



*A Meeting
of the
Modes*



**A RETREAT ON THE STATE OF
INTERMODALISM IN FLORIDA**

**A Report on the Discussions
and Findings of the Retreat**

Held February 12 – 13, 2007

**Convened By: The Florida Transportation Commission
Facilitation By: Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium**

“A MEETING OF THE MODES”

Renaissance Tampa Hotel, International Plaza
Tampa, Florida
February 12 – 13, 2007

A REPORT ON THE DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS OF THE RETREAT

Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium
Bob Jones, Hal Beardal, Chris Pedersen, Rafael Montalvo & Kathy Neill, FDOT
<http://consensus.fsu.edu>

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| <i>Executive Summary</i> | 2 |
| Facilitators’ Summary | 4 |
| | |
| <i>Appendices</i> | 15 |
| #1 Meeting Agenda | 15 |
| #2 Meeting Evaluation and Comment Form Summary | 16 |
| #3 Discussion Topics and Key Questions | 20 |
| #4 Small Group Notes | 21 |
| #5 List of Attendees..... | 62 |

“A MEETING OF THE MODES”

Tampa, Florida
February 12 – 13, 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Florida Transportation Commission (FTC) Chairman James Holton welcomed the 124 participants (*see Appendix #5, Participant List*) to an open dialogue with representatives of the various transportation modes and partners. He noted the Commissioners were here today to listen to the participants and to begin a dialogue between the modes on how to move forward together to create an inter-modal future for Florida. Stephanie Kopelousos, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Interim Secretary, followed, emphasizing FDOT’s support for inter-modal discussions and a desire to work with public and private partners to develop an inter-modal transportation system.

Presentations began with two speakers offering background information from different perspectives. Bob Romig, Director of the Office of Policy Planning, FDOT, reviewed the importance of inter-modalism from the state perspective. Next, George Schoener, Executive Director of the I-95 Corridor Coalition, described efforts to promote and coordinate inter-modal cooperation in a multi-state corridor from Florida to Maine.

A panel of modal representatives followed and offered insights on the economic impact of their respective mode and the need for intermodal engagement between the modes. The panel included Bill Johnson from the Florida Airports Council, Joe Giulietti from the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority, Ben Biscan representing the Florida Railroad Association, Pete Gunn from Space Florida, Bruce Brecheisen from Seaboard Marine and Mary Lou Rajchel and Jim Long with the Florida Trucking Association. *For the PowerPoint presentation slides associated with many of these presentation, visit the FTC website at: http://www.ftc.state.fl.us/A_Meeting_of_the_Modes.htm*

Following the presentations, Sally Patrenos, FTC Executive Director, set the stage for discussion of the following five key topics during the breakout group sessions: project identification and prioritization; financing and funding; legislative initiatives; fostering statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation; and common and individual modal visioning. She noted that participants would be asked for each topic to identify and discuss the shared challenges and shared opportunities for advancing intermodal success in Florida. The participants were assigned to five modally balanced discussion groups of about 25 members each on the afternoon of the first day and the morning of the second day

On the afternoon of the second day participants heard an overall summary report of the results of small group discussions of the five topic areas. Then each group reported on their ideas for better intermodal cooperation through existing programs and on short and longer

range strategies identified for intermodal success. (*For a set of the key discussion group questions see Appendix #3; for a complete set of notes for each of the small groups, see Appendix # 4).*

In terms of existing programs, participants generally concurred that the Strategic Intermodal System has provided funding and support for key intermodal projects including connector improvements. It was suggested that in the future the SIS could play a key part in bringing together and building support for intermodal solutions that include transit. The groups also agreed that the future corridors program, if done right, presents a tremendous opportunity for intermodal progress, including addressing alternate modes and fostering regional and inter-local cooperation. All groups viewed the regional visioning underway in parts of the state as additional opportunities for intermodal cooperation.

The reports on the short and longer-range strategies for the modes to move forward together fell into several topical categories:

- Continuing and expanding the intermodal dialogue;
- Improving intermodal planning;
- Consideration of new governance structures and bodies to enhance intermodal planning and funding;
- Addressing intermodal funding including--reforming the funding formula, new revenue ideas and linking and leveraging funding to address best intermodal approaches;
- Linking growth management and intermodal planning and initiatives; and
- Identifying the unique and common needs for intermodal planning and initiatives in both urban and rural areas.

Following the small group reports, in a concluding session reflecting on the meeting's outcomes, Chairman James Holton and Vice Chair Janet Watermeier thanked the participants for their commitment to improving Florida's intermodal efforts and for their participation and excellent ideas on achieving intermodal success in Florida. They tested and received support among the participants for the proposition that the Florida Transportation Commission should adopt at one of its upcoming meetings a resolution on supporting the intermodal dialogue with a focus on results. They suggested the resolution should reflect the joint product of this meeting of the modes and should articulate a key ongoing role for the Commission to play in enhancing, convening, and facilitating an ongoing dialogue among the transportation modes in Florida in the future.

“A MEETING OF THE MODES”

Tampa, Florida
February 12 – 13, 2007

FACILITATORS’ SUMMARY

Florida Transportation Commission (FTC) Chairman James Holton welcomed the 124 participants (*see Appendix #5, Participant List*) to an open dialogue with representatives of the various transportation modes and partners. He noted the Commissioners were here today to listen to the participants and to begin a dialogue between the modes on how to move forward together to create an inter-modal future for Florida. Stephanie Kopelousos, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Interim Secretary, followed, emphasizing FDOT’s support for inter-modal discussions and a desire to work with public and private partners to develop an inter-modal transportation system.

Presentations began with two speakers offering background information from different perspectives. Bob Romig, Director of the Office of Policy Planning, FDOT, reviewed the importance of inter-modalism from the state perspective. Next, George Schoener, Executive Director of the I-95 Corridor Coalition, described efforts to promote and coordinate inter-modal cooperation in a multi-state corridor from Florida to Maine.

A panel of modal representatives followed and offered insights on the economic impact of their respective mode and the need for intermodal engagement between the modes. The panel included Bill Johnson from the Florida Airports Council, Joe Giulietti from the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority, Ben Biscan representing the Florida Railroad Association, Pete Gunn from Space Florida, Bruce Brecheisen from Seaboard Marine and Mary Lou Rajchel and Jim Long with the Florida Trucking Association. *For the PowerPoint presentation slides associated with many of these presentations, visit the FTC website at: http://www.ftc.state.fl.us/A_Meeting_of_the_Modes.htm*

Following the presentations, Sally Patrenos, FTC Executive Director, set the stage for discussion of the following five key topics during the breakout sessions: project identification and prioritization; financing and funding; legislative initiatives; fostering statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation; and common and individual modal visioning. She noted that participants would be asked in each topic to identify and discuss the shared challenges and shared opportunities for advancing intermodal success in Florida. She stressed that participants then discuss the opportunities for better modal cooperation offered by statewide programs, such as the Strategic Intermodal System and the FDOT Future Corridors initiative. Before concluding she asked to participants to identify practical next steps for each mode and to offer recommendations to the FTC for continuing an intermodal dialogue.

The participants were assigned to five modally balanced discussion groups of about 25 members each on the afternoon of the first day and the morning of the second day to identify shared challenges to and shared opportunities for intermodal success in Florida in each of the five topic areas and key discussion questions (*see Appendix #3*) Below is a high

level summary synthesis of the five discussion groups' products. (For a complete set of notes for each of the small groups, see Appendix # 4).

SHARED CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTERMODAL SUCCESS IN FLORIDA

1. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION AND PRIORITIZATION

Challenges Impeding Prioritization Across Modes

- ✓ Funding restrictions
- ✓ Lack of common vision
- ✓ Lack of measures and data
- ✓ Different planning horizons
- ✓ With local focus on addressing commuter needs, multi-modal needs get ignored

Opportunities

- ✓ Create a common vision on where we want to go as a state
- ✓ Expand MPO membership for all modes
- ✓ Build on common interests, e.g., airports, seaports and tourists

2. FINANCING AND FUNDING

Challenges

- ✓ Funding restrictions, lack of flexibility to move beyond highway solutions. Gas tax \$\$ will not be able to support intermodal needs
- ✓ Private sector is under represented in these forums

Opportunities

- ✓ Build on lesson learned in creative intermodal cooperation including leveraging funds for intermodal solutions (Miami Intermodal Center, seaport lease arrangement to finance port improvements)
- ✓ User fees will play a more prominent role
- ✓ Regional visions can identify modal solutions to support how the region wants to grow
- ✓ Help leverage private sector funding and guide FDOT state investments
- ✓ Attach conditions to funding to promote intermodal cooperation

3. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES

Opportunities

- ✓ Seek more federal flexibility to use funding for intermodal solutions, including airport funding
- ✓ Create financial incentives for intermodal cooperation through state priority setting rewarding projects that tie in multiple modes
- ✓ Provide regional transportation entities the ability to raise funds
- ✓ Give regulatory relief for regional corridor solutions

- ✓ Provide assurances that local comp plan land use changes around hubs preserve the ports themselves and their ability to connect with trade and industrial uses
- ✓ Encourage transit oriented development
- ✓ Allow local option gas tax by simple majority vote of the local government and index the tax for inflation
- ✓ Support from the state for a more uniform security badge
- ✓ Caution- Tax revenues and insurance will be facing the Legislature in 2007

4. FOSTERING STATEWIDE AND REGIONAL, INTERMODAL COORDINATION AND COOPERATION

Challenges

- ✓ Getting modes to think and plan “outside the gate”
- ✓ Coordinating land use decisions with transportation

Opportunities

- ✓ Learn from successes (SR 528 Corridor)
- ✓ Create incentives and funding sources that provide clear policy expectations for intermodal cooperation (e.g., SIS funding criteria, Future Corridors Program)
- ✓ Regional visioning groups provide best opportunities for intermodal coordination and cooperation among modes and the development and environmental communities
- ✓ Project discussions at the feasibility stage should include the different modes

5. CREATING COMMON AND INDIVIDUAL MODAL VISIONS

Challenges

- ✓ No single institution is responsible for intermodal visioning
- ✓ Public and leaders may not yet sense the urgency for envisioning a different future in terms of expected growth and development

Opportunities

- ✓ Take up policy and vision prior to funding issues. Connect with regional visioning efforts
- ✓ Florida Seaports have developed 2016 Vision of Success working with its partners and users
- ✓ Shared visioning from an intermodal dialogue must produce a compelling case for public support that exceeds the ability of any individual mode and can transform the vision into action

SHORT AND LONG RANGE STRATEGIES AND PRACTICAL NEXT STEPS FOR INTERMODAL SUCCESS IN FLORIDA

On the following morning the groups reconvened to complete their discussion from the five topics and to address two additional questions:

- Can existing statewide programs (SIS, Future Corridors) provide opportunities for better modal cooperation?
- What kinds of short and longer-range strategies could form the basis for moving forward together? What are some practical next steps for each mode and for continuing the intermodal dialogue?

The afternoon of the second day included an overall report of the results of five topic areas taken up by each small group and a report from each of the five small groups on their ideas for better intermodal cooperation through existing programs and suggested short and longer range strategies and practical next steps for intermodal success.

BETTER INTERMODAL COOPERATION THROUGH EXISTING STATEWIDE AND REGIONAL PROGRAMS

The opportunities for better intermodal cooperation through existing statewide and regional programs (SIS, future Corridors, regional visioning) that were offered by each of the five groups are summarized and synthesized below.

There was agreement across the groups that the Strategic Intermodal System has provided funding and support for key intermodal projects including connector improvements, such as funding for the Miami and Tampa international airport intermodal projects. There was also agreement that it has provided the state with a big picture view of the statewide interest in interregional mobility. It has also placed a policy of seamless connectivity as a key SIS goal with intermodal connectors representing a key component of SIS. An example of the power of this policy was the Tri-Rail connection to the Miami Intermodal Center. When the original plans did not include connectivity between the two, the State intervened and mandated the connection based on the SIS policy. However, several groups suggested the need for engagement of the various private and public sector modal interests in a consistent and disciplined policy discussion and dialogue. One group noted the need to have Statewide Intermodal Transportation Advisory Committee active again in order to be truly strategic and identify the partnership opportunities.

It was also suggested that in the future the SIS could play a key part in bringing together intermodal solutions that includes transit. Each group acknowledged that the 75/25 funding split has been a divisive issue that has complicated intermodal cooperation at the local level. One group suggested that at some point there needs to be a better system balance that results in greater local participation in the intermodal/SIS projects. “We’ve drawn the boundaries, but sound intermodal planning and resources are still needed.” Several groups noted the lack of state and regional leadership impeded intermodal efforts. An example offered was the way in which parochial issues killed light rail in Orlando, (e.g., in-fighting among Disney, Universal). The message that was heard in Tallahassee and Congress was that

the local governments did not have their act together. The State must join with local and regional entities to demonstrate leadership and a shared vision, so the right message goes to Tallahassee and Washington that local governments are on the same page with a shared vision of success.

In terms of opportunities where the SIS might provide for greater intermodal cooperation, the groups identified:

- ✓ “The last mile is not connected.” E.g., Central Blvd only offered 50% for the airport who didn’t have the match.
- ✓ The need for more flexibility on the emerging SIS areas facilities.
- ✓ Reviewing the experience with the 50-mile rule to determine if it is effectively advancing intermodal policy.
- ✓ The need to include hub-to-hub connectors in the SIS as the hub markets are large, important and represent huge missed opportunities.
- ✓ FDOT through the SIS focuses on moving from region to region. Not much attention paid to intermodal issues when urban areas are considered. There is no legislation on ensuring impacts on urban modal options are considered nor is context sensitive design addressed in the SIS legislation.

The groups agreed that the future corridors program, if done right, presents a tremendous opportunity for intermodal progress, including addressing alternate modes and fostering regional and inter-local cooperation. As one participant noted, “The words were all right, but people hear it as just a road.” Each group identified longer term visioning as important as a means to connect with corridor development and redevelopment, the development of the SIS, and local government decision-making.

Several groups suggested that the various modes need to be involved at the feasibility study stage of new corridors. Many groups suggested this provided a great opportunity for transit, utilities, pipeline, and roadway improvements all in the same footprint as well as an opportunity to talk about mobility among the modes including some non-typical stakeholders. Some groups noted that there is a need to work with the current decision-making process, but this presents challenges in re-developing exiting corridors. Future corridors are an opportunity to identify the transportation need first, and then analyze which mode can address that need. The planning should include capacity for alternate modes in planning and design and include smaller non-SIS facilities as reliever facilities (DayJet plans; how is the state supporting this effort?) All groups agreed that passenger and freight rail need to be included in the FDOT New Corridors effort.

All groups agreed that the regional visioning underway are bringing together modes as part of developing those regional visions and there should be strong encouragement that those responsible for regional visioning include the modes and both the redevelopment of existing corridors and the development of new corridors.

All groups highlighted the need to change the funding streams and ranking systems to consider and reward regional and intermodal cooperation and inter-modal impacts (operating costs). Some groups suggested that intermodal investors should include the

development community, taxpayers, businesses, and the environmental community and feature more user fees and reflect a more diversified investment background reflecting the users.

All groups underscored the importance of sustaining a dialogue across the modes and the need to open the intermodal dialogue to focus and work together on common goals like the FTC has done with this “Meeting of the Modes.” Some groups suggested that momentum has been lost in the process of intermodal discussions, which over time could cause economic development to leave the state. One group suggested that there should be a renewed effort at education and focusing on freight issues in the intermodal dialogue.

STRATEGIES FOR INTERMODAL SUCCESS IN FLORIDA

The short and longer-range strategies, including practical next steps that could form the basis for the modes moving forward together, were offered by each of the five groups as summarized and synthesized below.

Continuing and Expanding the Intermodal Dialogue

There was clear agreement across all the groups that the Commission should take the lead in expanding the intermodal dialogue to create, through the dialogue, a statewide and a set of regional intermodal business plans that could help to cut costs and share benefits, enable and support action on key intermodal challenges, jointly create new intermodal opportunities and take advantage of existing ones. If needed, there was agreement that legislative direction should confirm intermodalism as a policy priority for the Commission. Some suggested the Commission should consider establishing an ongoing statewide intermodal working group and continue to create statewide and regional forums for intermodal discussion.

The dialogue objectives suggested by the small groups for the intermodal dialogue included:

- ⊙ Promote and support new intermodal planning incentives and better integration of the modal plans.
- ⊙ Focus on the challenges and opportunities presented by the four prototype corridors FDOT has proposed and include freight as part of the dialogue process.
- ⊙ Focus on refining and implementing dedicated innovative funding approaches to support the maintenance of existing and creation of new intermodal infrastructure. Suggestions included peak time tolling, expanding a state infrastructure bank, providing new authority to bond for intermodal projects, and crediting in funding decisions the presence of an effective intermodal plan.
- ⊙ Find ways to create common planning horizons. They currently vary by mode: Seaports 5 years, market driven, challenge; Airports 10 years; Transit-locally driven, Transit Development Plan recently went from 5 year to 10 year; Rail-private sector info; and Highways, 20-30 years
- ⊙ Link the coming alternative energy policy changes and opportunities to support for the intermodal system.

Many of the groups urged the Commission to underscore the link of the intermodal issue with efforts to sustain Florida's strategic economic competitiveness edge. In various ways, each group suggested that all modes need to get beyond "reaction" and the "maintenance" mode, and that the first step may be the development of modal visions of success. Indeed, some groups suggested the Commission facilitate the development of visioning for each mode as a next step to enable a process to develop a shared intermodal vision of success. Some groups also suggested the Commission convene intermodal regional workshops as an interim step to the next "meeting of the modes."

A theme that emerged from all the group discussions was the importance of expanding the dialogue to bring the public and private sectors and both operations professionals and planners together. Several noted that freight and emerging markets should be included in the dialogue as well as the users (manufacturers, retail outlets) rather than just their associations in visioning process.

It was noted there was a need to educate those in the public and private sectors regarding their shared intermodal objectives, along with their distinctive decision making processes and their respective needs for accountability and flexibility. In the end, it was observed in one group that public support for the intermodal planning process would depend on the perception that it is working effectively to bring public benefits and protect the broader public interest.

All of the groups noted the need to educate the public and legislators regarding the value of intermodal planning and projects for communities, the regions, and the state. It was noted by some groups that MPOs have not been strong advocates for freight and rail and it is important to educate MPO leaders and the general public on how important freight is to the Florida's economy.

Improving Intermodal Governance and Planning

All of the groups addressed various statewide intermodal governance and strategic planning issues. Several groups observed that information on long-range goals of modes is incorporated into the Florida Transportation Plan, which, in turn, is designed to guide all of the modes and partners. The SIS needs list is supposed to be connected to be a statewide list covering all modes. All agreed that FDOT has moved towards integrating intermodal planning, but there remains a silo effect and the system could still be better integrated. All agreed that existing modal institutions work well within their mode, but much needs to be done to work more effectively together.

Some groups suggested consideration of new governance structures and bodies to enhance intermodal planning and success, such as:

- ⊙ Consider creating a new Intermodal Transportation Commission--there is always an effective implementation step needed for success and not just great ideas and policy.
- ⊙ Assess and remove the current impediments to regional transportation authorities. Develop new regional authorities with taxing powers to coordinate and initiate intermodal projects that are consistent with a regional vision.

- ⊙ Develop statewide and regional intermodal partnerships composed of representatives from the modes who have authority to make decisions and will meet on a regular basis.
- ⊙ The SITAC was too formal. There needs to be more of an informal working group where these interests and agencies can talk across the modes about their needs.

Many noted that statewide prioritization helps to minimize transportation funding decisions based solely on parochial politics. Some noted that FDOT incorporates the direction set by MPO's into the work program that set the direction at the local and district levels. However, to be successful, the "intermodal mindset" must change throughout transportation planning levels (local, MPOs, FDOT Districts, statewide). Some groups pointed to the need for a greater intermodal focus by FDOT Districts. This could be facilitated by quarterly leadership meetings convened by each District with those in the region engage in intermodal efforts.

Suggestions to improve intermodal planning included:

- ⊙ Involve modes early in planning process and focus the planning process on intermodal solutions especially at the local level.
- ⊙ Involve modes in contributing to broader regional visioning
- ⊙ Improve the use of ITS as part of enhancing the intermodal planning process.
- ⊙ Enhance and support transit involvement on MPOs.
- ⊙ Include the bicycle/pedestrian mode as a part of the solution in terms of quality communities and alternative transportation. This mode often is over looked.

In terms of specific intermodal improvements the groups identified the following areas:

- ⊙ ITS has a role in enhancing intermodal efficiency and the state and regions should take steps to maximize real time ITS technology to help the various modes to ship freight.
- ⊙ There is a need to improve the way ITS technology is used to deliver the information to users so that it can be used to make a decision about choice of mode, route, or time of travel. It doesn't do any good to have a message board on the road saying congestion ahead if you're already on the road and can't get off the road.
- ⊙ We should make sure any new federal legislation addresses intermodal issues based on the best solutions that address regional needs.
- ⊙ As long as local government makes land use decisions on local development without sufficient regard to the transportation system, the state system will remain congested. Local governments have looked after the fact to the State to help fix congestion on major arterials.
- ⊙ We need to review and possibly redefine how we measure level of service. Right now we design roads to operate for the a.m. or p.m. peak hours. During the rest of the day that capacity sits underused. Incentives to use roadways during the off peak hours (i.e., congestion pricing) should be provided.
- ⊙ Congestion is limited in many areas to certain times of the day. Infrastructure can accommodate this through approaches such as reversible lanes. We should be looking to where we can eliminate congestion. In this context, how can public policies provide incentives for private practices that encourage telecommuting to help with congestion

management? This can work across age groups, and in all areas. This can be a part of an overall solution to congestion.

- ⊙ Several groups noted that the state should re-examine the way in which transportation entities acquire rights of way. For example, the restrictions on how soon you can acquire right of way should be reviewed and adjusted to encourage multi-modal projects. Another example of innovative multi-modal planning and intergovernmental commitment is the effort to develop I-595 elevated lanes for I-595 with floating highway lanes in Miami, allowing rail to locate in existing right of ways.

Addressing Intermodal Funding

All groups noted that funding will follow a shared intermodal vision and plan and identified a number of creative options for consideration in supporting intermodal initiatives that included:

Addressing and Reforming the Funding Formula

- ✓ Funding investment decisions must be driven by something other than a formula
- ✓ Without new funds, we have a zero sum game...taking \$\$ for transit takes \$\$ from highways
- ✓ As a solution to the diminishing gas tax revenue problem is addressed, will our overall transportation investment policies be addressed? Will getting the highway side more money lead to overall change and enable best transportation solutions to come forward that benefit all modes?

New revenue ideas

- ✓ Modal representatives should work with FTC to come up with funding activities for intermodal projects such as bond program backed by a general revenue bond with \$1-\$14+ leverage ratio
- ✓ New source of money is needed—consider a special statewide tax for intermodal projects?
- ✓ Consider including fees for intermodal improvements, e.g., vehicle registration fees, rental car fees for transit and regional intermodal initiatives
- ✓ Consider approaches used by other states for leveraging Florida state pension funds for the public side of public-private intermodal partnerships that keep the funds within the Florida economy and lets government earn the return
- ✓ Revenue authorities can be set up so that profits are kept in the system
- ✓ We need to think boldly out of the box on how transportation is funded. The Department should lobby/work with legislative leadership to secure general revenue to support transportation improvements
- ✓ Need to come up with new sources of revenues in terms of either toll, tax, or user fee
- ✓ Consider the possibility of implementing a statewide intermodal Capital Improvement Plan
- ✓ Consider using turnpike revenues to fund transit systems
- ✓ Should the state consider a 10-cent gas tax to support intermodal projects?

New Governance and Funding Ideas

- ✓ A regional transportation authority with taxing authority could put together funding for an intermodal project which brings money to the table and gets things done on a regional level
- ✓ If we want to move forward, regional transportation authorities must have ability to raise taxes and put funding referendums on ballot versus always going back to counties to request annual funding for transit and other modal funding

Link and Leverage Funding to Address Best Intermodal Approaches

- ✓ FDOT is transitioning towards transit; the best approach is to look for best alternative and put funds there, whatever the mode
- ✓ The State needs to leverage its funds to ensure and encourage local cooperation and commitment to priority intermodal strategies

Growth Management and Intermodal Planning and Initiatives

All groups acknowledged the strong relationship between funding and operating the transportation system and local development and land use decisions. Some groups suggested that there are times when FDOT needs to exercise leadership and make the right decision regarding the transportation system versus allowing local politics to drive those decisions. Several groups suggested the state needs to assess and bridge the gaps and broken links between transportation and land use- e.g., encourage transit oriented development, concurrency issues, development of regional impacts. For example one group suggested creating transit incentives and more intermodal incentives in the DRI process.

Intermodal Planning and Initiatives in Urban and Rural Areas

Several groups focused discussion on addressing the sometimes-distinctive needs for rural and urban planning in the context of intermodal efforts. The transportation decisions made in urbanized areas through the MPO system provide local governments with great authority regarding priorities. In terms of the Florida Transportation Plan, rural groups and counties have been represented and have presented their needs, but they do not have the planning capacity nor are they as well organized as the state's urbanized areas. Many suggested that FDOT should develop policies tailored to urban areas and to rural and suburban areas versus a "one-size-fits-all" approach. MPOs through their statewide association provide legislative recommendations related to intermodal and transportation efforts and needs each year. Rural interests need support to be able to provide comparable legislative recommendations designed with their needs in mind.

REFLECTIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Following the small group reports, in a concluding session reflecting on the meeting's outcomes, Chairman James Holton and Vice Chair Janet Watermeier thanked the participants for their commitment to improving Florida's intermodal efforts and for their participation and excellent ideas on achieving multi-modal success. They tested and heard support among the participants for the proposition that the Florida Transportation

Commission should adopt at one of its upcoming meetings a resolution on intermodal efforts. They suggested it could reflect on the joint product of this meeting of the modes and articulate a key ongoing role for the Commission to play in enhancing, convening, and facilitating an ongoing dialogue among the transportation modes in Florida and help to implement the consensus strategies and actions that could emerge from the dialogue. The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Appendix #1

FLORIDA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

605 Suwannee Street MS 9, Tallahassee, Florida 32399 ♦ (850) 414-4105 ♦ www.ftc.state.fl.us

James W. Holton, Chairman ♦ Janet Watermeier, Vice Chairman ♦ Sidney Calloway, Secretary ♦
Gabriel Bustamante ♦ Marshall Criser ♦ Earl Durden ♦ Martha Lanahan ♦ Marcos Marchena ♦ David
A. Straz, Jr.

“A MEETING OF THE MODES”

Renaissance Tampa Hotel, International Plaza
Tampa, Florida

February 12 – 13, 2007

Monday, February 12, 2007

- 12:00 – 12:30 Registration Staff
- 12:30– 1:00 **Welcome & Opening Remarks**
“Creating an Intermodal Vision” James W. Holton, Chairman, Florida Transportation Commission
Interim Secretary Stephanie Kopelousos, Florida Department of Transportation
- 1:00 – 1:30 **“Intermodalism – A Florida Perspective,”** Bob Romig, Director, Office of Policy Planning, Florida Department of Transportation
- 1:30 – 2:00 **Multi-State Corridor Perspectives,** George Schoener, Executive Director, I-95 Corridor Coalition
- 2:00 – 3:30 **“The Economic Impact of the Modes and the Case for Intermodal Engagement”**
• Noah Lagos, Florida Airports Council
• Joe Giulietti, South Florida RTA
• Ben Biscan, Florida Railroad Association
• Pete Gunn, Space Florida
• Mary Lou Rajchel, Florida Trucking Assoc.
• Bruce Brecheisen, Seaboard Marine
- 3:30 – 3:45 **Break**
- 3:45 – 4:00 **“Why, What, When, How”: Goals and Objectives,** Sally S. Patrenos, Executive Director, Florida Transportation Commission
- 4:00 – 5:30 **Modal Discussion Groups:(Pre-Assigned);**
Logistics for Small Groups: Bob Jones, Facilitator
Potential Topics:
✓ Project Identification & Prioritization
✓ Financing and Funding
✓ Legislative Initiatives
✓ Fostering Intermodal Coordination and
✓ Cooperation
✓ Shared and Individual Intermodal
✓ Visioning
- 6:00 – 7:30 *Reception – Business Casual Attire*
Facilitation provided by the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium, FSU

Tuesday, February 13, 2007

- 8:30 – 9:10 AASHTO’s “Bottom Line Report” John Horsley, Executive Director, AASHTO
- 9:10 – 11:30 Modal Discussion Groups: Continued from previous day
- 11:30– 1:00 Lunch (on your own)
- 1:00 – 1:15 “A Journey Into the Future: A 50-year Vision of Surface Transportation in Florida” Matthew Click, Florida’s Turnpike Enterprise
- 1:15 – 2:15 Modal Discussion Group Reports/Comments Facilitators, Participants
- 2:15 – 2:30 “The Modes Met---Now What?” Chairman James W. Holton and Vice Chair Janet Watermeier
- 2:30 Adjourn Chairman James W. Holton

APPENDIX #2

“A MEETING OF THE MODES”

Renaissance Tampa Hotel, International Plaza, Tampa, Florida
February 12 – 13, 2007

MEETING EVALUTATION FORM

| | <u>Disagree</u> | <u>Agree</u> | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------|----------|----------|
| | ☹ | ☺ | | |
| | ☹ | ☺ | | |
| | <i>CIRCLE ONE</i> | | | |
| <u>WERE THE MEETING OBJECTIVES MET?</u> | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| <u>1 Avg.</u> | | | | |
| • To review updates on related statewide and multi- 0=4.17 State initiatives | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| • To identify and discuss shared inter modal 0=4.5 planning challenges and opportunities | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| • To identify opportunities for improving inter 0=4.33 modal approaches in planning for corridors and other statewide and regional initiatives | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| • To review and discuss potential next steps for each 0=3.83 mode and for future inter modal dialogue | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| <u>MEETING ORGANIZATION?</u> | | | | |
| ◆ Background and agenda packet were helpful 0=3.83 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| ◆ Presentations were effective and informative 0=4.0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| ◆ Plenary discussion format was effective 0=3.67 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| ◆ Breakout discussion format was effective 0=4.5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| ◆ Facilitators guided participant efforts effectively 0=4.5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| ◆ Participation was balanced 0=3.83 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 |

What Did You Like Best About the Meeting?

- Real facts we are facing with inter modal
- Great concept. It was great to hear about other industries other than my own
- Opportunity to learn about other modes issues and challenges
- Concise and informative

What Could be Improved?

- Can you provide all power points to all attendees very useful information on facts
- Participation in the second day was limited. In my group we were down to 90 percent airport participants which limits the benefits of hearing
- Stop before 1:00 on the second day before lunch

Other Comments:

- Issues from the other modes
- Commission on state and regional multi-modal collaboration: information exchange, needs analysis, and based on state's transportation goals
- Well worth attending

COMMENT FORM SUMMARY *(on backside of meeting evaluation forms)*

What are the shared impediments/challenges to inter modal success in Florida?

- How each fits in long term vision balancing best capabilities of each mode
- Incompatible land use, growth management regulations that treat airports like shopping malls rather than transportation infrastructure
- Lack of understanding between public and private sectors regarding how the other sector works. Strings attached to money (both public and private). Parochialism. Multi-modal master plans that include environment and development interests
- Need for money
- Lack of effective communication/knowledge regarding goals/needs of other modes; current focus on narrow focus of each
- County government not being willing to participate with a regional agency

What are the shared opportunities for advancing inter modal success in Florida?

- Joint operational funding approach – fun state
- Education. Shared funding of projects based on benefits. User fees.
- All ultimately need one another – fighting for limited money is a waste of time and counterproductive
- Remove restrictions to inter modal activity (growth management); roadways are holding other modes hostage; concurrency requirements
- All modes need to have a fact sheet on their future money needs, up to 2050± as a guess, i.e. master plans. Then we need to get real money needs and together get funding through federal/state/private
- The increasing problem with congestion and the cost of fuel

Can existing statewide programs (SIS, Future Corridors) provide opportunities for better modal cooperation?

- Yes – and particularly on R/W issues – early purchase, tighter growth management aspects, broader ability to faster TOD
- “Think Airway Corridors” remove Growth Management “TPS” standards for SIS facilities “Airport Terminals, Air Cargo Facilities, Aircraft Hangars” as these are transportation facilitators not generators
- Yes
- Absolutely – it already is again learning, master plan needs with dates would help. I’m working on that
- Yes and already have
- Yes

What kinds of short and longer range strategies could form the basis for moving forward together?

- Joint communication (ITS use) structure support make sure all available are partial to all corridor planning
- Stop taking money from airports; seaports to build roadways (concurrency requirement); the money is better used by individual mode of transportation

- Allow hub-to-hub markets. Fuel environment and development communities. Keep discussions going. Improve education. Diversify investors. Make legal revisions for flexibility on funding rules
- Progress meetings like this group
- Regional modal technical advisory teams planning - more incentives to promote/encourage/mandate multi-modal development
- More meetings with all modes

What are some practical next steps for each mode and for continuing the inter modal dialogue?

- State program for amnesty in inter modal/multi-modal program operation cost - at least
- Coordination between modes by private sector, i.e. a great deal of freight lift is unused as passenger aircraft depart with nearly empty cargo hulls by use of transportation logistics and advance purchase of lift capacity; Airfreight could be relatively inexpensive as it is highly perusable and if not used is wasted
- Keep discussion going. Need plans. Policy, project and business/finance and implementation
- I would like facts on mode needs/costs/years etc; lack of funding/funding types etc. I have more ideas, call me Naranae Downs, DOT District 5, 386-943-5474
- These conversations need to take place from a strategic stand point (vs. a funding stand point) of the modes on a district basis on a regulatory schedule manner

APPENDIX #3

“A MEETING OF THE MODES”

Renaissance Tampa Hotel, International Plaza
Tampa, Florida
February 12 – 13, 2007

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION TOPICS AND KEY QUESTIONS

The participants were assigned to five modally balanced discussion groups of about 25 members each on the afternoon of the first day and the morning of the second day to identify shared challenges to and shared opportunities for intermodal success in Florida in each of the five topic areas and key discussion questions including:

1. Project Identification & Prioritization

- What issues impede your ability to work together, across modes and local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?
- What are the opportunities for working together, across modes and local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?

2. Financing and Funding

- What finance and funding issues impede your ability to work together across modes?
- What finance and funding issues offer opportunities for working together (e.g., to create public/private partnerships for joint funding of intermodal projects)?

3. Legislative Initiatives

- Are there existing statutes that impede your ability to work together?
- Are there legislative changes that would improve your ability to work together and create partnerships?

4. Fostering Statewide and Regional Intermodal Coordination and Cooperation

- What type of statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation has occurred across the modes?
- What are the best opportunities for fostering statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation?

5. Common and Individual Modal Visioning

- Has your mode established a statewide or regional vision? If yes, how?
- How can individual modes work together to create a common intermodal vision?

APPENDIX #4

BREAKOUT SESSIONS NOTES

The participants were assigned to five modally balanced discussion groups of about 25 members each for 1 ½ hours on the afternoon of the first day and for 2 hours and 15 minutes on the morning of the second day to identify shared challenges to and shared opportunities for intermodal success in Florida in each of the five topic areas and key discussion questions. Each of the five groups started on a different topic on day one. Below is a summary of the discussion for each of the five discussion groups. Each group had a facilitator and a note taker.

1. GREEN GROUP SESSIONS NOTES

Facilitator: Chris Pedersen, Note Taker: Brian Pessaro

Who's Here?

| Modes | Organization |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2 – Airports | 0 – Local Government |
| 4 – Highway/ Transportation | 1 – MPO's |
| 2 – Intermodal | 2 – Local/Regional Transportation Agencies |
| 1 – Rail | 0 – FTC |
| 1 – Seaports | 4 – FDOT |
| 3 – Transit | 0 – FHWA |
| | 2 – Private Sector |
| | 1 – Other/ Space |

Legislative Initiatives

Are there existing statutes that impede or present challenges to your ability to work together?

- ⊙ Not within the state. Federal regulations present more challenges and restrictions, especially in the space arena.
- ⊙ SIS statute provides incentives for working together even if it has caused tensions because of the funding shift.
- ⊙ XU funds can't be used as the local match for TRIP transit projects. (XU funds are urban attributable funds that go to urbanized areas with greater than 200,000 populations.)
- ⊙ There are constraints on the federal side as to how airports can spend their money.
- ⊙ Providing more financial incentives for collaborating across modes is needed.

Are there legislative changes that would improve your ability to work together and create partnerships?

- ⊙ Sometimes it's better to leave the legislation alone as it might create problems.

- ⊙ Legislation is needed to encourage transit-oriented development.

Fostering Statewide and Regional Intermodal Coordination and Cooperation

What type of statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation has occurred across the modes?

- ⊙ This meeting is one example
- ⊙ ITS Coalition Group

What are the best opportunities for fostering statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation?

- ⊙ Regional visioning groups. Problem though is that even though they're looking at future residential development and how that affects the transportation system, they're not really looking at freight.
- ⊙ At meetings like these, it needs to become second nature for FDOT to invite DCA and DEP.
- ⊙ Need to identify where the problem is with intermodalism. Is it the hubs, the corridors, or the connectors? Need a problem statement.
- ⊙ Ports and state need to partner to find creative means to plan for and fund improvements outside the port gate. Need to bear in mind that not all ports have the same governing structure and financial capabilities. Many ports have operating deficits. Tampa is one of the few ports that has taxing authority and is doing well.
- ⊙ Should investigate use of interstate shoulders for use of transit.

Common and Individual Modal Visioning

Has your mode established a statewide or regional vision? If yes, how?

- ⊙ Seaports – yes. 14 seaports came together to create a statewide vision for Florida. The vision looks out 5 years.
- ⊙ Airports – yes. Each commercial airport has a master plan. So do many general aviation airports.
- ⊙ Florida Aviation System Plan puts all of the individual master plans together. There's a regionalized plan and a statewide plan. Looks out 20 years.
- ⊙ Spaceports – Wilbur Smith Associates did a 50-year plan for the spaceport.
- ⊙ Rail – FDOT does develop a rail plan. But you're dealing with 14 private rail companies. It's hard to get them to coordinate on a plan. The rail vision for Florida is basically driven by the 4 big rail companies (e.g. CSX) and may not match what's in the FDOT plan. About 5 years out is far as they want to plan.
- ⊙ Transit – LYNX has done a Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) of their routes.
- ⊙ Para-transit – TD Commission does a 20-year plan that is updated every 5 years. There are also local Transportation Disadvantaged Plan,
- ⊙ JTA is doing a long-term vision in cooperation with the MPO. Will go out 50 years.
- ⊙ FDOT is trying to develop a long-term freight plan.
- ⊙ FDOT is developing a passenger rail-visioning plan.

- ⊙ Turnpike has a 20-year master plan and is currently building a 50-year vision.
- ⊙ Expressway Authority has 25-year master plan.
- ⊙ Myregion.org is a 50-year vision.

How can individual modes work together to create a common inter modal vision?

- ⊙ OOCEA is cooperating with myregion.org. Other modes should get hooked into regional visioning efforts.
- ⊙ Orlando International Airport is involved with myregion.org too.
- ⊙ So is LYNX.
- ⊙ When looking at projects at the feasibility stage, should include the different modes to the discussion.
- ⊙ The Florida New Corridors Initiative.
- ⊙ The FTP and the Florida Intermodal System Plan would be another opportunity to reach out to the modes.
- ⊙ The MPOs is another venue for the modes to get involved.
- ⊙ FHWA needs to talk more with FAA.
- ⊙ Different district boundaries across state agencies make coordination difficult.

Project Identification & Prioritization:

What issues impede or present challenges to your ability to work together, across modes and local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?

- ⊙ FDOT did try to come up with a way to prioritize across modes, but it didn't go anywhere. Trying to prioritize across modes is apples and oranges.
- ⊙ Restrictions on funding make prioritizing across modes difficult.
- ⊙ Need data on where the problems are. Where is the intermodal problem?
- ⊙ Because local elected officials and MPO boards have so much pressure to address commuter needs, other multi-modal needs get second priority.
- ⊙ The whole land use/transportation disconnect is an impediment.

Financing and Funding

What finance and funding issues impede or present challenges to your ability to work together across modes?

- ⊙ At federal level, there are restrictions on how the money can be spent intermodally.
- ⊙ There are also restrictions on how those funds can be matched.
- ⊙ For transit, there is a financial disincentive to expand routes because if they do they're required to provide ADA paratransit service as well.
- ⊙ SIS funds can't be used to make improvements to the terminal building where improvements are needed to capacity.
- ⊙ Need more flexibility in what SIS can fund.

- ⊙ FDOT add funds to the new 5th year of the Work Program, but what a port or airport says they need in Year 5 will likely change before then because of market demands. Need flexibility to shift funds to different priorities.
- ⊙ SIS funds not allowed to be used to purchase land for other modes.

What finance and funding issues offer opportunities for working together (e.g., to create public/private partnerships for joint funding of intermodal projects)?

- ⊙ Need to look more into toll roads
- ⊙ Loans and bonds

Day Two, 9:15-11:30 (after completing Topics from Day One)

1. Can existing statewide programs (SIS, Future Corridors) provide opportunities for better modal cooperation?

- ⊙ These programs already have begun the dialogue.

2. What kinds of short and longer-range strategies could form the basis for moving forward together?

- ⊙ Need statewide and regional intermodal partnerships composed of representatives from the modes who have authority to make decisions and meet on a regular basis.
- ⊙ The SITAC was too formal. Needs to be more of an informal working group where these agencies can talk across the modes about their needs.
- ⊙ Maximize real time ITS technology to help the various modes to ship freight.
- ⊙ Need to improve the way ITS technology is used to deliver the information to users so that it can be used to make a decision about choice of mode, route, or time of travel. It doesn't do any good to have a message board on the road saying congestion ahead if you're already on the road and can't get off the road.
- ⊙ The various modes need to be involved at the feasibility study stage of new corridors.
- ⊙ Passenger and freight rail needs to be included in the New Corridor effort.
- ⊙ Need to redefine how we measure level of service. Right now we design roads to operate for the a.m. or p.m. peak. During the rest of the day that capacity sits under used.
- ⊙ Need to provide incentives to use roadways during the off peak hours (i.e. congestion pricing).
- ⊙ Need to examine the way we acquire right of way. Need to look at the restrictions on how soon you can acquire right of way.

2. RED GROUP SESSIONS NOTES

Facilitator: Rafael Montalvo, Note Taker: Paula Warmath

Who's here?

| Modes | Organization |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 7 – Airports | 9 – Local Government |
| 1 – Highway/ Transportation | 1 – MPO's |
| 7 – Intermodal | 2 – Local/Regional Transportation Agencies |
| 0 – Rail | 3 – FTC |
| 1 – Seaports | 2 – FDOT |
| 3 – Transit | 0 – FHWA |
| | 1 – Private Sector |
| | 2 – Other/ Association FIMIA |

Fostering Statewide and Regional Intermodal Coordination and Cooperation

What type of statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation has occurred across the modes?

- ⊙ Expressway Authority approached about need for more reliable fuel access. This has been looked at a number of times. Worked with OIA. A number of economic issues, fuel access, aircraft manufacturing, etc. As a result of discussion between OOCEA and airport, we are looking at a large study area down to airport and over to port Canaveral, fuel lines, heavy rail, passenger, major landowners, a very well rounded group addressing a multitude of issues.
- ⊙ Various agencies funding. An interesting partnership with D5, airport, seaport, D5 and discussions about funding. As a result, the people who can benefit from the study have been involved. This includes funding. Gives hope for future that everyone who can benefit will invest. The issue relates to highway corridor, freight, passengers, and the pipeline. We realized after hurricanes there is vulnerability. This started as a problem with access to fuel. Getting fuel is not subject to the Jones Act—in terms of shipping—gives us better access to fuel. This also impacts the cruise business. Everything between the coast and us.
- ⊙ OOCEA is working on a concept study identifying common grounds, challenges.
- ⊙ OOCEA shared some of the right of way issues. Emphasis on the spaceport. The port authority was increasing the fuel farm.
- ⊙ There was recognition that many different areas were impacted so we had to work together.
- ⊙ Question: Are MPO's inviting the modes to the table? This has been a problem. The business community has stepped up because the MPO's have not done this. The lack of understanding of the businesses has been a huge impediment. Progress needs to

accelerate. The private business community in this area has stepped up and taken the initiative.

- ⊙ The Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) has made a difference—for example, connecting seaport to I4. There wasn't a mechanism to do this in the past. The intermodal connectors tend to fall into "no man's land". Didn't look at the whole picture but the pieces. Must also look at rail. Jaxport and china trade is going to put a huge strain on the highway system. Let's (FDOT) look at CSX and see if there can be better rail connections. A difficulty is how often we don't know the other person's business, time, capital. The more that we work together we will be able to identify solutions.

What are the best opportunities for fostering statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation?

- ⊙ Airport expansion leads to need for rail expansion. This will take cooperation between transit and FDOT and others. When rail or other modes are planning, we're not always thinking of transit in our long-range plan.
- ⊙ OOCEA is a lead agency and currently in the process of negotiating funding arrangements. We're not ready to enter agreements—in the data collection phase at this time. There are strings attached to funding. Aviation or utilities commission will consider what benefit will they receive. We don't know yet without the study. It's important to maintain relationships—keep communication open. This is critical.
- ⊙ We must be forward thinking and use a team approach to achieve results.
- ⊙ Tampa Bay Partnership is working with FDOT and others. There is a bill pending. We need to be thinking about these issues now. Have major organizations involved in developing the solutions. We need the seaports, airports, and FDOT to make this work. The business community is very energized. This is another opportunity.
- ⊙ OOCA is currently working with Polk County.
- ⊙ CSX and other private companies—look at some larger cities that have their own mass transit systems. The purpose is to move people with less congestion—not profit motive.
- ⊙ For information on growth and regional development issues in Central Florida go to myregion.org. This is a website spearheaded by the chamber of commerce.
- ⊙ Jax has worked closely with FDOT and I10 was accelerated. Rail is in a "chicken and egg position". Won't bring rail in with the hope of attracting business. Other modes must be in place before rail will come in.
- ⊙ The MIC is a "world class" example of multi-modal because it brings in everything except something that floats. Question: Are seaports eligible for SIS?—is this the hub-to-hub thing? Transit is not on the SIS.
- ⊙ People are under the misconception that rail is the answer for everything. For freight, it needs to be long range.
- ⊙ FL Intermodal Association is an organization that is statewide. Fairly informal—meets on a regular basis in Tallahassee and is made up of industry leaders.
- ⊙ Transmission lines are missing from the different modes—fiber, utilities—which are critical. To the business community, that's what intermodal means—it would include transmission lines.
- ⊙ Environmental and development communities should be involved in these discussions.

Common and Individual Modal Visioning

Has your mode established a statewide or regional vision? If yes, how?

- ⊙ Florida Airports Council has the Florida Aviation System plan. The council meets every 4 months. The last system plan went out to 2025. We are required under fed guidelines to develop 20-year plan. Then get that into the state's initiative (work program).
- ⊙ Question: Is there a 50-year plan? For most airports, there is. For example, we considered if Tampa built out to maximum capacity how long would it take?—approximately 50 years.
- ⊙ These are individual airport plans. Then the state has a statewide plan. The Florida airport plan is one of the best.
- ⊙ Question: Is the Century Commission involved? Not yet.
- ⊙ The three major airports are all landlocked. There are concerns at 50 years with northward sprawl, the opportunities will push out. It may already be too late.
- ⊙ Question: Did any of the 50-year plans have contingency? Tampa International Airport (TIA) will show how they can tie into regional system. When someone builds that system, TIA will be ready to accept it.
- ⊙ In Jax, we are discussing a corridor to incorporate high-speed rail. So in 50 year plan there would be locations identified for rail.
- ⊙ In Orlando, high-speed rail and light rail—had north and south terminal plans. Have spent substantial resources. Rail is like a commuter airline. Economics of service dictates the outcome.
- ⊙ OCEA has a 20 yr plan. We would like to look farther but land use is an issue. Worked with state land planning group to determine what their plans for conservation and environmental protection were. State lands says they don't have a plan because if they did it would be public record and drive up the cost of r/w. There is uncertainty regarding land use and this has a big impact.

How can individual modes work together to create a common intermodal vision?

- ⊙ Private industry never fails to surprise us. For example, one of the major malls wanted transit out because it caused problems. Then it realized that its employees were using the system so it came forward with resources. Must come to the table ready to move forward and seize the opportunities.
- ⊙ Incompatible encroachment from an airport perspective. The best way to protect is to own it yourself. Just trying to protect outside of airport property—trying to get local ordinances regarding noise levels. Planning 3rd and then 4th runway in the next 40 years.
- ⊙ Non-compatible uses around the seaport. If someone takes an industrial property and wants to build a condo, then that's a problem. There is a seaport plan—larger issues.
- ⊙ For airports the problem is not just land immediately around and adjacent to the airport. Tall structures in the next county can cause a problem—for example, cell towers.
- ⊙ In transit in three mega counties—they didn't talk to each other years ago. Now they do. Don't have a complete common vision but working on it. How does everything fit together?—the common vision. Circumstances are pushing them that way.

- ⊙ The private sector is facilitating the process—across the state connector. The job market is driving the connection. The critical piece, when built, transit is most effective in avoiding traffic. If the airports have a place where transit can easily get in and out then that's a plus.
- ⊙ Security issue—better to check security on one bus than to have to check 10-20 separate vehicles—not to mention the environmental issues, energy consumption, etc.
- ⊙ Commuter rail transit is a viable option for OOCEA. Regional perspective will have an impact on them—both freight and passenger. Also, beefing up feeder bus to support the larger system.
- ⊙ Altamonte Springs used its power to issue development orders to get r/w for a circulator system.
- ⊙ I-Drive has been working for years to get a circulator system. All examples of regionalization.
- ⊙ Hard to see into the future. If we knew then what we know now we would have saved a lot of money.
- ⊙ Regional/SW vision—passenger and freight. Is it being looked at as integrated with other systems? Interesting thing about rail is it is private. They come to table with the best information that they have at the time. Then something happens that may change their investment picture. Government isn't agile enough to react. Two prongs: 1) good thing we have a stable work program; and 2) bad thing that we have a stable work program. That results in not being able to react to the public sector issues.
- ⊙ Opportunity for state to put together intermodal funding system—there are master plans in place but we need to get rail and trucks in. Airports are public/private entities. We gather the information then deal with FDOT but the rails don't have that structure.
- ⊙ Florida is a high growth state we have more demand/needs. We are an origination/destination state.
- ⊙ Transit doesn't make money. Third party or FDOT will have to bring dollars to get them to the table.
- ⊙ Question: Do rail companies come looking to increase business? OOCEA—once someone asked about it but it didn't go very far.
- ⊙ Institutionally there are very limited government institutions with intermodal.
- ⊙ The state doesn't have authority to make regional authorities. Must have regional authorities to make this work.
- ⊙ Tampa Bay has six MPO's. The business community needs things to happen faster. The size of the group takes time to make this happen.
- ⊙ It is critical that all modes interact.
- ⊙ Orlando Chamber of Commerce retreat—Lynx, FDOT there. Business community agenda. The community is looking at it together. It was good for all to teach each other about their business. Ad hoc community based forums. Tampa Bay and Orlando are talking routinely.
- ⊙ MPO alliance (5 MPOs) not funding agencies but must have their input. Get out and talk to all sides of market. If communication is strong enough, may not need RTA (Regional Transit Authority) to accomplish same things.

- ⊙ At the Florida Transportation Meeting in Jacksonville, Jaxport talked about Mitsui deal. Impacts highway by 800 trucks a day. Highway not at table for discussion.
- ⊙ Question: Does funding have to be dedicated to the project? Must identify issue clearly—fuel, transportation, etc. All come to table and address issues.
- ⊙ RTAs are not a panacea. Jax is an excellent case of how it didn't work. Everything under one government but found better to split JTA and airport and seaport apart.
- ⊙ There is not one method that could be effective. Doesn't necessarily have to be an RTA but somehow people have to get together and it must be the right people.
- ⊙ Must maintain balance of government authorities.
- ⊙ Don't want an intermodal RTA—too large
- ⊙ When three counties were grouped together, some counties got less money than before but made the decision to go with it because it was better for the group.
- ⊙ Different avenues that have emerged during the discussion are SIS, community based efforts, and issue/problem based approach, ad hoc groups, RTAs.
- ⊙ Florida Transportation Plan—why hasn't anyone mentioned? It's at a broader policy level. We were trying to work at more practical level.

Project Identification & Prioritization:

What issues impede or present challenges to your ability to work together, across modes and local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?

- ⊙ Impediments—difference between government and private sector. Ports and transit are governmental and have much greater input in MPOs. They also work frequently with FDOT. When the private sector, particularly rail is brought in, it becomes difficult to get rail involved.
- ⊙ There are various true intermodal needs. There are differences in types of freight. There are different needs for intermodal freight v. tourist transport. The rail element seems to be an outside element. Possible freight, bulk (fuel)—all coming in on trucks. Engaged a private group to do a pipeline but couldn't get over the Charlotte River because of environmental issues. Has to go over rail—this was the best way. But how do you bring them in—will need to subsidize.
- ⊙ Two issues—The state of Florida needs to be competing for national/international opportunities—manufacturing, maintenance, and airbus—looking for key components. A recent opportunity went to Biloxi. They need access to an airfield but it isn't the freight, it's bringing the large components in.
- ⊙ In Hillsborough Co. must go through MPO process but already fully funded—aviation fuel taxes, federal funding. Also, they do many projects that are not funded through these revenue sources. Funded through PFC, non-federal, non-state funds.
- ⊙ OOCEA—Priority-setting process for aviation has nothing to do with MPO prioritization process. D5 MPOs play no role in prioritizing those projects. The fact is they are just different processes. They don't interact.
- ⊙ Infighting when prioritizing. Just a reality. Must be dealt with.

- ⊙ Institutions exist for intermodalism—FDOT and MPOs—the bridge to be built is between government and private industry. May need to make them work better.

What are the opportunities for working together, across modes and local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?

- ⊙ 75%/25% split move funding SIS v. other arterials. Locals see this as FDOT taking away from local projects. Locals feel that money is being taken from them to fund the SIS.
- ⊙ Continue Public/Private Partnerships (P3)—example, beeline corridor in Orange County. Must use P3 to afford to fund.
- ⊙ P3—governmental entities running airports need to safeguard investment through leases and sharing with other users. When sharing with private companies, what happens when that private company decides to close, leave state, etc.—what assurance is there that the taxpayers are protected. CSX example given.
- ⊙ FDOT needs to look at direct connections between airport and roads not eligible for SIS—can't go from a hub to a hub.
- ⊙ 50 years from now, we need to work together on master plans and tie all elements together without money in mind. What do we need vs. what can we afford. Bring developers and environmental into the plan as well. Must do really big picture. Need to have the facts for all the different modes and growth to support position with the legislature.
- ⊙ Question: Whatever happened to the FL Intermodal Advisory Council? It was a statutory body. But don't know what happened to it. It did some work but don't know the outcome.
- ⊙ The council did some work that was put in the FL Transportation Plan but that is not a project level document—a program level document. Maybe time for “phase 2” for the council—implementation.

Financing and Funding

What finance and funding issues impede or present challenges to your ability to work together across modes?

- ⊙ Types of strings attached to types of funding. When accepting federal funding, maybe strings should include interacting with the other entities.
- ⊙ In this area, the aviation authority is an independent authority. The port authority has some relationship to the county commission—commissioners are their board.
- ⊙ TIA has ad valorem taxing authority up to \$90M/year. But doesn't use it.
- ⊙ Jax—city only has authority to approve the budget.
- ⊙ Daytona Beach aviation is an enterprise zone. Contracts with county for fire and police.
- ⊙ Question: What about other modes: Port of Tampa port authority is a separate district, the mayor serves on the board, the board is appointed by governor, two members must have maritime interests.
- ⊙ Hartline is not maxed out on its taxing authority.
- ⊙ Problem is trying to get more funding but locals haven't taken advantage of local option tax.

- ⊙ OOCEA has same problem. Sales generate more revenue than gas tax. That's why the local officials are averse to using the local option gas tax. Some take STP funds and certain percentages go to transit, IT, traffic ops, etc. but not enough.
- ⊙ The public perception is that transit must be subsidized. Most people don't know that roadways must be subsidized as well—there no free roads.
- ⊙ Intermodal center project—because it is a public/private partnership with air ship how much is it airport related v. community related? Who should be making the investment? There are competing facilities within your area. This is the constant struggle.
- ⊙ In Ft. Lauderdale commissioners are pushing them to work closer together. Need more integration between the departments. County is pushing for greater coordination.
- ⊙ Tampa—pipeline from port to aviation. Have bag check at port—between the port and air authorities only. Look for common interests.
- ⊙ Is it worth the cost? Because cruise traffic is seasonal, is it worth it to spend millions on a people mover when it will be used somewhat sporadically.
- ⊙ Funding—there are reasons there are separations between airports and seaports—no revenue diversion allowed per federal regulations.
- ⊙ Jax—the cost of administration by airport was much greater than the return. Airport was providing administrative support for other modes.
- ⊙ There is a lack of an intermodal capital program.
- ⊙ Jax—MPO (includes Duval County) says we are maxed out on the gas tax but when you bring in the surrounding counties, who's going to wield the power when making the decisions? Who has the lion's share in the pool when making the decision on the resources?

What finance and funding issues offer opportunities for working together (e.g., to create public/private partnerships for joint funding of intermodal projects)?

- ⊙ Wekiva Pkwy project—cost is not just associated with cost of facility. Worked in partnership with development and environmental communities. Environmental community wanted to hold lands for protection. FDOT has no authority to acquire except for road, not environmental protection. There is a movement to have about 50% of transportation dollars to be transferred to FDEP for environmental acquisitions. Also transferred development rights. Need to look at this and bring land acquisition group to the table.

Legislative Initiatives

Are there existing statutes that impede or present challenges to your ability to work together?

- ⊙ Local impediments mostly. Cities, counties, regional. Very parochial. TIA serves a five county region. Less than 42% are coming to Hillsborough County others are going to Pinellas County. Must get people from where they live to where they work in order for this to work. There is a local bill to create a regional transit authority in Tampa area. Transit (surface only). Has a lot of momentum.

- ⊙ Airports could not expend dollars off of their property. Needed to be able to do this to acquire airport access. Prevents airports from partnering. Airports need flexibility.
- ⊙ NY's JFK has done some of this with their train from the airport. Used airport funds. This was challenged but upheld.
- ⊙ Could be opportunities to provide funds to acquire r/w.
- ⊙ Concurrency applies to the airports but doesn't seem appropriate. No one is coming to Tampa just to come to the airport.
- ⊙ We should be able to provide r/w as long as it serves the airport.
- ⊙ Huge education process will be needed this year. Legislative term limits have caused great turnover. Constant reeducation process. Many new people on committees so it takes time to educate.
- ⊙ MPOAC—change statute on local option gas tax. Majority rather than supermajority should be required as the vote to oppose gas tax. Apply CPI (Consumer Price Index) to local option gas tax.

Are there legislative changes that would improve your ability to work together and create partnerships?

- ⊙ *See section above.*

Day Two, 9:15-11:30 (after completing Topics from Day One)

1. Can existing statewide programs (SIS, Future Corridors) provide opportunities for better modal cooperation?

- ⊙ Jax—more flexibility—on the emerging SIS areas there are restriction in SIS sites. The 50-mile rule. Flexibility to have second one. St. Johns port and commercial airport and Cecil Field to link together.
- ⊙ Need to include hub to hub. The hub markets are big and important and huge missed opportunities.
- ⊙ Need to have SITAC again in order to be truly strategic. To reach for the common goal. Opportunities to partner, the only way to know that they are available are with consistent discussion.
- ⊙ Lost momentum in the process of intermodal discussions. This will cause economic development to leave the state.
- ⊙ Must not let things fall off of the table. Do not lose momentum.
- ⊙ Need movement to intermodal by district, and interregional priorities need to be established. This should consist of routine meetings (quarterly) with FDOT included.
- ⊙ Investors should include development community, taxpayers, businesses, environmental community—more use of user fees, a more diversified investment background that reflects the users.

2. What kinds of short and longer-range strategies could form the basis for moving forward together?

- Intermodal commission--there is always an implementation (part 2) not just great ideas and policy but it be required to have implementation.
- Without statewide prioritization, we go back to our parochial politics. This ultimately leads to a disproportionate share of where the money is going.
- Make existing institutions work better together. They work very well singularly but it takes effort and practice to work together.
- What do we want Florida and the country to look like in 50 years? How do we do that? Look at the interstate system—planned 50 years ago. Imagine this state and the country without this system.
- Is transit on all of the MPOs? No, not all. Was in bill last year but didn't pass. Probably in this year's bill.

3. What are some practical next steps for each mode and for continuing the intermodal dialogue?

- ⊙ Do we ever get to the point where we are not just reacting to failed highway system/interchange—always in a maintenance mode? What is the plan? That is the impetus behind the New Corridor Initiative. Look at what we need, not what we can afford. All modes have a role in this process. Can't continue to be reactive. Tolls will be part of the solution.

- ⊙ What would a professional planner do with this? We are mostly operational types. But operations and planners need to be at the table.
- ⊙ We must be more proactive. Need to look at what we need and stop looking at the money.
- ⊙ Look at what we need. Prioritize. Develop business plan to determine how to pay for it. There are strategies that can be used to move funds where needed.
- ⊙ Does the national energy policy need to be brought into this issue? Yes, because there is a disconnect. There is no alternate energy source.
- ⊙ Public policy—wean off of fossil fuels. We may end up with transponders on our cars and we will be charged by the time of day that we are driving.
- ⊙ Toll facilities can charge higher fees for peak times.
- ⊙ Educate public/private sectors. They have different objectives. Need to be more integrated and understanding of each other's processes.
- ⊙ I-595 major transformation—much based on light rail discussions. County very involved but apparently not the airport.
- ⊙ TIA—involved in construction around its perimeter. Working very closely with FDOT.

3. PURPLE GROUP SESSIONS NOTES

Facilitator: Bob Jones, Note Taker: Brian Watts

Who's here?

| Modes | Organization |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 1 – Airports | 2 – Local Government |
| 4 – Highway/ Transportation | 1 – MPO's |
| 2 – Intermodal | 5 – Local/Regional Transportation Agencies |
| 1 – Rail | 1 – FTC |
| 1 – Seaports | 4 – FDOT |
| 3 – Transit | 0 – FHWA |
| | 3 – Private Sector |
| | 0 – Other |

Common and Individual Modal Visioning

Has your mode established a statewide or regional vision? If yes, how?

- ⊙ Central Florida. No. A lot of work done to bring things forward. Yes on a rail vision. Informally, myregion.org did lots of work for trans. Visioning. Outcome will be a vision by the end of the year.
- ⊙ Seaports. Florida Ports met last year recognizing need of shared vision. Shared efforts on funding with various groups for projects. Projects go through approval process. Ports in region met and concluded with a shared mission plan for ports and overall development within the state. Based on vision to 2016.

- ⊙ Air. Sophisticated vision and plan. Plans are very developed but not intermodal. Only within the fence line.
- ⊙ Rail. They are different. Not much advocacy for it. Amtrak has a vision. Not with each RR company. Efforts to develop a vision for high-speed rail. FDOT is developing a rail vision. Starting to get support from the state. Nothing on passenger visioning. Passenger mode is lacking.
- ⊙ Transit (Bay area). Lots of proposals but because funding is so focused, no one wants to pay for other communities. 10 years ago commissioner (Bay) tried but funding was not there on a regional level. No shortage of vision, but actions implementing the visions has not happened. Funding sources limit ability to develop vision and action.
- ⊙ Transit. No regional level activity. No local support for regional visioning. St. Lucie County transit tried now they need to act on it. MSTU service tax is available and is taken but Martin County has not come up with their side of funding. Implementation is difficult.
- ⊙ Transit (JTA) trying to develop regional effort and only one to the table on light rail is Duval County. Lots of studies, meetings, but no funding from locals/counties.
- ⊙ FDOT (John). The issue of dealing with the SIS is to understand that it is not a funding mechanism. SIS vision is to help with the transportation issues of a specific portion of transportation. SIS is for moving people (highways) and efficiently as possible.

How can individual modes work together to create a common intermodal vision?

- ⊙ Top issue is funding. All modes would like to see intermodal activity. Priorities relate for whom you work for and where you live. Local governments felt short-changed with funding when SIS and emerging sis came along.
- ⊙ Value of intermodal activity. How do modes compare/compete for funds? What is statewide significance of intermodalism?
- ⊙ Even though transit has had great growth, they're not getting a consistent share of funds. Different people get a different piece of the pie. We need equity in funding.
- ⊙ Modes must consider connectivity to highways/transit/other modes. We haven't communicated well between modes. Private companies transport people with shuttles and moving people. We need to have a meeting of modes. How are people arriving and leaving each mode. How do people connect to and from SIS? Connectivity needs to be considered and requires communications. This is critical.
- ⊙ There's no facility for transport from transit systems and meet at airports but not between other modes. If no new funding then there can be no expansion to connection to other modes. Incentives are needed for developing
- ⊙ FDOT developed a "Moving Broward" Collaborative. Combined studies and integrated work with modes. Seaport/airports integrated services to have transit for those with layovers for shopping, etc. Effort was to look at studies and determined any duplication of services. As the effort went forward, funding became available.
- ⊙ Regional Planning. Within Broward (Ports, transit) has close collaboration with MPO. On a regional basis there is a synergy between modes. On a regional basis they are able to plan together.

- ⊙ A need for advocacy. Funding is a problem when citizens supporting the vision. Geography and communities make it difficult to have a common vision. Average person doesn't understand issues and makes funding (tax money) difficult to come by.
- ⊙ Where does the real vision come from? Wherever it comes from, there should be ownership. If local level wants it, there must have some skin in the game.

Project Identification & Prioritization:

What issues impede or present challenges to your ability to work together, across modes and local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?

- ⊙ Orlando. It's down to the people – they love their cars. Even people coming from urban North. We need to get port freight to distribution centers easier. We need to educate/inform people and get them out of cars. HOVs are going away because people have free time in their car.
- ⊙ Most N.E. states people would love to have the commutes we have in Florida. People love their cars here and can go back to transit et al since that's what they had in the N.E.
- ⊙ We need to have the vision and the will to make it happen. Influxes of people to the state are the reason and the resource to make it happen.
- ⊙ Tools are needed to inform and engage the public. "Stop Growth" cheering was response to article. The pain has to be great enough to desire to change from what we have. People will eventually choose the least pain.
- ⊙ Transportation visioning, in general, like to stay within transportation. Mixed use zoning, sidewalks, etc. No collaboration with non-transportation orgs. Need to connect with zoning people and other areas.
- ⊙ Florida 10 Million. Visioning awhile back that couldn't support visioning with funding. SIS connects hubs, and then locals connect around hubs. We don't have the will so the Commission is on the right track in this intermodal visioning effort.

Day Two additional points

- ⊙ Mixed use settings you get them to the location but there are no facilities at the local level.
- ⊙ This is a way to place modes in a more competitive light.
- ⊙ Part of this could be that intermodal could get an extra boost in prioritization.
- ⊙ Sometimes when project details are looked into, big picture is not sometimes considered.
- ⊙ Land use is often overlooked. Developers often dictate high capacity transportation. FDOT does a good job with mobility but there is not urban focus at the begin/endpoints. Transit is often not in the mix.
- ⊙ Where is the bigger vision that shapes overall region's view?
- ⊙ If transit is adequately funded with good service then people will use the system.
- ⊙ At what point does SIS consider transit? How can we intertwine these two? How do we connect transit to other regions?
- ⊙ When such congestion levels are achieved, we must figure out how to get people off the roads and into alternative modes. We are at the point in some places that you can't build any more lanes. For transit gaps in urban areas, the tools are not there.

What are the opportunities for working together, across modes and local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?

- ⊙ Broward transit met with people in neighborhoods and brought the message to them. Public was shown/brought the message and worked with public to develop a light rail.
- ⊙ Everyone knows growth is coming. The best visioning processes focuses on the fact that growth is coming. People can be creative on how people coming here in the future will live. Which way is most beneficial to the people who live here now – likely not being the same as it is now.
- ⊙ P3. Integrating a park n Ride and affordable housing in U.S.1. This will re-develop the community and bring opportunity to area.

Day Two additional points

- ⊙ Transportation and land use needs to be tied together before any construction begins.
- ⊙ Airports serve regions bigger than local community it's in. Communities need to think regionally, cross-region impacts. Need to bring people together on a regional level and collective visioning.
- ⊙ Emerald Coast (four county and military) dynamics are different from other regions. Cross-region visioning is needed.
- ⊙ Parking spaces can be a way of encouraging transit. Limit parking in developments and commercial sites, and people may choose transit and other modes.
- ⊙ A vision defines success. If you're working towards a vision, then you start with the definition of success.

Financing and Funding

What finance and funding issues impede or present challenges to your ability to work together across modes?

- ⊙ Roads are always funded first. Demand is so much higher than resources available forcing people to drive because funds go to roads.
- ⊙ DRIs are reviewed at state level not locally.
- ⊙ Visioning process is rarely considering funding.
- ⊙ MPO. One of the challenges in getting funding together is that dollars are held in SIS system. Local communities had limited dollars and less likely to take regional approach when local needs are great. Generally transit competes with road projects. Getting modes to work together is difficult. Modes only work with themselves no thinking of transit or other modes in the planning and visioning. It all comes down to funding. Because SIS diminished funds to locals, nothing is there for funding.
- ⊙ CUTR. One of the challenges of selling a vision is misalignment of funding to projects. We are working (with increased costs) to keep the buying power in check. There's a lot of discussion about land use and pricing. If market doesn't track visioning, policies and funding don't follow along. People can buy-in to vision without economic reality.

Day Two additional points

- ⊙ Funding is carved up and sliced by modal silos. We need to change funding stream and consider cross modal impacts (operating costs). Impact of additional lanes versus other modal impacts.
- ⊙ Challenge is to evaluate benefits across modes.
- ⊙ History of decisions with modes doesn't suggest there were a lot of intermodal impacts. We need to think intermodally. Connections are needed.
- ⊙ Can the SIS (funding and projects) be successful where we don't pin hopes on technology to resolve congestion/mobility issues? Telecommuting won't be effective enough. We need an urban vision on how transit will connect within and across regions.
- ⊙ Vision of the public can be different from the vision of transportation authorities. How do you engage people into a realistic discussion? People perceive problems with commutes but don't know details and can't visualize practical solutions.
- ⊙ Better linkages will produce better values/products/services.

What finance and funding issues offer opportunities for working together (e.g., to create public/private partnerships for joint funding of intermodal projects)?

- ⊙ Commission started with corridors but told can't be done. Corridors are still moving forward. We can't start with cost or it won't be done.
- ⊙ If plans are made and vision is there, funding will happen. Someone has to come in and say where Florida will be in 50 years. Then figure out a way to make it work.
- ⊙ Buy and develop a little above our means. Have to get to what is important to the region and then come up with a plan to get there.
- ⊙ JTA is trying to approach developers along riverfront. Deal can be made for transit credits so they're not paying as much to FDOT and they're taking cars off the road.

Day Two additional points

- ⊙ Since transit can't pay for itself, what options are out there?
- ⊙ What about Public-Private Partnerships? The public pays either directly or through indirect means. Tolls versus tax revenues. It's perception.
- ⊙ It's difficult to understand transportation costs and difficult to compare across modes.
- ⊙ Auto modes have gas tax, parking, and maintenance. On transit fair only covers a small piece of trip. It is difficult to compare both modes. Economics and costs are radically different across modes. It's not easy to build a case for transit.
- ⊙ Economic development, out twenty years, amenities desired will be different in the future.
- ⊙ New generation still has the desire for autos. Next generation though may be looking toward dense, urban areas.

Legislative Initiatives

Are there existing statutes that impede or present challenges to your ability to work together?

- ⊙ Bay area. House and Senate bill talks about creating regional transit authority. 35 of 50 pages are about bonding authority. Bonds only work for those with positive revenue

streams. At some point there needs to be a sharing of funding for transit component. Argument is weak for transit.

Day Two additional points

- ⊙ Growth Management (DCA) has some control over some statewide visioning. Each district is autonomous. Various regions in Florida have different response to projects. There's a need for uniformity on processes. Legislative answer?
- ⊙ Growth Management planners come to the table with ideas. Where does transit fit? There is a need for comp. Plan support and guidance to have right components in comp. Plan.
- ⊙ Put in place ways to connect transit systems and development.
- ⊙ Only mechanism in transportation is when there is a congestion problem. Don't know how to put that into legislations. Local law is necessary.
- ⊙ From a practical standpoint, proposals to Mayors/legislatures, we can make our argument but we're an industry with a lone voice (airports).
- ⊙ We need to think land use and intermodal perspective in presenting collective projects for infrastructure needs. When land use is presented with two or more modalities, more consideration may be applied from authorities.
- ⊙ Linkage of land use and multi-modal transportation issues.
- ⊙ Easier for local officials to sell intermodal projects than single mode projects.
- ⊙ Developers tend to build just below DRI requirements. Multi-modes can increase density – giving them additional density credits if they consider gap housing.
- ⊙ When transit is considered, we need to be realistic in choosing modal choice. We need to look at efficiencies of intermodal systems. We still need sufficient modal capacity for a particular market. Let's substitute modes where there are efficiencies making sure transit function with good service. We need to lower cost of replaced modes when substituting.

Are there legislative changes that would improve your ability to work together and create partnerships?

Day Two additional points

- ⊙ At policy level, what legislative effort needs to be pushed? No systematic decision-making is going on statewide.
- ⊙ What role does the people side of mobility when costs and mobility are considered. We need a balance with good outcomes with multi-modal efforts. This is high-level. Economic impacts with efficiencies.
- ⊙ We need to put case studies in front of us to look at intermodal successes and intermodal collaboration.
- ⊙ Much of the ports, airports were established long before residential communities and commercial development. Expansion of these facilities is difficult. Lots of silo visioning goes on but not much intermodal visioning.
- ⊙ Until people are forced to go on transit, it won't happen. It won't be put into legislation.
- ⊙ Lots of funding comes from Ad Valorem. Caps on spending and funding may be coming in this upcoming session.

Fostering Statewide and Regional Intermodal Coordination and Cooperation

What type of statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation has occurred across the modes?

Day Two points

- ⊙ Port of Miami is good example of multi-modal cooperation. Ship containers to trucks, then much of it goes on trains.
- ⊙ In Broward, there is one transit express route into Golden Glades and connects the whole county. Bus transit in Broward connects to Tri-rail. This works rather well. There is also a project developing to connect transit to the airport.

What are the best opportunities for fostering statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation?

- ⊙ Public-Private partnerships. You can give infrastructure folks development rights and incentives are there to build the projects. Private enterprise can also get tax credits for development and infrastructure.
- ⊙ Growth is coming. We need a push for leadership and policy. Creative solutions are possible. Opportunities are there for funding solutions.
- ⊙ Public information and education. Article in Jax paper. With large growth (map) in paper it informs people on what growth is like and will be. It gets the public's attention. Can be a powerful attention grabber.

1. Can existing statewide programs (SIS, Future Corridors) provide opportunities for better modal cooperation?

- ⊙ We need to work with the decision-making process we have. This makes it difficult to re-develop exiting corridors. Longer term visioning is important so new corridor development needs linkage between SIS, corridor development, and local government.
- ⊙ At some point the modes need to talk to each other. SIS can play a key part in bringing together intermodal solutions. This can include transit. There may not be limits in SIS funding to use SIS funds for transit solutions at end-points.
- ⊙ At some point there needs to be a system balance and the locals are not participating in the modal/SIS projects. We've drawn boundaries but sound intermodal planning and resources are needed.
- ⊙ FDOT focuses on moving from region to region. Not much attention paid to intermodal issues when urban areas are considered. There is no legislation on ensuring impacts on urban modal options are considered. Nothing on context sensitive design is in legislation.

2. What kinds of short and longer-range strategies could form the basis for moving forward together?

- ⊙ A taxing authority can put together an intermodal project and think in terms of big picture. This can bring money to the table and get things done on a regional level.
- ⊙ As long as local government makes decisions on local development, state system will be congested. Locals then look to State to fix congestion on major arterials.
- ⊙ Congestion is limited in many areas to certain times of the day. Infrastructure can accommodate this (reversible lanes). Where can we eliminate congestion? Telecommuting? This works across age groups, and in all areas. Put incentives in place for working at home. This can be a part of an overall solution.
- ⊙ DRIs/developers in statute there's not much there. There needs to be transit incentives and more intermodal incentives. Re-work statute to consider intermodal approach. This can be effective.
- ⊙ More emphasis involving the users (manufacturers, retail outlets) on getting private sector involvement rather than associations in visioning process.
- ⊙ Bicycle/pedestrian mode often is over looked.
- ⊙ 10 cents gas tax? Increases in gas prices were accepted why not a gas taxes increase?

4. ORANGE GROUP SESSIONS NOTES

Facilitator: Kathy Neill, Note Taker: Dave Hutchinson

Who's Here?

| Modes | Organization |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2 – Airports | 2 – Local Government |
| 0 – Highway/ Transportation | 1 – MPO's |
| 8 – Intermodal | 1 – Local/Regional Transportation Agencies |
| 2 – Rail | 2 – FTC |
| 1 – Seaports | 4 – FDOT |
| 3 – Transit | .5 – FHWA |
| | 2 – Private Sector |
| | 0 – Other |

Financing and Funding

Draft summary bullets:

- Need more flexibility (at state/federal levels) to spend transportation funds as needed (e.g., beyond highway solutions). For example, federal funding “silos” and restrictions/requirements impede the development of intermodal solutions.
- Need to be creative about leveraging funds needed for intermodal transportation solutions (e.g., not enough gas tax dollars to address needs).
- Examples cited of creative intermodal cooperation and innovative finance to address intermodal solutions were identified (e.g., Miami Intermodal Center, seaport lease arrangements to finance improvements).

- Regional visions can identify modal solutions to support how the region wants to grow, which should drive how DOT funding decisions are made and help to leverage private sector funding.

What finance and funding issues impede or present challenges to your ability to work together across modes?

- ⊙ General aviation airports cannot generate funds -- the challenge is funding infrastructure, being able to meet concurrency requirements—doesn't have funds to build roads need to support the impact on on-site airport improvements
- ⊙ No “transportation” fund. There are “silos” with different requirements/restrictions for particular mode.
- ⊙ For transit: Fed government requires dedicated funded source, local share, and ability to show 20 years operations. However, no regional dedicated funding sources, even local funding sources may be difficult to document. Example, it took 5 years to get three counties MPOs in south Florida to develop a regional priority list to document support for regional transit needs — also, local counties may not cooperate on regional needs.
- ⊙ For the Federal New Starts Program, you must have a finance plan; the state new start funds require funding but dedicated funding sources are extraordinarily challenging to obtain
- ⊙ Federal New Starts requirements are too challenging—they can require that PD&E can go to 90 percent design
- ⊙ We (modes) are all competing for limited dollars
- ⊙ We are not creative enough—expecting gas tax to solve problem, must be willing to consider toll roads. We have to get past local issues, such as concurrency, to get to federal dollars—must use impact fees, create incentives such as higher density
- ⊙ FDOT cannot get advance ROW acquisition (local cooperation needed for this)
- ⊙ Issue in SE Florida way funds are divided among the districts, FDOT cannot afford to build highways in SE Florida, but cannot move all the funds to other modes—is the state ready to get out of the building highways mode?
- ⊙ We need to look for non-highway solution in urbanized areas
- ⊙ Need more flexibility to spends funds as needed
- ⊙ Private sector feels Government takes too long, decisions needed in 6 months, not two years
- ⊙ Bridge over Amelia River had been hit and damaged, railroad cannot afford to replace bridge, Coast Guard had no funds
- ⊙ Focus on SIS takes away opportunity for transit, which usually has a more local orientation
- ⊙ MPOs always question District equity—urban areas feel they are not getting a fair share.
- ⊙ Would industry like to get control of growth management funds out of FDOT?
- ⊙ Transit would like a bang for buck approach to moving people—measure commuter rail versus cost of a lane mile.
- ⊙ Privatization is not necessarily the answer—DOT's follow rules, having good rules is important

What finance and funding issues offer opportunities for working together (e.g., to create public/private partnerships for joint funding of intermodal projects)?

- ⊙ Example cited of public/private of intermodal projects
- ⊙ Silos—certain portion of funds are allocated to specific modes, not making intermodal tradeoffs is a problem. Canada uses one pot of funds for a region or municipality for transportation, then they examine what can best be done to use available funds. However, Canada would appreciate having a dedicated funding source for transportation.
- ⊙ Feds presume flexibility (flex funds to transit)—ability to flex funds is there, need will and leadership at state and local levels to actual use this flexibility. 80/20 highway/transit is not set in stone
- ⊙ Miami has done a good job with Transit Oriented Developments (TODs)—great opportunities for developing intermodal transportation solutions
- ⊙ TOD requires much higher density, use of air rights
- ⊙ Opportunity—FL statute provides for 15 percent minimum of gas tax be used for public transportation (in other states, gas tax can only be used for highway improvements)
- ⊙ Besides TODs, other PPP opportunities, especially with regards to new corridors?
 - Ft Lauderdale had 2020 intermodal vision in its airport long range plan (e.g., Sunport). Sunport is under development, which ties in ports, airport, transit, and rail.
 - Seaports have PP relationships through lease arrangements
 - Miami intermodal center is under construction—was an innovative way to make something happen, rental car agencies helping fund People Mover
 - 90 percent of people at DOT working on highways, local governments want to take care of highways first
- ⊙ Transportation component of regional visions provide an opportunity for modes to shift mode split—modes need regional visions, that can help drive how DOT makes funding decisions and leverage private sector funding—linking transportation to how regional wants to grow versus mode driven
- ⊙ Take the politics out of it
- ⊙ DOT did a good job of getting input from the modes on the needs for the SIS, especially from SITAC

Legislative Initiatives

Draft summary bullets:

- Need to provide more federal flexibility on use on use of federal transportation funds to allow intermodal solutions.
- Need to create financial incentives for intermodal cooperation (e.g., state priority setting) that reward projects that tie in multiple transportation modes.
- Regional transportation entities need to have the ability to raise funds (e.g., tax sources independent of working through the counties).

- For regional corridors/transportation solutions, should projects pre-exempt or get regulatory relief from local control.
- Need to ensure that local comp plan changes regarding land use around transportation hubs (e.g., restrictions passed to preserve industrial land around ports and airports are maintained)

Are there existing statutes that impede or present challenges to your ability to work together?

- ⊙ Federal funding silos—“color of the money,” restrictions within funds (e.g., federal aviation funds can’t be used off airport property even though airports need good highway access)
- ⊙ Need to get aviation community to open up to regional cooperation (e.g., general aviation serving as a reliever to larger international airports)
- ⊙ Same is true in truck and rail projects—rail can’t get funds out of highway fund
- ⊙ Why do we need to have so many MPOs? MPOs should consolidate if we are talking about regional visioning?
- ⊙ We need to eliminate bureaucratic layers, examine increasing or reducing powers of MPOs
- ⊙ Any chance of NEPA streamlining for demonstration projects? Yes, this is being considered for the federal multi-state corridor initiative.
- ⊙ Timeframes for funds don’t always match
- ⊙ Too many requests for available federal funds
- ⊙ Regarding land use—are local land use restrictions impediments to transportation development
- ⊙ Land use restrictions are not the issue (e.g., if seaport master plans are incorporated in the local comp plans, then improvements are exempted from DRI reviews). However, local comp plan changes regarding surrounding land use issues are big issues for seaports (e.g., restrictions passed to preserve industrial land, but were not implemented).

Are there legislative changes that would improve your ability to work together and create partnerships?

- ⊙ Need to reward initiatives that tie in multiple modes
- ⊙ Good transit helps highways
- ⊙ Encourage intermodal cooperation with financial incentives
- ⊙ General aviation airports need to be viewed as a way to add capacity to system
- ⊙ Proposed federal funding aviation changes could have negative implications for general aviation, very light jet possibilities to serve as reliever for commercial aviation airports and other mode
- ⊙ In FL, only counties can impose certain taxes—no regional authorities have that authority—need to be able to go out to the voters versus going through counties
- ⊙ State should consider a higher authority for regional or statewide significant
- ⊙ Reward system for local governments for allowing higher density for transit/rail—no higher density, no transit/rail stop

- ⊙ Local government—for example, often stops regional authorities turning a roadway lane into bus only lane.
- ⊙ Should regional projects be exempt or get regulatory relief from local control? Perhaps regional or state control in these corridors? These issues are evolving. Regional solutions require regional authority
- ⊙ Statewide thinking is needed for new corridors—you can't design a system for each community
- ⊙ State of Illinois and Chicago metro area consolidated land use and transportation decision-making. We need better integration of land use and transportation decisions.

Fostering Statewide and Regional Intermodal Coordination and Cooperation

Draft summary bullets:

- Numerous examples of statewide/regional intermodal cooperation were cited (e.g., Central Florida Commuter Rail project, Florida Inland Ports study, Miami Intermodal Center).
- Tie transportation funding decisions to intermodal cooperation and coordination (e.g., should be part of the SIS funding criteria, Future Corridors Program).

What type of statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation has occurred across the modes? Numerous examples were cited:

- ⊙ Central Fl Commuter Rail Project (CSX, FDOT, agreement enhances freight capacity of parallel corridor in order to accommodate passengers)
- ⊙ MPOs did come together (finally) to prioritize regional project in SE Florida with plans in place
- ⊙ Regional fare cards
- ⊙ Transit has regional dispatch contract in Orlando
- ⊙ Miami Intermodal Center, connections to airport, between rental car companies and intermodal center, involves numerous parties, went to US DOT as a united group
- ⊙ Florida Inland Ports study
- ⊙ Mitsui in Jacksonville

What are the best opportunities for fostering statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation?

- ⊙ When cooperation and coordination is tied to money (funding)
- ⊙ SIS provides opportunities to tie benefits to multiple modes
- ⊙ Make this a part of SIS funding criteria
- ⊙ Future corridors funding will be influenced by regional support and modal partner support
- ⊙ Giving intermodal projects special dispensation from permitting, regulatory relief for regionally significant projects

- ⊙ Airports and seaports do get relief (exempt from DRI process) if they have a master plan that is part of local comp plan

Common and Individual Modal Visioning

Draft summary bullets:

- Florida Seaports have developed “2016 Vision of Success” to develop a common vision of success working with partners.
- Other statewide plans for transit and airports were recognized as mechanisms for identifying a common, statewide modal vision within the context of Florida Transportation Plan.
- Likewise numerous examples of regional modal cooperation were cited that developed outside a formal visioning process (e.g., transit).
- While airports, seaports, railroads, and transit agencies can be competitors for funding, these entities can work cooperatively regarding common, shared issues/concerns and provided an effective coalition for statutory changes and for proposed funding projects.

Has your mode established a statewide or regional vision? If yes, how?

- ⊙ Seaports-yes, master planning process, ports are growing fast yet funds are not growing but shrinking. It was the right thing to do; ports recognized need to plan, look for economies of scale, Ports Council facilitated a look at how the statewide system of ports operated. First step was ports are deciding how they want to grow; next they will work with statewide visioning activities.
- ⊙ Transit-primarily locally owned and operated. In 1998 was Transit 2020 was adopted, it still good and now integrated as part of the 2025 Florida Transportation Plan. The transit community was very involved in FTP, and wants to integrate transit into overall transportation system planning.
- ⊙ MPO Chairs County Council is a mechanism in Tampa region ”we are finally getting together” worked
- ⊙ Aviation Authority in Tampa/Hillsborough worked on transit center—may not be visioning, but progress is being made. We used to be very suspicious of one another and now realize we need to work together—MPO need to be involved in new regional transportation authority.
- ⊙ Airports—share ideas and cooperate through SEAFast, but generally compete with other airports.
- ⊙ Airports-find common issues, legislative issues. Work with Florida Airports Council.
- ⊙ Business leaders in three communities came together first in SE Florida, then leaders came together, then regional authority was formed. Examples-bus acquisition, bus testing, etc. lots of support from FDOT, results include economies, savings.
- ⊙ Mobility of freight can bring many modes to the table—as all modes are involved.
- ⊙ Passengers can also be a common factor.

Project Identification & Prioritization:

Draft summary bullets:

- Impediments or challenges include:
 - Lack of measures to rank multiple modes against each other.
 - Lack of a methodology to evaluate modal trade-offs.
- MPOs and the public overall do not recognize the importance of other modes for moving people and freight. Perhaps the law should be changed about MPO membership to include more modes on the Board.

What issues impede or present challenges to your ability to work together, across modes and local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?

- ⊙ There is lack of understanding among the general public of how modal projects benefit the public at large and other modes. Modes are not ranked against each other. Lack of standard methodology for ranking multiple modes against each other.
- ⊙ Need to incorporate better information in ranking processes.
- ⊙ Lack of acceptable methodology to do modal trade-offs makes it hard to do modal trade-offs. Purpose of project may not be the focus (moving people or goods). Silo issue again.
- ⊙ SIS criteria are an impediment (for example, berths and cranes for getting containers onto trucks are not eligible. Five-year time frame locks it in—eligibility won't be considered for five years -- work program is not flexible to address the more immediate business needs of ports.
- ⊙ Airports are perceived as not something good—noise, indirect benefits are not recognized
- ⊙ Smaller airports are not fully staffed, so are not able to participate in the MPO/local government planning process. Planners at larger airports understand the process; director of smaller general aviation airports may not understand importance of process. People don't see general aviation airports as part of transportation system as a means of moving people and goods
- ⊙ Small airports- small staff, director plus maintenance and operations no time or training to monitor local comp plan amendments,
- ⊙ Lack of measures to rank multiple modes against each other. Lack of a methodology to evaluate modal trade-offs.
- ⊙ MPOs and the public overall do not recognize the importance of other modes for moving people and freight. Perhaps the law should be changed about MPO membership to include more modes on the Board.

What are the opportunities for working together, across modes and local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?

- ⊙ In urban areas, membership of MPOs is critical. Have not included all modes, or not all modes have participated in the process. Need broader inclusion of various modes in MPO process, perhaps include industry representatives
- ⊙ MPOs do not want to dilute local power through forming regional MPOs.

- ⊙ Example in Tampa—Chair Coordinating Council has been effective in last few years; Broward, Dade, Palm Beach have less success in working regionally—some success regarding rail in recent years.
- ⊙ SE Florida has 3 MPOs, regional body, regional transportation authority which focuses on moving buses and trains.
- ⊙ Need political incentives to work together
- ⊙ DOT needs to be aware of and accepting of regional visions. MPO process focuses on highways—ports and airports are not part of regional transportation authorities, RTA
- ⊙ Top down approach needed to reform the system to plan for all modes.
- ⊙ Structural changes needed and must be mandated to include modes, yet public does not want expanded airports, rail facilities.
- ⊙ Education on value of modal investments needed.

Day Two, 9:15-11:30 (after completing Topics from Day One)

1. Can existing statewide programs (SIS, Future Corridors) provide opportunities for better modal cooperation?

Draft summary bullets:

- Funding criteria needs to give priority to projects that have support across modes
- Future corridor programs allows for identification of the best solutions for a corridor, and allows for preservation of future multi-modal options even if not practical right now

2-13-07 Participants Comments

- ⊙ Yes
- ⊙ First projects need to demonstrate most regional and intermodal cooperation—ranking system needs to show multi-modal approach to funding
- ⊙ Future corridors are opportunity to identify need first, then which mode; include capacity for alternate modes in planning and design, include smaller non-SIS facilities as reliever facilities (DayJet plans, how is the state supporting this effort)
- ⊙ Make sure programs clearly give weight to projects that have support across modes
- ⊙ Future corridor initiatives offers opportunity to address alternate modes, foster regional and interlocal cooperation
- ⊙ Seamless connectivity is an SIS goal; intermodal connectors are key component of SIS. For example, the Tri-Rail connection to the Miami Intermodal Center: the original plans did not include connectivity between the two. The State intervened and mandated the connection. The county wanted to maintain local control—they had heavy rail and addressed this connectivity, they did not control commuter rail and didn't care about this connectivity. Top down approach was needed.
- ⊙ Parochial issues killed high-speed rail in Orlando, (in-fighting among Disney, Universal). Message leaving FL to DC was that locals did not have their act together. The State must demonstrate leadership, so right message goes to Washington that locals have their act together.

2. What kinds of short and longer-range strategies could form the basis for moving forward together?

Draft summary bullets:

- This is a great start and the discussion should be continued
- RTAs are funded by local governments, which sometimes create impediments to intermodal solutions. We need to think about potential long-term solutions; for example:
 - FDOT needs to continue to serve in a leadership role to encourage counties to cooperate in multi-modal solutions
 - Giving RTAs taxing authority

- We need to continue to change the mindset in the planning process to focus on multi-modal not just highway solutions. This is particularly important at the MPO and local government level, as their priority lists drive District funding decisions

2-13-07 Participants Comments

- ⊙ This Meeting of the Modes is a great start
- ⊙ State needs to leverage its funds to ensure and encourage local cooperation
- ⊙ Funding is DOT's big stick or carrot
- ⊙ FDOT cannot use the stick-it does not work; if you don't have local buy-in, forget it
- ⊙ If we want to move forward, RTA's must have ability to raise taxes, put referendums on ballot, etc. versus always going back to counties, annual funding for transit
- ⊙ Perhaps include fees for intermodal improvements e.g., vehicle registration fee for transit
- ⊙ Suggestion: Use turnpike revenues to fund transit systems
- ⊙ Information on long range goals of modes is incorporated into FTP which is supposed to guide us all
- ⊙ SIS needs list is geared to be a statewide list covering all modes
- ⊙ FDOT has moved towards integrating planning and public transportation; there is still the silo effect as the system could still be better
- ⊙ As solution to gas tax revenue problem is addressed, will overall transportation investment policies be addressed? Getting highway side more money could lead to overall change and best transportation solutions coming forward that benefit all modes.
- ⊙ FDOT is transitioning towards transit, best approach is to look for best alternative and put funds there, whatever the mode
- ⊙ Decisions must be driven by something other than a formula
- ⊙ Make sure new federal legislation must address these issues based on best solutions for regional needs.
- ⊙ New pot of money is needed—special statewide tax for intermodal projects
- ⊙ Planning horizon varies by mode
 - Seaports 5 years, market driven, challenge
 - Airports 10 years
 - Transit-locally driven, Transit Development Plan going recently went from 5 year to 10 year
 - Rail-private sector info
 - Highways, 20-30 years
- ⊙ DOT needs urban policy and rural/suburban policy versus one size fits all; MPO's provide legislative recommendations each year. Rural areas have more resources per person than urban areas.
- ⊙ Ex. D7, D5 may need internal (FDOT) structure needs mindset with less institutional commitment to taking care of highways
- ⊙ Does MPO priorities accordingly? (Transit versus highways).
- ⊙ MPO's set the direction, FDOT takes lead from MPO's. Mindset change must occur throughout transportation planning levels (local, MPOs)
- ⊙ Without new funds, we have a zero sum game...taking \$\$ for transit takes \$\$ from highways
- ⊙ Decisions are made in urbanized areas—locals have great authority regarding priorities

- ⊙ FTP level—rural groups participate to protect their interests, they think the urbanized areas get more \$\$
 - ⊙ Regional visions as to how an area wants to grow. Regional perspective is critical –it worked very well in hurricane response, emergency situations allowed FDOT to step and in make decisions as to where resources should go.
 - ⊙ Ex—I-595 elevated lanes; floating highway lanes in Miami will allow rail in existing ROW. Local commitment required.
 - ⊙ FDOT can facilitate and serve as a forum for long term solutions
 - ⊙ Sometimes FDOT needs to just make the right decision versus allowing local politics to drive decisions
 - ⊙ There is a strong relationship to local growth and land use decisions. Are local governments really planning for growth
- 3. What are some practical next steps for each mode and for continuing the intermodal dialogue?**

Draft summary bullets:

- State needs to preserve investment in existing infrastructure (general aviation airports), and have a continuing dialogue about options for new funding for multi-modal options (e.g. PPP's, bonding and other options)
- The FTC should continue to have a role in convening the modes to address various issues such as:
 - Integrating modal plans,
 - Creating financial incentives to encourage intermodal cooperation, and
 - Providing a forum for ongoing communication and mutual understanding of issues

2-13-07 Participants Comments

- ⊙ Commission can continue to make this convening of the modes a priority, identify means for bringing modes together for decision making to address issues such as:
 - Incentives for intermodal planning are needed
 - As modes develop their plans, they need to take an intermodal approach (e.g., transit agencies need to be aware of what airports and rail modes are doing)
 - Requirement versus incentive? Attach having an intermodal plan to funding decisions
 - Ongoing project of commission can be to recommend and advocate integration of modal plans
 - Industry prefers dialogue versus legislative mandate
- ⊙ Group supports legislature empowering FTC to pursue intermodal dialogue and development of financial incentives and other creative solutions
- ⊙ Funding will still need to be dedicated to existing infrastructure
- ⊙ New funding sources needed to fund intermodal priorities—how could be subject of future meetings
- ⊙ Expand State Infrastructure bank?

- ⊙ Authority to bond needs to include revenue source to bond against— legislation could address this
- ⊙ I-595 an example of leveraging funds, creating intermodal public/private partnerships
- ⊙ Fees at ports need to be nationwide, versus just local or ships will go to another port--
- ⊙ Emerging markets need to be included in the dialogue
- ⊙ We have to have flexibility in plans to respond to market opportunities, decisions by markets
- ⊙ The public must be comfortable with process protecting public interest
- ⊙ The issue needs to be addressed as an emergency, requires outside the box thinking, and may need a review of the rules and regulations

5. BLUE GROUP SESSIONS NOTES

Facilitator: Hal Beardall, Note Taker: Christie Holland

Who's Here?

| Modes | Organization |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 3 – Airports | 3 – Local Government |
| 2 – Highway/ Transportation | 1 – MPO's |
| 5 – Intermodal | 1 – Local/Regional Transportation Agencies |
| 2 – Rail | 4 – FTC |
| 3 – Seaports | 2 – FDOT |
| 3 – Transit | 0 – FHWA |
| | 3 – Private Sector |
| | 2 – Other/ Trade Association |
| | 1 – Other/ Transportation Consultation |

Project Identification & Prioritization:

Project Identification & Prioritization Summary Bullets:

What issues impede or present challenges to your ability to work together, across modes and with local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?

- ⊙ A lack of common measures makes it difficult to evaluate and prioritize projects across the modes
- ⊙ Intermodal projects are impeded by government regulation and limits on the use of funding. Inefficiency of government
- ⊙ The difference between state and private planning horizons is a major challenge

What are the opportunities for working together, across modes and local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?

- ⊙ Important to have a common vision on where we want to go as a state
- ⊙ In the future we need to look to the private side and user fees
- ⊙ We need to position ourselves to get the Cuban trade

2-12/13-07 Participant Comments

What issues impede or present challenges to your ability to work together, across modes and with local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?

- ⊙ Since implementation of SIS it is difficult to measure prioritization projects across the modes. There are no common measures. It is difficult to spend money in a fair and equitable manner.
- ⊙ So little money. It is such a competitive environment because all the modes need funding their respective stovepipe. Each mode focuses within their own silo and on their own mission and forget to coordinate and work as teams
- ⊙ You have to look at the intermodal transportation system as a whole when you are talking about moving people. We need to consider out of state impacts too. Population centers in other parts of the state are fighting over limited resources. You need broad-brush strokes when it comes to building a plan that can work for all. Need to develop a plan with regard to having a tax base to fund the system
- ⊙ Government regulation hinders working across modes, for example a project in Miami to create a viaduct for cargo. The FAA said the projects were not appropriate use of airport revenues. We lost two years fighting FAA while construction costs were escalating. The FAA focuses on protecting airport revenues for good reasons, but it sometime impedes us from moving forward with good intermodal projects.
- ⊙ Fuel taxes go into Transportation Trust Fund, but distrust results from too many diversions into the general fund. Trucking pays a heavy vehicle use tax of \$550 but it then goes to general fund
- ⊙ Challenges with the SIS are the same today as the first day. Where are we going to get the money? Do we have a financial plan to build what we want? Where we went wrong as a state was having all the modes the table looking only from their own narrow needs. Is this really strategic? Small communities are now beginning to think regionally. Expectations were very high that there would be a pot of money for the SIS. Unless we have a financial plan together to leverage state, federal and local money. We need to put together a true financial plan with partners who are really committed. We will only build what we have funding for.
- ⊙ SIS is to comprehensive and not strategic enough
- ⊙ At the state level we made huge strides forward to allow the SIS conversations to happen at all. There has to be a forum to start the conversation
- ⊙ The federal funding is not there. The various funding sources are very restrictive on how the funds can be used, causing gaps in the system.

- ⊙ We, as a state, need to be one voice to say we need flexibility to have a seamless transportation system to move people and goods
- ⊙ The difference between the state (5 years) and private planning horizons (2 years) is a big challenge
- ⊙ DOT uses rigid formulas in the planning processes which do not create an environment to build what you need to build when you need it
- ⊙ Condemnation of land is one of the biggest problems. We need to move mass quantities of people
- ⊙ PPP (public private partnerships) are not active enough
- ⊙ Challenges include private economics vs. competition. State funding sources don't concern themselves with competition. Confidentiality is also an issue for the private sector. Government regulations hinder projects. Private sector has to have the ability to match.
- ⊙ Need to think about equipment needed to move goods, not just infrastructure. For example the orange express was a short train experiment, which would have worked with different type of equipment.
- ⊙ Private sector is really underrepresented at this forum. These forums are more public sector talking to public sector
- ⊙ If you had funding set aside for public private partnership matching program so the private sector could know it is available earlier.
- ⊙ Difficult getting key connections, which need to be made. The MIC is a cooperative effort with the airport, highways, and rail line. Roughly two dozen forms of revenues to get federal funding for the people mover
- ⊙ Port of Miami Terminal has \$1 billion on table. The project is ready to go. It is there environmentally and ready to go. It involves seaport, airport and public sector and each is willing to move forward
- ⊙ A common vision is important. Whatever it takes to alleviate congestion should be the unified theme
- ⊙ Prime example is the FSTED program. The funding is there, they have a strategic 5-year plan, and they then build it.
- ⊙ MIC and POMT were concepts which started 20 years ago. The community is the impediment that we have got to over come. Trying to back pedal and respond to market conditions we could see, however local government and developers have a way of pushing transportation projects away costing millions in lost time and increased costs
- ⊙ Both airports and seaports succumb to state and federal requirements for security. The ports had the identification badge worked out before, now have to spend millions due to bureaucracy
- ⊙ Inefficiency of government
- ⊙ What have we learned over the past 20 years that we can use to get over the hurdles to the new corridors?
- ⊙ Insistence by the planning community (both local and state levels) that modes, other than roads, are merely traffic generators, not part of the transportation system. This is especially true relative to concurrency and impact fees.
- ⊙ Being able to operate globally within existing local governance structure.

- ⊙ Inefficient burdens placed on business by the policies of governments within our state

What are the opportunities for working together, across modes and local governments/MPOs, to identify and prioritize intermodal projects?

- ⊙ We talk about the shortage of state and federal funding. Does anyone think the funds are going to be there? The future needs to be focused more on the private side and user fees.
- ⊙ We need to appreciate the efficiency of the current transportation system. The system is so efficient that the cost of water bottled nearby is almost the same as water imported from New York or even Italy.
- ⊙ We, as Florida, need to get together with the other donor states and fix the inequality of federal funding
- ⊙ There is no trust in the trust fund. Lets spend the money we have in a good way
- ⊙ There are over 50 total National corridors of significance. In Florida the only one we had was High Speed Rail. Now we have the I-95 corridor designated so we have a suitcase we can tap into in Washington
- ⊙ Need to do a better job as modes in supporting each other. This year FAA is being reauthorized. We have the opportunity to use PFC to expand highway access
- ⊙ Cuba is going to be free soon. From a statewide perspective we need to position ourselves to get the Cuban trade. Port directors say they can't handle the load
- ⊙ Would like to see more connectivity between the modes and more efficiency with the truckers. Need to address security issues in ports for them to be more efficient
- ⊙ How can we make Florida more competitive? Need to move toward a more standardized domestic containers and get into logistics of moving loads between modes
- ⊙ Airports and seaports do not sit at the table with Enterprise Florida. Private sector doesn't have time to wait on the bureaucracy. Need to bring a group of business leaders together and discuss how international trade is the driving economic forces
- ⊙ Florida needs to become the super highway to America.
- ⊙ Need to be careful because user fees create problems when you are trying to be competitive
- ⊙ Need to focus on efficiencies and costs. The ports in the Caribbean will expand their ports if we make things too inefficient. Federal government adds to inefficiencies. We can build the infrastructure but feds don't want to staff the security or inspection required.
- ⊙ Congress is talking about 100% cargo screenings. That would shut down our economy
- ⊙ Creation of efficient freight and passenger mobility and connectivity in our transportation corridors.

Financing and Funding

[Financing and Funding Summary Bullets](#)

What finance and funding issues impede or present challenges to your ability to work together across modes?

- ⊙ Where are we going to get the money? We will only build what we have funding for.
- ⊙ Need to develop a plan for a tax base to fund the system
- ⊙ Shippers are the missing link in this conversation. The private sector is underrepresented in these forums

What finance and funding issues offer opportunities for working together (e.g., to create public/private partnerships for joint funding of intermodal projects)?

- ⊙ The window of interest for the private sector is limited. How do we develop a common vision and interest?
- ⊙ We need to speak with one voice. We were very successful when public and private worked together on the I-95 corridor designation
- ⊙ Need to reserve funding to match private funding on projects that are ready to go

2-12/13-07 Participant Comments

What finance and funding issues impede or present challenges to your ability to work together across modes?

- ⊙ Shippers are customers of both trucks and rail. They are the missing link in this conversation – USDOT is hosting some forums of the shippers looking at their business models
- ⊙ World economy makes Florida a victim
- ⊙ If we over regulate and make shipping inefficient we will lose to the Caribbean and other ports
- ⊙ We are going to have 85% more trucks and we are not going to have 85% more lanes
- ⊙ Shipper has one deal to make. He is looking for the fastest, cheapest, safest way to ship.
- ⊙ As a state, who do we want to be? In Miami civic leaders are looking at the port system. Do they really want to have a port with all the traffic or a condominium with nice cars parked outside?
- ⊙ We are not the originator of what the state is consuming. If we are to continue to grow in numbers of people then we are going to continue to grow as a consumption state
- ⊙ Environmental impacts will become even more restrictive in the future related to trucking and seaports
- ⊙ Lack of local 50% match prevents us from completing the last mile to the airport
- ⊙ We are in a transition from the traditional “free” system to user fees
- ⊙ Project to add a second HOV lane to I-95 HOV with congestion pricing. USDOT pilot to take existing HOV and realign the lane to create a new lane for tolling during rush hours. Also looking at addition of toll express lanes on I-595
- ⊙ Competition for limited transportation funding leads to attempts to divert modal funding for hub access. All modes must work together for state economic benefits. Diverting funding may help interconnectivity but hurts modal capacity.
- ⊙ Prioritization of issues

- ⊙ Rigid formulas need to be replaced to expedite planning process that will allow us to meet our transportation challenges in a timely manner.

What finance and funding issues offer opportunities for working together (e.g., to create public/private partnerships for joint funding of intermodal projects)?

- ⊙ Difficult to get private sector interest and buy-in to a project since the window of interest in the private sector is much shorter. How do we get that vision and interest?
- ⊙ Use public funds to get through the environmental stage, which cuts time from 7-8 years to 4-5 years.
- ⊙ We need to speak with one voice. We were very successful when we went to Washington to get the I-95 corridor designation. We have a new Governor, and new leaders. History proves that government responds to crisis. Our state has reached a major crisis. If we get hit by a couple of storms it will bankrupt us. Leadership wants to hear from private sector.
- ⊙ Congestion pricing
- ⊙ The modes have projects ready to go if we have the money. The rail and seaports can have projects put down. Need to reserve funding to match private funding on projects that are ready to go. Need to have discipline in the process.
- ⊙ Reduce local share match for on-hub SIS/GM funding for modal access
- ⊙ Matching funds
- ⊙ Globalization brings opportunities that can be fostered with our trading partners.
- ⊙ Trade agreements on multilateral basis are the beginning of cross-nationalism of efficiencies required in a global world.

Legislative Initiatives

Are there existing statutes that impede or present challenges to your ability to work together?

- ⊙ FAA restrictions on use of airport revenues
- ⊙ State of Florida went to far with the FUPAC port security badge issue and should consider revisiting the process. Duplication of the TWIC cards looking a situation of wearing 3 badges and the cost associated with each badge. Impacts not only port workers, but anyone who comes to the port. Funds would have been better used for capital
- ⊙ Truckers are required to do an additional background check if you are driving hazardous material
- ⊙ Need to blend the processes for security checks. It seems like everyone is moving forward and no one can put the brakes on
- ⊙ International airports also have the issue for employees getting into customs area
- ⊙ Opportunity through better coordination
- ⊙ Be alert to the impact of possible legislative changes

- ⊙ Caution everyone to be alert to fiscal issues the state will be dealing with in this session. There will be special sessions to deal with tax and revenue issues and insurance. We need to be very vigilant that transportation funding is not raided again
- ⊙ One of the biggest challenges is globalization. Florida and many of its cities should be looked at as national states.
- ⊙ Looking at Florida's future beyond 2020, we should acquire and develop a District of Americas (like the District of Columbia) as a gateway to world trade.
- ⊙ The legislature decides funding and general discretion for the FDOT. There is no lobbying group to help the legislature focus on critical issue such as intermodalism. The FDOT does not lobby in this way.

Are there legislative changes that would improve your ability to work together and create partnerships?

- ⊙ FAA restrictions on use of airport revenues
- ⊙ Opportunity to streamline background check systems
- ⊙ We need to revisit the eligibility criteria for the SIS to be sure it is strategic
- ⊙ Broader issue involves trying to provide the correct systems where there is no regional visioning
- ⊙ Wish we could get a better process for streamlining project development. Transportation is a partner, but not the driver. We need to figure out ways to help partners find a solution. It is important that all modes be involved
- ⊙ It is tough for policy makers to vote against security
- ⊙ As a basic policy we should say no to unfunded mandates
- ⊙ Caps on the number of workers available impacts capacity
- ⊙ None of the 8 airports funded as pilot programs for increased screening are in Florida
- ⊙ TSA controls capacity by not providing the required personnel for increased screening
- ⊙ Immigration, customs and screening need to be staffed and funded by the feds
- ⊙ Need support from the State of Florida for a more uniform security badge
- ⊙ Need to be alert to the tax revenue and insurance issues in the next legislative session
- ⊙ We have made a big investment in identifying SIS facilities and connectors. We need to protect it from inconsistent land use decisions
- ⊙ Remove all modes (i.e. airports and seaports) from concurrency requirements.
- ⊙ Require a portion of private sector impact fees to be spent on modal access.

Fostering Statewide and Regional Intermodal Coordination and Cooperation

What type of statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation has occurred across the modes?

- ⊙ Central Florida regional vision process involves 7 counties and includes Metroplan Orlando (3 counties)
- ⊙ Myregion.org has led the How Shall We Grow? It is a visioning process that tries to look out 50 years to see how the region would look if we continue what we are doing

today. The public involvement part has engaged 8000 folks in community meetings and is seeking input on-line from the whole community on possible alternative growth scenarios. I do have concerns that we may not be reaching a typical cross section of citizens

- ⊙ Online polling as to 3 growth alternatives choices and the current trend
- ⊙ The plan is to adopt the preferred growth scenario in summer, 2007, and then try to develop a plan designed to achieve changing the course we are on. Each of the alternatives are intermodal in nature
- ⊙ There is no legal standing for the regional visioning. What comes first is the vision to guide what comes later relating to comp plan changes. Need first to develop a common understanding of what you want
- ⊙ TRIP funding has provided incentives for regional cooperation
- ⊙ SE Florida is landlocked. They are going to have to become denser. Central Florida has plenty of land. That may undermine any alternative scenarios
- ⊙ If density is currently going down in Central Florida, how can you provide transit in that area?
- ⊙ When developing high-density areas in conflict with our philosophy and the need to protect green space. Is this social engineering or responding to market changes?
- ⊙ State is changing very fast. The trends of the past are perhaps not the ones we should be paying attention to. South Florida is losing school enrollments. Types of people coming to our state are different than they were. People are also moving out due to congestion and quality of life issues particularly in South Florida.
- ⊙ Aviation has a process that has been in place for twenty years for local, regional and statewide input into the vision for airport development. The last major update was two years ago.

What are the best opportunities for fostering statewide and regional intermodal coordination and cooperation?

- ⊙ Coordinated land use decisions
- ⊙ Need to coordinate with locals on land use planning to protect SIS connectors, and also extract funds from developers
- ⊙ TRIP should not be formula based. Miami should be in competition with Orlando. Whoever plans regionally better gets the funding.
- ⊙ We must look at institutional structures to be able to protect from political pressures. You need good commonly accepted measures
- ⊙ In a limited access future you need to maintain flexibility of what type of access
- ⊙ Need a complete community concept first

1. Can existing statewide programs (SIS, Future Corridors) provide opportunities for better modal cooperation?

Draft Summary Bullets

- Absolutely, SIS has provided funding for key projects (examples Miami and Tampa Airports)

- The SIS helps the state look at the big picture. We have to keep fighting for the 75/25 funding split to support the SIS
- Still need support to complete the “last mile”- still need to address the match needed
- Future corridors program if done right presents a tremendous opportunity for transit, utilities, pipeline, and roadway improvements all in the same footprint. Corridors program is an opportunity to talk about mobility among the modes

2-13-07 Participants Comments

- ⊙ Absolutely, in Miami projects like 25th street and viaduct would not be provided without SIS. The MIA is a leading airport for international freight. The choking point is land side access
- ⊙ SIS funding for key projects at Tampa airport
- ⊙ The SIS provides the state with a big picture to counter the local politics. We know the 75/25 funding policy will be attacked but we need to work protect it. It is all about transportation
- ⊙ Last mile is not connected. Central Blvd only offered 50% for airport who doesn’t have the match
- ⊙ We have to keep fighting for the 75/25 funding split for the SIS
- ⊙ Education and focus on freight. Need to educate planners on freight needs.
- ⊙ Some modes do a bad job in lobbying. They need to defend who they are and what they need
- ⊙ Future corridors program if done right presents a tremendous opportunity. The words were all right but people hear it as just a road. Opportunity for transit, utilities, pipeline, and roadway improvements all in the same footprint. Corridors are an opportunity to talk about mobility among the modes
- ⊙ Bus rapid transit is a way to break down modal disconnect between roads, transit, tolls.
- ⊙ Evacuation and security issues make a good argument to protect transportation funds
- ⊙ Need to open the dialogue like we are doing these two days so we can work together toward common goals

2. What kinds of short and longer-range strategies could form the basis for moving forward together?

Draft Summary Bullets

- Need to open the dialogue like we are doing these two days so we can work together toward common goals such as how to cut costs and share benefits
- All modal partners should stay engaged in the prototype corridors
- Modes need to be involved in regional visioning activities
- Leverage state pension fund to form our PPP funding. Need to keep our revenue generation ideas in Florida.
- Need to come up with new sources of revenues such as tolls taxes or user fees.

2-13-07 Participants Comments

- ⊙ Continuing the dialogue to help cut costs and share benefits

- ⊙ Have modal partners reach out to each other to stay engaged in common focus
- ⊙ All modal partners should stay engaged in the prototype corridors
- ⊙ Modes should get involved in regional visioning activities
- ⊙ Think out of the box on how things are funded; be bold. The Department should lobby/work with legislative leadership to get general revenue
- ⊙ Should work with FTC to come up with funding activities such as bond program backed by General Revenue Bond with \$14 leverage ratio
- ⊙ Leverage state pension fund to form the public side of our PPP funding. Let government earn the return
- ⊙ Revenue authorities can be set up where profits are kept in the system
- ⊙ Green field is much riskier
- ⊙ Money will follow the plan
- ⊙ Need to come up with new sources of revenues in terms of either toll, tax or user fee
- ⊙ Need to keep our revenue generation ideas in Florida
- ⊙ What MPOs want for community doesn't include freight and rail. We need to make the general public understand how important freight is to the economy

3. What are some practical next steps for each mode and for continuing the intermodal dialogue?

Draft Summary Bullets

- Commission should consider holding intermodal forums of this nature on a regional basis prior to a more statewide
- Modes need to do their own visioning processes to develop goals, then have the FTC bring the modes back together
- Need to involve the intermodal partners in the development of the four prototype corridors –
- We should recognize and appreciate how efficient our current transportation system is in delivering goods and work toward addressing the challenges to that efficiency.

2-13-07 Participants Comments

- ⊙ FTC should do a follow-up in 6 months to get a status on what has been done as a result of this discussion
- ⊙ Commission needs to do more forums of this nature. Offer opportunities for regional modal discussions prior to another statewide discussion.
- ⊙ Modes need to do their own visioning processes to develop goals that can be submitted to the commission before they bring the modes back together
- ⊙ Florida is a consumer state. We do not have products being shipped out. We need to attract businesses to manufacture products.
- ⊙ Call focus to the four prototype corridors and include freight as part of the process
- ⊙ Updating the Atlantic Commerce Corridor
- ⊙ We need to develop an advocacy piece for better communication so we can support each other

APPENDIX #5

**Meeting of the Modes
Attendee List**

| | | | |
|-----------|------------|--|---|
| Alexander | Lorenzo | State Seaport Manager | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Allen | Jerry | Deputy Director | Palm Beach County Department of Airports |
| Allen | Phillip | Chair | Florida Seaport Transportation and Economic Development Council (FSTED) |
| Andress | Kathy | Deputy Port Director | Port of Palm Beach |
| Arrington | Steven L. | Director of Strategic Planning and Research | Jacksonville Transportation Authority |
| Ashbaker | William | State Aviation Manager | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Ayer | Lucilla L. | Executive Director | Hillsborough County M.P.O. |
| Bacot | Lisa | Executive Director | Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged |
| Ball | Robert | Executive Director | Southwest Florida International Airport |
| Barley | Harold W. | Executive Director | METROPLAN Orlando |
| Barrow | Cynthia | Executive Director | Bartow Municipal Airport |
| Beardall | Hal | | Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium, FSU |
| Beckford | Anthony C. | Transit General Manager | Sarasota County Area Transit |
| Biscan | Ben | President | Florida Railroad Association |
| Blaylock | Michael | Chief Executive Officer | Jacksonville Transportation Authority |
| Boyle | James D. | Regional Transportation Planner | Jacksonville Transportation Authority |
| Burleson | Bob | President | Florida Transportation Builders Assoc. |
| Camuso | Craig | Vice President, Corp Communications/Public Affairs | CSX |
| Cann | Stan | District Secretary D-1 | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Clary | Lowell | Assistant Secretary for Finance and Administration | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Click | Matthew | Intergovernmental Programs Coordinator | Florida's Turnpike Enterprise |
| Connor | Don P. | Consultant | Genesee & Wyoming Railroads |
| Coven | Ed | State Transit Manager | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Crawford | Edwin (Ed) | Government Affairs Office | Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority |

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| | | | (HART) |
| Criser, III | Marshall M. | Commissioner | Florida Transportation Commission |
| Curry | Terry | Operations Manager | Okaloosa County Airports |
| Downs | Noranne | District Secretary D-5 | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Flagg | Diane B. | Director of Collier County Alternative Trans. Modes | Collier County |
| Giulietti | Joe | Executive Director | South Florida Regional Transportation Authority |
| Glassman | Howard | Executive Director | MPOAC |
| Goddeau | Amie K., P.E. | SIS Program Coordinator, District 4 | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Goodman | Cathy | Executive Assistant | Florida Transportation Commission |
| Gunn | Pete | Director of Safety and Security | Space Florida |
| Haddad | Nazih | Manager, Passenger Rail Development | High Speed Rail |
| Hagan | Ken | Vice-Chairman | Hillsborough County M.P.O. |
| Harris | Lyn | Government Affairs and New Starts Manager | Miami-Dade Transit |
| Hart | Marion, Jr. | State Public Transportation and Modal Administrator | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Hickson | Frank | District Planning Manager, District 5 | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Holland | Christie | Finance and Revenue Manager | Office of Financial Development, FDOT |
| Holton | James W | Chairman | Florida Transportation Commission |
| Hutchinson | David L. | Senior Policy Analyst | Office of Policy Planning, FDOT |
| Ismart | Carolyn | Manager, Environmental Management Office | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Johnson | Marycatherine | Director of Finance, Administration & Meeting Services | Florida Airports Council |
| Johnson | William R. | Executive Director | Florida Airports Council |
| Jones | Bob | Director | Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium, FSU |
| Kaliski | John | Principal | Cambridge Systematics, Inc. |
| Kancharla | Ram | Sr. Director, Planning & Development | Tampa Port Authority |
| Keller | Toy | Vice President, Programs & Planning | Florida Ports Council |
| Kelley | Laura | Deputy Executive Director | Orlando-Orange County Expressway Authority |
| Kopelousos | Stephanie | Interim Secretary | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Lanahan | Marty | Commissioner | Florida Transportation Commission |
| Lee | Ed | Administrator, Rail Planning/Safety | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Lemke | Debra | Director of Governmental Affairs | Southwest Florida International Airport |
| Leonhardt | Fred | | Gray Robinson, P.A. |
| Lewis | Diana | Airport Director | St Lucie County International Airport |

| | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| Llort | Ysela | Assistant Secretary for Intermodal Development | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Long | Jim | Vice President | Florida Trucking Association |
| McDonald | David | Executive Director | Manatee County Port Authority |
| McLawhorn | J. Marsh | Chief of Government Affairs | LYNX |
| Mierzejewski | Ed | Director | Center for Urban Transportation Research |
| Miller | Louis | Executive Director | Tampa International Airport |
| Miller | Frank | Airport Director | Pensacola Regional Airport |
| Monroy | Carmen | Lee County Transit Division | Grants Analyst |
| Montalvo | Rafael | | Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium, FSU |
| Moore | Lennon | Planning Director | Orlando-Orange County Expressway Authority |
| Neill | Kathy | Intergovernmental Programs Coordinator | Office of Policy Planning, FDOT |
| Olivero | Luis | Manager of Governmental Relations | Greater Orlando Aviation Authority |
| Ori | Robert V. | Planning Technology, INC. | Florida Airports Council |
| Parker | Jeffrey | President | Jeffrey Parker & Associates |
| Patrenos | Sally | Executive Director | Florida Transportation Commission |
| Pedersen | Chris | | Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium, FSU |
| Pessaro | Brian | Metropolitan Planning Coordinator | Office of Policy Planning, FDOT |
| Piccolo | Fredrick | President/CEO | Sarasota/Bradenton International Airport |
| Polzin | Dr. Steven E. | Director | Mobility Research Program |
| Raihill | Karen | | St. Petersburg, Florida |
| Rajchel | Mary Lou | Director | Florida Trucking Association |
| Ratcliffe | Lawrence | Director, Network Planning | CSX Transportation |
| Reich | Stephen | Interim Director | Tampa-Hillsborough County Expressway Authority |
| Reichert | Mark | Assistant Executive Director | Florida Transportation Commission |
| Rich | A. Wayne | Of Counsel | Broad and Cassel |
| Richmond | Pamela | | MSCW |
| Romig | Robert | Director, Office of Policy Planning | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Satterlee | Mark | Staff Director | St. Lucie MPO |
| Saul-Sena | Linda | Councilwoman, Tampa City Council | Hillsborough County M.P.O. |
| Schoener | George | Executive Director | I-95 Corridor Coalition |
| Sharkey | Jeff | Director | Florida Intermodal Transportation Association, Inc. |
| Skelton | Don | District Secretary D-7 | Florida Department of Transportation |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|---|
| Smith | Arlene | Assistant to the Director of Aviation | Daytona Beach International Airport |
| Smith | Joe | Chair | Transportation Task Force, Tampa Bay Partnership |
| Snyder | Mike | Executive Director | Orlando-Orange County Expressway Authority |
| Sotorrio | Ana | Associate Director, Governmental Affairs | Miami International Airport |
| Stewart | Michael | External Affairs Director | Jacksonville Aviation Authority |
| Straz, Jr. | David A. | Commissioner | Florida Transportation Commission |
| Tassinari | David | Manager, Finance and Performance Management | Florida Transportation Commission |
| Taylor | John | Systems Planning Office | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Thibault | Kevin | Assistant Secretary for Engineering and Operations | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Valdes | Carlos | President | Trade and Transport Council |
| Wainio | Richard | Director | Tampa Port Authority |
| Warmath | Paula | Deputy State Right Of Way Manager | Office of Right of Way, FDOT |
| Watermeier | Janet | Vice Chair | Florida Transportation Commission |
| Watson | Linda S | Chief Executive Officer | LYNX |
| Watson | Wes | Executive Director | Florida Public Transportation Association |
| Watts | Brian | Performance Monitoring Coordinator | Office of Policy Planning, FDOT |
| Webster | Douglas | Assistant to the Aviation Director | Ft Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport |
| Weidner | Jeff | District 4 Transit | Florida Department of Transportation |
| Williams | Corine | Transit Manager | St. Lucie County Transit |
| | | | |
| Late Registrants - breakout group not identified | | | |
| Brancheau | Robert | Senior Director, Planning/Governmental Affairs | Greater Orlando Aviation Authority |
| Spillman | John | President | Innovative Transportation Strategies, Inc. |
| Wheat | John | Deputy Executive Director | Hillsborough County Aviation Authority |
| Valente | Mickie | | Florida Council of 100 |
| Lettelleir | Amy E. | Associate Director, Public Finance | Raymond James & Associates, Inc. |
| Reidy | Rich | Aide to County Commissioner Ken Hagan | Hillsborough County |
| Sebesta | Senator Jim | Registered Real Estate Broker | |

