

Florida Rail System Plan
Rail Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Meeting #3 Summary
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida
September 30 – October 1, 2008

Table of Contents

Meeting Summary	Pages 2-16
Appendix I: Meeting Agenda	Pages 17-18
Appendix II: Meeting Evaluation Summary	Pages 19-20
Appendix III: Combined Draft Policy Statements Considered	Pages 21-28

Florida Rail System Plan

Rail Stakeholder Advisory Committee: Meeting 3

Ft. Lauderdale, Florida

September 30 – October 1, 2008

Introduction: September 30. The meeting began at 1:00 p.m.

The Assistant Secretary for Intermodal Systems Development, Debbie Hunt, as Chair of the Rail Stakeholder Advisory Committee, called the meeting to order. The Chair welcomed and thanked all members for their continuing hard work to help the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) develop a new more visionary, strategic, and policy-driven approach to developing the next Florida Rail System Plan. The Chair reminded members the 2008 Florida Rail System Plan will be developed in two phases. The product of Phase I will be the Policy Element, which will be guided by the Advisory Committee.

This initial five meeting process is designed to help the Committee work together to establish a policy framework for setting priorities. At the end of those five meetings, the Department hopes to have as much consensus as possible on what those statewide policies should be. The Committee's recommendations will be submitted to the Secretary of Transportation and lead to the adoption of a Rail System Policy Element by the Secretary by December 31, 2008.

The Chair said the Policy Element will address the following:

- Vision, goals and possible objectives;
- Roles and responsibilities in the rail system in Florida;
- Prioritization policies focusing on statewide public benefits; and
- Recommendations to be considered in the update of the Strategic Intermodal System and the Florida Transportation Plan

Phase II will result in a Rail Investment Element to be completed by June 30, 2009. We hope to provide an opportunity in Phase II for additional stakeholder involvement to help us identify the list of needs, prioritization methodology, and other implementation policies.

This third Rail Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting in Ft. Lauderdale builds upon the Committee's work in the organizational meeting in Tampa and the second meeting last month in Tallahassee. At this meeting, the Committee briefly reviews and closes on the redrafted vision statement. Following presentations on freight-related and safety issues, the majority of time focuses on discussing and refining a combined set of draft advisory recommendations.

Members Introduction

The Chair asked the Rail Stakeholder Advisory Committee members to introduce themselves. This is the list of all present members and the stakeholder interest they represent:

- Debbie Hunt - Florida Department of Transportation, Assistant Secretary for Intermodal Systems Development, Chair
- Marion Hart - Florida Department of Transportation, State Public Transportation and Modal Administrator, Vice-Chair
- Dr. Scott Paine - Citizen
- Ben Biscan - Florida Railroad Association
- Mayor Tom Eschenberg - Florida League of Cities
- John Adams - Enterprise Florida
- Christine Kefauver - Central Florida Commuter Rail Commission
- Don Skelton - Florida Department of Transportation, District Seven Secretary
- Gus Pego - Florida Department of Transportation, District Six Secretary
- Stan Cann – Florida Department of Transportation, District One Secretary
- Jim Wolfe – Florida Department of Transportation, District Four Secretary
- Denise Bunnewith - Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (Representing Mayor Richard Kaplan)
- Richard Schuler – Florida Trucking Association, Chairman
- Drew Galloway - Amtrak
- David Arganbright- Florida East Coast Railway
- David Anderton - Port Everglades
- Lisa Mancini - CSX Transportation
- Thomas Pelham - Department of Community Affairs, Secretary
- Sally Patrenos - Florida Transportation Commission (Representing Marcos Marchena)
- Keith Schue - Florida Nature Conservancy
- Sally Mann - Florida Department of Environmental Protection
- Linda Watson – Florida Public Transportation Association
- Joseph Giulietti – South Florida Regional Transportation Authority, Executive Director (Representing Bruno Barreiro)

Agenda

The Chair introduced Hal Beardall and Rafael Montalvo with the Florida Consensus Resource Center. She indicated Mr. Beardall and Mr. Montalvo will provide facilitation support to the Rail Advisory Committee during the five Committee meetings. Ms. Hunt asked Hal Beardall to review the agenda (Appendix I) and the supporting material in the notebooks.

The Chair also sought a motion to adopt the second organizational meeting summary included in Tab 3. The motion was approved unanimously.

Finalize Draft Vision Statement

The Chair asked Mr. Beardall to review the draft vision statement as revised by the ad hoc drafting group immediately prior to this meeting. Following this review the Chair opened the floor for questions and comments.

- Replace the phrase “rail has contributed” with the phrase “rail is contributing” since Florida will likely not be able to fully achieve what is recommended under the vision statement before 2030.
- Can we insert a statement regarding protecting natural resources in the vision statement to mirror what we say in the descriptive narrative?
- Please define “smart growth”.
- Consider replacing the term “smart growth” with “growth”.
- We cannot encourage any kind of growth, we need to recommend a vision that promotes urban infill, freight villages, and transit oriented developments. As such, we either continue to use the term “smart growth” or identify another term that is synonym to “smart growth”.
- Replace the term “smart growth” with “compact smart growth”.
- Under the revised annotated version, replace the term “safe, seamless, interconnected...” with “safe, increasingly seamless, interconnected...”.
- The term “enhanced” before “smart growth” implies Florida has already begun to implement smart growth strategies. The term should be stricken or replaced with “foster”.
- Florida has implemented smart growth strategies in many parts of the State. It would be incorrect to assume otherwise, the word “enhanced” should not be replaced or deleted.
- Replace the term “enhanced smart growth” with “smarter growth”.
- Replace the term “enhanced smart growth” with “continued smart growth”.

The following strikethrough/underline version addresses the comments and suggestions made by the ad hoc drafting group and the full committee during their review and discussion

Draft Vision Statement

The Vision:

Florida has a safe and secure, and efficient passenger and freight rail system providing mobility, improving quality of life and promoting economic opportunities and environmental sustainability for Florida.

Annotation:

It is the year 2030. Florida’s residents, visitors, and businesses enjoy improved quality of life, increased economic opportunities and competitiveness, ~~enhanced~~ continued smarter growth in and around urban centers, and greater environmental sustainability. Rail ~~has contributed~~ is contributing significantly to all of these by providing safe, and

increasingly seamless, interconnected passenger and freight mobility throughout the state, its regions and in many cases its communities, as well as efficient connections to national and international markets. It does this through thoughtful investment strategies, effective public/private and public/public partnerships, and full integration with other modes of transportation.

The facilitators proposed the revised version above be reviewed as part of a single text document at the next meeting and possibly adopted as part of the whole package of recommendations at the final meeting.

Presentation: National Rail Freight Infrastructure Capacity and Investment Study – American Association of Railroads and the AASHTO “Bottom Line Report”

The Chair introduced Larry Ratcliffe with CSX and Lance Grenzeback with Cambridge Systematics. Messrs. Ratcliffe and Grenzeback both took turn in discussing the status of the freight rail system in the United States and the investment needs required to ensure the system is fully operational and can help support the national mobility needs. The presentation also included a discussion on capacity and congestion along key railroads nationally and in Florida. The presentation can be found in Tab 5 or at <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rail/plandevl.htm>.

Following this presentation, the Chair opened the floor for questions. (Responses to member’s comments are shown in *italic*)

- The presentation assumes demand growth is a linear function going into the future. Assuming this is based on historic figures, how far back in time did you go to develop the current trend? *For this study, we used a model developed by Global Insight to forecast data into the future. Based on 2003 traffic growth data, it is estimated that demand will increase by 3.4 percent annually.*
- The number of trains estimated on CSX’s S line in Florida is underestimated (25 trains per day). If you shift freight trains from the A line, the S line will increase above 25 trains per day. *It is not recommended that you rely on a national study to estimate traffic data at the State level.*
- Can the rail system pay for its own improvement needs? *Yes, railroads can fund themselves using revenues generated from their business growth.*
- How are commuter needs accounted for in your study? *These will have to be addressed through ongoing discussions between freight rail operations and state and local transportation agencies.*
- Will you be addressing the issue of at grade crossings in Phase II of this study? *We looked at the issue of at grade crossings from a broad national perspective. The topic of at grade crossings should be evaluated at a more local corridor level.*
- When do you anticipate beginning to work on Phase II? Will you be analyzing the impact of widening the Panama Canal, gas prices, the potential recession on rail in your study? *We anticipate starting to work on Phase II in late*

October. We will be evaluating the economic impacts from widening the Panama Canal, the energy crises, and other topics as well.

Review Draft Committee Report Format

At the request of the Chair, Mr. Beardall asked members to turn to the yellow sheets in Tab 6 and review the revised draft report outline. The outline presents the initial thoughts on what the final Committee report may look like and include.

The Chair asked members if they had any concerns about the proposed initial draft report outline. (Responses to member's comments are shown in *italic*).

- Ensure a discussion on how the plan fits with other existing plans is included in the report. Discuss in particular the relationship between the Rail Plan and the Florida Transportation Plan, the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), and other modal plans.
- Under key trends and conditions, make sure you discuss changes in trends.
- Clarify what is meant by implementation issues to be addressed in Phase II. *This section discusses how high level policies and objectives can be implemented or practically applied.*

Presentations

The Chair introduced Ed Lee with the Rail Office at the Florida Department of Transportation. In his presentations, Mr. Lee discussed the various departmental actions and programs pertaining to railroad safety and security and provided an overview on current and historic freight rail traffic trends in Florida. Mr. Lee's presentations can be found in Tab 7 or at <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rail/plandevl.htm>.

Following Mr. Lee's presentations, the Chair opened the floor for questions. (Responses to member's comments are shown in *italic*)

- Do most trespassing fatalities involve juveniles? *Most trespassing fatalities involve adults.*
- Is the Department working with organizations such as the homeless coalition to minimize adult rail trespassing accidents? *The issue regarding accidents related to trespassing is addressed through the Department's Operation Lifesaver Program.*
- We are looking at suicide as a safety issue when in reality it is more of a behavioral issue. The Department of Transportation is not responsible for medical/behavioral issues.
- Can we determine the number of trespassing fatalities that involve a suicide attempt? *The Department will investigate this issue further.*
- Railroads belong to an open system that cannot be fenced. Trespassing accidents are predominantly intentional and include suicide and intoxication cases.
- Is it the responsibility of state government to save people from themselves?

- State Legislature should develop a new policy in favor of dismissing those lawsuit cases filed on behalf of trespassers.
 - Such a policy would be unfair, since the public sector does not protect the safety of children and veterans, however; the law as it is written today does.
- The majority of goods moving by rail in Florida is bulk goods and therefore not intended for direct consumption.
- Shifting traffic to intermodal relieves congestion.
- Strategies are being developed including through current transportation legislation to identify ways to relieve congestion on key highways. To date, no strategies have been recommended to address congestion issues for more local delivery/end trips.
- Are there public-private partnership opportunities for additional freight rail investments to support creative economic development strategies to increase Florida's ability to ship more goods?
 - There are currently no advantages for strategies to increase Florida's rail outbound traffic since the State's production capability is limited. Florida has a largely consuming base.
- Can you provide examples on how other states have invested in rail? *Staff will investigate this issue.*
- The North Florida Transportation Planning Organization is organizing a symposium in collaboration with import and export businesses. The symposium will be held on October 16. This effort will include a discussion on strategies to ensure containers shipped to Florida do not leave the State empty.

Review and Refine Combined Draft Policy Recommendations

The Chair asked Mr. Beardall to review the combined proposed draft advisory policy statements (See Appendix III). Mr. Beardall noted that the Red and Blue Drafting Groups each created potential advisory policy statements during the August 26-27 meeting of the Rail Stakeholder Advisory Committee. Each group held a separate teleconference during September to review, discuss, and refine the statements. Staff combined the revised statements from both groups into one set and placed them within the five goals of the current 2025 Florida Transportation Plan for purposes of further review. Mr. Beardall noted much of the time spent today and tomorrow will focus on clarifying, refining, and adding to these statements. He reminded members the material was sent prior to the meeting to allow members an opportunity to review the policy statements and be prepared to discuss the following questions:

- Does the statement capture the key concept? Does it need any clarification?
- For statements grouped together, do they address the same concept?
- If so, what is the key concept at the core of the statements?
- For each goal section as a whole, are any major concepts still missing?

Following this review the Chair opened the floor for comments and questions. The following bullets summarize the comments and suggestions for improvement offered during the discussion of each section. (Responses to member's comments are shown in *italic*)

I. Safety and Security

- The policy recommendation under II-H is a safety issue and therefore should be placed under goal I.
- The Department should continue the Operation Lifesaver outreach program. This outreach effort should be extended to include community organizations.
- Determine whether funding is available through the Transportation Security Administration. *Currently legislation is being developed by the U.S. Congress to address safety and security for rail. These include H.R. 2095 and S.63.*
- With the tremendous number of fatalities on highways, would a modal shift to rail reduce those numbers producing a safer overall transportation system? This should be discussed as part of the policy recommendations.
- Continue to improve security and look for opportunities for Federal funding for both capital and operations.
- Positive train control should be addressed. In particular, the Committee should determine the effect of positive train control on freight rail services. Could positive train control become a major impediment to bringing passenger service back to the East Coast Railway?
- The Committee should recognize and support potential Federal legislative changes affecting rail.
- The Committee should recognize funding for new regulations, such as positive train control, may be available through public private partnership.

II. Quality of life and Environmental Stewardship

Appropriate Land Use Decisions

- Can you define “regional component” under II-A?
 - *II-A implies a statewide vision is too broad and should address more local and regional visions.* In other words, the State Rail Plan should support regional and local plans.
 - II-A calls for integrating regional plans to create a cohesive State plan.
- What do you mean by visioning? *A visioning process is generally the step that precedes the development of goals, objectives, and implementation items. It provides a broad picture of how the State would like to grow.*
- The State vision should realize the need for each region in Florida is different with respect to rail.
- Combine policy statements II-A and II-F. Policy statement II-A calls for the development of a vision and II-F calls for integrating the State’s Rail Plan with existing land use policies and plans.
- We need to include a global perspective to determine how regional projects impact other areas within and outside the State.
- Florida’s State Rail Plan should be viewed as a framework. Regional plans should fit into that framework. Each region of the State is different, however; the Plan should be flexible to allow each region to fit into the statewide framework.

- The Committee should recommend considering the highest and best use of a rail facility regardless of ownership.
- Review policy statement II-A to read as follows: “Develop a State rail plan with compatible regional components”.
- Is policy statement II-B applicable to all modes. *Staff will investigate this issue.*
- Review policy statement II-B to include the following sentence: “Use the result of the study to make investment and planning decisions regarding rail”.
- The term “quality of life” under policy statement II-B is too broad. Consider striking this policy statement and including it under the environmental sustainability subheading where it can be discussed in further detail.
- Policy statement II-B should read as follows: “Encourage conducting studies that highlight the benefits of investing in rail transportation.”
- The Committee should also recommend a policy that calls for collecting data on the benefits/negatives of rail investments.
- Review policy statement II-B to read as follows: “Study the effects of increasing the emphasis on rail and quality of life”.
- Policy statements II-B and II-H have significant overlap.
- Can we determine the impacts of rail facilities on other modes?
- The policy statements under Appropriate Land Use Decisions are in fact moving away from the concept of appropriate land use decisions to support rail.
- Create a structure to connect policy statements II-A, II-F, II-H, and II-I.
- Policy statement II-C appears to be limiting the ability of communities throughout the State to plan for their own future.
- Policy statement II-C should be reworded to call for better integrating transportation and land use planning.

General Public Comments

Prior to the end of the first day, the Chair stressed the importance for input from the public as this process moves forward and offered all members of the public the opportunity to speak to the group from the microphone. One public comment was offered on Day One.

- Peter Buchwald, Executive Director with the St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization is looking forward for the possibilities of passenger rail expansion across Florida. The TPO region is growing at a pace exceeding neighboring Indian River County and Martin County. However, the TPO is concerned that the Florida Intercity Passenger Rail Vision Plan did not include a proposed Coastal Station in St. Lucie County. A passenger rail station supports the County’s mobility and economic goals.

The Chair noted additional opportunities for input through the public comment form (available at the sign in table) and online (<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rail/plandevol.htm>) are available. Any written comments received will be shared with the Committee

After the Committee adjourned for the day, David Anderton with the Port of Everglades offered a quick overview of the Ports activities and future growth plans. Mr. Anderton's presentation can be found at <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rail/plandevl.htm>.

Day 2. The meeting began at 8:30 a.m.

Presentation: FDOT Benefit/Cost Analysis

The Chair introduced Ed Lee, with the Rail Office at the Florida Department of Transportation. In his presentation, Mr. Lee discussed how his Department currently evaluates the costs and benefits of investing in rail projects. Mr. Lee's presentation can be found at <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rail/plandevl.htm>.

Following Mr. Lee's presentation, the Chair opened the floor for questions. (Responses to member's comments are shown in *italic*)

- The proposed calculator appears to favor investments in freight. *It is more complex to conduct benefit/cost analyses for passenger rail projects. They must be done on a case-by-case basis.*
- How does the Department determine the matching amount for SIS projects? *There is a 50 percent matching requirement for Class I railroads and a 75 percent matching requirement for shortline railroads.*
- All rail projects go through the benefit/cost analysis process.
- Is there a validation effort to supports the results from the benefit/cost analysis tool? *Now that we have completed several rail projects using this tool we will work to compare the actual project costs and benefits and compare those to the results from the benefit cost analysis tool.*

Review and Refine Combined Draft Policy Recommendations (Continued)

The Committee continued from day one to review the draft policy statements and consider the following questions:

- Does the statement capture the key concept? Does it need any clarification?
- For statements grouped together, do they address the same concept?
- If so, what is the key concept at the core of the statements?
- For each goal section as a whole, are any major concepts still missing?

The following bullets summarize the comments and suggestions for improvement offered during the discussion of each section. (Responses to member's comments are shown in *italic*)

II. Quality of life and Environmental Stewardship

Appropriate Land Use Decisions

- Under policy statement II-D replace the work "laws" with "programs and policies".

- Combine the second and third paragraphs under policy statement II-D.
- A discussion on how to prioritize limited funding is needed. Consider adding some language on this issue under policy statement V-D.
- Policy statement II-E should be revised and summarized to remove repetition.
 - Policy statement II-E should encourage investments in modes other than highway.
- Under policy statements II-H, the Committee should recommend adopting engineering criteria and design standards to accommodate rail clearance for higher speed and commuter rail.
- The Committee should encourage compact mixed use urban development at transit nodes to make passenger rail feasible.
- Policy statement II-I should be implemented, where feasible.
 - Rail consideration in transportation and land use plans should reflect both passenger and freight needs.
 - Not all communities are currently well positioned to receive freight or passenger rail service.

Environmental sustainability

- Policy statements II-J and II-K should be combined.
- Environmental issues should include both environmental benefits and costs.
- The Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) process identifies conflicts and or issues. The process should be broadened to also capture benefits.
- As indicated under policy statement VI-G, a screening process is needed prior to investing in planning for projects. The screening process should include the input from the public and political powers.
- Consider combining policy statements II-J, II-K, and VI-G.
- The purpose of the ETDM process is to resolve all conflicts early in the process. A new screening process is therefore not required. The Committee should recommend expanding the ETDM process to include input from the public and policymakers.
 - The ETDM process includes a public input component.
 - The ETDM is an administrative process. Policymakers are not involved in the process. As such, establishing public support through an early process is needed.
 - The private sector is concerned public screening processes are time consuming.
- Education recommendations under policy statement II-N should be expanded and addressed under a separate goal area or sub-goal area.
- Provide examples of environmental benefits under policy statement II-O. One example is the impact of rail investments on reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
- The Committee should work with the Governor's climate action team to develop environmental recommendations for the rail group. Keith Schue with the Florida Nature Conservancy will provide additional language on environmental sustainability.

- Policy statement II-P should discuss both the consequences and benefits of investing in rail.
- Strike the first sentence under policy statement II-Q. Define carbon credits. Clarify the meaning of the term: “...be linked to a beneficial public investment...”
- The Committee should look at the environmental impacts of rail investments at the multi-state, state, regional, and local levels. This is because transportation and environmental systems are not limited by geographic boundaries.

III. Maintenance and Preservation

- What is the difference between Goal III – Maintenance and Preservation and Goal V – Sustainable Investment? The goal on sustainable investment is intended to emphasize the monetary benefits from investing in railroads. Goal III on maintenance and preservation discusses policies related to maintaining and preserving the system’s physical assets.
- The Committee should support public and private partnership to upgrade and maintain rail facilities to preserve and enhance their capacity for passenger and freight movement.
- The Committee should promote the use of intelligent transportation technology and other transportation system management strategies.
- The Committee should recommend developing tools to capture whether an investment will continue to meet rail needs into the future.
- The Committee should recommend protecting capacity for future freight needs on existing railroads.
- The Committee should recommend preserving the capacity of highway rights-of-way for future rail capacity.
- The Committee should recommend reserving corridor right-of-way for passenger rail within major new road corridors and consider retrofitting existing corridors for rail.

IV. Mobility

- Strike the work “improved” under policy statement IV-A.
- Policy statement IV-B is not practical. The State and private railroads cannot promote economic and industrial development at every hub along existing corridors. *This statement is not aimed at Class I railroads. Rather the goal of this recommendation is to attract those industries that depend on shortline railroads for mobility.* Policy statement IV-B should then be reworded to specify it is intended to serve the needs of shortline railroads.
- Policy statement IV-A should indicate the rail plan will be a part of a larger multi-modal system.
- Under policy statement IV-C, replace the term “encourage consideration” with “consider”.
- A policy recommendation on reliability that serves both mobility and economic needs should be introduced.

V. Sustainable Investment: Sustainable Transportation Investments for Florida's Future.

- Policy statements V-A and V-B are interrelated. Regions should be able to decide how they want to spend SIS funds based on regional needs. This would make funding for rail needs more likely.
- Include a regional component under policy statement V-B.
 - The first bullet under policy statement V-B should be “public support”.
 - The proposed process under policy statement V-B is already available.
 - The policy statement should be reworded to call for the need to adopt the project assessment methodology tool.
 - Policy statement V-B is not consistent with the intent of Goal V on sustainable investments.
- Rail investments (especially freight rail investments) cross multiple regions. It is therefore, to make investment decisions at the regional level.
- Regions and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) would program money for freight if they were more involved in the State and District planning decision-making process.
- The Committee should focus on setting up priorities and criteria for investing in rail. These priorities and criteria will be incorporated in future Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) and Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) updates.
- Rather than enumerating a new methodology, could we enhance as needed the technical review under ETDM or other existing processes to support rail prioritization and investment strategies.
- Policy statement V-C.
 - To achieve broad public support, political leadership is required.
 - To achieve public support for rail, especially passenger rail, a public education outreach effort should be developed and implemented. Political leadership will not be achieved without broad public support.
 - Does this also apply to private companies? *No.*
 - There are two distinct components under this policy statement. One is the need to inform the public at large to promote rail as a viable alternative mode of transportation and two is the need to inform public officials to gain their support.
- Under policy statement V-D, the Committee should recommend exploring opportunities to begin taxing on a regional basis. There is a need to create regional taxing authority.
- Under policy statement V-E, replace the word “allow” with “encourage” since under the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) regional multimodal planning projects can be funded.
 - What are matching requirements for passenger rail projects under TRIP? *As with roads of regional significance, the matching requirement for passenger rail is 50 percent.*

- Policy statement V-F should call for renaming the charter county transit surtax instead of expanding it. This tax currently funds both transit and non-transit capital and operation and maintenance projects, as such, it should be labeled “transit”.
- Policy statement V-G fits better under the subsection on public-private partnerships. Furthermore, given current State budget conditions, it will be difficult to justify reserving funds for future use.
- The Committee should develop policy language that would encourage the private sector to communicate needed information without the risk of violating proprietary information.
- Strike the word “equity” under policy statement V-H.
- The Committee should recommend developing a cost-benefit tools that compares the costs and benefits of transportation investments across all modes and between projects within modes.
- Policy statement V-I should recognize the State has other important priorities in addition to transportation. Reword policy statement V-I to call for no transfer of dollars from transportation to other programs.
- Policy statement V-J should be moved to section III on maintenance and preservation. Rephrase policy statement V-J to read as follows: “recommend a methodical re-evaluation of all abandoned rail corridors in terms of their highest and best use.
- Consider deleting policy statement V-K. The Committee should be careful about using preemption measures; this is an extreme measure that causes more problems than solve them.

Public-Private Partnerships

- How are you defining “balance” under policy statement V-M. The term “balance” refers to the need to balance the need to protect the private sector’s proprietary information with the need for government transparency.
- Policy statement V-N is related to the political process. The Department cannot implement this recommendation.
- Public-private partnerships should be considered to support system operations.
- A discussion on educating the public on the benefits of public-private partnerships should be included in this section.

VI. Planning (Alternatively a subsection under mobility)

- Strike the word “lean” from policy statement VI-A.
 - Ensure the screening process does not include components that are merit-based.
- Under policy statement VI-B, revise the first sentence to read as follows: “Create a new model, structure, or forum to bring together freight movers, policymakers, business, and economic leaders to constructively address mutual issue”.
 - Is policy statement VI-B limited to freight needs? *No*.

- Transportation impacts the economy and the economy impact transportation. As such, the Committee should recommend policies that allow business leader to provide input at the State, regional, and local level.
 - Replace the term “freight moves” with a broader term.
- The various statements under policy statement VI-C can be combined into one paragraph.
- Policy statement D should be revised to read as follows: “Florida should continue to work with the Federal government...” as opposed to Florida should work with the Federal government...”
- Under policy statement VI-E, the Committee should call for reviewing “best practices and programs” from other states.
- Under policy statement VI-E, replace the term “maximize” with “enhance”.
 - Are development opportunities a subset of land use opportunities? Is the term land use used in the broader sense? Land use opportunities can create investment opportunities.
- Policy statement VI-F should read as follows: “Encourage a more robust streamlined permitting process”.
- Policy statements VI-G and VI-H fit better under the discussion on environmental sustainability.

Regional Coordination

- Some Committee members were pleased with Policy recommendation VI-I
- The Regional Coordination section appears to predominantly support passenger rail needs. At the metropolitan planning level, freight is becoming a growing concern given the increasing goods mobility needs.
- Members recommend broadening the scope of this section to include consideration for both passenger and freight needs. At the regional level, District Secretaries should encourage Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to work together.
- We need to also recommend a role for Regional Planning Councils (RPCs) to promote regional coordination. What is the relationship between RPCs and MPOs?
 - Policy statement VI-I should include a reference to RPCs.
- Replace the term “incentivize” with enhance under policy statement VI-I.
- Funding for Regional plans is not limited to State resources. Regional plans are eligible for Federal funds. As such, policy statement VI-J should refer to Federal funding opportunities.

Working Lunch

The Chair introduced Kim Delaney, with the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council. In her presentation, Ms. Delaney discussed how the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council and the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority are connecting land use and transportation decisions and encouraging Transit Oriented Developments, where feasible. Ms. Delaney’s presentation can be found at <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rail/plandevel.htm>.

Following Ms. Delaney's presentation, the Chair opened the floor for questions. (Responses to member's comments are shown in *italic*)

- Transit Oriented Developments (TODs) should be addressed under policy statement II-E. Particularly, the Committee should recommend revising State Statutes to address concurrency issues for local facilities.

General Public Comments

The Chair stressed the importance for input from the public as this process moves forward and offered all members of the public the opportunity to speak to the group from the microphone. No public comments were offered on Day Two.

The Chair noted additional opportunities for input through the public comment form (available at the sign in table) and online (<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rail/plandev.html>) are available. Any written comments received will be shared with the Committee members, she added.

Next Steps

In her concluding remarks, the Chair thanked Committee members, the public and staff for their participation in, support of, and contribution to the Florida Rail System Plan development process. The Chair

- Urged members to visit the Florida Rail System Plan website at <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rail/plandev.html>;
- Informed the audience the vision statement and draft policy recommendations will be revised by Committee members and presented to the full Committee at the next meeting on November 12 in Jacksonville;
- Indicated a meeting summary for this first meeting will be available for review; and
- Asked members to complete the evaluation form contained in their handbooks before adjourning. (See Appendix B for meeting evaluation summary)

The Chair also reminded members to discuss today's meeting and the materials with their respective constituencies prior to the next meeting in Jacksonville to keep their constituencies informed and seek broader input.

The Chair also noted that the next (and fourth) meeting will be a full day meeting held on November 12, instead of the originally scheduled two-day meeting on November 12-13. A fifth full day meeting will be scheduled in early December.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 PM.

Appendix I

Florida Rail System Plan
Rail Stakeholder Advisory Committee – 3rd Meeting
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida
September 30-October 1, 2008

"Plan for the future because that's where you are going to spend the rest of your life." -- Mark Twain

Proposed Meeting Objectives

- Review and finalize the draft vision statement.
- Review additional information relevant to the formulation of recommendations.
- Review draft format of the RSAC report, including introduction, background, and organization.
- Review and refine draft advisory recommendations.
- Agree on next steps and assignments for the final Rail Stakeholders Advisory Committee Meeting to be held November 12-13, 2008, in Jacksonville.

DAY ONE

- 1:00 Opening Remarks and Agenda Review**
- 1:15 Finalize Draft Vision Statement**
- 1:45 Presentations: *National Rail Freight Infrastructure Capacity and Investment Study (American Association of Railroads) & Freight-Rail Bottom Line Report (AASHTO)***
Larry Ratcliffe, CSX Transportation
Lance Grenzeback, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
- 2:30 Review Draft Committee Report Format**
- 2:45 Break**
- 3:00 Presentations: *Rail Safety in Florida & Florida's Rail Freight Traffic***
Ed Lee, FDOT
- 3:45 Review and Refine Combined Draft Policy Recommendations**
- 5:15 Review Public Comment Received**
- 5:30 General Public Comment**
- 5:55 Discuss Evening Dinner Plans and Review Schedule for Day 2**
- 6:00 Adjourn for the Day**

Florida Rail System Plan
Rail Stakeholder Advisory Committee – 3rd Meeting
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida
September 30-October 1, 2008

DAY TWO

- 8:00** Coffee
- 8:30** Review Agenda for Day Two
- 8:35** Presentation: *FDOT Benefit/Cost Analysis*
Ed Lee, FDOT
- 9:00** Continue to Review and Refine Draft Policy Recommendations
- 10:00** Break
- 10:15** Continue to Review and Refine Draft Policy Recommendations
- 11:45** Working Lunch
Presentation: Kim Delaney, Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
- 1:00** Continue to Review and Refine Draft Policy Recommendations
- 2:15** Discuss the Approach to Prioritizing Advisory Recommendations
- 2:45** Review Draft Committee Report Format
- 3:00** Public Comment
- 3:15** Next Steps
- 3:30** Adjourn

Appendix II

MEETING EVALUATION SUMMARY

**Florida Rail System Plan
Rail Stakeholders Advisory Committee – 3rd Meeting
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida – Sept. 30 – Oct. 1, 2008**

Proposed Meeting Objectives

☺	☹	☹	☹	
<u>Agree</u>	<i>CIRCLE ONE</i>			<u>Disagree</u>
5	4	3	2	1 =Avg.

WERE THE MEETING OBJECTIVES MET?

• Review and finalize the draft vision statement;	6	3	3	0	0 =4.25
• Review additional information relevant to the formulation of recommendations;		5	5	2	0 =4.25
• Review draft format of the RSAC report, including introduction, background, and organization;		4	6	1	0 =4.27
• Review and refine draft advisory recommendations; and,		7	4	1	0 =4.50
• Agree on next steps and assignments for the final Rail Stakeholders Advisory Committee meeting to be held on November 12-13, 2008		5	3	1	0 =4.44

MEETING ORGANIZATION

	☺	☹	☹	☹	
• Background and agenda packet were helpful	7	5	1	0	0 =4.46
• Presentations were effective and informative	6	7	0	0	0 =4.46
• Plenary discussion format was effective	6	5	2	0	0 =4.31
• Facilitator guided participant efforts effectively	7	6	0	0	0 =5.00
• Participation was balanced	6	5	1	0	0 =4.42

What Did You Like Best About the Meeting?

- Open environment to have thorough discussions.
- Great discussion. Lets keep going!
- I like the port.
- Somehow you go us through it all!
- Quick response at drafts- staying focused on goals.

What Could be Improved?

- Better sound system.
- Logistics- sound, sight.
- Spend 5 minutes for agenda review NOT 30 minutes/ over kill!
- Terrible AV.
- Slides not clean due to light.
- Meeting location- difficult to hear.
- Tighter agenda- one day format is a good idea.
- A facility with better acoustics and less direct sunlight.

Other Comments (use the back if necessary):

- Please supply overview of ETDM and TRIP

Appendix III

RSAC COMBINED DRAFT POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction:

The Red and Blue Drafting Groups each created potential advisory policy statements during the August 26-27 meeting of the Rail Stakeholder Advisory Committee. Each group held a separate teleconference during September to review, discuss and refine the statements. Below, the facilitators have combined the revised statements from both groups into one set and placed them within the five goals of the current 2025 Florida Transportation Plan for purposes of further review.

The letters preceding the statements are intended only for purposes of reference during discussion and do not indicate any form of prioritization. The facilitators grouped statements we believed captured the same concept together under the same letter.

Summary reports from the teleconference for each group will be made available on the RSAC website and included in the meeting notebook for the next RSAC meeting on September 30 – October 1. Each statement is followed by a designation in a () as a cross reference to the ~~striketrough~~/underlined revisions captured in the teleconference reports. The letters within the () indicate the original theme under which each idea was created. The number refers to the respective statement under each theme. As a reminder, the Blue Group discussed themes A-D and the Red Group discussed themes E-H.

Much of our time at the next RSAC meeting will focus on clarifying, refining and adding to these statements. Please review the combined statements and be prepared to discuss the following questions:

- Does the statement capture the key concept? Does it need any clarification?
- For statements grouped together, do they address the same concept?
- If so, what is the key concept at the core of the statements?
- For each goal section as a whole, are any major concepts still missing?

You will also be given an opportunity to discuss the potential goal structure for your final report.

**RSAC COMBINED DRAFT POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS
BY 2025 FTP GOALS:**

I. Safety and Security: A safer and more secure transportation system for residents, businesses, and visitors;

(No statements have been offered)

II. Quality of Life and Environmental Stewardship: Enriched quality of life and responsible environmental stewardship;

Appropriate Land Use Decisions

- A. Develop a State vision for rail with regional components. (F1)
- B. Study the positive and negative impacts of increasing the emphasis on rail on the quality of life. (A9)
- C. Remove structural impediments that create the disconnect between transportation and land use planning. (A8)
- D. Work with the Department of Community Affairs and the Florida Department of Transportation to create laws providing incentives for those investment decisions promoting infill development. (B2)

Provide financial incentives for land use decisions, which support Transit Oriented Development. (B3)

Provide incentives, including financial incentives, to local governments to promote land use patterns that are supportive of transit. (F3)

Provide tax credits for rail investments designed to promote desirable land use patterns or economic development. (F5)

- E. Consider alternatives to the current concurrency system, such as weighted concurrency credits, concurrency bonuses, or an alternative mobility fee, which is broadly assessed. (B5)

Reform transportation concurrency to allow local governments greater flexibility. Consider alternatives to the current concurrency management system that makes roadway LOS the paramount factor in concurrency management. (F8)

- F. Regional Planning Councils, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, State and Regional Transportation Authorities should convene planning processes to integrate rail and land use at the regional level. (F2)
- H. Consider impacts of new rail facilities on communities. Consider grade separation whenever possible for future facilities or land use decisions. (F6)
- I. Require consideration of rail in the land use and transportation elements of comprehensive plan. (F7)

Environmental Sustainability

- J. Implement the Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) process for early coordination of project and corridor review to identify potential environmental issues. (H1)
- K. Call for early coordination, even before ETDM, between agencies and stakeholders, to identify environmental issues before significant costs have been invested. (H2)
- L. The Florida Rail System Plan should highlight environmental benefits, smaller environmental footprint, of rail when compared to roads. These benefits should be described in ways that align with those identified at the Federal level, to maximize the eligibility of Florida projects for Federal funding. (H4)
- M. Use transfers of corridor ownership, corridor improvements, or other projects as opportunities to address existing environmental issues. (H5)
- N. Educate the public and policy-makers about the environmental and other benefits of rail to increase understanding of and support for rail. (H6)
- O. Use environmental benefits of rail as explicit factors in the project assessment methodology (see Theme E). (H7)
- P. Regional Planning Councils, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, the Florida Department of Transportation and other agencies and partners should make explicit in regional plans the environmental consequences of various different modal mixes in corridor and regional planning. (H8)
- Q. Use carbon credits and green credits to promote desired land use patterns or projects. If a project can be linked to a beneficial public investments (in this case rail), provide tax or other credits. (H9)

III. Maintenance and Preservation: Adequate and cost-efficient maintenance and preservation of Florida’s transportation assets;

(No statements have been offered)

IV. Mobility and Economic Competitiveness: Stronger economy through enhanced mobility for people and freight; and

- A. The rail system plan should support improved seamless connections of intra-city and inter-city rail to local transit systems. (A2)
- B. Promote economic and industrial development along existing and new freight rail corridors. (F4)
- C. Encourage consideration of the environmental and economic benefits of rail in large regional visioning and planning efforts. (H3)

V. Sustainable Investment: Sustainable transportation investments for Florida’s future.

- A. Recommendations for consideration during the SIS update: (A1)
 - o Review the policy for the distribution of SIS dollars as it relates to highways, rail and other modes of transportation.
 - o Support an increased emphasis on the role of rail in the transportation system by making additional components in the rail system eligible for SIS funds.

Currently TRIP and SIS funding is not comparable across modes. Rail projects should be evaluated as part of an overall multi-modal transportation policy that looks at the potential benefits of all modes when looking for the best way to meet a particular need. (E2)

Reevaluate percentage allocation of transportation dollars by mode. The percentage allocation of transportation dollars should reflect the respective benefits of each mode, as highlighted by the project assessment methodology described above. (E4)

- B. Develop a project assessment methodology tool to weigh the full range of quality of life, environmental and other important factors. Develop criteria to account for factors including, but not limited to the following: (E3)
 - o Private support
 - o Partnership support
 - o Density
 - o Impact on land use – potential for shaping land use in desirable ways
 - o Impact on quality of life
 - o Impact on air quality
 - o Emissions of harmful pollutants, including greenhouse gas emissions

- Environmental sensitivity
- Larger, multi-jurisdictional purpose
- Regional differences
- Cost per unit, whether of passenger or freight
- Return on investment, financial and other
- Costs of not proceeding with the project?

In evaluating alternatives, incorporate the value of inter-city and intra-city rail in preserving capacity function of other modes in the SIS. (A3)

Consider regional rail projects and other modes as alternatives to new or expanding highways. (C9)

Conduct cross-benefit analyses between modes and between project alternatives within the same mode to help make more informed investment decisions and prioritize projects. The tool should include environmental impacts, green house reductions and other public benefits. (A4)

- C. Achieve broad public support for investing in rail at the regional and local levels. (A5)

Promote understanding of the economics benefits of rail. Develop or disseminate information about studies demonstrating the return on investment (financial and other) of transportation projects. Make ROI a criterion considered in the project assessment methodology. (E9)

The Department should support alternative studies to help the public better understand the Department's investment decision and the value/cost of investing in a wide variety of projects. The Department should pursue initiatives for transparency in its decision making process by including the alternatives considered in the final decision. (B1)

- D. Identify ways for communities to more easily afford to do regional rail projects, including decreasing disincentives and promoting incentives through legislative action as needed. (C7)

Legislature should provide additional funding sources including: (E5)

- Bonding
- Additional gas tax
- Local option sources
- Tax credits
- Tax increment financing
- Other

The Legislature should make it easier for local governments to exercise local options by removing the requirement for supermajority approval. (E8)

- E. Allow Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) dollars to be spent on regional multimodal planning. (D4)
- F. Expand the Charter County Transit System Surtax option to all counties. (D5)
- G. Develop a mechanism to reserve public funds for swift response to public/private partnerships. (D8)

Consider a policy for creating a set aside to support public/private partnerships. (D9)

The legislature should authorize procedures to set aside funds or use funds remaining unallocated at the end of each funding cycle (in ways that do not affect committed projects) to respond to rail opportunities. Develop mechanisms to disseminate information about available funds to potential partners. (G3)

- H. Ensure formulas for prioritization are equitable across different components of the system – freight, passenger, other. (E6)
- I. The Legislature should ensure allocation of all transportation-related revenues in the State to transportation. (E7)
- J. Require careful (heightened?) consideration of possible future reuse of unused rail corridors before allowing their use for “rail-to-trail” projects. (F9)
- K. The legislature should consider a state version of federal “preemption” for rail projects of statewide significance. (This recommendation should be reconsidered after reviewing additional information about the current relationship of proposed rail projects to local government comprehensive plans.) (F10)

Public-Private Partnerships

- L. Develop clear processes for negotiating public private partnerships that are efficient, effective, and respect legitimate concerns for confidentiality and public concerns for disclosure. (D1)
- M. Ensure a balance between public and private needs. (D2)
- N. It is the responsibility of public officials to ensure the public understands the impacts and benefits of public-private partnerships– the benefits need to be clearly laid out up front. (D3)

VI. Planning (Alternatively a subsection under mobility)

A. Establish an inclusive, efficient, lean screening process to bring parties together early to review and determine whether or not there is sufficient political and public support or commitment to get it done. The process would be convened by an appropriate public entity such as FDOT for inter-regional projects or a regional entity for a two or three county project. (A6)

B. Create a new model, structure or forum to bring together freight movers and policy makers to constructively address mutual issues. (A7)

Promote and support better communication between Florida Department of Transportation modal offices, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, economic development organizations and other agencies to explore and respond to opportunities. (G2)

C. There is a need for better coordination and understanding the planning efforts of seaports, rail, airports, etc., and how local efforts can support those plans. (B4)

Need to coordinate planning and design of new infrastructure to address the needs of various users and future flows (segregated facilities, passing sidings, and impacts on communities) (C3)

Improve system integration between freight and passenger rail and connections with other modes of transportation. (C2)

D. The State should maximize federal dollars to match state dollars. As a donor state, Florida should work with the Federal government to receive more Federal funding. (C1)

Ensure maximum flexibility in State plans and procedures to optimize opportunities to use Federal dollars. (E1)

E. The Committee should emphasize the need to review and implement best practices from other states on integration of land use changes to maximize coordination between the various modes of transportation. (C4)

F. Support using streamlined methods for permitting such as EDTM in the private sector. (D6)

G. Develop an initial screen (similar to how ETDM evaluates environmental issues) for identifying needs and evaluating the public support and political feasibility of a project. (D7)

H. Implement the Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) process for early coordination of project and corridor review. (G1)

Regional Coordination

- I. The Department's District Secretaries should foster regional coordination between Metropolitan Planning Organizations to ensure better coordination of investment and planning for regional rail projects and opportunities. (C5)

Emphasize the need to foster cross coordination between Metropolitan Planning Organizations on rail opportunities. (C6)

- J. Further incentivize regional coordination on multiple modes, including freight and passenger rail, within corridors. For example, Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) dollars could be used for planning for very specific, targeted corridors, with authorization from the Secretary and District Secretary. (C8)