

2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update

Addendum to Partner and Public Comments Report

This addendum contains written comments made on specific draft Leadership Committee recommendation as well as the 10 open-ended questions, which were received subsequent to preparation of the comment report included in the October 1-2 meeting notebooks.

System Designation

SD.1 Emerging SIS.

- Both should be considered together and prioritized together. Having two separate, but related, designations only leads to confusion.

SD.2 Highways.

- Having separate designations is confusing and over-lapping. Criteria should also include strategic uses of the highways.
- Please sunset the FIHS - all it does at this point is cause confusion as there are people that think there is money to do something to them.

SD.3 Intraregional Rail.

- hub-to-hub
- Based on policy and direction we should be doing this but based on funding it is not realistic. There will probably be a lot of people commenting that this should be done but please look at impacts to funding, what systems would be included and then report that back out for comment before adding more to the system.

SD.4 Freight Rail Terminals and Corridors.

No additional comments

SD.5 Intermodal Connectors.

- This may dilute funding opportunities for other projects as some of this may be eligible for other funding opportunities.

SD.6 Hub-to-Hub Connectors.

No additional comments

SD.7 Intermodal Freight Drayage Routes.

No additional comments

SD.9 Emerging SIS Spaceports.

No additional comments

SD.8 Community and Environmental Screening Process.

No additional comments

Military Assessment

MA.1 Designation of Military Access Facilities.

- Criteria should also include strategic importance of the military facility to both international military missions and state disaster recovery missions.
- We can't keep adding facilities and corresponding needs without adding funding as we can't afford the existing system we have now.

MA.2 Consideration of Military Access Needs.

- You should be doing this just not with SIS funding.

Discussion Questions:

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

- It should increase; needs to have increased faster than changes to the SIS system.
- The threshold of the SIS should increase, and reviewed every 2 to 5 years.
- Stay as it is - with no increase in funding, adding to the system does not make any sense.

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

- Emerging SIS should be combined into the SIS, with the Emerging SIS criteria being included in SIS criteria.
- Separate designation criteria and policies should be retained for the Emerging SIS.
- Having a higher level makes sense as some roads are more important than others.

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?**
- Yes to all. Other types of facilities that should be included are major medical facilities.
 - Only commuter rail and other fixed-guide way system connectors should be included in the SIS.
 - Yes, Hub-to-hub but it needs to be evaluated.
 - Yes, Integrated Logistics Centers
 - Yes, we need to support Intermodal freight and obtain other FDOT funds other than SIS to support this function.
 - The last three bullets the answer is NO. We need to protect funds from being diluted. These criteria typically are supported and funded heavily by other sources.
 - The short answer is no as we cannot fund what needs to be done currently so adding more facilities is not the way to go.

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

- Criteria and process should be simplified and streamlined.
- Increase SIS threshold and incorporate seaport bulkhead as it is a necessary infrastructure for waterway traffic.
- Please start to think what we can do to improve the SIS that is something short of ultimate improvements but can be built because it is affordable and improves the operating conditions over what we have now.

Needs Assessment

NA.1 Statewide Systems Approach.

- Each transportation entity should establish their priorities in accordance with their own need

NA.2 Freight Mobility.

- Need a concurrence on statewide significance.
- FDOT shall identify and appropriate funds to support SIS from the state transportation trust fund every year.
- Identifying roles and responsibilities within the framework of the SIS is only supporting the program in concept but it does not support the program to come to fruition.

NA.2A Passenger Mobility.

- Need concurrence on statewide significance.

NA.3 Response to Economic Development Opportunities.

- SIS investment must be significantly increased! In the interim until road user fees are VMT based, the state gas tax must be increased by 10 cents to 20 cents per gallon to support the system needs - a 5 cents per gallon increase would only equate to a \$30 per year additional cost to a driver driving approximately 12,000 miles annually.

NA.4 Coordination with Economic Development Strategies.

- It needs to incorporate individual entities visioning efforts as well.

NA.5 Role of Regional Visions.

- It needs to incorporate individual entities visioning efforts as well.

NA.6 Support for Regional Visions.

No additional comments

NA.7 Proactive Planning for Emerging SIS.

No additional comments

NA.8 Corridor Plans.

No additional comments

NA.9 Transportation and Land Use.

No additional comments

NA. 10 Urban Mobility Strategies.

No additional comments

NA.11 Project Evaluation Measures.

No additional comments

NA.12 Efficient Transportation Decision-Making.

No additional comments

NA.13 Energy and Climate Change.

- How in the world is one to evaluate this set of criteria on any type of project? How many inches does increasing a 2-lane roadway to a 4-lane roadway increase the level of the ocean by? Sounds really good - not practical to implement. Too politically correct and not realistic!

NA. 14 Funding Eligibility Guiding Principles.

- Projects parallel to SIS facilities that relieve congestion on SIS facilities should be eligible for SIS funding.
- Funding of safety improvements on a SIS facility should be eligible for SIS funding.

Prioritization Process

PR.0 Prioritization Factors.

- Previous comments said that both SIS and Emerging SIS should be combined.

PR.1 Partner Input.

No additional comments

PR.1A Partner Communication.

No additional comments

PR.2 Multimodal and Innovative Projects.

No additional comments

PR 3 **Flexibility.**

No additional comments

Finance Strategy

FI.1 **Investment Strategies.**

- Approximately 65 - 70% of discretionary funds should be allocated to the SIS System; 75% is too much.

FI.2 **Funding Sources.**

- SIS investment must be significantly increased! In the interim until road user fees are VMT based, the state gas tax must be increased by 10 cents to 20 cents per gallon to support the system needs - a 5 cents per gallon increase would only equate to a \$30 per year additional cost to a driver driving approximately 12,000 miles annually.

FI.3 **Incentive Program.**

No additional comments

FI.4 **Federal Funding.**

- Is this for transit, aviation, highways, and intermodal centers? Currently, there are no federal programs supporting our Seaport Development Program

FI.5A **Regionally Significant Facilities.**

No additional comments

FI.5B **Urban Transit Capital Projects.**

No additional comments

Implementation

IM.1 **Modal Integration.**

- Is this required by F.S.?

IM.2 Advisory Committee.

- Do not need any additional advisory committees. Too many already!

IM.3 Partner Coordination and Outreach.

No additional comments

IM.4 Performance Measures.

- Developing realistic and measurable performance measures will be very difficult!

Discussion Questions:

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.**

- Increase amount of funds available to be spent on the SIS System.

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

- Bulkheads and dredging are an integral part of the maritime waterways. Bulkheads should be eligible for funding as these are our sidewalks

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

- Ports should prioritize their own projects based on their own needs.
- Benefit: Cost ratios

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

- Do projects that would yield the highest rate of investments.
- Explain the system to them and work with them to fund local system needs.

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

- Through Workshops.
- Eliminate the mystery from the system and eliminate other conflicting and confusing programs.

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

- Increase funding levels for SIS.
- SIS investment must be significantly increased! In the interim until road user fees are VMT based, the state gas tax must be increased by 10 cents to 20 cents per gallon to support the system needs - a 5 cents per gallon increase would only equate to a \$30 per year additional cost to a driver driving approximately 12,000 miles annually.