as hubs.
- Involve all stakeholders affected by changes.
- Consider all impacts on other facilities too.
- Resources or plans to mitigate sprawl encouraged by improving facilities that make commuting long distances easier.
- SIS encourages people to move out of metropolitan areas because of “improved” transportation; anything to mitigate/offset the financial aspect to metropolitan areas that may result. Perhaps a greater emphasis on rail in the future.
- Impact of SIS on non-SIS local facilities – I-75 is a N/S SIS corridor that impedes local E/W traffic flow, and increases cost of crossing SIS with local facilities.

### **Written Comments from Workshops and Other Sources:**

- Be sensitive to existing state roads, maintenance funding, and sustainability at the cost of designating another road on SIS.
- Reduce threshold criteria for general aviation/reliever airports to 5,000 linear ft. runway length and remove "reliever" designation requirement.
- Reduce military facility size criteria.
- The focus needs to move decisively away from automobiles and roads and towards forms of transit.
- Bike, pedestrian connectors as well as "naturists" destination site appealing to tourists (e.g. Everglades City)
- Add to SIS committee bike/pedestrian interest representatives. FDOT has a statewide bike/pedestrian coordinator; Florida Bicycle Association is a non-profit that serves the entire state.
- Add general aviation airports; they relieve capacity problems at commercial service airports
- Designation criteria should be focused on the following in order: (1) livability; (2) environment; (3) economy. Livability enhances both #2 & #3. What we focus on should enhance our way of life. Less roads--more alternatives.
- Do not expand the criteria so much as it lets every road qualify.
- None now.
- The criteria that currently exist as well as the process should be strictly followed with no "end runs" around the criteria to satisfy a specific request. For example, the Sarasota Airport was added

although it did not meet the 50-mile criteria so the definition was changed to obligate their request. Once designated at least one major airline serving the airport pulled out reducing the number of passengers to below the emerging criteria, yet the airport was not taken off the list as a SIS hub. Each hub should be reviewed annually against the criteria and designated appropriately to ensure that SIS funds are targeted to the right facilities.

- Allow MPOs a greater role in SIS planning and priorities.
- No changes needed. Don't change just for the sake of changing.
- While we feel that light rail is the answer in the long term, and thus strongly support it, we do feel that a major first step is the development of a meaningful mass transit system. It seems that will be best provided by a bus network, utilizing Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) as well as some system for inexpensively getting riders from their homes to transit hubs. Senior citizens cannot afford taxis on a routine bases, and may not be able to drive even though they are quite capable of riding on a mass transit system. We need to teach them!
- Needs to develop and publish prioritization criteria so can see how/why one project is considered "better"/"more beneficial" than another.
- Prioritize needs and restructure existing components to deliver immediate benefits such as improve railroad connectivity before new funds are required. Distribute present resources differently to meet these needs.
- Include a criterion that provides for intermodal connectivity to offer neighborhoods and community access to SIS facilities through connectivity-demand for Transit-Rail. Include transportation alternatives: Bus-ways, Trolleys, and a Metrorail system connecting South Western developed areas North then Eastern access to Airport and downtown Miami and the Broward.
- I feel that FDOT is nothing resembling transparent regarding the prioritization of projects. Once glance in the dark blue booklet says 9 projects for District Four and 9 projects for District 3. With the population so unequal--where is the bang for the buck? With the politicians, I see.
- Find a new term for "Emerging SIS."
- Eliminate "loose ends" in the SIS network. For example, why is S.R. 826 designated as SIS south of S.R. 874 when it does not connect to any hub, corridor, or connector?
- Utilizing operating LOS to better reflect need for capacity improvements in rural areas.
- I do not support any further changes to the SIS designation criteria.
- Ferries should be added.
- Maintain what is currently designated before adding unfunded extremely expensive other modes that have proven not to pay for themselves.
- Adding ferry routes

- Current system provides dramatic advantage to existing facilities (ports, airports, Industrial Centers, roads, rail, etc.) and acts to exclude growing and developing facilities. This makes SIS an investment in and a focus on History rather than the future.
- Look at SR16; Connects military installations in St. Augustine to Camp Blanding; Hurricane evacuation; Need East/West road between I-295 and SR 207. Make first coast outer beltway a SIS facility--no additional cost because this road is projected to be a toll road and totally self sufficient.
- Limit SIS to primary road/rail/and other multimodal corridors--the SIS is being used for funding criteria and not necessarily need.
- Change the name to: Strategic Inter-regional System.

---

## Needs Assessment

---

### **Discussion Question 1: What changes would you suggest to the adopted SIS goals shown below?**

- 1. A safer and more secure transportation system for residents, businesses, and visitors**
- 2. Effective preservation and management of Florida's transportation facilities and services**
- 3. Increased mobility for people and for freight and efficient operations of Florida's transportation system.**
- 4. Enhanced economic competitiveness and economic diversification.**
- 5. Enriched quality of life and responsible environmental stewardship.**

### **Verbal Workshop Comments:**

- What are the goals? Everything seems to be center towards larger metro areas.
- Highways are extremely congested in this area. Are they really looking at rail in this area to move people?
- You mentioned moving people; what about bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
- Need to focus on efficiency, not just capacity. The locals are allowing for denser development. How do we change the system to compensate and protect? For example, allow for HOV. Need to provide and focus on more than just capacity. We need to provide, protect, and promote statewide efficiencies as part of general investment for the SIS.
- Goals are general – not specific.
- Look for baseline – area with best transportation system to use as benchmark and test Florida's system against the benchmark. Network with other states.
- Where is society going? Towards electric power for automobiles. Need electric car infrastructure.

- Safer and more secure – how much do we spend on safety and security? Where is the priority? Bridges, ports.
- Bicycle/pedestrian facilities not mentioned in goals.
- Cost/benefit ratios/analysis for projects.
- Ports in the gulf are quicker for access for distance, but port in Miami are already passed congestion point, so freight movers are sending freight and growth to Savannah. We the SIS are not planning for the future especially in NWF.
- Preservation and management of facilities – advance acquisition of right-of-way for system. Funding source.
- Need a way to keep score – put it in a way so people can understand it. Show in such a way that the average person can understand it. Present in simple terms so people can evaluate it.
- Proposed goal: Florida transportation uses most advanced, highest and best IT available.
- Public participation not included in goals and objectives.
- Agency coordination should be included as goal.
- Seamless – we don't have it. Is that a goal? How is it defined? Is it a priority? We want a transportation system that will take us everywhere in the world. Facilitate the movement of people and tourists here from everywhere in the world.
- Efficient operations – implies between modes.
- Regional connectivity should be elevated to a goal.
- Mobility – shortening the amount of time between major destinations in the state. Reducing delays at hubs along the way. Making the transfer as smooth as possible and maximizing the number of trips served by the facility.
- Preservation and management – we need ITS to encourage high-tech economic and employment growth.
- The SIS committee has no bicycle/pedestrian representation on it. Every trip begins and ends with a pedestrian movement.
- Success of high-speed rail or highways depends on how people can move at the beginning and end of the trip.
- No real emphasis on intermodalism, what is cost benefit analysis between modes?
- Quality of life - social aspects - social implications of having a SIS facility
- Quality of life and mobility needs, how does it all fit together?

- Goal order - any reason for order? Mobility is important why not higher in goal
- Goal to have space port changes studied in SIS? Downsizing, new program, keep area competitive
- How are we going to keep up paying for the implementation? What is the goal?
- Regarding Goal # 2 need to be more effective in identification. If the corridors are identified then preservation will be better.
- How do we establish a goal to move our people and goods along existing corridors? What is the focus of SIS, is it new roads or existing corridors?
- There is no SIS funding for expanding hubs such as terminal expansion. What about hub expansion in Taft? Thought the hub was being moved not expanded. (leveraging multiple funding sources to cover expansion and then SIS funding is being used on the connectors)
- Does Mobility include efficiency? Yes, seamlessness between modes and efficiency between modes
- Mobility factor should be redefined to include carbon credits, reducing greenhouse gasses rather than just moving people from Ft. Lauderdale to Miami. (looking at mobility and economic factors – more statewide perspective)
- Transportation needs to be more coordinated with land use.
- Great opportunity to attract jobs – FL has had a mass exodus of people – need to bring jobs to FL.
- Second goal – does it address future? (right of way used as example)
- Fourth goal - needs flexibility)
- The goals do not sound very proactive. For example, these goals (the verbiage) read reactive. This is supposed to be futuristic and forward planning, isn't it?
- Specific objectives should follow goals.
- Are the goals listed in priority order?
- When it comes to increased mobility, what is really measured by? Mobility is misused here. Does it consider the modes that people really want?
- I think is grand this plan to create community rails and hubs instead of adding highway lanes, but apparently there are funding and management issues. Is there a plan to create better management and solve these issues?
- Safety. Is hurricane evacuation part of the SIS? *Response: Every road functions as an emergency evacuation route, so using this criterion alone would create a huge list of facilities.*
- How about bridges to some islands that need evacuation? I-395 and I-195 connect to I-95 developing an evacuation route for the Miami Beach islands.

- Coordination should be included in these goals. As well as mass transit.
- Add multimodal facilities in urban areas to address mobility and quality of life.
- Consider short sea shipping as a possible alternative to eliminate truck traffic.
- What does ‘secure’ mean in goal 1? *Focusing on security for people and freight SIS airports, seaports, and other facilities. The meaning of security differs by mode? Is that \$ for cameras? No, those are funded through other sources. In this case it is more about balancing security and mobility.*
- It is interesting to see environmental stewardship when you look at the location of the relocation of the Panama City Airport? *The airport did go through the NEPA process and received a Record of Decision.*
- There is nothing on the goals concerning the bicycle/ pedestrian facilities? *This is because the focus is on the high-speed, high capacity facilities and interregional connectivity. But there are policies about providing accommodations for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.*
- What about the Florida National Scenic trail? *We will make note of that.*
- What about neighboring states and countries? There needs to look at collaborating with other states, such as Alabama.
- Is there a way to address help in funding, i.e. public-private partnerships?
- On economic competitiveness is there any weight given to counties that are part of the areas of critical economic concern - lower thresholds? *5 REDI counties do not have SIS highways. The designation threshold is lower in the Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern, but many highways do not meet this threshold.*
- Move quality of life and environment higher in list to emphasize importance – appears to be least important
- Evacuation is part of safety, could be made more explicit.
- These are too broad and need to be “pinned down” for the SIS.
- Very broad terms. They need subcomponents and tightening up.
- Need to address the future as well as the present.
- The first goal wording seems a bit odd in grouping residents with businesses – since business is one sector among many. How about adding “natural resources” too? What does security mean for businesses?
- Perhaps substitute “system users” or “users of the system” for all of the named groups, since they are the ones directly impacted by the system.
- End the first goal statement after the word “system.”



- 1<sup>st</sup> goal – need to add “efficient.”
- What is sustainable investment?
- Need to better understand how SIS will work within new transportation concurrency exception areas (TCEA) under SB 360.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> goal – should it include “expansion”?

### **Written Comments from Workshops and Other Sources:**

- Invest in passenger rail, bike/pedestrian infrastructure as much as, if not more than roads. Set aside funds to maintain existing infrastructure and find alternatives to building wider roads or more roads.
- Some of these goals may come into conflict with each other. For example, maintaining or improving connectivity between regions and promoting economic development and diversification may result in the need to widen sections of the SIS that would not be needed otherwise. An example would be the placement of significant commercial/industrial land uses along I-10 between I-75 and I-95. This may require that this section of I-10 be widened to 6 lanes, but the development of land anywhere along this segment of road would require it be widened between I-75 and I-95. If the land uses were placed west of Live Oak however, the state may have to widen I-10 from I-95 to the site at a significant additional cost (the piece west of I-75).
- The goal should be to maintain what we have and make sure it works well, while achieving the most efficient system possible for the movement of people and goods. The state should be clear about where it is prepared to improve the transportation system and steer appropriate development to these areas by sharing this information with the public. It should not be in a reactionary mode, responding to development and trying to accommodate whatever land use a private interest feels will work best for them.
- Mass transit; through traffic; "move over" signs
- Support and enhance passenger rail and intermodal stations
- If they imply the inclusion of bike/pedestrian elements, as it appears, then such components must be funded and built, not simply a stated goal.
- Preservation of right of way is important, but the transportation system components may have to evolve away from current modes. Focus of much freight service should focus on foreshortening the supply loop, e.g., sustainable agriculture, regional and sub regional supply and distribution. First Bullet--delete "A safe and" and "more"; Third bullet--delete "and for freight"
- Add regional site analysis for intermodal/integrated Logistics Center.
- Become truly "strategic" by planning for enhanced efficiency in freight and people movement. Instead of building more lanes, build more rail. Make it more convenient to travel and ship by rail than by road.
- A safe, secure, and more responsive...

- The effective preservation of the existing SIS network should include funding solutions of failing sections of the network.
- No change, (but) just a timely implementation of the entire plan.
- Tie mass transit to all goals on 3. Add--"by providing multi-modal alternatives."
- None, looks good.
- Good.
- Include life cycle cost analysis requirements and preference for hardened structures at airports (building, hangars) etc. so as to eliminate costs of loss of use after wind events specifically for the elevated importance of SIS facilities and supporting business/structures.
- Language on #1 and 2 could be more succinct (ie: "Secure" in #1 and "Effective Presentation" maintenance which is not really an element in SIS funding)
- Add the term /goods after freight in 3
- A safer and more secure and "efficient".... A plan which places an equal emphasis on economic cost and operational effectiveness
- None.
- None.
- Enhance wording to stress (efficiency-improve by use of ITS, open road tolling, grade separation) this would enhance capacity but we also need to look at mainline capacity increases as well.
- Don't current environmental rules make #5 a given? Enough is enough.
- So general that I can't imagine opposition.
- OK
- A safer, more efficient and secure...
- Since the vast majority of personal trips will continue to be made by car, ensure that highway capacity keeps pace with population and economic growth.
- These seem ok.

## **Discussion Question 2: What changes are needed in the eligibility of different types of modal projects for SIS funding?**

### **Verbal Workshop Comments:**

- Being able to get people to the airport, but not fixing the runway does not make sense. There are some cases of funding runways in the state. My suggestion is that if it moves people and goods it should be included. Why should the public pay for private profits?
- We should have distance criteria like Georgia uses. For example, locations 50 to 100 miles near an airport.
- Adding things to the eligible list does not add funding.
- Some funding is related to partner agency having funding for project (e.g. port authority berth, airport terminal).
- When projects are planned there might be more money available but stage construction or value engineering may be better. Building for 2035 traffic when attractors aren't there. Money not available to build triple-decker bridges.
- No guidelines on how you would fund Emerging or new commuter rail lines. Split of funding or designation of funding for commuter rail. Incentive to local match for funding. Percentage of new flexible money added on as state money.
- Roads are put on the regional system so they can secure TRIP funds. Make local match for regional/local roads and the State dollars will go further.
- Why is preservation funding not included in SIS funding?
- Congestion during shuttle launches. Any thought of special event management for parking, car traffic? Need a more safe and secure way to move cars
- Some locals view the SIS is the vault of money and the way to get funds is to get on the system.
- Why is there little of SIS funding actually on SIS hubs? Why focusing on just connectors. Why not actually spend on rail line spurs, cranes etc? It seems we will build a road to your house, but not a rail line spur to your business.
- How does SIS funding eligibility work between SIS and Emerging SIS? Why don't SIS facilities compete against other SIS for funding and Emerging SIS compete with Emerging SIS?
- Bicycle access on limited access highways. Valuable corridor for bike/pedestrian transportation.
- Seaport project – bulkhead maintenance not included; consider an allowance in SIS
- Passenger terminals look at intermodal – fixed guideway.
- Improvements for lower vehicle miles traveled, consider other modes

- Treatment of SIS toward spaceport – hard to fit spaceport into SIS criteria. Truck, rail, bringing equipment into the port for shipment. Cannot view spaceport like an airport or seaport
- No space project identified in “Investing in Florida’s Future” brochure, but picture is shown on front of the brochure
- Can you fund a SIS project if it is not in an MPO plan?
- Need to look at last mile (pedestrians).
- Expanded eligibility for rail terminals and stations.
- Allow corridor purchase to be broken away from the actual project development.
- Parallel facilities to intersystem to serve local traffic to take pressure off interstate system. Including highway and rail modes in parallel facilities.
- Security and long-range transportation plans – Security needs to be defined better for highways. Security needs are clear at seaports and airports, but less so for other facilities.
- Inland port facility, different types of ports, need to be considered.
- Should maintenance be an eligible use of SIS funds
- Broward County is thinking about mobility hubs. Is there a possibility that these hubs be considered for SIS funding? *Response: Some of the proposed mobility hubs, such as Tri-Rail and Amtrak stations, are already part of the SIS.*
- 17/18 TriRail stations are eligible for funding. Please explain why BCT hubs aren’t eligible. Is it because there is no intercity element? *Response: yes.*
- Would the proposed FEC commuter rail service be eligible? *Yes, if the proposed commuter rail criteria is adopted.*
- Would a transit service that serves multiple counties be eligible? *Yes, if it connects multiple urbanized areas or metropolitan districts.*
- FDOT gives extra weight for projects that support highways. Bottlenecks along the county should be addressed.
- FDOT is not providing funding for rider facilities. Need to provide for public transit stations.
- Are there funds for project developments and environmental work? *Response: Yes, funds can be used for PD&E studies and planning projects for facilities anticipated to be part of the SIS once developed.*
- Do the eligibility guidelines apply to new facilities; do they need to be designated as SIS or Emerging SIS? *Response: The Miami Intermodal Center [MIC] is an example of a new development which used SIS funds. The MIC was established as a planned SIS facility, because of its characteristics and*

*projected passenger volumes, and after being built it would be part of the SIS as long as actual passenger counts meet the adopted thresholds.*

- How are funds distributed and financing is established? Is it just based on capacity improvements? Response Based on several factors including mobility benefits, economic returns, and reasonable distribution across the state, etc.
- The railroad tracks that go to the seaport are not being used as often anymore. A station can be placed next to the Freedom Tower to allow mobility along the existing rail tracks. Is there anything being done? Response: District 4 is studying the FEC passenger rail system, which will connect Downtown Miami with Ft Lauderdale.
- It is problematic to put public dollars to a private roadway.
- Concerns for a new port being added to the SIS. More money should go toward smaller projects, instead of sending the bulk of the money to the larger ports.
- Has there been any discussion on making the ports deeper? Answer: *We having been doing dredging with SIS funds.*
- How do you treat intermodal centers? E.g. Jacksonville and Miami. State is funding terminal development in these cases.
- We are being short-sighted by not including safety as stand alone projects

### **Written Comments from Workshops and Other Sources:**

- Re-prioritize based on most efficient mode based on greenhouse gas production.
- Community based orientation based on comprehensive plan
- Not sure I even like SIS since it short changes certain modes (see above--Q1) and geographic areas
- Add terminal construction and equipment, on storage facilities, land acquisition, and general airside improvements as projects eligible for funding.
- Expand eligibility for rail and terminal destinations.
- Unclear from the "goldenrod" handout whether public acquisition of privately-own rights-of-way is eligible for funding, but if not, it should be; and if so, it should be a priority while property values are diminished.
- Agree generally--Insure multi-modal distribution of funds is appropriate for state/local, no influenced by political interests (as much as that is possible).
- "Regional SIS Intermodal Site" not just by numbers but by planning efforts at a regional basis.
- I would apply a "system of systems" approach. Does this impact/improve/detract from the overall operation of the SIS?

- Should include eligibility for planned facilities.
- Funding for the erection of parking facilities necessary to access each of the SIS components.
- OK.
- Priority should be given for match funding in the event of local participation or other funding source. The opportunity to "move up" the list could induce local participation.
- Influence design criteria to eliminate "political interest" specifications that allow substandard building systems. Example: require 150mph wind zone or 180mph wind zone design for criteria and non-critical structures.
- Do not change the existing criteria.
- Hub to Hub Connectors including people mover systems should be eligible for SIS funding.
- A greater emphasis should be placed on projects directly related to intermodal facilities. (Facilities that combine more than one mode of transportation.) Place less emphasis on highway alone projects
- SIS Funding should also consider parallel corridors to SIS facilities.
- None.
- They should only be funded after the needs of existing SIS facilities are met.
- More inclusive criteria: The idea of focusing on a few large, existing hubs and corridors is inherently rear-focused and excludes smaller, developing hubs, corridors, and facilities.
- Toll assisted facilities which are self sufficient should be considered and put on the SIS system to eliminate duplication.
- Funding should be provided to existing SIS first. If the SIS facility is not priority it should be removed from the system.
- There is a conflict under Hub that needs to be addressed. "Terminal construction" is not eligible for funding but on-dock rail track and connectors are (but on-dock rail is a terminal). Therefore, only on-dock rail that serves more than one railroad should be eligible for funding. Otherwise, you are funding terminal construction for on user just because it is at a port.
- They look pretty good, as is.

---

## Prioritization Process

---

### **Discussion Question 3: What factors should be used to establish SIS priorities on a statewide basis?**

#### **Verbal Workshop Comments:**

- Panama Canal is being widened and there is a problem with Port of Panama City. Access for the trucks to get at port in timely basis is a problem. Biggest problem is that we are trying market ourselves as a regional gateway, but there is a connectivity issue with access to the port.
- Funding these things with local partners is difficult. You need to have determined a need. Typically, there needs to be a volume capacity problem before an improvement.
- Reasonable distribution between modes - how is that determined? It should be better defined.
- Highways and Bridges are in poor condition in our area. Any SIS factors are not going to help NWF, we need other factors. Because the people are in Miami the money goes to south FL, there needs to be factors other than population, money, pay back, capacity volumes, etc.
- There is little NWF can expect for funding. Once you look at population the ‘reasonable distribution’ is moved back to Miami
- What do you mean with preservation – focusing on maintain the existing conditions? We need higher priority of maintaining existing facilities.
- Context sensitive design needs to be more important in order to increase people capacity not just people capacity – which needs more energy conservation and more efficient land use. Answer: there has been some discussion in the committee on looking at this.
- The issues are how do you pick one private over another? Using that process is not fair. That is an ongoing problem for the committee.
- The economic impact in a smaller ESIS airport will really affect the community more so then the impact of a bigger SIS hub like Tampa. There is more impact and more economic impact helping smaller hubs.
- Who determines what is reasonable when one talks about reasonable distribution?
- Relies heavily on the highway side, priorities set for a regions vision
- Freight – ports – falls thru the process. Freight needs fall out modal issues discussed more
- Will there be criteria for the source for public private partnerships? How does the Department balance between the existing priorities and getting funding for certain developer driven project.
- The Port Tunnel will cost \$1 billion; I-395 upgrades will cost \$600 million. Palmetto/ Dolphin Interchange will cost \$800 million for a GRAND TOTAL of 2.4 billion dollars to move freight and

cars from the Port of Miami/ Downtown to Doral/Medley. A port rail link and metro rail line would be equivalent. We need to start to see equal treatment of transportation resources in Miami-Dade.

- Economic criteria should be considered as part of criteria.
- What about environmental stewardship? There should be criteria that look at air pollution and social justice issues.
- Should have criteria for urban areas.
- Is the SIS designed to accommodate the disproportionate population growth? There should be considerations in place for population.
- How does congestion factor into prioritization?
- Is economic competitiveness within state considered? Rural areas considered.
- Leveraging funds – toll roads, people willing to pay to use roads.
- Has it been quantified how much money is spent in administering public transportation in Florida? TBARTA, Airport Authority, PSTA, public this... multiple layers of public agencies. New York Port Authority is a good model. Consolidation should be a priority.
- Criteria across modes (highway, rail). Funding allocation spent across modes. Don't stack one type of improvement against another. Cost-benefit analysis.
- Concerned about distribution of funding. He knows there is more money made in Miami, and money made in Miami will help rural areas, but there is not a lot of SIS in NWF. Need to have safety net for economic opportunities for rural areas. What are the safe guards for all areas of the state, so all are benefactors and locals can participate in the receiving money and get a "fair share of money"
- Regional connectivity – works towards satisfying other objectives like economic competitiveness.
- Corridors and connectors – real problem on the connectors and the hub – the last mile the hardest to build. Weighting of connectors – more emphasis.
- SIS funding is a mystery-lists go up projects come down, how are they selected
- Better system to identify candidates
- Criteria for designation are clear - but how is the money spent
- Cost benefit analysis
- How is ETDM used in the SIS?
- Screening process need more details
- Natural disasters – safety – ability to handle disasters
- How do you define economic competitiveness? On a SIS project basis how is it defined?

- Issue of declining gas tax revenues – where is additional funding coming from – mobility fee?
- Declining economic condition – future economic development – main priority for SIS funding should be future economic development.
- Counties have to cut back even though this is a great time to build roads. Counties don't have funds and money should go to the counties to cover their priorities.
- Task force may be needed to look at funding priority for future or new schemes-taxing by time of day you drive VMT
- Innovative financing – total cost to ownership, maintenance, repair. Innovative financing options justification – get the benefit earlier. Money is cheaper for partnerships
- SIS cost feasible plan needed by MPOs. Set milestones in update process for SIS.
- Is there ability for the committee to be more flexible in implementing the prioritization process?
- The final calculations lack a cost benefit feasibility analysis. Objective analysis is needed and not apparent.
- What is the latest mechanism for coordination amongst all agencies when it comes to SIS? This is needed when it comes to priorities.
- Safety should be an important factor.
- FDOT should have SIS specifications and a comparison on how revenue is allocated and compare with other states.
- The projects are being prioritized one way but the money is being allocated in a different way. There should be a consistency.
- Equity issues, especially from D4 and D6. There should be comparison apples to apples statewide along the projects and how they are evaluated.
- Is there a spreadsheet that shows the prioritization and the related score? *There is a decision support tool. There is not a single number to rank projects.*
- Reasonable distribution – what about Emerging SIS vs. SIS? We in Northwest Florida will lose out on money.
- What does geographic distribution mean? *There is a policy of having a reasonable distribution of funds across all economic regions or Districts, measures over long periods of time.*
- Is there any focus on housing? No not at this time.
- There is a concern of the Northwest Florida Transportation Corridor Authority (NFTCA) being development-focused membership in the committee. I would caution using NFTCA because it is biased towards development.

- What do you mean by partner input?
- How do you deal with multiple priority lists? How do you deal with all those number one projects? *There is a bottom up and a top down approach.*
- Are you suggesting restructuring the TPO so they have a seat at the table when determining the prioritization process?
- A corridor operating over capacity should be major factor in setting priority.
- Is there a weighting formula?
- Would a more objective process be better? Current process seems highly subjective
- Is equitable distribution a consideration – by geography, mode? How does equitable distribution factor into prioritization?
- Evacuation as a prioritization factor.
- How do you determine statewide vs. local benefits?
- How do facilities that are already operating at or above capacity figure into the prioritization?
- Is there a formula to help evaluate the prioritization?
- Formula would help level the playing field and aid in deciding between objective and subjective decisions.
- Consider “need” by population, demographics, etc.
- Look at distribution of funding and resources up until now and how it disproportionately has missed rail, freight, and passenger rail – the non-highway modal choices.
- Preservation needs are okay. We need also to invest in new system components, shifting to other modes and make them a higher priority going forward.
- Can it be acceptable to say that we have built enough highways and we can tolerate congestion (not try to keep up LOS standards) to foster a shift to other modes?
- I am happy with all the work D3 did on the planned designation for Port St. Joe. I think you get more bang for the buck starting in a new areas then spending in urban or larger ports?
- Can you give an overview of the logic behind including Port St. Joe with its proximity to Port of Pensacola. *Response: The District worked with various partners focusing on economic development. The port conducted a study stating that it would be a great catalyst for economic development. They asked us to give them an extra year – a facility usually needs to meet criteria in three years, but they forecasted it to meet criteria in four years. They had financial plan/master plan to show meeting thresholds that was basis adding the port. In addition, it is more than 50 miles from other SIS ports.*
- How does goal of sustainability work in the prioritization process?

- Maybe the MPO Long Range Transportation Plans should precede the SIS Update to provide their input to the State earlier. Regional input should drive prioritization.
- How do military bases factor into prioritization process?

### **Written Comments from Workshops and Other Sources:**

- Equity between regions and the willingness of the local agencies (County, City, MPO, and RPC) to work with the FDOT to develop a plan that supports local desires and the goals of the Department. If local agencies have an agenda that is different from the Department, such as limiting the movement of people and goods, or approving development that will negatively impact SIS facilities, the Department should seek out more friendly environments in which to improve transportation.
- There are more problems than we have money to solve. Cost effectiveness and leveraging should be used in the evaluation process, but not to the point of ignoring long term problems in rural areas. Coordinated projects that support more than one mode or hub should also get priority.
- Prioritized logically not politically.
- Number of modes of transportation accessing connectors between urbanized areas economic potential.
- See above, but if we are committed to SIS, we should look long-term taking into account the need for viable options beyond SOVs and freight-hauling trucks.
- Regional economic impact, quality of life, and safety.
- Create SIS in areas wither limited or no SIS is currently--"share the wealth."
- Identification of future transit and multimodal transportation needs
- Need to look also as regional impacts. Multi-modal options to move people and goods to urban hubs.
- Roads that link the state coasts. i.e., East coast and West coasts--SR80, SR70, SR60, etc.
- Shift funding from land capacity to rail capacity along major highways.
- Economic development; safety, security and efficiency; reduce overall financial impact of the SIS both from a capitalization and O&M perspective. i.e., the total cost of ownership.
- Statewide a north south corridor, between I-95 and I-75 needs to be a priority (other than US27). Long term solutions should be the priority. Trying to fix existing failing situations is a short term solution.
- Time, structure the project to receive immediate mid-term and long-term benefits.
- Contribution to Florida's 1) economic growth, 2) the nation's growth, and 3) global growth.
- Cost benefit analysis needs to be performed. Security improvements.

- Safety, equitable split of money, benefit gained, and opportunity of alternative routes (non-SIS options).
- Operation LOS, not AADT. Industrial center work as hubs in rural areas and require long trips.
- Egress/ingress for industrial areas. Consider contracting critical path, off road large items (such as sound walls) directly with specialty contractors to normalize costs and reduce construction schedules for other work.
- Greater emphasis and priority placed on highway modes of transportation.
- Priorities that make the state more economically competitive
- Priority #1--projects associated with facilities, which combine more than one mode of transportation
- Operating LOS; 2) Hurricane evacuation/Emergency evacuation
- Safety, capacity and usage
- More Regional input
- ROI, population density, will it actually work? I guess tri-rail is growing now, great. It lost money for 20(?) years. This is a good indicator to back off rail and realize the time to get out of the car is not up us in Florida. Nodes are not close enough or are too close.
- Not only freight/industrial hubs but the residential "hubs" from to work trips originate
- Equality--all projects should be considered equally even though they might be more votes in South Florida.
- Logical connectivity of major systems.
- Cost-effectiveness in achieving performance.

---

## Finance Strategy

---

### **Discussion Question 4: What suggestions do you have about the SIS investment strategy and potential funding sources?**

#### **Verbal Workshop Comments:**

- How are these investments going to be applied in this area?
- Is the I-75 Design Build in south Florida a success? Are there any in NWF?
- There is no equal footing get in NWF to help us get out of the funding box issue.

- What is the return from investing in private companies? Do we get any money back?
- I suggest sustainable funding. We do not have sustainable funding. It really is not sustainable. There are good years and bad years. Need to look at sustainable. Toll roads and fees are great, but it really is not sustainable because it really doesn't fund themselves let alone help fund others
- We need to look into a transportation utility fee option.
- Sustainable funding are we talking about taking SIS funds and put on projects not on the SIS. What does other TRIP; New Starts have to do about the SIS? The Leadership is focusing on the concept that for the SIS to function well, other programs need to function well.
- The term "sustainable funding" is throwing people off.
- Public private partnerships – don't give system away. China could end up owning system. Be careful about funding source.
- Is there someone – one person in SIS – in charge of public-private partnership?
- "Business models" instead of PPP. More specific.
- Are PPP really a funding source? Really a loan or collecting tolls.
- Gas tax on a per mile usage.
- Look at the decline in gas tax revenue and look at other funding sources (e.g. VMT fees). Evaluation of declines in traditional funding sources and look for other sources.
- Special use lanes that aren't funded. The I-95 model looked at further.
- Federal reauthorization proposals suggest collapsing programs into 4 main categories. Is DOT looking at this as well
- Regionally significant projects –should relate to a vision. How is that defined?
- Freight based revenue stream
- Highway gas taxes funding private for profit railroads, peculiar
- Is private partnering a consideration
- Joint funding – federal funds. Explain how that works
- Please give examples of user fees. Users of system could contribute to cost of facility.
- New reauthorization bill – categories of funding will let states decide. How will that work at a state level?
- Sustainable funding? Any thresholds?

- Recognize no free lunch. If we are going to have a system that meets our needs, we need the funding to put it in place. Remember whatever we can buy today, we can save money by buying before the need hits.
- 75/25 funding split – 75 discretionary to SIS and 25 to non-SIS projects. Non-discretionary funding - what percent is for capital projects like this? What part of capacity funding is considered discretionary versus non-discretionary?
- Has there been discussion about making the work program more flexible?
- User fees discussion - are you talking about tax on miles traveled? *Response: yes, a VMT fee is one option being looked at for future funding, given declines in gas tax revenues.*
- Is there any talk about pay back into the system for users that benefited from it? CSX is a potential example.
- What does mobility fee mean? *Response: fees collected from developer to compensate for transportation impacts of new developments.*
- What sort of discussion has come up in regards to oil independence and greater fuel efficiency?
- The future corridors action plan, which was developed by FDOT a couple years ago, should be revisited to gather information on possible funding strategies.
- How should the state assist in funding future transportation from Okeechobee to Cuba and/or the Panama Canal. Is it considering things like this?
- Is the I-595 project a good example of innovative funding?
- From the slide presentation, what is meant by the green bar – public transportation? *Response: this is for public transportation projects operating grants covered by the state.*
- Are TRIP and New Start funding a good idea? What is meant by sustainable and according to whom?
- Does the state feel that it has reached its goals over the past five years as the SIS has grown?
- Tolling.
- What is the SIS relation with the Miami Dade Expressway Authority (MDX)? *Response: MDX is represented on the SIS Leadership Committee. All current MDX roads are part of the SIS.*
- How do they regulate tolling and getting additional SIS funds? MDX is using tax dollars for their improvements and are also tolling the roads. *Response: MDX is overseen by a board of directors, and the Florida Transportation Commission provides oversight to all regional authorities in the state.*
- The trend is becoming more public-private partnership. I-595 is an example as well as the Port of Miami. Public should be educated more on the process.
- More money for non-SIS roads.

- Bad idea to use tolled roads and no-cash exits; for example the extension of SR 836.
- The guidelines for commuter rail should be revised. Connectivity with other facilities such roads and adding parking facilities should be considered.
- Access to transit.
- Trip and used to support SIS facilities.
- How is it determined what amount of money goes into the SIS versus money allocated to non-SIS facilities? *Response: Based on law and Department policy.*
- Opposed to toll roads, and tax dollars going to private agencies.
- SIS took away local funds. It is important, but SIS did not create new funding resource with SIS. Locals are not getting funding from the state for local facilities. TRIP is not enough to support all local funding. Need to increase the gas tax to help local funding.
- Need to pursue new funding source. We need intangible tax as an alternative instead of just raising the gas tax.
- What about tolling existing interstates when you go from six lanes to eight? You cannot toll interstates, but there have been some pilot projects on tolling adding lanes.
- How does Crosstown Connector (in Tampa) fit into funding?
- Shouldn't we have more use of Public-Private Partnerships?
- Is Florida still a "donor" state? Can we fix that?
- Could the DOT consider making a recommendation to the Legislature to enter into a funding arrangement with the counties that would be eligible for SIS, so the tax increment that would be gained from this could be shared between the counties and DOT, for a period of time.
- SIS continues funding disparity between those who already have SIS facilities and those that do not; including majority of funding going to SIS.
- Why is an increase in gas tax not recommended?
- Also include 'vehicle miles traveled' (VMT) options and protecting the money collected now.
- Support and encourage emphasis on public/private partnerships.
- Consider axle weights as another source of fee – truck/freight vehicles are getting bigger, we need to address the wear/tear on the roads and assess a fee.
- Public/private partnerships are going to provide less than 10% of the funding.
- Need more public education to help the public understand the need for public sources of funds.

## Written Comments from Workshops and Other Sources:

- It appears that over the last number of years, the amount of funding available for roadway and other transportation projects has been decreasing. Given the formula for allocating funds between the SIS and other transportation needs, we can expect this to continue. You can either change the ways funds are allocated or generate/find more funding and put the additional monies into the local transportation system. One way to generate funds would be to change policy such that the state can accept money for impacts to its system by development that would then be used to correct issues. Local governments have been collecting money from development for years through impact fees and the DRI process where monies are accepted as a form of mitigation.
- In the current discussions on a mobility fee to replace concurrency and the DRI process, the state should make sure its interests are represented and a system to receive and spend the funds they deserve is clearly laid out.
- Reduce LOS on maintenance. Allow and assist communities to provide for maintenance.
- Consider going back to a non-SIS strategy.
- Potential funding through advertising contracts on rail, BRT, etc.; reduce VMT and emission grants.
- Invest comprehensively in the big-ticket items, i.e., ROW acquisition and partner in local expenses-cost-share.
- Incentive based--charging for single occupancy vehicles. Charge more for truck weight; Stop "widening" and adding lane miles as the top priority
- Priorities should use triple bottom line: environment--economy--social. These all support one another. Roads should be carefully and sparingly planned. Priorities should increase rail, foot, and bike transit.
- Need to invest in rail. Cannot keep widening roads. Widen road costs money, create community problems, and create unsafe pedestrian crossings; Also invest in public transit where feasible.
- Change gas tax funding to an incremental increase instead of flat cent per gallon. Add freight tax on highways--more funding to rail.
- Another option would be for the state legislature to stop raiding the transportation trust fund every year to pay for other services they choose are more important than transportation.
- More involvement from private sector and increased user fees to obtain a timely implementation of the plan.
- Maintain flexibility.
- Have matches increase likelihood of funding.
- Run SIS selection like TRIP-requiring partnering for projects. Rural areas of critical economic concern will have less % match requirements.

- Direct offering to individuals in the public for buying investment bonds quasi-stock in the project. Local business and motoring public might want the chance to be silent stakeholders in large projects with established toll/business plan long term.
- Expand toll fees and surcharges for all passenger and freight modes.
- Funding sources need to be (examined?) and much of the \_\_\_\_\_SIS funding sources (gas tax/ (doc stamps?), etc.
- Increased user fees; 2) Increased gas tax; 3) Tolls
- Protect transportation taxes and use it for what is intended for--do not transfer--or limit % that can be transferred; Increase state gas tax, registration/tag renewals; P3 is way of future--need to make process easier to increase % of projects; Truck charge by weight (like Germany)
- Limit SIS to economic feasibility first.
- Greater use of tolling and public-private partnerships.

---

## Implementation

---

### **Discussion Question 5: How should FDOT better communicate and coordinate SIS decisions with public and private sector partners at all levels?**

#### **Verbal Workshop Comments:**

- Districts need to be given adequate opportunity to improve and give a reasonable response to locals. The maps in NWF do not look at good and the neither does the funding split.
- Are you working with the local chamber of commerce for each area
- Focus groups around the state are good, but you need better participation
- There are many economic development groups that influence decision makers and FDOT needs to do a better job pulling these groups in to the process.
- Greater use of social media and reach more professional groups to get more input.
- This is supposed to be a regional meeting. Where are the rest of the representatives from the area? We are from Tallahassee/ Leon County. There is mostly only FDOT here. To get people involved you need to send these results out to representatives not just expect people to go looking on the SIS website.
- Regarding community and environment, specifically the ETDM process the committee states that ETDM is killing us on moving projects forward. In the leadership committee, there seems to be issues from ETDM and the EIS (NEPA process). We need to streamline the process, so good projects can move forward. There was a discussion that ETDM be applied to all modes for SIS capacity

projects. There is a lot that needs to be expanded on as the process is expanded to other modes. ETDM works for the corridors, but there are certain facilities that ETDM may not needed to be applied to or that will work for. I think their comments were just on how long it takes for Environmental documents to be generated.

- Need to elevate communication to highest level to assist on agency specifically focusing on EDTM.
- Performance measures should be identified.
- Engage MPOs more in the establishment of SIS cost feasible plan. Technical recommendations made by the MPO for regional impacts.
- Integration of modal planning at the state level. Doing it earlier is better.
- Economic competitiveness – Panama Canal can be widened in 4 years and a PD&E study here could take that long.
- What is meant by “strategic”? High priority for FDOT to State’s economic vitality and mobility. It means who gets the money – conscientious process to say who gets the limited funds.
- The SIS process is the intent to pick the most critical part of the transportation network. There should be one grand plan that considers local environment (bike/pedestrian) as well.
- What is definition of moving fast and flexible? Current process is long. Fast reaction task team for projects that need to move quickly such as threshold project for economic development. Suggestion of one point of contact in district and one point up the chain to Tallahassee.
- Local level on a county basis DOT should do outreach to find out what their needs are.
- Systems engineers archive information for counties to search for existing documents – better search engine
- SIS technical advisory committee be more flexible to take into account local issues, level of service for local areas
- Working through the MPO’s.
- More direct contact with Economic Development organizations.
- Some TPO’s recognize that there has to be out of box thinking. Need taskforce to come up with economic solutions
- MPO involvement most effective and critical. Reasonable size of stakeholders – only 26 in Florida.
- Participation in advisory committee has been a very positive opportunity.
- It will be wise to revise the timing in the functional classification system.
- It is hard to understand the TIP as it related to the SIS.

- Have there been any considerations in public-private partnership with rail stations that will support connectivity with Broward County? *Response: The state is working on some stimulus projects to address transit issues.*
- Is there connection between tri-rail and Metro-rail transfer station? *Response: Yes, the stations are on the same building.*
- Redefinition of Seaport for the Port of Miami River. Can the Miami River be added in the SIS? *Response: It does not meet the current criteria for the Emerging SIS as a seaport or waterway, but it could be added in the future if volumes grow above the threshold.*
- Is Tamiami Airport considered a SIS facility? *Response: Not today.*
- The regions are too large. Reducing the region designation would make it more effective.
- Functioning improvements along parallel facilities.
- Port Tunnel. Is it more effective to build a very expensive tunnel that provide for better bridges?
- There needs to be more visibility of the SIS Cost Feasible Plan especially on the website. *Answer: There is going to be more information as part of the enterprise SIS.*
- There needs to be more coordination with FDOT. We work well with FDOT D3, but at the state level, FDOT does not come back to locals. You cannot find how the local prioritization is reflected in project list. There seems to be a disconnect between District and Central Office.
- There also seems to be a disconnect on the time to review things at the local level.
- Will the system be updated every five years? What about the technical data? *There is annual look at activity levels on facilities.*
- Who would the technical advisory committee be advising? Are we creating another layer? It is really a multimodal issue. Are you replacing the SITAC?
- What is the source of the additional recommendations? You want one statewide body to look at Miami, Jacksonville, and Northwest Florida.?
- It would be difficult for a group to look at the all the transportation interests in Florida. It has to be regionally somehow? One group can never come together and address the entire state.
- Improve website navigation – so much information makes it hard to find anything.
- What sort of interaction is there between SIS, MPOs, and MPO Coalitions?
- In perspective – MTPO/TPOs are on same five-year cycle – current planning on same cycle – maybe start this process on 4-year cycle giving MPOs something to work with for plan.

## Written Comments from Workshops and Other Sources:

- More advertising of meetings to attract citizen and non-traditional partners. Provide materials using simple, precise language that is non-technical.
- The FDOT has a number of forums in which to communicate SIS information to elected officials and the public. If the public is not prepared to attend work program meetings, county and city commission meetings and project specific meetings, more meetings is not the way to reach them. There is extensive communication with the MPOs on the priority of projects and what the Department considers important. FDOT staff also meets with the elected officials and staff in each county to explain what they have planned for transportation and receive local input on what the community feels is important. We have enough communication going on within a District.
- May need to provide District staff with the reasons a project outside of their District was chosen over one in the District, so they can explain it to local officials and the public.
- Assist communities to get the word out to their own people.
- The MPO process seems like the best approach (needs to be more evident than is currently the case).
- Improved promotional and marketing efforts through all media outlets and on the web.
- Do outreach through local government calendars and make materials readily available well in advance of the public workshops. Establish local committees to understand the process and spread the word.
- Early and often. Focus on grass roots efforts by getting buy in or at least understanding at the local level before proposals are brought forward.
- More outreach on a yearly basis--not every 5 years.
- Deemphasize roads; emphasize rail, bus, and alternative modes; Hire a non-FDOT person to facilitate communications planning--many terms are not familiar to many folks.
- Hold public workshops as you do now.
- Continue with workshops and public meetings.
- Continue to keep in transparent! Ensure industry organization are advised (i.e., for aviation AOPA, NBAA, ATA, IATA, etc.)
- FDOT should work with PCs, MPOs/TPOs on future planning and needs.
- Email update/brief to all FTBA members
- Communication and coordination current efforts with TPO is very good. However at the general public level there are few people who know or understand SIS.
- Conduct workshops more frequently

- Give updates to local jurisdictions prior to enacting.
- Larger role for MPOs and Local governments.
- This survey seems to be duplicable and too bureaucratic. Reduce these items to the most important objectives. Too much duplication. This needs to be consolidated into specific goals and strategy. There are so many objectives and strategies which are discussed that I am not sure anything will get done.
- Perhaps a writer-in-residence, to write up-ads and give presentations--e.g., at Chambers of Commerce.

### **Discussion Question 6: What other changes would you suggest regarding SIS implementation?**

#### **Verbal Workshop Comments:**

- The question then becomes are you going to fix existing problems or are you going to address problems. It is hard to retrofit a solution - should have the opportunity to be proactive and to do proactive planning.
- “Critical” Intermodal System - could be called.
- Need more freight corridors for rail – a grid system. Eliminate choke points.
- Growth pattern in Florida - large cities growing independently and SIS is to connect large urban areas.
- How did the SIS change when Governor changed? Leadership Committee has discussed consistency with reducing greenhouse gas omissions.
- Is Heartland corridor practical instead of focusing on existing corridors such as rail?
- Has the leadership committee reached out beyond the U.S. for greenhouse gas reduction and looking at other countries experiences?
- Rail infrastructure to include both freight and passenger mobility.
- Recommendations on Metro rail and Tri-rail: Not enough people use Metrorail due to Connectivity issues. Recommend adding a transfer station to go to places of interest such as: airport, stadium, expo center, Mall of the Americas, International Mall, Dolphin Mall, future Marlins Stadium. Transfer to Universities: FIU, Tamiami Fair an Expo. Connection to west Kendall, residents, Tamiami airport, metro zoo, future water park, tourist destinations, Justice building. South to Homestead, airport base, homestead hospital, Florida City outlet Mall, evacuation route from south residents. Also, adding transfer stations between the colleges and universities.
- Resident of northeast Miami-Dade County suggests new way of funding. FDOT is only improving highways. I don’t see enough effort in transit. Highways are becoming a nightmare. FDOT is not promoting public transit. It took me 45min to 1hr to drive south to FDOT. Other locations for the workshop should be recommended.

- Are there other definitions for terms as environmental stewardship? Is there are glossary of definitions for some of the terms?
- An example of evacuation is the busway down to Homestead and Florida City. In emergency evacuation it is useful since our roads are already to capacity. US-1 traffic is to its maximum.
- Has FDOT had any involvement with the reconstruction of the Bay Harbor Bridge? Sidewalks do not comply with ADA or safety standards. *Response: This was a city project.* Even though this is not a FDOT project FDOT should take action and make sure other county and city roads are safe.
- How does the SIS fit in with other planning efforts?
- The SIS should be focused on multimodal and the linkages between modes. Less emphasis on highways and more on transit and rail
- In general, highways are less efficient and less economically competitive under the principles guiding how we change the SIS Plan. Consider modal tradeoffs.
- Rural multimodal corridor plans – suspect they add highways and induce development in areas where we don't want it?
- All SIS planning should hook into growth management planning at every level.
- The SIS should be highly respectful of Florida's remaining rural and large wild habitat areas. The future SIS should protect these agricultural and wild areas, recognizing that highways induce growth.
- Consider ways to keep SIS highways from being overtaken with local commuter trips.
- Concern re: what is regional? Is it a specific mile radius? Need to define for purposes of SIS Plan.

### **Written Comments from Workshops and Other Sources:**

- Look more at the health and social justice impacts of prioritization and implementation.
- Out of ideas. Good luck.
- Coordinate with metro boards
- More involvement from local jurisdictions
- Change eligibility to include hub features that accommodate people once they are outside a car, truck, bus, or train. (Also, the MPO process seems to work pretty well in Lee County, but SIS doesn't come up as often as it probably should, considering how much funding is tied to it. Not sure if that's bad just an observation).
- Look at water management issues of South Florida. Ensure SIS represents the best interest of the Everglades and sheet flow issues.
- Focus should turn away from roads and autos to transit.

- Tie funding sources from taxpayers to projects and describe the intended improvements benefits.
- More funding without reducing other projects.
- Funding for SIS is fine and good for rail, but where are most traffic problems generated? That should help identify the focus on non-SIS programs.
- Prioritize improvement, establish which components need immediate change and expansion (railroad for example should be prioritized over highways).
- Is there a five-year work program of SIS funds? Would be nice to see that.
- Hardened structure requirement...100-year life cycle at nominal up front premium. Use 30-year life and high maintenance costs for terminals/hangars/admin and emergency.
- Continued and possibly greater involvement of regional concerns and priority to the State level.
- More emphasis should be placed on the seaport mode.
- Don't add anything.
- Where SIS facilities are not operating at LOS standards and are not scheduled for "immediate" improvement the FDOT should work with local government to establish connections with alternate local facilities to improve capacity issues. Rather than create de facto moratoriums.