



DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES
BROWARD METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Regional Transportation
Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC) Meeting
Wednesday, October 13, 2021 1:30 PM
100 West Cypress Creek Road
6th Floor, Suite 650
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309-2181

Members Present

Acting Chair Bill Cross, Broward MPO
Sabrina Aubery, Florida Department of Transportation District 4
Lois Bush, Florida Department of Transportation District 4
Kim Delaney, Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
Tewari Edmonson, Miami-Dade TPO
Wilson Fernandez, Miami-Dade TPO
Ken Jeffries, Florida Department of Transportation District 6
Tom Lanahan, Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
Natalie Yesbeck Pustizzi, South Florida Regional Transportation Authority

Broward MPO Staff

Hannah Bourgeois
Paul Calvaresi
Carl Ema
Paul Flavien
Rebecca Schultz

Also Present

Conor Campobasso, Palm Beach TPA
Lisa Colmenar, Miami-Dade TPO

REGULAR ITEMS

(All Items Open for Public Comment)

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Acting Chair (A/Chair) Cross called the workshop to order at 2:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes – June 10, 2021 & September 9, 2021

The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

3. Approval of Agenda

This Item was not addressed.

4. Public Comments

None.

5. Comments from the Chair

None.

ACTION ITEMS

None.

NON-ACTION ITEMS

1. 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Revenue Review and Discussion

Conor Campobasso, representing the Palm Beach TPA, provided an update on the scope of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The scoping phase of the RTP is nearly done, and the team is nearing the procurement and development phases. In June 2021, the first draft of the RTP was sent to partner agencies, and comments from those agencies were incorporated into the document. A workshop was held in August for discussion of the second draft, after which comments were also incorporated from the agencies. A third draft has just been completed the previous week.

The mission is a shared RTP that summarizes the region's needs, gathers support for adopted policies, and creates a blueprint for implementation. It advocates for flexible and equitable reallocation of funds to implement regional priorities, and will focus on the changing needs of the region, including emerging technologies, resilient infrastructure, transportation options, and harmonious land uses. The 2045 RTP builds on the accomplishments of the 2040 Plan, updating deliverables as needed and focusing on project delivery, outreach, and education.

There are 10 tasks associated with the 2045 RTP, some of which are administrative. These include:

- Beta testing and goals/objectives/measures
- Revenue and finance: a section including initial analysis of Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) forecasts has been removed, and local revenues, such as surtaxes, will also be considered
- Language modified to ensure coordination between the RTTAC and the three transportation agencies in different scenarios

Peter Gies of Broward MPO Staff recalled that at a previous meeting, the Committee had discussed the incorporation of themes such as freight, resiliency, safety, and technology, for which he had hoped to see more robust tasks to support local MPOs. He pointed out that these are regional issues not limited to the three counties, and suggested that the scope include a more “built out” plan related to specific issues, which would be supportive of the tasks the three agencies are undertaking.

Ms. Bush advised that equity also be considered as an additional theme to be incorporated. She encouraged the review of a broad range of plans that relate to transportation, housing, and economic development. While this will require a larger budget, the result will likely be a more closely aligned plan.

Ms. Bush continued that there are plans for a regional needs assessment in conjunction with planning for Strategic Intermodal Systems (SIS) in 2050, and suggested that the process could examine how needs assessments are done to coordinate the three agencies’ work. A/Chair Cross advised that the Committee would welcome a presentation on SIS.

Mr. Lanahan suggested that a visitor/tourism component could be considered as well, as this is a major pillar of the South Florida economy. Another consideration is evacuation concepts for hurricanes and other types of emergencies.

Mr. Calvaresi observed that there may be efficiencies and cost savings that can be realized by incorporating information from previous RTPs rather than doing this work again from the beginning. He felt the primary goal is to determine what the Plan is trying to do as an overall document, and to address any issues from the previous Plan that may remain unfinished.

Mr. Edmonson advised that he would like to see identification of the one key item it is hoped the RTP will accomplish for 2050. He referred to the strong case for more flexible funding in the 2045 RTP as an example.

The mission statement accompanying the RTP’s scope establishes the charge for the document, summarizing regional needs, gathering support for adopted policies, and creating a blueprint for implementation. It also states that the RTP advocates for a flexible and equitable reallocation of funds to implement priorities. Ms. Delaney explained that this leads to a conclusion that flexible funding is an overarching theme of the 2045 RTP.

The next part of the mission statement addresses where the region is going by referring to the changing needs of the region, including emerging technologies, resilient infrastructure, transportation options, and harmonious land uses. Ms. Delaney emphasized that land use needs to be brought up to a par with the other considerations.

A/Chair Cross agreed that this is generally true, although he suggested that “transit-supportive” may be a more accurate term than “harmonious.” He pointed out that the previous plan identified the economic impacts of transit-supportive land use surrounding major transit investments. Ms. Delaney noted that the land use aspect of the RTP should be fleshed out further to address some of these concerns.

Ms. Bush added that there is a difference between scenario planning that considers where a region wants to go and scenario planning that explores what might happen. She felt the RTP should address the latter scenario, which relates to resiliency and other considerations as well. She was also in favor of adding equity to the mission statement.

A/Chair Cross observed that the mission statement refers to the equitable reallocation of funds, pointing out that the primary tool of the transportation agencies is the funding of projects. He felt specific recommendations of what should be addressed would be more helpful. Ms. Bush proposed a closer focus on accessibility, including the ability to reach desired destinations, pointing out that this access to transportation is not equitable across the board.

A/Chair Cross also noted that while he was not in favor of significantly more scenario planning after so much had been done in preparation for the 2045 RTP, he felt there were new areas that should be incorporated into the 2050 RTP. He was particularly supportive of further exploring accessibility, including best practices and how accessibility can be applied to the agencies’ individual LRTPs.

Mr. Gies recalled that current transportation models have outputs that allow for the calculation of accessibility. He advised that this could be undertaken using current models, as this may be able to supplement or complement what is already gained from transportation models using a level of service perspective. He concluded that he was supportive of looking at this task as proposed by A/Chair Cross in lieu of further scenario planning.

Ms. Delaney referred to the goals and objectives of the 2045 RTP, as the scope of the 2050 document is clear in its reliance on looking at the goals and objectives of prior Plans. She reiterated that the 2045 RTP focused on flexible funding, which was not a popular area of focus but an honest identification of what is needed. It may be that equitable access to transportation is similarly positioned. This could be tested in the modeling of different scenarios.

Lisa Colmenar, also representing the Miami-Dade TPO, suggested additional discussion of the resilience of infrastructure. A/Chair Cross requested feedback on whether the term “sustainability” should be replaced by “resiliency.” Ms. Delaney felt resiliency could become a major goal of the RTP, addressing emergency operational impacts, sea level rise, and other considerations. It was noted that this would build on the foundation laid by the 2045 RTP.

Mr. Fernandez expressed concern that the RTP and the three agencies' LRTPs will need to reflect some of the same priorities. Because the LRTPs' scopes are not yet prepared, he cautioned that there is no connection to be made between the documents at this time. He emphasized that the documents must be able to support one another.

Ms. Delaney asked how the schedules might be adjusted to address this timing issue. Mr. Fernandez replied that representatives of each agency could be asked to give an assessment of where their respective LRTP scopes are in terms of development. These will also need to be reflected in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) with identified costs.

A/Chair Cross noted that this Discussion Item will come back before the RTTAC in December 2021 as an Action Item, and will then be presented to SEFTC in February 2022 for formal endorsement. This means the scopes of the LRTPs will need to be finalized over the next one to two months in order to ensure that they reflect the same goals as the RTP, unless the RTTAC endorsement can be pushed back to January 2022. It was determined that the latest meeting at which the RTTAC scope can be presented for approval would be February 2022.

Mr. Calvaresi stated that the RTTAC schedule is currently set to meet every even-numbered month; however, this can be changed if necessary. He concluded that a date will be set for the next meeting, and encouraged the Committee members to be flexible in their schedules and to encourage similar flexibility from their elected officials in SEFTC as well.

A/Chair Cross advised that the RTTAC would plan to meet in January 2022, with a date yet to be determined, and send the RTP scope to SEFTC in February 2022 as planned. It was suggested that the Palm Beach TPA host the February 25, 2022 SEFTC meeting.

Mr. Calvaresi noted that there is also a procurement schedule to be followed. Mr. Campobasso replied that he did not foresee any issues with procurement.

Ms. Delaney asked if the Committee wished to review slides addressing the scope, as this could provide guidance on where these issues would best be included. It was noted that Task 4 of the scope includes review and refinement of prior RTP goals. The Committee agreed by consensus that resiliency could be added under this task, while truck and freight circulation and distribution could be included under objectives that deal with the economy.

A/Chair Cross asked for more information on the deliverable of a legislative policy summary. Mr. Campobasso replied that this would be an update to legislative policies addressed in the 2045 RTP, based on ongoing legislative discussions. A/Chair Cross advised that he was not certain the best action in this case was updating previous information, pointing out that the previous focus was on legislative funding flexibility. He

recommended instead providing a comprehensive review of any new federal transportation bill that might be prepared before the 2050 RTP is begun. The RTP could collect this data and review any implications that would affect the three agencies in the development of their individual plans as well as the RTP. She characterized this as the RTP providing legislative information as a service to the individual agencies.

Mr. Edmonson advised that another aspect of the scope that should be emphasized is support for the RTTAC by SEFTC. This would include support services by the Palm Beach TPA that are similar to the support services provided to SEFTC and its subcommittees by the Broward MPO during the previous RTTAC cycle. A/Chair Cross clarified that this is listed under the Tasks. It was noted that this is intended to cover updates and interim progress reports to the RTTAC.

Ms. Bush commented that the list seems to have moved from a library of measures of effectiveness for regional goals and objectives to actually clarifying these measures and setting targets for them. Ms. Delaney replied that the scope as presented has been in production for some time, resulting in detailed and measurable objectives and targets as part of the development of the RTP.

Ms. Bush continued that she had understood the regional transit network in the 2045 RTP to be for scenario purposes only, and asked if the 2050 RTP will include this network as well. A/Chair Cross advised that there will be a transit network in the Plan, although what it will look like may be dependent upon what is available to be incorporated.

Ms. Delaney noted that there has not been significant discussion on revenue and finance, and that the three counties have different statuses with regard to potential funding sources. The scope as drafted addresses the establishment of new as well as existing surtax resources. Mr. Calvaresi noted that Task 5.1 calls for the consultant to create a financial resource and record a technical memorandum, both of which were part of the 2045 RTP. He recalled that this was addressed in the previous document, and if there is a nexus between revenue sources and their allocation to funding programs, it is very difficult to find. As a result, the previous RTP looked at transportation programs to arrive at the conclusion that flexible funding should be “the way to go” and new sources were only needed as dedicated funding sources, such as Broward’s transportation surtax.

A/Chair Cross stated that there is the possibility that a new federal transportation law will include significant changes from what has been included in the last several transportation bills. He proposed that the 2050 RTP be updated to reflect these prospective changes. In addition, FDOT is currently updating its SIS program, which is one of the key targets for a discussion of flexible funding. He expected that by the time the 2050 RTP is underway, new guidance on SIS will be available from FDOT. He encouraged having the consultant closely review the new SIS guidelines and report back to the Committee on any changes.

Mr. Lanahan suggested that the new federal legislation and the flexibility afforded by the new SIS be specifically mentioned in the 2050 RTP. Ms. Bush added that leveraging should also be considered as a theme, pointing out that billions of dollars are allocated for resiliency funding at the state, federal, and local levels. She emphasized the importance of leveraging investments across these entities to increase resiliency.

Ms. Delaney next addressed development of the transportation network. Mr. Calvaresi advised that this is a required task of SEFTC, as it is the transportation network used to program Transportation Regional Incentives Program (TRIP) funds. This may also be incorporated into future SIS funding. He recommended that no changes be made to this section.

A/Chair Cross observed that one item discussed as part of the Broward MPO's 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is considering where resiliency funds are allocated. They did not wish to use these funds broadly across the area, as it is likely that every road cannot be saved, but instead recommended focusing on where resiliency investments could do the most good. He suggested the Committee determine whether they would like to come up with a version of the regional transportation network that focuses on resiliency by addressing key roadways.

Mr. Gies advised that there has been previous work done on this topic, some of which may need to be updated through the South Florida Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment. This would build upon existing work. A/Chair Cross advised that the first step is determining the network of roadways that should be saved, followed by determining where the impacts of climate change are most likely to affect this network and should be mitigated.

Ms. Delaney pointed out that there are equity implications embedded in this process, and asked how a regional methodology would be developed to make this determination. She continued that there may be some cover available due to objective analysis, with the RTP establishing a methodology that is somewhat removed from the politics of this discussion. This objective view could be used by the three transportation agencies as well.

A/Chair Cross advised that this could raise a number of discussions, pointing out that sometimes saving an individual roadway could result in harming its surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Bush added that in terms of the resiliency of the regional transit network, the intensification of high-capacity transit corridors may require greater analysis, as it may be necessary to relocate or attract residents to less vulnerable areas.

Ms. Bush continued that when the South Florida Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment was undertaken by the Broward MPO, FDOT was asked to provide a supplemental study that considered how storm surge in combination with sea level rise

would disrupt the transportation network. FDOT used a regional travel demand model as well as a sea level rise projection to determine areas with the potential for disruption. She advised that this information could help in determining economic consequences, including lost trips and increased delays.

Ms. Delaney continued that scenario planning can take different forms: it can be reactive, such as testing the number of individuals who would be affected by a transit investment, or proactive, such as recommending land use policies that locate individuals in specific areas in order to support the efficiency of moving these residents from place to place. She requested input from the RTTAC on this topic, noting that Regional Planning Councils typically prefer proactive planning while MPOs have more experience with both reactive and proactive planning.

Mr. Gies recalled that at a recent Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) conference, there was discussion of how MPOs typically carry out their scenario planning. He noted that the tendency of MPOs to undertake more reactive planning may be related to the need to maintain a link between proposed investments and the impact of those investments on the overall network. He pointed out, however, that the accessibility aspect the Committee has discussed may be able to provide a more proactive method in which a scenario that increases accessibility is considered.

A/Chair Cross stated that he did not feel more land use scenario planning would be helpful, as the Committee has shown conclusively the importance of supportive land use surrounding a transit network. He felt additional consideration of land use would be repeating what has already been done, and preferred to focus on climate change, resiliency, telecommuting, and other new issues not previously addressed.

Paul Flavien of the Broward MPO recommended consideration of electric vehicles as part of any resiliency scenario. He pointed out that these vehicles are becoming more common, and noted that electric vehicle technology is more fully developed than automated and/or connected vehicles and should be considered separately from them.

Mr. Calvaresi observed that the Committee can consider output in terms of level of service, and suggested that they consider output in terms of accessibility as well. Ms. Bush emphasized that accessibility measures combine transportation and land use, and noted that the key difference between sustainability and resilience is that resilience is related to disruptions. The RTP could focus on mitigation by considering the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and their potential impacts, as well as adaptation to the impacts that do occur. Mr. Flavien added that electrification of the transit fleet could be one such consideration.

Ms. Delaney noted that the scope calls for up to six alternative scenarios, and suggested that the definition of these scenarios may require additional work. A/Chair Cross advised that scenario planning tends to be a significant driver of costs for regional planning, based on the 2045 RTP's negotiations. He felt it is important to only ask for

the development of scenarios that are necessary. He recommended that if further research is desired, this not be included under scenarios, but instead to be separate direction for consultant research.

Ms. Delaney reviewed some of the proposed scenarios, including sustainability, transit-supportive land use as a baseline, and a default scenario. A/Chair Cross reiterated that he felt a focus on land use and scenario planning was “the wrong path,” as these have already been done; in addition, each of the three agencies will run a land use scenario for their individual plans.

Mr. Edmonson agreed that scenario planning should remain as minimal as possible in an attempt to keep costs low. He advised that for Miami-Dade, telecommuting and automated, connected, electric, and shared (ACES) vehicles are two scenarios from which they can draw information and use it in their plan. It was noted that the telecommuting scenario can be seen as tying into accessibility measures.

Mr. Flavien addressed technology and ACES, stating that little data is available on these issues. This means when a scenario is developed, it would be difficult to determine whether the output is positive or negative.

Ms. Delaney concluded that this leaves only two potential scenarios in addition to the existing/default scenario as a baseline. Mr. Campobasso stated that ACES should remain as a scenario unless it is ultimately determined that the output is worth less than the cost of running the scenario.

A/Chair Cross recommended replacing the telecommuting scenario with accessibility, as telecommuting can be considered one aspect of an accessibility scenario. He continued that the ACES/technology should remain, and a sustainability scenario could be added, resulting in three scenarios. Mr. Campobasso agreed with this proposal.

Ms. Bush stated that the definition of resiliency can be modified to include mitigation, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and adaptation efforts. Sustainability, however, is a broader term. She recommended caution in how these two terms are used, as they are not interchangeable.

Ms. Delaney listed the following scenarios:

- Sustainability, focused on carbon dioxide emissions reduction and electrification of the transit fleet
- Accessibility, including telecommuting and telehealth
- ACES technology

She asked if a potential resiliency scenario should consider what might happen to the transportation network when different filters of resiliency investment are applied to it.

A/Chair Cross asked if any specific roads are projected to be underwater by 2050, and whether a scenario should be created to reflect the prospective loss of this infrastructure. He proposed that this be listed as a fourth optional scenario that has not yet been fully defined, as this provides some flexibility for future discussion. It was noted that the addition of a fourth scenario, however, could significantly increase costs.

Ms. Bush emphasized the importance of considering mitigation and adaptation as two aspects of resiliency. Unified sea level rise projections are based on assumptions about greenhouse gas emission levels. She characterized this as a way to advocate for transportation that would minimize these emissions while promoting walkability and transit-supportive areas.

Ms. Delaney continued that the 2050 RTP scope discusses coordination with the RTTC's Modeling Subcommittee, as well as the engagement of the consultant with the Subcommittees. One regional model will be used for all three LRTPs/MTP, which is a requirement of SEFTC. This is a necessary fixed cost for the RTP. Under the category of models for scenario testing, the Committee agreed that this will change from five to four scenarios, as previously discussed.

Task #9 addresses development of the RTP itself, including multiple modes of transportation, as well as references to the Climate Change Action Plan and Regional Freight Plan. Modes include transit, with the development of a transit network as a result of the RTP. A/Chair Cross noted that Broward County Transit (BCT) currently has a major Transit System Plan underway, which should be reflected in the document. Palm Tran also has an updated transit plan, and Miami-Dade has recently approved its Better Bus Network, which is scheduled for implementation in 2022.

Regarding freight, Ms. Delaney advised that the concerns raised earlier in the meeting could be addressed by the 2050 Southeast Florida Regional Freight Plan. Mr. Flavien noted, however, that there is no interest among freight providers to create this Plan, which would require the rewording of references to this document. Mr. Gies added that there are other issues that have arisen throughout the region, including truck parking, "truck platooning," and others, which will be addressed through a separate Action Plan. This Plan could make up the freight element of the RTP.

It was noted that the most recent Regional Freight Plan adopted was in 2014 as part of the 2040 RTP forecast. Mr. Flavien recalled that the last Regional Freight Plan was created by the three transportation agencies in partnership with FDOT, with FDOT providing the majority of funding. In 2045, the agencies approached FDOT regarding an update, but it was also determined at that time there was no appetite to update the Regional Freight Plan.

Mr. Flavien continued that the Truck Parking Action Plan and any additional appropriate documents can be incorporated into the 2050 RTP. The project list from the 2040

Regional Freight Plan can also be updated, as many of the facilities suggested in that Plan have likely been built by now.

The discussion moved on to ACES, resiliency and equity, with the Committee noting that this includes background research and analysis, but little new work to be undertaken. Mr. Calvaresi noted that the RTP document is the culmination of work done on several tasks as well as an examination of where South Florida is as a region and where it is going.

Ms. Delaney concluded that she has received significant direction for the revision of the scope based on today's discussion, and will list these edits for the Palm Beach TPA. The changes are likely to result in cost reduction as well as a more focused scope.

Ms. Bush requested clarification of what else is needed from the RTTAC members, such as additional feedback on the scope once the document has been circulated. It was clarified that Mr. Campobasso will integrate the comments from today's input into the scope, with some edits, to further refine it. The revised scope will then be shared with the Committee for further review, with the intent of presenting the scope to the RTTAC for approval in January 2022 and to SEFTC in February 2022.

A/Chair Cross asked if the members felt an intermediate RTTAC meeting, possibly in December 2021, would be necessary for further discussion of the scope. Ms. Delaney noted that today's discussion has been very thorough, and pointed out that further discussion could overburden a regular RTTAC Agenda. She suggested distributing the revised scope to the members in November 2021, which could be followed by a virtual meeting in December, as no action would be needed. Mr. Calvaresi noted that a standing RTTAC meeting has already been scheduled for December, which could be changed to a workshop meeting.

Mr. Edmonson asked at what point the Palm Beach TPA will be able to provide costs associated with the proposed scope, or if plans are going forward under the impression that the changed scope will remain within the \$900,000 traditional funding cost of the RTP. Mr. Campobasso replied that at present, the assumption remains that the work will cost \$900,000 or less. Tasks have been removed from other areas of the document, which will result in some cost savings. The time frame by which firmer costs must be calculated has not yet been determined.

A/Chair Cross commented that the \$900,000 budget assigned to the previous RTP cycle was very tight, resulting in challenging negotiations with the consultant and the elimination of some elements to reduce costs. He was not certain that the current cycle would fall within this limit, particularly regarding inflation and other fiscal concerns. He recommended consideration of raising this figure to \$1 million.

Mr. Edmonson noted that while additional aspects may be added to the scope, there should be monitoring of how additional hours will affect the RTP's costs. He advised

that this will be part of the contractual relationship between the Palm Beach TPA and the consultant team. A/Chair Cross reiterated that more funds should be set aside for the RTP in the event that the costs cannot be negotiated to below \$900,000.

It was asked when the Palm Beach TPA expects to send out an RFP for consultant procurement. Mr. Campobasso replied that a six-month procurement process has been planned, with the understanding that this could be extended by another two months. Because the timeline has shifted during discussion of the scope, this time frame will need to be reevaluated. It was noted that this amended time frame remains consistent with the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

Mr. Fernandez stated that he would recommend waiting until all three UPWPs are approved by their respective boards, and a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to this effect could be drafted. A/Chair Cross advised, however, that when the Broward MPO oversaw the 2045 RTP, the first six months of the contract were paid solely by Broward MPO funds, as they were aware the other two agencies' contributions would show up in the next UPWP cycle. He also noted that it is possible to go through the procurement process, including negotiations, without issuing a notice to proceed until July, by which time all three agencies should have adopted their UPWPs. He concluded that moving forward with procurement is a low-risk step.

Mr. Flavien noted that the scope of the RTP typically goes to SEFTC for approval. Mr. Fernandez asserted that the MOU forms the basis of the agencies' respective UPWPs before they are approved. Mr. Calvaresi advised that he did not recall requirement of MOUs for previous RTPs, as the inter-local agreement that created SEFTC states that SEFTC must provide an RTP.

Ms. Delaney thanked all present for their contributions to the discussion of the scope, and concluded that she would forward her notes to Mr. Calvaresi for distribution to the full Committee.

2. 2050 Long Range Plan Update

Ms. Colmenar reported that she and other RTTAC members from Miami-Dade have already reviewed how they hope to structure and outline their LRTP. These activities are already being incorporated into the UPWP, along with funding. They are awaiting official guidance from FDOT's Central Office and the FHWA to complete scope development.

Mr. Campobasso advised that the Palm Beach TPA has finalized the timeline for its LRTP and is developing a structure and reviewing different elements that may be included in the scope.

Mr. Gies stated that the Broward MPO has begun writing the scope for its MTP and has a good idea of the budget. They hope to finalize the scope in January 2022 and

advertise for a consultant in March, with a notice to proceed after the start of the new fiscal year. They will issue a call for projects and needs assessment from late 2022 into 2023.

3. TRIP Program

Mr. Calvaresi advised that he and Mr. Edmonson worked to establish rules for creating the current TRIP list, including dividing funds according to each county and ranking the projects within their counties. Other information can be pulled into the TRIP list from the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). It was determined that the TRIP document did not have to reflect a history of previous projects that have been funded through the TIP in the past, but to reflect what will be funded with TRIP dollars moving forward.

Two documents will be produced for RTTAC: a redlined version, which shows deletions and changes that will be noted in a working draft, and a clean version, which will ultimately be presented for RTTAC approval.

Mr. Jeffries stated that FDOT is coordinating between Districts 4 and 6 to provide the TRIP list before the end of October 2021. He noted that the year for which funds are requested will show for new projects.

A/Chair Cross noted that the draft TRIP list is proposed to be presented at the December 2021 RTTAC and then to SEFTC at its February 2022 meeting for adoption. He emphasized the importance of finalizing the document in December.

Ms. Pustizzi requested clarification of the deadline for the call for TRIP projects. A/Chair Cross clarified that the call for projects is currently open.

4. SIS Policy Update

Mr. Calvaresi thanked the three agencies for their coordination on a joint letter to FDOT, noting that the document was well-received. The message from the 2045 RTP regarding greater flexibility in funding is making its way to the state level, as FDOT is now considering the use of SIS funds for off-SIS facilities to increase movement along the network. There was also significant discussion of the term “inter-regional,” as FDOT is considering a much broader definition. Next steps include sending the policy to the MPO Advisory Council (MPOAC), which will seek approval at the state level for policy changes. He concluded that the RTTAC has influenced policy that will be adopted by the state.

Mr. Edmonson asked if the three agencies are submitting individual comments regarding SIS funding, or if comments will be sent only from RTTAC as a group. A/Chair Cross replied that joint comments have been sent due to the timing of the request. He added that the comments may be seen as more meaningful when they come from the

three agencies in combination rather than from individual entities. He encouraged any additional comments to be coordinated among agencies for greater effectiveness.

Ms. Bush advised that when FDOT Districts present to the agencies and their advisory bodies and boards, they take notes on comments received, which are submitted to FDOT's Central Office for tracking. Any input from individual meetings is being captured and shared.

5. Draft Southeast Florida Transportation Council (SEFTC) Agenda

Mr. Calvaresi noted that while there is a SEFTC meeting scheduled for October 29, 2021, the only action item that could be presented at that meeting is a Resolution for the FDOT SIS policy update. He was not certain that this Resolution was necessary, as there has already been a response. If this action item is removed, the meeting may not be necessary.

It was determined by consensus that the October 2021 SEFTC meeting would be cancelled. Non-action items will be moved to the February 2022 meeting, along with RTP scope review, approval of the TRIP list, and election of new SEFTC officers.

COMMITTEE REPORTS (no discussion)

1. Modeling Subcommittee

Mr. Edmonson stated that this network has been 90% completed. All agencies are currently working on their 2020 job allocation process, which is scheduled to be complete by January 2022. The Subcommittee has decided to proceed with an open source modeling platform rather than a proprietary model.

2. Public Participation Subcommittee

None.

3. TSM&O Subcommittee

None.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

1. Member Comments

With no other business to come before the Committee at this time, the workshop was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

NEXT RTTAC MEETING: November 11, 2021