



**FTP/SIS Steering Committee Meeting**  
**Summary of Meeting #6**  
**December 11, 2015**  
**Hyatt Regency Jacksonville Riverfront – Jacksonville, FL**

<b>Committee Members or designees present (in alphabetical order by last name)</b>	
<i>Steering Committee Member, Organization</i>	<i>Designee (if applicable)</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Biter, Florida Department of Transportation (Chair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Jim Wood
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Honorable Susan Haynie, Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (Vice Chair)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alice Ancona, Florida Chamber of Commerce	<input type="checkbox"/> Katie Kelly
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karl Blischke, Florida Department of Economic Opportunity	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mark Bontrager, Space Florida	<input type="checkbox"/> Stephen Szabo
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Janet Bowman, The Nature Conservancy – Florida Chapter	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken Bryan, Rails to Trails Conservancy - Florida	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bob Burleson, Florida Transportation Builders Association	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Laura Cantwell, AARP Florida	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> James Christian, Federal Highway Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Andra Cornelius, CareerSource Florida	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Debbie McMullian
<input type="checkbox"/> Karen Deigl, Florida Public Transportation Association	<input type="checkbox"/> Lisa Bacot
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Ely, Transportation and Expressway Authority Membership Florida	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Cori Henderson, Enterprise Florida	<input type="checkbox"/> Megan McDonald
<input type="checkbox"/> Steven Holmes, Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tisha Keller, Florida Trucking Association	<input type="checkbox"/> Ken Armstrong
<input type="checkbox"/> Bill Killingsworth, Florida Department of Economic Opportunity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ana Richmond
<input type="checkbox"/> Rocky McPherson, Florida Defense Alliance	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Bob O'Malley, Florida Railroad Association	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Susan Pareigis, Florida Council of 100	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charles Pattison, 1000 Friends of Florida	<input type="checkbox"/> Ryan Smart
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Samuel Poole, Urban Land Institute - Florida Chapter	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> William Secombe, Visit Florida	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Goldman
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Honorable Doug Smith, Florida Association of Counties	<input type="checkbox"/> Eric Poole
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chris Stahl, Florida Department of Environmental Protection	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pat Steed, Florida Regional Councils Association	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Paul Steinman, Florida Department of Transportation - District 7	<input type="checkbox"/>

<input type="checkbox"/> Michael Stewart, Florida Airports Council	<input type="checkbox"/> Allan Penska
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Honorable Matthew Surrency, Florida League of Cities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Megan Sirjane-Samples <input type="checkbox"/> Kathy Till
<input type="checkbox"/> Lt. Col. Troy Thompson, Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> James Hightower
<input type="checkbox"/> The Honorable Karson Turner, Small County Coalition of Florida	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chris Doolin
<input type="checkbox"/> Matt Ubben, Floridians for Better Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Walsh, Florida Ports Council	<input type="checkbox"/> Doug Wheeler <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Toy Keller
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Honorable Jim Wood, Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Ken Wright, Florida Transportation Commission	<input type="checkbox"/> Bob Romig <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mark Reichert

### FTP/SIS Staff

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Wood, FDOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Kaliski, Cambridge Systematics
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carmen Monroy, FDOT	<input type="checkbox"/> Karen Kiselewski, Cambridge Systematics
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Watts, FDOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shelley Lauten, triSect
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dana Reiding, FDOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Danny Shopf, Cambridge Systematics
<input type="checkbox"/> Regina Colson, FDOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sarah Walker, Cambridge Systematics
<input type="checkbox"/> Melanie Weaver Carr, FDOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matt Wilson, Cambridge Systematics
<input type="checkbox"/> Maria Cahill, FDOT	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Meeting Highlights

### Welcome and Review of Today's Agenda, Richard Biter (Chair)

Richard Biter, Chair of the FTP/SIS Steering Committee, welcomed the Steering Committee members and requested that members (and designees) introduce themselves and mention which organization they are representing.

- During the introductions there was a request to have a brief discussion of the Governor's new budget proposal and its implications for small county road programs at sometime during the meeting.
- Rich took a moment to discuss the newly approved long term transportation bill, Fixing America's Surface Transportation or FAST Act.

Rich reminded members that the Steering Committee's charge is to provide recommendations to the Secretary of FDOT on the updates of the Florida Transportation Plan and Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Policy Plan. He mentioned that the public comment period would be moved up to 9:30 A.M. and asked Shelley Lauten, facilitator, to review what was covered in the previous Steering Committee meeting and the agenda for the meeting.

## **Public Comment**

There were no comments from the public.

## **Approval of Meeting #5 Summary**

Rich asked Steering Committee members to review the summary of the previous meeting and asked for consensus to approve the summary.

There were no comments about the Meeting #5 Summary. The Meeting Summary was approved unanimously.

## **Review of Public Comment of Draft FTP Policy Element**

Shelley pointed Steering Committee members to their notebooks to review the summary of public comments received on the Draft FTP Policy Element. Dana gave a brief public and partner involvement update and highlighted each of the changes that were made to the FTP Policy Element based on the input received during the public comment period. Steering Committee members offered the following questions and comments (*responses to questions provided in italics*):

- Will it be made clear which edits were made to the FTP Policy Element based on public comment?  
*Yes, we will review each of the changes we made based on Public Comment.*
- Is the Florida Transportation Commission Resolution to affirm the process followed statutory requirements or is it an approval of the FTP?
  - *The resolution was to affirm the process followed statutory requirements.*

## **FTP Policy Element Discussion and Finalization**

Dana reviewed each major section of the Draft FTP Policy Element, asking for input from the Steering Committee on the final draft to go to the FDOT Secretary. Steering Committee members offered the following questions and comments (*staff responses to questions provided in italics*):

- Reference that these quotes are public input. If there is no citation, it seems like it is a comment made by the Steering Committee.
  - *Should we consider removing the quotes completely? Or could we get quotes from Steering Committee members?*
    - **Consensus was to remove all of the quotes.**
- Why did we choose these measures for the “Numbers to Watch” in each section?
  - *These numbers to watch were intended to present the concepts we would like to track and set the stage for the Implementation Element. Are the numbers to watch useful in helping regional and local governments make decisions? If not, should they be completely removed? Or potentially, could we make them more conceptual without numbers?*

- Consider revising the first two options (Zero Fatalities, and Bridge/Pavement Condition) and leaving the rest as they are.
- **There was consensus to revise the first two “Numbers to Watch” so that they are more general and match the other “Numbers to Watch” in the document.**

#### **Goal: Safety and Security for Residents and Visitors**

- How do we account for growth in population when we state we want zero transportation related fatalities? Should we be using per capita instead?
  - *We are using the same target as the Strategic Highway Safety Plan and that number will not change. Our attempt to manage that by a 5 percent annual reduction is difficult because of growing population and high vehicle miles traveled. The update of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan and the FTP Implementation Element will focus specifically on the performance measures that are related to this measure.*
  - *FDOT’s goal is to eliminate transportation related fatalities and works to achieve that though a reduction of 5 percent annually. This is a target that we do not always meet, but one that we continue to work towards.*
  - This document guides local governments as they update their plans. This number will guide the local governments and encourage them to make decisions that support this goal.
- Is zero fatalities the most appropriate number to watch? Is this a realistic goal?
  - *Zero fatalities has to be the goal and it should drive everything we do as it relates to safety. No transportation related deaths are acceptable. This is the vision of FDOT.*
- The Implementation Element will likely resolve many of the specific detailed issues. The Policy Element is more high level than the Implementation Element will be.
- Consider including a bullet under collaboration about “Collaboration between federal, public, and private entities to efficiently manage airspace”
- There should be a reference somewhere, maybe in this document or in the SIS Policy Plan, that references shared airspace between federal, private, and public entities.

#### **Goal: Agile, Resilient, and Quality Infrastructure**

- It seems like the specifics of some of the major issues we have discussed will be addressed in the Implementation Element. Is that accurate?
  - Yes.
- I think the changes reflect the public comment well.
- Why did we choose to use the target of 90 percent of pavement meeting standards and 80 percent of bridges meeting standards here?
  - *This is a statutory target and we determined to refer to that target.*
  - If this is the case, I suggest making these numbers a footnote. The metric in this section and the previous section seem somewhat meaningless. If it is a metric we are already successfully achieving, why are we highlighting it? This document should challenge us to

create a better transportation system, not to continue to meet standards we are already exceeding.

- This is somewhat of a balancing act of funding resources. If resources are allocated elsewhere, the condition of Florida's bridges and pavement may revert back toward or even below the statutorily mandated targets. This measurement is good and should stay where it is.
- Is this just an example of the types of performance measures that will be discussed in more detail in the Implementation Element?
  - *That is correct.*
- Consider changing the heading from numbers to watch to "Vision Goals" or something along those lines. That could help resolve the issue we are having with some of these numbers.
- It seems fine to include in here and leave a footnote as previously suggested. As long as it includes "meet or exceed".
  - The footnote needs to be very explanatory so that users understand that FDOT is not leaving 10 percent of bridges or pavement in disrepair.

#### **Goal: Efficient and Reliable Mobility for People and Freight**

- Is "quick fix improvements" the right term to use? It seems like we are suggesting poor quality improvements.
  - This refers to low cost improvements that can be implemented quickly and provide significant improvements.
  - *We can add this to the Glossary to clarify.*
- Consider adding Vulnerable Road Users to the Glossary.
- Could we reference the small county road programs specifically, as we have done for TRIP?

#### **Goal: More Transportation Choices for People and Freight**

- We discuss the use of public transportation on page 19. Should we add something on periodic surveys?
  - *That is something we will address in the Implementation Element.*
- If something appears in the Emphasis Areas column, but is not as clearly stated in the other columns, will it still be accounted for? Do we need to reference these things consistently throughout?
  - *The intent of these five columns was to be written independently. All five will be considered in implementation.*

#### **Goal: Transportation Solutions that Support Florida's Global Economic Competitiveness**

- On page 22, a graphic of a bag of money might not be the best way to convey this idea. Could we find a different image?
- Change text to illustrate that connectivity "can **help** create..."

- Should we update the number of Florida Origin Exports to show how Florida is growing compared to the gross domestic product.

#### **Goal: Transportation Solutions that Support Quality Places to Live, Learn, Work, and Play**

- It would be good to include the reference to the Guiding Principles and the 4 Cs included in the Florida's Future Corridors planning process?
  - *We reference the Future Corridor Guiding Principles earlier in the document.*
  - It would be good to incorporate more text about this if there is room.
- Get a better complete streets image.
- If the word "aesthetic" is removed it may help to reduce the pushback for spending money on landscaping for aesthetic purposes alone.
  - There is more than just shade, we should remove this modifier as well.

#### **Goal: Transportation Solutions that Support Florida's Environment and Conserve Energy**

- I do not like the change to the carbon dioxide statement. I would be more comfortable stating, "carbon dioxide emissions have not increased since 2002."
  - The other emissions have had significant reduction while the carbon dioxide has not changed much since 2002. That is why the statement was clarified.
  - Agree with proposed language. Population has increased significantly but carbon dioxide emissions have remained about the same. That is a big positive and the statement should be positive.
    - *Staff will revise the language to illustrate the contrast between the reduction in carbon dioxide vs the other emissions.*
- How much of the carbon dioxide emissions are related to cars and trucks?
  - I don't know specifically, but I know the transportations sector is the second largest contributor to carbon dioxide emissions. First is energy providers.
- Do we want to proactively tie ourselves to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards?
  - *This is a federal law that is also a part of FDOT's performance measures and is something that has been a part of FDOT's performance reporting for several years.*
- We mention performance measures in this goal area and nowhere else. Do we need to reference that in each section?
  - *During implementation each area will have specific performance measures. However, there are fewer established performance measures related to this goal are and defining them is a big part of the implementation process. Staff will revise this statement to make that clear.*
- Consider incorporating an image of the new Altamonte Water Treatment Center instead of the deer crossing sign.

#### **Transition to Implementation**

- What happened to the bullet on return on investment?

- *The group determined in the last meaning that the bullet seemed restrictive.*
- Could this be “included but not limited to” or “for example”?
  - *Staff will incorporate a reference to “return on investment” in this section.*

### General Comments

- Is there anything in this plan or in the public comments that reflects the public opinion on tolling? What about for other issues that other agencies may be interested in?
  - *We have all of the notes, comments, and summaries available on the FTP/SIS Website (floridatransportationplan.com). If you have specific requests, we would be happy to find that information for you.*
- Consider defining express lanes in the Glossary as well.
- Will this plan have an effect of FDOT’s performance measures?
  - *During implementation, staff will review the existing performance measures and compare them to the FTP. New performance measures will be developed with input from the Steering Committee if necessary based on the goals, objectives, and approaches laid out in the FTP.*
- *With the changes discussed this morning included, is there consensus for moving forward with the plan as drafted?*
  - **There was consensus to support the FTP Policy Element with the changes discussed during the meeting.**

### Break

### Overview of Draft SIS Policy Plan

Rich asked Brian Watts, FDOT Office of Policy Planning, to provide an overview of the Draft SIS Policy Plan. Steering Committee members offered the following questions and comments (*responses to questions provided in italics*):

- Are there references to cost and prioritization?
  - *That is something we will address in implementation. It is referenced in the Next Steps section of this plan.*
  - Are there principles that will guide how these decisions will be made?
    - *This is done through the objectives and emphasis areas.*
- Can we include something about how we add prioritization and how we determine which facilities are prioritized?

- *On page 20 in the Next Steps section, we could incorporate some text that generally addresses this issue. There should be something that conceptually outlines the prioritization needs that will be further refined in the implementation guidance.*
- We need to pick a source for the population projections that is consistent.
  - *In the FTP, we chose to use the BEBR Medium projections for population while other partners, such as the Florida Chamber, are using BEBR High projections.*
- Is there a way we can include a map of SIS facilities?
  - *We have discussed this and decided that including a map but the fact that the SIS is continually changing the map will be outdated shortly after published. It is also impossible to show all of the SIS facilities on a statewide map so some will be not be visible at this scale.*
  - Could we include the map in or near the Glossary as a reference?
  - The map is useful for illustrating what the SIS is for users not familiar with the system.
  - Consider providing a QR Code or hyperlink that takes users to the most up to date SIS map. This could be used in other parts of the plan as well.
  - Could we incorporate the SIS facilities on the cover in the blank Florida profile?
- Consider relabeling the SIS Projects as Examples, Example Projects, etc. to ensure readers know that there is more than just these few facilities on the SIS.
- We don't specifically discuss Emerging SIS throughout the document. Is that something we have left out on purpose?
  - *We have tried to be more generic as the Steering Committee has made it clear that Emerging SIS may not be the best term going forward. We can expand the discussion on this term.*
  - We need to be sure we don't get away from the concept of Emerging SIS. I agree with how emerging facilities are addressed in this report including the references to rural areas, fast growing areas, and catalytic projects.
- The first and last mile emphasis area seems to get away from the intent of the SIS. Doesn't this include the whole transportation system?
  - *This is not intended to fund local systems, but rather encourage to connections to the local system to support first and last mile connectivity.*
    - This concept is not made clear in the text. I suggest you revise it to make that point clear.



- Safety is not specifically addressed here. Is the reference to the FTP goal of safety and security enough or does it need to be addressed more specifically?
- There isn't enough discussion about the growth in population and how it affects Florida's economy. We should be saying more about how Florida stands globally.
- Would it be useful to include the capacity of how many users are on the system on an average day?
- Looking at the graphic on page 2, it seems to highlight the facilities that are not included as well.
  - *We were considering just including the number that are designated without referencing the total.*
- Consider using an icon to illustrate which objective or objectives each project represents.
- Incorporate a footnote as to how the projects that were included were selected for this document.
- Is there a way we can tie the emphasis areas to the objectives and strategies? Can we do this visually?
  - *One approach was to introduce the emphasis areas after the objectives rather than before. It seems like this could resolve your concern here.*
- We need to be clearer as to why we are highlighting only three FTP goals in this plan rather than focusing on all seven.

### **Draft SIS Policy Plan Discussion**

Brian then reviewed the proposed SIS objectives and approaches listed below in **bold**. Steering Committee members offered the following questions and comments (*responses to questions provided in italics*):

#### **Emphasis Areas**

- Incorporate "market based, choice driven options"

#### **Interregional Connectivity**

- Can we incorporate a reference to the fact that hubs should be located close to population centers rather than out in the suburbs. This will help address first and last mile connectivity.
  - Each city will have to determine how they want to approach this. Orlando, for example, has determined that much of its activity is on the periphery rather than in the downtown core.
  - *We can include a specific approach that encourages SIS passenger hubs be planned and developed consistently with local visions and plans.*

- When users rely on passenger rail, they want to get off the train at their final destination rather than having to make a connection. We should be careful about where these facilities are planned. Consider incorporating something along the lines of, “encourage economic development in Florida’s urban centers.”

## Intermodal Connectivity

- Is bicycle, pedestrian, and last mile really a SIS issue? The SIS should be focused on the corridors, connectors and hubs. We need to clarify this discussion to ensure we are staying true to statutory intent.
  - *We will rewrite the section to make a point that SIS hubs need to be designed to provide access to the local system and support first and last mile connectivity.*
  - We need to be clear so that we do not set up false expectations with the language we use in this section.
- Consider where Florida is going in the future. Users’ last mile connectivity may not be via automobile travel any longer. We should connect users to the downtown area and provide connectivity between Florida’s ports and airports to the downtown areas.
  - Need to rethink where the intermodal centers are going to go. Are we building where we have space or where it is convenient or are we carefully selecting the right location, such as a downtown area, that will encourage the most use of the intermodal center?
- Should we start considering urban centers as hubs? These are really the best examples of passenger hubs.
  - We need to be careful how we define hubs. Conceptually, if downtown Miami was designated as a SIS passenger hub, SIS funding would be able to fund bike racks for the entire city.
  - This is something that should be left to the regional planning efforts of the local area. The SIS is meant for the largest, most strategic facilities and the local partners should be responsible for providing connectivity to these facilities.
  - For this document, we should define what the hubs are and let the local governments and regional governments determine where the hubs should be. Also, referring to population centers as hubs gives a strong disadvantage to facilities and urban areas located in Northwest Florida.
- Is there a place to highlight the coordination with local governments on land use decisions in more detail?

## Economic Competitiveness

- There were not specific comments related to this section. Many of the concerns in this section were discussed in previous sections.

## Future Corridors Update

Jim Wood, FDOT, provided a brief update on the status of the Future Corridors planning process including the launch of the I-75 Relief Task Force, which kicked off earlier in Ocala on December 7, 2015. He also reviewed a copy of the Future Corridors Guiding Principles and asked Steering Committee members for their input to these guiding principles. Jim requested that all input be provided by January 11, 2016 to ensure it could be incorporated before the Task Force met on January 25, 2016. Steering Committee members offered the following questions and comments (*responses to questions provided in italics*):

- Is Commerce included here. Could it be a 5<sup>th</sup> C?
  - *Commerce is incorporated in each of the existing 4 Cs and there has been discussion on whether or not to add a 5<sup>th</sup>.*
- Does this include new technologies such as automated, connected, and shared vehicles? Will these new corridors be multimodal?
  - *Yes, we are anticipating all of those opportunities.*

## Work Plan for 2016 and Next Steps

Dana reviewed the proposed Work Plan for 2016, including tentative dates and locations for meetings. Steering Committee members offered the following questions and comments related to the charge and work plan for 2016 (*responses to questions provided in italics*):

- *There seems to be a need for a webinar either before or after the public comment period. Is that something this group would like to do? Should we meet again before or after the public comment period?*
  - *Staff will update the SIS Policy Plan and send a version to the Steering Committee before the public comment period. FDOT will make changes as necessary and send to public comment. Following public comment FDOT will make additional revisions as necessary and will tentatively schedule a web conference to discuss the changes.*
    - ***There was consensus to move forward with this strategy.***
- Florida Trucking Association is having a meeting in Tampa during April 2016. We could consider hosting a meeting there in conjunction with this meeting.
- Florida Trucking Association is having its annual conference the same time as the Floridians for Better Transportation meeting. Since the committee met during that week in 2015, FTA would prefer not to meet during that meeting again in 2016.
- The Emerald Coast Transportation Summit will occur in November and the Gulf Power Economic Development Symposium is in October. Both of these would be good events to hold a meeting in conjunction with in Northwest Florida.

- League of Cities Annual Conference is in Hollywood in August and Policy Meetings are held in Orlando. Please schedule around those or consider doing meetings in conjunction with those.
- *Staff requested that Steering Committee members provide all dates for any potential conflicts and upcoming meeting dates in 2016.*

#### **Closing Remarks**

Rich closed the meeting by thanking the Steering Committee for their hard work and dedication throughout the process of updating the FTP and SIS Policy Plan.

#### **Adjourn**

Meeting concluded at 2:17 P.M.