

---

# **2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee**

*Recommendations for the 2010 SIS  
Strategic Plan*

October 22, 2009

---



## Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction and Background.....	1
2.0 Goals and Objectives.....	4
3.0 System Designation .....	6
4.0 Military Assessment .....	9
5.0 Needs Assessment.....	11
6.0 Prioritization Process .....	15
7.0 Finance Strategy .....	17
8.0 Other Implementation Strategies.....	21
Appendix A. Strategic Intermodal System Statutory Requirements .....	A-1
Appendix B. 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee Members .....	B-1
Appendix C. 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee Meetings .....	C-1
Appendix D. Glossary.....	D-1
Appendix E. List of Sources .....	E-1





## 1.0 Introduction and Background

In 2003, the Florida Legislature and Governor, through ss.339.61-64, Florida Statutes, established Florida's Strategic Intermodal System, known as the SIS. The SIS is composed of transportation facilities and services of statewide and interregional significance.

In Section 339.61, Florida Statutes, the Legislature described its intent in establishing the SIS, declaring:

*"... that the designation of a strategic intermodal system, composed of facilities and services of statewide and interregional significance, will efficiently serve the mobility needs of Florida's citizens, businesses, and visitors and will help Florida become a worldwide economic leader, enhance economic prosperity and competitiveness, enrich quality of life, and reflect responsible environmental stewardship. To that end, it is the intent of the Legislature that the Strategic Intermodal System consist of transportation facilities that meet a strategic and essential state interest and that limited resources available for the implementation of statewide and interregional transportation priorities be focused on that system."*

In January 2005, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), in cooperation with its transportation partners, adopted the first SIS Strategic Plan. The Plan provided policy direction for planning and implementing the SIS. The Plan documented the policies and criteria used to designate which transportation facilities and services are part of the SIS, building upon the recommendations of a 41-member SIS Steering Committee in 2002. The Plan also described the policies and processes FDOT, in cooperation with its partners, would use to identify potential investment needs involving SIS facilities, and to set priorities among these needs. The Plan also described the finance strategy FDOT would use to fund SIS investments. Finally, the Plan, along with accompanying documents, provided guidance to FDOT and its partners for implementing the SIS.

Florida Statutes require FDOT to update the SIS Strategic Plan at least once every five years, subsequent to updates of the Florida Transportation Plan. The Plan must address the following<sup>1</sup>:

- A map of designated SIS facilities, as well as facilities planned to be added to the SIS in the future;
- An assessment of investment needs involving SIS facilities;
- A project prioritization process;
- A finance plan based on reasonable projections of anticipated revenues, including both 10-year and 20-year cost-feasible components; and

---

<sup>1</sup> See ss.339.64 (1)-(4), Florida Statutes.



- An assessment of the impacts of proposed improvements to SIS corridors on military installations.

Florida Statutes also require FDOT to provide metropolitan planning organizations, regional planning councils, local governments, transportation providers, affected public agencies, and citizens with an opportunity to participate in and comment on the update of the SIS Strategic Plan. The statutory requirements related to the SIS Strategic Plan are included in Appendix A of this report.

FDOT is developing the first update of the SIS Strategic Plan, with anticipated adoption in January 2010. In January 2009 FDOT established a 31-member 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Leadership Committee to provide overall guidance to this process and develop policy recommendations to guide FDOT as it drafts the updated Plan. The members of the Committee represented transportation agencies and providers, regional and local governments, business and economic development interests, and community and environmental interests. A list of Committee members is provided in Appendix B of this report.

The Committee held six publicly noticed meetings between January and October 2009. Committee members received technical presentations from FDOT staff and consultants and other state agency staff regarding transportation trends, conditions, and issues; reviewed the accomplishments and challenges of the SIS during its first five years; and reviewed public and partner input on future strategies for the SIS.

The Committee also established seven “breakout groups” to review issues and opportunities and suggest future policies for inclusion in the Plan. These groups met via publically noticed meetings or teleconferences, and addressed the following topics: community and environmental issues; the future of the Emerging SIS; finance strategies; regional visioning; trade and logistics issues; urban issues; and additional implementation issues. The full Committee synthesized the recommendations from these seven groups to develop draft recommendations for public and partner comment. The Committee meetings and other activities are summarized in Appendix C of this report.

FDOT conducted extensive partner and public involvement activities in support of the Committee process as well as the Plan update. FDOT convened 12 public workshops around the state during September 2009, involving a total of 639 participants and generating nearly 1,200 comments in response to the draft Committee recommendations. In addition, FDOT conducted more than 150 briefings of statewide, regional, and local partners, involving more than 2,350 people. Opportunities for public input also were provided at each Committee meeting, as well as through FDOT’s web site. The public and partner involvement activities in support of the Committee and the Plan update will be documented in an evaluation report by FDOT to be published in late 2009.

At its final meeting on October 1-2, 2009, the Committee adopted a set of 40 policy recommendations to FDOT to guide the development of the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan. This report documents the final recommendations, which are organized into seven sections:

1. Goals and objectives;
2. System designation;
3. Military assessment;
4. Needs assessment;
5. Prioritization process;
6. Finance strategy; and
7. Other implementation strategies.

The report also includes the following appendices:

- A. Statutory requirements;
- B. List of Leadership Committee members;
- C. Summary of Leadership Committee meetings
- D. Glossary and acronyms; and
- E. List of sources.

## 2.0 Goals and Objectives

### Background

The Committee reviewed existing goal and objective language included in two documents:

- **2005 SIS Strategic Plan.** The 2005 SIS Strategic Plan identifies five long-range goals for the SIS, based on the legislative intent, the recommendations from the original SIS Steering Committee, and partner and public input. The 2005 Plan also listed potential factors associated with each goal to guide prioritization decisions, which also could serve as objectives for planning the SIS.
- **2025 Florida Transportation Plan.** In late 2005, the Secretary adopted the 2025 Florida Transportation Plan (FTP), which sets a long-range policy framework for all aspects of transportation in Florida. The 2025 FTP defined five long-range goals, as well as long-range objectives and implementation strategies associated with each goal.

### Recommendations

The Committee recommends the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan use as its overarching framework the five long-range goals established in the 2025 FTP. These goals are as follows:

- A safer and more secure transportation system for residents, businesses and visitors;
- Enriched quality of life and responsible environmental stewardship;
- Adequate and cost-efficient maintenance and preservation of transportation assets;
- A stronger economy through enhanced mobility for people and freight; and
- Sustainable transportation investments for Florida's future.

It is assumed these goals would be updated following adoption of the 2060 FTP in December 2010, so the SIS goals reflect the goals of the current statewide plan.

The Committee also recommends the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan define specific objectives under the FTP's mobility and economic competitiveness goal to guide SIS planning and investment decisions. These objectives should reflect the following guidance:

#### Connectivity

- Enhance connectivity between Florida's economic regions and between Florida and other states and nations for both people and freight.

#### Efficiency

- Reduce delay on and improve the reliability of travel and transport using SIS facilities.

- Provide for safe and efficient transfers for both people and freight between transportation modes and between the SIS and other transportation systems.

### **Choices**

- Expand modal alternatives to SIS highways for travel and transport between regions, states, and nations.

### **Economic Competitiveness**

- Support anticipated growth in domestic and international freight and visitor flows to and from Florida.
- Develop Florida's transportation system to support statewide goals related to economic diversification and development, including supporting statewide targeted industries.
- Improve access to rural employment centers, including those in Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern.

### **Optimal Use of System**

- Maximize the use of existing facilities, including identifying new roles for underutilized facilities where possible.
- Preserve new capacity on the SIS for projected growth in trips between regions, states, and nations, especially for trips associated with economic competitiveness.
- Minimize impacts of SIS capacity expansion on facilities primarily handling regional and local travel.

### **Climate Change and Energy**

- Reduce growth rate in vehicle-miles traveled and associated energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions.

### **Additional Considerations**

- Facilitate intermodal transportation to support national defense goals.
- Facilitate intermodal transportation to support emergency response and evacuation needs.

As part of the overall Florida transportation system, the SIS would be planned and managed consistent with the long-range objectives of the FTP pertaining to safety and security; quality of life and environmental stewardship; maintenance and preservation; and sustainable transportation investments. These objectives are listed for reference purposes in Appendix D of this report.

## 3.0 System Designation

### Background

SIS facilities have been designated through the work of statewide transportation partners, consistent with the recommendations of the initial SIS Steering Committee in 2002, 2003 legislation creating the SIS, and the 2005 SIS Strategic Plan. Two system components, collectively known as ‘The SIS,’ have been designated:<sup>2</sup>

- **SIS** facilities, which meet high levels of people and goods movement and generally support the major flows of interregional, interstate, and international trips; and
- **Emerging SIS** facilities, which meet lower level of people and goods movement and generally serve fast-growing regions and Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern.

Each component includes three types of facilities:

- **Hubs** -- ports and terminals moving goods or people between Florida regions or between Florida and other markets in the United States and the rest of the world;
- **Corridors** -- highways, rail lines, and waterways connecting regions within Florida or connecting Florida and other states or nations; and
- **Connectors** -- highways, rail lines, and waterways linking hubs and corridors.

The Committee reviewed the existing principles and policies guiding the designation of SIS and Emerging SIS facilities, including the emphasis on interregional, interstate, and international travel; the use of objective measures of transportation activity reflecting national and industry standards; the consideration of economic requirements of key industries; the consideration of transportation facilities emerging in importance; and screening for responsible environmental stewardship. The Committee also reviewed the specific designation criteria as of the most recent adopted change in July 20, 2008, including minimum size thresholds and economic connectivity criteria for each SIS mode, as well as the criteria used as part of the community and environmental screening process.

The Committee received periodic technical reports on FDOT efforts to explore options for updating the criteria and thresholds to reflect updated data, the draft Committee policy recommendations, and additional partner and public input. The Committee also received input from other statewide partner groups on potential designation changes. In particular, the Committee discussed the existence of two statewide strategic highway networks – the SIS highway component and the Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS), a system of high-speed, high-capacity highways identified in the early 1990s to connect Florida’s urbanized

---

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this document, as well as all parts of the SIS Strategic Plan, references to “SIS” include both SIS and Emerging SIS facilities, unless otherwise specified.

areas. The Committee received technical reports from FDOT on options for reconciling the SIS and FIHS definitions and/or sunsetting the FIHS as a separate highway network.

The Leadership Committee discussed the possibility of an overall increase or reduction in the size of the SIS to expand system coverage or to respond to concerns about available revenues. The Committee concluded the designation should focus on those facilities of greatest strategic value to the state's economy, and found the existing system generally was of statewide significance. The Committee also discussed targeted changes to SIS criteria related to specific policy objectives; if implemented these changes would result in a modest increase to the overall size of the system.

## Recommendations

The Committee recommends the SIS Strategic Plan generally retain the existing designation principles and structure, with the following specific recommendations:

1. **Emerging SIS.** FDOT should maintain separate designation criteria and policies for the Emerging SIS.
2. **Highways.** To maintain the strategic role of the SIS highways, FDOT should:
  - Sunset the Florida Intrastate Highway System as a separate statewide highway network;
  - Recognize the currently designated SIS and Emerging SIS highways as the highway component of the SIS; and
  - Develop criteria to evaluate future proposed changes to this network. The criteria should consider factors such as the functional characteristics of highways, connectivity to urbanized areas<sup>3</sup> and rural employment centers<sup>4</sup> (including those in Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern), and traffic and truck volumes.
3. **Intercity Passenger Rail and Urban Fixed-Guideway Transit.** FDOT should refine SIS designation criteria to include intercity passenger rail (e.g., Amtrak and high-speed rail) as well as urban fixed-guideway transit systems (e.g., commuter rail, heavy rail, light rail, and bus rapid transit) connecting multiple urbanized areas<sup>5</sup> within a single economic region.

---

<sup>3</sup> Urbanized areas are defined by the U.S. Census. For this purpose, the SIS designation also would recognize metropolitan divisions as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.

<sup>4</sup> Rural employment centers are defined as rural counties supporting job opportunities for the surrounding counties (including designated Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern), measured by concentrations of employment specific to each mode, as identified through Agency for Workforce Innovation data.

<sup>5</sup> Urbanized areas are defined by the U.S. Census. For this purpose, the SIS designation also would recognize metropolitan divisions as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.

4. **Freight Rail Terminals and Corridors.** To maintain the strategic role of the SIS rail system, FDOT should continue to update designation criteria for SIS freight rail terminals and corridors to:
  - Change the criterion for intermodal freight rail terminals from tonnage to units handled;
  - Apply existing rail criteria to evaluate new types of terminals incorporated into integrated logistics centers; and
  - Continue to work with railroads to develop data and methodologies to accurately reflect the importance and function of the entire freight rail system.
5. **Emerging SIS Spaceports.** FDOT, in consultation with Space Florida and other partners, should develop criteria for designating Emerging SIS spaceports.
6. **Intermodal Connectors.** FDOT should provide greater flexibility in intermodal connector designation to support multiple modes and trip purposes accommodated at specific hubs.
7. **Hub-to-Hub Connectors.** FDOT should develop criteria to designate 'hub-to-hub' transit systems and other fixed-guideway facilities directly connecting two SIS hubs.
8. **Intermodal Freight Drayage Routes.** FDOT should develop criteria to designate public roads used for moving freight over short distances between two SIS hubs.
9. **Community and Environmental Screening Process.** FDOT should continue to apply the SIS community and environmental screening process to all facilities proposed for SIS or Emerging SIS designation to guide choices among potential facilities for designation and to flag potential issues involving designated facilities for consideration in future investment decisions. FDOT should work with federal, state, and local agencies to ensure the process reflects the most appropriate data and methodologies, to ensure timely consideration of this information in designation decisions, and to make certain the results from this process carry forward into and inform project-specific evaluations performed in the Efficient Transportation Decision-Making (ETDM) process.

The Committee does not have specific designation recommendations related to other SIS modes, such as airports, seaports, and waterways. The Committee reviewed proposed criteria changes under consideration by FDOT, and recommends FDOT complete its reevaluation of designation criteria, consistent with these policy recommendations. The Committee encourages FDOT to provide opportunities for partner and public review and comment before these criteria changes are adopted and implemented.

## 4.0 Military Assessment

### Background

The 2005 Florida Legislature amended various sections of Section 339.64, Florida Statutes, adding provisions to evaluate the connectivity of military facilities to the SIS. Specifically, these amendments call for FDOT to:

- Coordinate with federal, regional, and local partners on the planning for the Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET) and Strategic Rail Corridor Network (STRACNET) transportation facilities either included in the SIS or providing a direct connection between military installations and the SIS.<sup>6</sup>
- Coordinate with regional and local partners to determine whether the road and other transportation infrastructure connecting military installations to the SIS, the STRAHNET, or the STRACNET is regionally significant and should be included in the SIS.
- Include in the SIS Strategic Plan an assessment of the impacts of proposed improvements to SIS corridors on military installations either located directly on the SIS or located on the STRAHNET or STRACNET.

The Committee received a briefing from the Florida Defense Alliance and FDOT on existing military installations in Florida today and their connectivity to the SIS. The Florida Defense Alliance has identified 20 military installations and 3 unified commands in Florida operated by the U.S. Department of Defense. Currently, 3 military installations are directly connected to the SIS, 16 are connected to the SIS via STRAHNET or STRACNET facilities, and 4 are connected via other roads or rail.

The Committee also reviewed the location of Coast Guard and National Guard facilities not under the Department of Defense's jurisdiction, and noted the unique role played by Camp Blanding as the Governor's Continuity of Government site during emergencies.

The Committee also reviewed the treatment of military installations in the 2005 SIS Strategic Plan. Consistent with the guidance of the 2002 SIS Steering Committee, the 2005 Plan acknowledged the role of the military installations and their transportation impacts. However the 2005 Plan did not designate military installations as part of the SIS because they do not primarily serve as transportation hubs. The roads and rail serving the military bases were not explicitly designated as SIS corridors or connectors, although some of these facilities were designated for meeting other criteria. SIS implementation includes the military installations

---

<sup>6</sup> The Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET) is a network of highways identified by the U.S. Department of Defense to provide defense access, continuity, and emergency capabilities for defense purposes. The Strategic Rail Corridor Network (STRACNET) is an interconnected and continuous rail line network, also identified by the U.S. Department of Defense, serving over 170 defense installations in the United States.

and surrounding communities as one group of partners, and provides greater weight in the prioritization process for SIS facilities in proximity to military installations.

## Recommendations

The Committee recommends the SIS Strategic Plan address military transportation needs in two ways:

10. **Designation of Military Access Facilities.** FDOT should develop criteria for designating as SIS or Emerging SIS the transportation facilities linking SIS facilities to the state's strategic military installations. FDOT should work in consultation with the Florida Council on Military Bases and Mission Support, the Florida Defense Alliance, the base commanders, and other partners to develop these criteria. The criteria should consider the military and civilian personnel at each installation, as well as the access facilities previously designated as part of the Strategic Highway Network and/or the Strategic Rail Corridor Network.
11. **Consideration of Military Access Needs.** FDOT should work with the Florida Council on Military Bases and Mission Support, the Florida Defense Alliance, the base commanders, and other partners to ensure military transportation needs are considered in SIS planning and investment decisions, as well as in statewide modal plans. FDOT should work with the federal government and local governments to clarify roles and responsibilities for planning, implementing, and funding improvements to these facilities, including potential partnerships.

In response to the first recommendation, FDOT has developed draft criteria for designating the military access facilities. These criteria consider the total military and civilian personnel at an installation, which is indicative of the mobility needs for the installations. The draft criteria would designate STRAHNET or STRACNET facilities serving military installations with at least 0.25 percent of total U.S. military and civilian personnel. This threshold is similar to the threshold used for other modes when compared to national totals. The Committee recommends FDOT complete development of designation criteria consistent with these policy recommendations. The Committee encourages FDOT to consider additional characteristics which might cause an installation to be of statewide significance, such as the emergency operations role played by Camp Blanding. The Committee encourages FDOT to provide opportunities for partner and public review and comment before these criteria are adopted and implemented.

## 5.0 Needs Assessment

### Background

The Committee reviewed the existing policies and processes used by FDOT and partners to identify potential investment needs involving SIS facilities, including the SIS Multimodal Unfunded Needs Plan adopted in 2006 based on needs identified in statewide modal plans and partner plans. The Committee noted the existing Needs Plan is more comprehensive for highways than for other SIS modes.

The Committee also reviewed the existing processes used to evaluate these needs, including the measures for each mode. The Committee received briefings on the Efficient Transportation Decision-Making process, which is used for early evaluation of potential community and environmental impacts for highway and some public transportation facilities. The Committee monitored legislative changes and subsequent agency actions in 2009 related to the state's growth management laws, and discussed the potential implications of these changes for coordination of SIS investment and land use decisions. Finally, the Committee monitored statewide research and policy development activities related to climate change and energy.

The Committee's breakout groups discussed in greater detail key issues and how they might be addressed through SIS needs assessment activities, including urban mobility, trade and logistics needs, community and environmental issues, and unique needs for Emerging SIS facilities, particularly those in rural areas. An additional breakout group discussed the role of regional visioning in shaping future transportation needs in the context of long-range regional goals for economic development, land use, environmental stewardship, and community livability, as well as how these visions relate to adopted state, regional, and local plans.

The Committee also reviewed the guidelines used by FDOT to determine the types of investments involving SIS facilities eligible for the state and federal funds allocated by FDOT to the SIS, known as "statewide managed SIS funds."

Finally, the Committee reviewed examples of SIS projects completed, underway, or planned in each District, as well as input from FDOT staff, partners, and the public on implementation experience to date.

### Recommendations

The Committee organized its recommendations related to SIS needs assessment into three areas: needs identification, needs evaluation, and eligibility for statewide managed SIS funds.

## *Needs Identification*

12. **Statewide Systems Approach.** SIS investment needs should be developed using a statewide, systems approach, with consideration of strategic regional needs and opportunities.
13. **Freight Mobility.** FDOT should work with partners<sup>7</sup> to identify freight mobility strategies and investment needs across modes, including the identification of freight projects of statewide significance as potential priorities for state and federal funding.
14. **Passenger Mobility.** FDOT should work with partners to facilitate interregional and interurban passenger mobility strategies and investment needs across modes, including the identification of passenger projects of statewide significance as potential priorities for state and federal funding.
15. **Response to Economic Development Opportunities.** FDOT should obtain continuing input from modal, business, economic development, and other partners on market conditions and economic development opportunities to help determine associated SIS investment needs.
16. **Coordination with Economic Development Strategies.** FDOT should work with public and private partners to coordinate SIS investments with statewide and regional economic development strategies.
17. **Transportation and Land Use.** FDOT should work with state, regional, and local partners to coordinate transportation, land use, and development plans to preserve the functionality of the SIS for statewide and interregional travel while also supporting community visions and plans for future growth and development. SIS investments should be consistent with local government comprehensive plans and strategic regional policy plans.
18. **Regional Visions.** SIS planning and investment decisions should consider the results of regional visioning efforts. The 2060 FTP will provide the broad policy framework through which the SIS is implemented and updated in the future. As such, the 2060 FTP should continue to encourage the development and implementation of regional visions.

---

<sup>7</sup> Partners are defined for this purpose as those parties with interests in transportation facilities and services, including both transportation and transportation-related interests. Transportation partners include the general public, local governments, metropolitan planning organizations and other regional entities and organizations, public and private sector users and providers, Native American Nations, the Florida Department of Transportation, and other state and federal transportation-related agencies. Transportation-related partners would include public and private organizations with an interest in land use, economic development, community livability, environmental stewardships, public health and safety, and other issues related to transportation.

19. **Proactive Planning for Emerging SIS.** FDOT should encourage proactive planning and intergovernmental coordination regarding future investments in Emerging SIS facilities to help accomplish statewide policy objectives and achieve regional visions.
20. **Corridor Plans.** FDOT should develop, maintain, and update multimodal corridor plans to guide future investment decisions for major SIS facilities. These corridor plans should develop strategies for the SIS to connect businesses and travelers to markets in other regions, states, and nations through multiple modes of transportation. These corridor plans could identify, coordinate, and leverage funding for investment needs involving SIS and non-SIS facilities in the same corridor. These corridor plans should evaluate all opportunities to maximize the efficient use of the existing SIS facilities, and determine if the most cost-effective solutions for improving mobility on SIS facilities involve investments in non-SIS facilities. In such cases, FDOT should work with partners to develop strategies for leveraging funding sources to implement the non-SIS investments. If other funding sources are insufficient to meet this need, FDOT may consider the use of discretionary funds for this need, subject to state law and based on criteria including the system-wide impact of the improvement and appropriate land use strategies to ensure any capacity made available on the SIS facility by the project is used for international, interstate, or interregional mobility.
21. **Urban Mobility Strategies.** The 2060 FTP should include urban mobility strategies to complement the statewide and regional emphasis of the SIS.

### *Needs Evaluation*

22. **Project Evaluation Measures.** FDOT should develop project-specific measures to evaluate needs and projects proposed for SIS funding. The measures should reflect the purpose and goals of the SIS, with emphasis on mobility for people and freight and economic competitiveness.
23. **Efficient Transportation Decision-Making.** FDOT or the project sponsor should apply the Efficient Transportation Decision-Making (ETDM) process to evaluate projects adding new capacity or developing new facilities on all SIS modes using state funding. ETDM application should recognize unique modal processes and constraints, such as federal preemption on certain types of rail projects. The ETDM process should evaluate findings from the community and environmental screening performed as part of SIS designation. ETDM findings should carry forward into and guide project development, environmental studies and regional, state, and federal permitting decisions.
24. **Energy and Climate Change.** SIS planning and implementation decisions should consider how SIS investments help accomplish statewide goals for reducing energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. FDOT also should work with partners to develop a methodology for evaluating the potential risks to SIS facilities due to sea level rise and other anticipated impacts of global warming.

## ***Funding Eligibility***

25. **Funding Eligibility Guiding Principles.** The following principles should guide FDOT's decisions about the eligibility of potential SIS investments for statewide managed SIS funds:
- FDOT SIS funds should be used for projects to improve mobility on SIS corridors and connectors, including projects to improve the efficiency of existing facilities; projects to add capacity to existing facilities; projects to acquire or preserve right of way for future expansion; and projects to construct new facilities meeting the criteria for planned SIS facilities.
  - FDOT SIS funds should be used for projects improving the efficient movement of people and goods onto and off of SIS hubs. FDOT SIS funds also should be used to contribute toward the development or expansion of intermodal or multimodal terminals.
  - FDOT SIS funds should be used on facilities owned by the private sector only where public benefits exceed public costs.
  - Safety, security, preservation, and routine maintenance activities should be the responsibility of the facility owner or operator and generally should be funded through other sources.

## 6.0 Prioritization Process

### Background

The Committee reviewed the policies, factors, and processes used to set priorities among SIS investments over the long-term (through the SIS Cost-Feasible Plan) and the short-term (through FDOT's Work Program). The Committee reviewed FDOT's work to date on the SIS Highway Element Cost-Feasible Plan, and noted the need to continue coordination with modal partners to develop a multimodal cost-feasible plan. The Committee also reviewed how FDOT currently makes investment decisions for three categories of funding available for SIS investments:

- State and federal funds allocated to the SIS (referred to as statewide managed SIS funds);
- State funds allocated for public transportation modes on the SIS (aviation, seaports, and rail); and
- State and federal discretionary funds allocated to Districts.

The Committee also reviewed input from FDOT staff, partners, and the public on the effectiveness of these existing prioritization processes.

### Recommendations

The Committee recommends the SIS Strategic Plan reflect the following prioritization factors and processes:

26. **Prioritization Factors.** FDOT should consider the following principles in setting priorities on a statewide basis among potential SIS investments:
- Prioritize projects best supporting the FTP goals and the SIS mobility objectives, with emphasis on economic development, improved mobility, and increased intermodal connectivity.
  - Give additional consideration to projects:
    - Furthering other adopted statewide goals and priorities;
    - Supporting established priorities for regional and local partners, including the plans and visions supported by applicable metropolitan planning organizations and county governments;
    - Supporting more than one mode or facility on the SIS;
    - Maximizing the use of existing transportation infrastructure;
    - Supported by land use, access, and other strategies to ensure additional capacity is preserved for its intended purpose;

- Leveraging resources to conserve the state's ecosystems and address climate change impacts, including reductions in energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions;
  - Leveraging federal government, local government, private sector, or other funding sources; and
  - Providing a positive return on investment to the state.
27. **Partner Input.** FDOT should expand regular opportunities for the full range of partners to provide input on SIS investments and on the framework used to set priorities among these investments.
28. **Partner Communication.** FDOT should expand communication with the full range of partners on how SIS prioritization decisions were made, and how the selected projects support statewide goals.
29. **Flexibility.** FDOT should have flexibility in the SIS work program to respond to changing conditions and unanticipated strategic opportunities.

## 7.0 Finance Strategy

### Background

The Committee received briefings from FDOT on the Florida's transportation revenues and funding programs, and specific funding issues including the federal stimulus program and the upcoming federal transportation authorization.

An FDOT analysis of recent and programmed FDOT capacity investments in the SIS and non-SIS concluded the following:

- Between 1999 and 2003, the last five years before the SIS was created, FDOT capacity investments totaled over \$8 billion, of which 68 percent were allocated to facilities now part of the SIS.
- Between 2004 and 2008, FDOT capacity investments in SIS and non-SIS facilities increased dramatically to about \$13.3 billion, primarily because of increased revenues resulting from a strong economy and new revenues from State Documentary Stamp proceeds; 73 percent of those investments were on SIS facilities.
- Between fiscal years 2010 and 2014, FDOT's adopted five-year work program plans about \$13.8 billion for capacity investments, including about \$1.6 billion in "roll forward" from previous years and another almost \$1.4 billion in federal economic stimulus funds. The share programmed on the SIS is 67 percent; about the same as before the SIS was created.

FDOT also reported the allocation of SIS investments among types of facilities:

- Between 1999 and 2003, 84 percent of state investments in facilities now included in the SIS were allocated to highway corridors, 9 percent to hubs and non-highway corridors, and 6 percent to intermodal connectors.
- Between 2004 and 2008, the shares changed to 75 percent for highway corridors, 15 percent for hubs and non-highway corridors, and 10 percent for intermodal connectors. Investments in hubs and non-highway corridors were about three times higher than the last five years before the SIS was established, while investments on intermodal connectors were about two and one half times higher.
- Between fiscal years 2010 and 2014, FDOT's work program allocates SIS investments across these categories in a similar manner to the 2004-2008 period.

The most recent SIS Multimodal Unfunded Needs Plan, adopted in 2006, identified \$53.2 billion in unfunded needs (measured in 2006 dollars). FDOT reported this total has likely increased during subsequent years due to cost increases, revenue decreases, and better information on long-term needs for the non-highway modes in particular. The Committee also reviewed recent and projected trends in transportation revenue sources, and identified future funding for both SIS and non-SIS capacity investments as a significant concern for future implementation.

## Recommendations

The Committee organized its recommendations on the SIS finance strategy into two categories: funding sources and investment strategies.

### Funding Sources

30. **Funding Sources.** FDOT should identify and pursue revenue sources and strategies developed under the previous SIS Strategic Plan, including the following:
  - Consider expanding the use of direct transportation user fees such as tolls and freight or passenger surcharges where appropriate, including advanced technologies and operational strategies for fee collection and use. Particular attention should be given to sustainable revenue sources to address concerns about the future of the motor fuel tax, such as a fee based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT).
  - Consider increased opportunities for joint funding of SIS projects, including public-private partnerships (PPP), identify barriers to joint funding, and work toward removing those barriers.
  - Expand and clarify participatory funding strategies to encourage multimodal projects and partnerships with federal and local governments, independent authorities, or private entities. FDOT should consider the availability of non-state funding commitments (e.g., matching funds) as a factor in setting state funding priorities, while ensuring project implementation decisions are based on the priorities set forth in the SIS Strategic Plan.
31. **Federal Funding.** FDOT should aggressively pursue strategies to optimize federal funding, such as working with its congressional delegation and partners to advocate for a greater share of transportation funding for all modes for Florida and flexibility in the use of federal funds in future federal authorizations. FDOT also should coordinate with transportation partners to position Florida for available discretionary federal funding.
32. **Incentive Program.** SIS partners should work with the Legislature to explore the feasibility of a state incentive program for multimodal projects of statewide and regional significance. The program would be designed to facilitate transportation infrastructure/economic development investment opportunities and/or funding commitments subject to time constraints, including those associated with discretionary federal funding programs or public/private sector partnerships. The program should use state funds to leverage federal, modal, and private-sector funding sources for projects with public benefits.
33. **Local Funding.** The 2060 FTP should consider strategies for increasing local transportation funding sources.

## Investment Strategies

34. **Investment Strategies.** FDOT should enhance state transportation capacity investment strategies to emphasize economic competitiveness and serving Florida’s population and businesses, while maintaining its commitment to the preservation and safety of the entire state transportation system. FDOT should continue implementation of the investment policies developed under the previous SIS Strategic Plan and aggressively work to remove barriers to implementing the policies. To further advance the policies, FDOT should:

- Continue to make progress toward the goal of allocating 75 percent of new discretionary capacity funds<sup>8</sup> to the SIS and Emerging SIS. However, during rapidly changing economic conditions or to meet specific project requirements the rate of transition towards this goal may have to be adjusted to reduce the impact of revenue reductions on facilities not on the SIS.
- Develop appropriate strategies to ensure emphasis on the SIS gives greater attention and resources to non-highway modes.
- Ensure a strategic distribution of funds:
  - Among regions;
  - Between SIS and Emerging SIS facilities; and
  - Among SIS modes.

“Strategic distribution” is intended to be applied over the long-term, recognizing the need for annual fluctuations in funding distribution as a result of considerations of relative project priorities and partner input and to accommodate the enormous cost of major projects.

35. **Regionally Significant Facilities.** FDOT should continue to provide funding assistance for regionally significant facilities<sup>9</sup> not included on the SIS through state funding programs such as the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP), the Transit New Starts programs, and small county road programs.

36. **Urban Transit Capital Projects.** SIS investments should be coordinated with transit projects funded through the separate State New Starts program to encourage capital

<sup>8</sup> The policy does not apply to certain funds, such as public transportation program funds or funds reserved by federal or state law for specific purposes (e.g. must be used in urbanized areas with a population greater than 200,000). "New discretionary capacity funds" means any funds above the prior funding level, which FDOT has the discretion to allocate to projects either on or off the SIS and Emerging SIS.

<sup>9</sup> These regionally significant facilities may include other commercial service and major reliever airports, other deepwater and major special-generator seaports, other major freight terminals and distribution centers, regional passenger terminals, and highway, rail and waterway corridors serving major regional economic centers.

investments in urban transit capital projects (both new systems and extensions of existing systems). The state should provide sustainable funding for transit capital projects through the New Starts program. FDOT should coordinate SIS and New Starts funding decisions to facilitate commuter rail and intercity transit development, and to ensure SIS passenger rail systems and terminals are integrated with state, regional, and local transit systems.

## 8.0 Other Implementation Strategies

### Background

The Committee also discussed other aspects of SIS implementation not covered in the previous categories, with emphasis on partner coordination. The Committee reviewed input from FDOT staff, partners, and the public on lessons learned from implementation to date, as well as potential enhancements in the future.

### Recommendations

The Committee recommends the SIS Strategic Plan reflect the following implementation strategies:

37. **Modal Integration.** FDOT should strengthen the role of the SIS Strategic Plan as an integrating framework for the elements of statewide modal plans covering SIS airports, spaceports, seaports, waterways, rail, transit, and highways. As FDOT implements these plans the agency should take steps to fully integrate modal planning.
38. **Technical Advisory Committee.** FDOT should establish an ongoing statewide technical advisory committee to provide periodic input on SIS designation and implementation issues. This committee should comprise all SIS modes as well as representatives of state, regional, and local agencies and other statewide public, private, and nongovernmental interests.
39. **Partner Coordination and Outreach.** FDOT should conduct early, proactive, and ongoing outreach to and coordination with the full range of partners involved in the SIS, with emphasis on:
  - Proactive outreach to promote understanding of SIS policies and benefits, especially to newly elected and appointed officials at all levels of government;
  - Continuing interagency coordination on how the SIS relates to other statewide priorities;
  - Encouragement of best practices for intergovernmental coordination at all levels; and
  - Continued outreach and coordination with public and private stakeholders.
40. **Performance Measures.** FDOT should develop and regularly report multiple performance measures to evaluate the overall performance of the SIS, including outcomes to help inform future investment decisions. These measures should reflect the FTP goals and the SIS mobility objectives with emphasis on mobility and economic competitiveness.





# Appendix A. Strategic Intermodal System Statutory Requirements

## Section 339.61, Florida Statutes

(1) There is hereby created the Florida Strategic Intermodal System. For purposes of funding projects under the system, the department shall allocate from the State Transportation Trust Fund in its program and resource plan a minimum of \$60 million each year, beginning in the 2004-2005 fiscal year. This allocation of funds is in addition to any funding provided to this system by any other provision of law.

(2) The Legislature finds that increasing demands are continuing to be placed on the state's transportation system by a fast-growing economy, continued population growth, and projected increases in freight movement, international trade, and tourism. The Legislature also finds that the state's growing regional and intercity economic centers will increase the demand for interregional and intercity travel and that the evolving service-based and information-based industries will change the type of transportation system that business and industry demand, increasing the importance of speed and reliability. The Legislature further finds that our transportation system must be designed and operated in such a way that it preserves the abundance of natural and manmade amenities that have been so successful in attracting new residents, businesses, and tourists to this state. Therefore, the Legislature declares that the designation of a strategic intermodal system, composed of facilities and services of statewide and interregional significance, will efficiently serve the mobility needs of Florida's citizens, businesses, and visitors and will help Florida become a worldwide economic leader, enhance economic prosperity and competitiveness, enrich quality of life, and reflect responsible environmental stewardship. To that end, it is the intent of the Legislature that the Strategic Intermodal System consists of transportation facilities that meet a strategic and essential state interest and that limited resources available for the implementation of statewide and interregional transportation priorities be focused on that system.

(3) Funds paid into the State Transportation Trust Fund pursuant to s. 201.15 for the purposes of the Florida Strategic Intermodal System are hereby annually appropriated for expenditure to support that program.

History.--s. 46, ch. 2003-286; s. 12, ch. 2004-366; s. 35, ch. 2005-290; s. 8, ch. 2008-114.



## Section 339.64, Florida Statutes

(1) The department shall develop, in cooperation with metropolitan planning organizations, regional planning councils, local governments, the Statewide Intermodal Transportation Advisory Council, and other transportation providers, a Strategic Intermodal System Plan. The plan shall be consistent with the Florida Transportation Plan developed pursuant to s. 339.155 and shall be updated at least once every 5 years, subsequent to updates of the Florida Transportation Plan.

(2) In association with the continued development of the Strategic Intermodal System Plan, the Florida Transportation Commission, as part of its work program review process, shall conduct an annual assessment of the progress that the department and its transportation partners have made in realizing the goals of economic development, improved mobility, and increased intermodal connectivity of the Strategic Intermodal System. The Florida Transportation Commission shall coordinate with the department, the Statewide Intermodal Transportation Advisory Council, and other appropriate entities when developing this assessment. The Florida Transportation Commission shall deliver a report to the Governor and Legislature no later than 14 days after the regular session begins, with recommendations as necessary to fully implement the Strategic Intermodal System.

(3)(a) During the development of updates to the Strategic Intermodal System Plan, the department shall provide metropolitan planning organizations, regional planning councils, local governments, transportation providers, affected public agencies, and citizens with an opportunity to participate in and comment on the development of the update.

(b) The department also shall coordinate with federal, regional, and local partners the planning for the Strategic Highway Network and the Strategic Rail Corridor Network transportation facilities that either are included in the Strategic Intermodal System or that provide a direct connection between military installations and the Strategic Intermodal System. In addition, the department shall coordinate with regional and local partners to determine whether the road and other transportation infrastructure that connect military installations to the Strategic Intermodal System, the Strategic Highway Network, or the Strategic Rail Corridor is regionally significant and should be included in the Strategic Intermodal System Plan.

(4) The Strategic Intermodal System Plan shall include the following:

(a) A needs assessment.

(b) A project prioritization process.

(c) A map of facilities designated as Strategic Intermodal System facilities; facilities that are emerging in importance that are likely to become part of the system in the future; and planned facilities that will meet the established criteria.

(d) A finance plan based on reasonable projections of anticipated revenues, including both 10-year and 20-year cost-feasible components.



(e) An assessment of the impacts of proposed improvements to Strategic Intermodal System corridors on military installations that are either located directly on the Strategic Intermodal System or located on the Strategic Highway Network or Strategic Rail Corridor Network.

History.--s. 49, ch. 2003-286; s. 37, ch. 2005-2; s. 7, ch. 2005-281; s. 36, ch. 2006-1.



# Appendix B. 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee Members

<b>Interest Areas:</b>	<b>Represented by:</b>
Statewide Transportation ( <i>Chair</i> )	Ms. Debbie Hunt, Assistant Secretary, Florida Department of Transportation
District Transportation ( <i>Vice-Chair</i> )	Ms. Noranne Downs, Secretary, FDOT District 5
Airports	Mr. Bob Ball, Director, Lee County Port Authority, Florida Airports Council  Designee - Ms. Debra Lemke, Lee County Port Authority  Designee - Mr. Bill Johnson, Executive Director, Florida Airports Council
Cities	The Honorable Kathy Till, Commissioner, City of Apopka, Florida League of Cities
Counties	The Honorable Gordon Goodin, Commissioner, Santa Rosa County, Florida Association of Counties
District Transportation	Mr. Jason Peters, Intermodal System Development Manager, FDOT District 3
Federal Transportation	Mr. Martin Knopp, Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration
Highways	Mr. Javier Rodriguez, Executive Director, Miami-Dade Expressway Authority, Transportation & Expressway Membership of Florida  Designee - Ms. Mayra Diaz, Senior Planner, Miami-Dade Expressway Authority
Metropolitan Areas	The Honorable Richard Kaplan, Chair, Broward County Metropolitan Planning Organization, Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council  Designee - Mr. Howard Glassman, Executive Director, Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council

<b>Interest Areas:</b>	<b>Represented by:</b>
Military Issues	Mr. Rocky McPherson, Director, Defense and Military Programs, Enterprise Florida, Inc., Florida Defense Alliance
Private Sector SIS User	Mr. Jim Barr, Vice-President of Environment, Ryder Corporation, Private Sector
Rail	Mr. Ben Biscan, President, Florida Rail Association Designee - Mr. Mark Nordling, Florida Rail Association
Regional Planning	Ms. Pat Steed, Executive Director, Central Florida Regional Planning Council, Florida Regional Councils Association
Rural Development Issues	Mr. Jim Poole, Executive Director, Lake City Chamber of Commerce, Enterprise Florida's Rural Issues Working Group Designee - Ms. Gina Reynolds, Deputy Director, Lake City Chamber of Commerce
Seaports	Ms. Toy Keller, Vice-President for Planning, Florida Ports Council
Small Counties	Mr. Chris Doolin, Executive Director, Small County Coalition Designee - Mr. Brad Purcell, Commissioner, Putnam County
Space	Mr. Mark Bontrager, Vice-President of Spaceport Operations, Space Florida Designee - Mr. Derek Nolek, Space Florida
Statewide Business	Mr. Todd Pokrywa, Vice-President of Planning, Schroeder-Manatee, Inc., Association of Florida Community Developers, Inc. Mr. Tony Carvajal, Executive Vice President, Florida Chamber Foundation, Florida Chamber of Commerce
Statewide Economy	Mr. John Adams, President & Chief Executive Officer, Enterprise Florida, Inc. Designee - Ms. Bridget Merrill, Vice President, Targeted Opportunities, Enterprise Florida, Inc.
Statewide Environment	Ms. Sally Mann, Director, Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, Florida Department of Environmental Affairs Designee - Mr. Chris Stahl, Environmental Specialist, Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, Florida Department of Environmental Protection

<b>Interest Areas:</b>	<b>Represented by:</b>
Statewide Environment (continued)	Ms. Laurie Macdonald, Florida Program Director, Defenders of Wildlife  Ms. Janet Bowman, Associate Director of Government Relations, The Nature Conservancy  Designee - Mr. Chris Barry, The Nature Conservancy
Statewide Growth Management	Ms. Victoria Tschinkel, Chair, 1000 Friends of Florida  Designee - Mr. Tim Jackson, Vice-Chair, 1000 Friends of Florida  Mr. Charles Gauthier, Director, Division of Community Planning, Florida Department of Community Affairs
Statewide Tourism	Mr. Dale Brill, Director, Office of Tourism, Trade, and Economic Development  Designee - Ms. Keisha Rice, Office of Tourism, Trade, and Economic Development
Statewide Transportation Policy	Mr. Bart Pullum, Commissioner, Florida Transportation Commission  Designee - Ms. Sally Patrenos, Executive Director, Florida Transportation Commission
Transit - Regional	Mr. Bill Cross, South Florida Regional Transportation Authority, Florida Public Transportation Association
Transit - Urban	Mr. Chuck Cohen, Executive Director, Palm Tran - Palm Beach County Transit, Florida Public Transportation Association  Designee - Mr. Wes Watson, Executive Director, Florida Public Transportation Association  Designee - Mr. J. Marsh McLawhorn, Florida Public Transportation Association
Trucking	Mr. Tom Hindle, Comcar Industries, Inc.  Designee - Ms. Mary Lou Rajchel, President & CEO Florida Trucking Association  Designee - Mr. Matt Ubben, Florida Trucking Association
Waterways	Mr. David Roach, Executive Director, Florida Inland Navigation District



---

# Appendix C. 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee Meetings

## C.1 Overview of Leadership Committee Meetings

### Full Committee Meeting #1 ~ January 26-27, 2009 ~ Orlando, FL

The first meeting of the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee began with introductions of all members and their expectations for the committee. FDOT staff provided presentations on the development and implementation of the SIS, including SIS accomplishments and challenges over the last five years. FDOT staff also presented a summary of long-range trends likely to shape transportation decisions over the next few decades. The committee members discussed the proposed meeting guidelines and the consensus building process and schedule. They also reviewed and refined the process goal statement; assumptions and guiding principles; and key roles and responsibilities of the committee and the FDOT. In conclusion, the committee members offered desirable and undesirable outcomes for the future of Florida as it relates to transportation to set the stage for discussion at future meetings.

### Full Committee Meeting #2 ~ February 23, 2009 ~ Orlando, FL

The primary purpose of the second meeting was to identify key issues to focus subsequent committee meetings. FDOT staff provided background presentations on SIS designation criteria and transportation planning, programming, and funding in Florida. In addition, two panels of committee members provided modal and governmental perspectives on SIS implementation to date and needs for the future. Sena Black, Senior Vice President, Enterprise Florida, Inc., provided an overview of the *Roadmap to Florida's Future: Strategic Plan for Economic Development*. FDOT staff shared additional technical information requested by the committee at its first meeting. After initial discussion on key issues, the chair suggested creating "breakout groups" on five topics to discuss further details of specific issues and potential draft policy recommendations. The five topics were: Emerging SIS, Community and Environmental Issues, Urban Issues, Trade and Logistics Issues, and Implementation Issues. The Chair asked these breakout groups to meet via teleconference during April and May and report back to the full Committee in May. Descriptions of each breakout group can be found in section C.2 below.

### **Full Committee Meeting #3 ~ May 19-20, 2009 ~ Orlando, FL**

The third meeting focused on the initial recommendations from the breakout group meetings held in April and early May. A committee member from each breakout group provided a brief summary of the group's discussion and the resulting initial recommendations. FDOT staff provided presentations on SIS goals and objectives and the investment decision-making process. Members also reviewed and discussed SIS designation policy issues. At the conclusion of the full committee meeting, each breakout group met again to refine its initial recommendations to reflect the input from the full committee.

### **Full Committee Meeting #4 ~ June 22-23, 2009 ~ Orlando, FL**

The fourth meeting focused on further refinement of proposed policy recommendations. The revised recommendations from the five breakout groups, together with additional technical recommendations suggested by staff based on committee discussion to date, were organized by the statutorily required elements of the SIS Plan: designation, military assessment, needs assessment, prioritization process, finance strategy, and implementation. Members reviewed and discussed a proposed outline for the Leadership Committee report, as well as the purposes and goals of the SIS. The members rated and discussed all draft recommendations developed by the breakout group and staff. At the conclusion of the meeting, the chair indicated further discussion was needed on some recommendations before the fifth meeting in August. The chair asked members to serve on two additional breakout groups over the next several weeks, with one focusing on finance strategy and the other on regional visioning. The chair also asked the full committee to meet during two teleconferences to further discuss the draft recommendations and provide guidance to staff for revisions before the fifth meeting.

### **Full Committee Meeting #4a ~ July 13, 2009 ~ Teleconference**

This teleconference focused on draft policy recommendations related to system designation and military assessment. For system designation, FDOT staff presented background information describing the draft policy recommendations and potential criteria changes to implement these policies. Members then discussed potential revisions to the draft policy recommendation. For military assessment, FDOT staff presented additional information including further detail on the location and function of the state's military installations and a map showing one option for potential designation of military access facilities. Members then discussed potential revisions to the draft policy recommendations for military issues.

### **Full Committee Meeting #4b ~ July 20, 2009 ~ Teleconference**

The second teleconference focused on draft policy recommendations related to needs assessment, prioritization, and implementation. For each topic, FDOT staff provided background information as necessary. Members then discussed potential revisions to the draft policy recommendations.

### **Full Committee Meeting #5 ~ August 20-21, 2009 ~ Tampa, FL**

During the fifth meeting, members continued to discuss and refine draft policy recommendations. The members heard an update on the public and partner involvement process including plans for the upcoming regional workshops. Staff gave a presentation on the status of the update of SIS designation criteria to implement the draft policy recommendations, which was followed by a discussion to provide strategic direction for the overall size and scope of the system. Committee members provided reports from the regional visioning breakout group and the finance breakout group. Charles Gauthier, Department of Community Affairs, provided an update on the implementation of recent changes in growth management laws. On the second day, members participated in a prioritization exercise to help understand the factors involved in setting priorities for SIS investments, followed by a discussion on prioritization policy recommendations. After all draft policy recommendations were reviewed, staff described how these draft policy recommendations would be used in the regional workshops being held around the state in September. The chair asked all members to attend the upcoming regional workshop in their area if they are able.

### **Full Committee Meeting #6 ~ October 1-2, 2009 ~ Tallahassee, FL**

The sixth meeting began with a review by staff of the public and partner feedback received during the regional workshops and additional briefings in September. Members reviewed and provided comment on revised goals and objectives developed based on committee and public input. Members then reviewed the revised draft policy recommendations and discussed final changes as needed. Key topics for discussion included the SIS investment strategy, prioritization factors, and funding eligibility guidelines for statewide managed SIS funds. The Committee members and designees present unanimously adopted a final set of policy recommendations to FDOT on the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan. The Chair thanked all members for their service.

## **C.2 Overview of Breakout Group Meetings**

The chair initially organized five breakout groups to clarify potential issues and begin to draft potential recommendations before the May meeting. These groups were open to all interested members, and met by teleconference two to three times during April and early May 2009. The chair also organized two other breakout groups, covering finance and regional visioning. The chair asked specific members to serve on the regional visioning breakout group, while the finance breakout group was open to all interested members. These two groups met one to two times in July 2009. The FDOT support team provided background and technical information for each topic. Committee members participated in discussion and developed draft policy recommendations.

### **Emerging SIS Breakout Group (April 17; April 27; May 20, 2009)**

The Emerging SIS Breakout Group focused on policies for designating and planning the Emerging SIS component. The group reviewed existing Emerging SIS designation criteria and policies, and assessed the type and volume of transportation activity on Emerging SIS facilities. This group considered three key questions:

1. Is there a continued need for separate designation criteria and policies for the Emerging SIS, or should we fully integrate those facilities designated as Emerging SIS into the SIS?
2. If we retain a separate Emerging SIS category, should the designation emphasize policy objectives, such as connections to economically distressed areas, rather than minimum size thresholds?
3. If we retain a separate Emerging SIS category, how should we encourage proactive planning for the future of these facilities?

The group drafted recommendations for presentation to the full committee at the May meeting.

### **Urban Issues Breakout Group (April 17; May 4; May 20, 2009)**

The Urban Issues Breakout Group focused on understanding key issues related to intraregional mobility needs, urban congestion, regional and local road systems and public transportation systems, and urban growth management goals. This group considered five key questions:

1. How should the SIS support intraregional movement of people and goods, recognizing the importance of Florida's urban areas?
2. How should the impact of urban congestion on interregional, interstate, and international trips using the SIS be reduced?
3. How should the role of regional and local road systems linked to the SIS be addressed?
4. How should the role of public transportation systems (transit and commuter rail) on the SIS be re-examined?
5. How should the relationship between the SIS and land use planning/growth management in urban areas be re-examined?

The group drafted recommendations for presentation to the full committee at the May meeting.

### **Trade and Logistics Issues Breakout Group (April 20; May 11; May 20, 2009)**

The Trade and Logistics Issues Breakout Group discussed growth in global trade in the future and potential development of inland ports and distribution networks. From this discussion, they considered the following questions:

1. How can the SIS prepare for anticipated growth in global trade over the next few decades?
2. Should there be proactive efforts to develop inland ports and distribution networks?

3. How should this opportunity be addressed in the SIS Strategic Plan update?

The group drafted recommendations for presentation to the full committee at the May meeting.

### **Community and Environment Issues Breakout Group (April 24; May 6; May 20, 2009)**

The Community and Environment Issues Breakout Group reviewed the existing community and environment screening process used to support SIS designation and its relationship to the Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) process. The group also reviewed policies and processes related to regional visioning, the Critical Lands and Water Identification Process (CLIP), the Cooperative Conservation Blueprint, new air quality standards, and the state's Climate Change Action Plan. The group considered the following questions:

1. How can existing processes for community and environmental screening, Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM), and others be integrated and enhanced to ensure the SIS supports environmental stewardship and community livability goals?
2. Should we give greater attention to air quality, climate change, and energy issues in SIS planning and investment decisions?
3. How should SIS planning and investment decisions incorporate regional and community visions?

The group drafted recommendations for presentation to the full committee at the May meeting.

### **Implementation Issues Breakout Group (April 24; May 20; June 3, 2009)**

The Implementation Breakout Group focused on partner coordination; integration of the SIS with regional plans and systems and SIS investment decision-making including the prioritization process. The group also addressed several recommendations referred from other breakout groups. This group considered these various topic areas over three meetings. The group drafted recommendations for presentation to the full committee at the June meeting.

The meeting on **partner coordination** reflected on five questions:

1. How can we achieve improved coordination among the transportation modes on the SIS?
2. How can we improve coordination among the state, regional, and local governments involved in planning and investing in the SIS?
3. How can we strengthen coordination of FDOT with partner agencies (economic, growth management, environment)?
4. How can partner coordination be integrated more effectively in planning by nontraditional partners?
5. What other related to partner coordination should be considered as part of this update?

The key questions for **integration with regional plans and systems** include:

1. How should the SIS respond to unique regional issues?
2. How should the SIS respond to regional visions and plans?
3. How can SIS integration with regional and local transportation systems be improved?
4. How should support and incentives for regional visioning efforts be enhanced?

The questions for **SIS investment decision-making** centered on the following questions:

1. How can we make the process for identifying and prioritizing SIS investments more effective? Should we recommend changes to the project prioritization process?
2. Should we recommend changes to refine the eligibility criteria for all modes?
3. Should we create more flexibility in the use of SIS funds?
4. Should we clarify policies for projects on which there are private sector/public funding partnerships?

### **Regional Visioning Breakout Group (July 14)**

The Regional Visioning Breakout Group met to further discuss the role of regional visions in the implementation of the SIS and to reconcile the various recommendations on this topic prepared by the different breakout groups. Specifically, this group focused on the following questions:

1. How can regional visions provide guidance for SIS investments?
2. Are there other examples of regional coordination which would provide the same guidance for SIS investments?
3. Is the existing guidance in the 2025 Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) sufficient to describe the linkage between regional visioning and the SIS?
4. Are additional recommendations needed in the 2010 SIS Strategic Plan specific to how regional coordination and visioning should provide guidance to SIS investments?
5. What guidance would you like to provide to the 2060 Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) process?

The group drafted recommendations for presentation to the full committee at the August meeting.

### **Finance Breakout Group (July 20; August 3, 2009)**

The Finance Breakout Group met to discuss issues related to investment principles, funding partnerships, and funding sources. They considered the following questions:

1. What principles should guide FDOT's investments in transportation capacity for people and freight through the SIS?



2. What funding partnerships need to be developed or continued to advance key SIS projects in the future? What barriers exist to developing or continuing these partnerships, and how can these barriers be addressed?
3. What additional sources should be considered to augment available funding for the SIS?
4. What guidance would the Committee like to provide on funding and finance issues for the rest of Florida's transportation system as input to the 2060 Florida Transportation Plan?

The group drafted recommendations for presentation to the full committee at the August meeting.



# Appendix D. Glossary

**Capacity Funds** - Funds allocated by the FDOT for 1) highway rights-of-way and construction, and 2) aviation, rail, seaports and intermodal access programs after funds for operations, preservation, safety, and security have been excluded.

**Community** - A physical or cultural grouping of stakeholders with common interests created by shared proximity or use. Community can be defined at various levels within a larger context (e.g., neighborhood, city, metropolitan area, or region).

**Connector** - Highways, rail lines, or waterways connecting hubs and corridors.

**Consultation** - When one party confers with another identified party and, prior to taking action(s), considers that party's views.

**Cooperation** - When parties involved work together to achieve a common goal or objective.

**Coordination** - The comparison of plans, programs and schedules of one agency with related plans, programs and schedules of other agencies or entities with legal standing, and adjustment of plans, programs and schedules to achieve general consistency.

**Corridors** - Highways, rail lines, waterways and other exclusive-use facilities connecting major origin/destination markets within Florida or between Florida and other states/nations. Also see "Transportation Corridor."

**Designation** - The process of identifying hubs, corridors, and connectors meeting the criteria established to be a part of the SIS.

**Discretionary** - A term used to indicate FDOT has some legal discretion on how and where funds can be expended.

**DOT** - Department of Transportation.

**Drayage Route** - The route used to move loaded or empty equipment between customer locations and rail ramps. SIS "intermodal freight drayage routes" are public roads used to move equipment between two designated SIS hubs, such as a seaport and an intermodal rail freight terminal.

**Economic Competitiveness** - A state or region's ability to compete in global markets, as evidenced in the attraction of new businesses and the expansion of existing businesses.

**Economic Connectivity** - Service to key origin-destination markets and population centers.

**Economic Diversification** - The development and growth of new industries, which are not a large part of a state's or region's existing industries.

**Efficient Transportation Decision-Making (ETDM)** - A FDOT initiative to improve and streamline the environmental review and permitting process by involving resource protection agencies and concerned communities from the first step of planning. Agency interaction continues throughout the life of the project, leading to better quality decisions and an improved linkage of transportation decisions with social, land use and ecosystem preservation decisions.

**Emerging SIS** - Facilities and services of statewide or interregional significance meeting lower levels of people and goods movement than SIS facilities. Both "Strategic Intermodal System" and "Emerging SIS" are a formal part of "The SIS."

**Environmental Stewardship** - A philosophical concept of government, the public, resource users, and businesses all taking responsibility and working together to care for natural resources.

**FDOT** - Florida Department of Transportation.

**Fixed-Guideway** - A form of transit consisting of vehicles only able to operate on a guideway constructed for a specific purpose (e.g., rapid rail, light rail). Federal usage in funding legislation also includes exclusive right-of-way bus operations, trolley coaches, and ferryboats as "fixed guideway transit."

**Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS)** - A system of existing and future limited access and controlled access facilities, which have the capacity to provide high-speed and high-volume traffic movements in an efficient and safe manner.

**Florida Transportation Plan (FTP)** - A statewide plan defining Florida's long-range transportation goals and objectives for at least the next 20 years.

**Hub** - Ports and terminals moving goods or people between Florida regions or between Florida and other origin/destination markets in the U.S. and the rest of the world.

**Hub-to-Hub Connector** - A connector allowing for transfers between modes and connects two hubs, such as transit facilities connecting airports with intermodal passenger terminals or major cruise passenger seaports.

**Impacts** - The effects of a transportation project, including a) direct (primary) effects; b) indirect (secondary) effects; and c) cumulative effects.

**Intercity** - Relating to the connection between any two or more cities. Such connections may be within a region (see **intraregional**) or between two regions if the cities are different regions (see **interregional**).

**Interregional** - Relating to the connection between any two or more regions.

**Intermodal** - Denotes the seamless movement of people or cargo between transport modes.



**Intermodal Connector** – See **Connector**.

**Intraregional** – Relating to the connections with both ends within a single region.

**Local Government Comprehensive Plan** – Florida’s Growth Management Act requires all of Florida’s 67 counties and 476 municipalities to adopt Local Comprehensive Plans to guide future growth and development. Comprehensive plans contain chapters or “elements” that address future land use, housing, transportation, infrastructure, coastal management, conservation, recreation and open space, intergovernmental coordination, and capital improvements.

**Metropolitan Division** – A county or group of closely-tied contiguous counties serving as a distinct employment region (65 percent or more of its employed residents work within the county and the ratio of the number of jobs located in the county to the number of employed residents of the county is at least 0.75) within a Metropolitan Statistical Area containing an urbanized area with a population of at least 2.5 million. Defined by the U.S. Office of Management Budget.

**Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)** – An organization made up of local elected and appointed officials responsible for developing, in cooperation with the state, transportation plans, and programs in metropolitan areas containing 50,000 or more residents. MPOs are responsible for the development of transportation facilities that will function as an intermodal transportation system and the coordination of transportation planning and funding decisions.

**Military Access Facility** – For the purpose of the SIS designation process a road or rail line providing a connection between a military installation and a SIS highway or rail corridor.

**Military Installation** – For the purpose of the SIS designation process, military installation refer to U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or National Guard installations to which active duty soldiers, sailors or aviators are assigned.

**Mobility** – The degree to which the demand for the movement of people and goods can be satisfied. Mobility is measured in Florida by the quantity, quality, accessibility, and utilization of transportation facilities and services.

**Mode** – Any one of the following means of moving people or goods: aviation, bicycle, highway, paratransit, pedestrian, pipeline, rail (including commuter, intercity passenger and freight), transit, space and water.

**Multimodal Corridor Plan** – A plan identifying transportation needs involving SIS, Emerging SIS, regionally significant and local facilities in a corridor.

**Need** – A demand for a mobility improvement that has been identified on the basis of accepted and adopted standards and other assumptions (e.g., land use) and documented in a formal long-range or master plan.

**Non-highway modes** – Modes of transportation that do not utilize highway right-of-way. Examples include fixed guideway transit, rail, and water modes.

**Partners, Transportation** – Parties with interests in transportation facilities and services, including both transportation and transportation-related interests. Transportation partners include the general public, local governments, metropolitan planning organizations and other regional entities and organizations, public and private sector users and providers, Native American Nations, the Florida Department of Transportation, and other state and federal transportation-related agencies. Transportation-related partners include public and private organizations with an interest in land use, economic development, community livability, environmental stewardships, public health and safety, and other issues related to transportation.

**Project** – A specific proposed transportation facility or service that is listed in an adopted Work Program, Cost-Feasible Plan, or Unfunded Needs Plan.

**Public Road** – Any road under the jurisdiction of and maintained by a public authority (Federal, state, county, town or township, local government, or instrumentality thereof) and open to public travel.

**Regional Planning Council (RPC)** – An organization that promotes communication, coordination, and collaboration among local governments, metropolitan planning organizations and other local regional authorities on a broad range of regional issues, including transportation and land use planning. The entire State of Florida is covered by the boundaries of the 11 RPCs.

**Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern** – Designated by the Governor, these areas must be a rural community or region that has been adversely affected by and extraordinary economic event or a natural disaster, or that presents a unique economic development opportunity of regional impact that will create more than 1,000 jobs over a five-year period. Such areas are to be priority assignments of the Rural Economic Development Initiative (REDI).

**Rural Employment Center** – Rural counties supporting job opportunities for the surrounding counties (including designated Rural Areas of Critical Economic Concern), measured by concentrations of employment specific to each mode.

**State Highway System (SHS)** – A network of approximately 12,000 miles of highways owned and maintained by the State of Florida or state-created authorities. Major elements include interstate highways, Florida’s Turnpike System, other toll facilities operated by transportation authorities, and arterial highways.

**Strategic** – Highly important to or an integral part of a long term plan of action.

**Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET)** – A network of highways which are important to U.S. strategic defense policy and which provide defense access, continuity and emergency capabilities for defense purposes.

**Strategic Intermodal System (SIS)** – A transportation system comprised of facilities and services of statewide and interregional significance, including appropriate components of all modes. Both “SIS” and “Emerging SIS” facilities are a formal part of the “SIS.”



**Strategic Rail Corridor Network (STRACNET)** - An interconnected and continuous rail line network consisting of over 38,000 miles of track serving over 170 defense installations in the United States.

**Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP)** - A plan, required by Section 186.507 of Florida Statutes, developed by each of Florida's 11 Regional Planning Councils. A SRPP serves as the regional long-range guide for the physical, economic, and social development of the comprehensive planning district, and identifies regional goals and policies. SRPP subject areas include affordable housing, economic development, emergency preparedness, natural resources of regional significance and regional transportation. The statutory requirement is implemented by Rule Chapter 27E-5 of the Florida Administrative Code.

**System** - Individual facilities, services, forms of transportation (modes) and connectors combined into a single, integrated transportation network.

**Transit** - Mass transportation by bus, rail, or other conveyance that provides general or special services to the public on a regular and continuing basis. Transit does not include school buses, charter services, or sightseeing services.

**Transportation Corridor** - Any land area designated by the state, a county, or a municipality which is between two geographic points and which is used or is suitable for the movement of people and goods by one or more modes of transportation, including areas necessary for management of access and securing applicable approvals and permits. Transportation corridors shall contain, but are not limited to, the following: a) existing publicly owned rights-of-way; b) all property or property interests necessary for future transportation facilities, including rights of access, air, view and light, whether public or private, for the purpose of securing and utilizing future transportation right-of-way, including but not limited to, any lands reasonably necessary now or in the future for securing applicable approvals and permits, borrow pits, drainage ditches, water retention areas, rest areas, replacement access for landowners whose access could be impaired due to the construction of a future facility, and replacement right-of-way for relocation of rail and utility facilities.

**Urbanized Areas** - Defined by the Census as an area consisting of a central place(s) and adjacent densely settled territory which together have a minimum residential population of at least 50,000 people and generally an overall population density of at least 1,000 people per square mile of land area.

**Work Program** - The five-year listing of all transportation projects planned for each fiscal year by the FDOT, as adjusted for the legislatively approved budget for the first year of the program.



# Appendix E. List of Sources

The Leadership Committee used many documented sources when considering the 40 recommendations presented in their report. The main sources included:

- *2005 SIS Strategic Plan;*
- *2025 Florida Transportation Plan;*
- *FDOT, 2006 SIS Multimodal Unfunded Needs Plan;*
- *FDOT, 2007 SIS Data and Designation Update;*
- *FDOT, Draft 2035 SIS Highway Element Cost-Feasible Plan, 2008;*
- *FDOT, Investing in Florida's Future: SIS Program Highlights, 2009;*
- *FDOT, Florida Aviation System Plan, 2007 and updates;*
- *FDOT, Florida Waterway System Plan, 2008;*
- *FDOT, 2009 Florida Rail System Plan -- Policy Element;*
- *FDOT, Transit 2020 Vision Plan, 2000;*
- *FDOT, Florida's Transportation Tax Sources: A Primer, 2008);*
- *Seaport Working Group, Recommendations to FDOT on Florida Seaport System Plan (2009);*
- *Enterprise Florida, Roadmap to Florida's Future: Florida's Strategic Plan for Economic Development, 2007;*
- *Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change, Florida's Energy and Climate Change Action Plan, 2008;*
- *Century Commission for a Sustainable Florida, Critical Lands and Waters Identification Project;*
- *Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Cooperative Conservation Blueprint ;*
- *Defenders of Wildlife, Getting Up to Speed: A Conservationist's Guide to Wildlife and Highways, 2007.*

Additional information used in the drafting of Leadership Committee recommendations is documented on the website [www.sisupdate.org](http://www.sisupdate.org).