

**MIAMI-DADE
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE
(to the Year 2035)**

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING NO. 18

MEETING SUMMARY

**Stephen P. Clark Government Center
111 N. W. 1st Street
Miami, Fl 33128**

10th Floor CITT Conference Room

**Monday, June 9, 2009
10:00 A.M.**

Members Present

**Mayra Diaz
Alissa Escobar
Xavier Falconi
Wilson Fernandez
Carl Filer
Larry Foutz
Jose Gonzalez
Sunil Harman
Rolando Jimenez
Shari Kamali
John O'Brien
Bhairvi Pandya
Joseph Quinty
Carlos Roa
Elizabeth Rockwell
Napoleon Somoza
Phil Steinmiller
Vivian Villaamil
Norman Wartman
Mark Woerner**

Others Present

**Oscar Camejo
David Clodfelter
John Garcia
Ken Jeffries
Ernesto Polo
Mary Ross
Franco Saraceno
Myung Sung
Vontressia Young**

**MIAMI-DADE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE
(TO THE Year 2035)**

**STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING NO. 18
MEETING SUMMARY**

**Monday, June 9, 2009
10:00 AM
10th Floor CITT Conference Room**

I. Welcome – Introduction of Members

Carlos Roa welcomed Steering Committee members to the meeting.

II. Approval of Meeting #17 Summary (held May 18, 2009)

The meeting summary from the May 18th Steering Committee meeting was approved unanimously by the Steering Committee.

III. Draft Cost Feasible Plan

Franco Saraceno, Gannett Fleming, began the discussion of the draft cost feasible plan by explaining the cost feasible plan development process, which is being done in a series of steps, including the development of a draft plan in 2008 dollars. In the next step, the plan will be disaggregated by period and costs and revenues will be inflated to year of expenditure dollars. In the final step, adjustments will be made as necessary. The current draft being discussed today is in 2008 dollars with no period disaggregation. Mr. Saraceno went on to explain the difference between flexible and non-flexible revenue sources and the methodology used to develop the draft cost feasible plan. The inflexible funding sources include the following:

1. Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) – These funds can be planned only for SIS facilities and the LRTP process must defer to the FDOT for planning purposes.
2. Miami-Dade Expressway (MDX) toll revenue – These funds can be planned only for MDX facilities.
3. Florida Turnpike Enterprise (FTE) toll revenue – These funds can be planned only for FTE facilities.

The funding sources that are flexible and can be utilized for different purposes include the following:

1. Other Arterials & ROW – These funds can be planned for both highway and transit projects and for both right of way acquisition and construction. Up to 10% of these funds can be utilized on non State Highway System facilities.
2. Transportation Management Area (TMA) – These funds are the same as XU funds and can be planned for highway, transit, intermodal, non-and motorized projects and for all project phases.

3. Gas tax revenue – These funds are distributed by policy to the Department of Public Works and Miami-Dade Transit for both construction and operations/maintenance (O&M) of the respective facilities.
4. Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) – These funds can be planned for both highway and transit improvements that are on facilities identified as Corridors of Regional Significance. TRIP funds can only be assumed for 50% of project costs. A local match must be identified for the other 50% and can come from local funds or XU (TMA) funds.

Other funding sources include State and Federal New Starts funds, which are utilized on a 25% and 50% matching basis, respectively. The other 25% must be identified from a local funding source.

The flexible funding worksheet was developed as a tool to develop the cost feasible plan by “funding” projects in the ranked order as they were evaluated by the Steering Committee. The first 20 rows of the flexible funding worksheet includes the following categories of projects/expenses, all of which must be subtracted from the revenue prior to “funding” needs projects:

1. Bike/Ped set aside
2. Congestion Management set aside
3. Existing Public Works Facilities O&M
4. Existing MDT Facilities O&M
5. Planned bus acquisitions
6. 2009 TIP projects that are not included in the 2010 TIP due to lack of funding availability.

For transit and county road projects, O&M costs (in addition to existing system O&M costs) are assumed for a period of 10 years, which represents about half of the plan period. In the next iteration of the plan development process, when periods are defined, the O&M costs will be adjusted to account for the appropriate period of time between 2015 and 2035 for each project.

Mr. Saraceno explained that, for premium transit corridor projects, the assumed technologies for cost estimating purposes (and modeling purposes) are consistent with current Locally Preferred Alternatives (LPA), where available. David Clodfelter, MDT, discussed the current update of the MDT Pro Forma, which has been requested by a County Commissioner to include several proposed increases in existing revenue sources, including an increase in the current local option gas tax rate, a millage increase, and a fare increase for transit services. The existing transit system O&M cost is projected to incur a deficit of \$2.5 billion between now and 2035, half of which is the result of a projected decrease in sales surtax revenue. Mr. Clodfelter also mentioned that the orange line corridors (North and East/West) represent the highest MDT priorities and that federal earmarks will be requested in the amount of \$20 million for right of way acquisition for those two corridors.

An alternative scenario (to the assumption of LPAs) that can be exercised is the assumption of bus rapid transit (BRT) or BRT Lite for the premium transit

corridors. The cost of BRT Lite relative to heavy rail is about 10%, which would allow for more corridors to be funded. The issue of the projected O&M deficit, however, will prevent the cost feasibility of any transit projects. While the current draft cost feasible plan scenario, which is based on the November 2008 Pro Forma (non-expansion version), does not indicate an O&M deficit, ideally, consensus between MDT and the LRTP process should be reached. Mr. Clodfelter stated that the updated Pro Forma will be available sometime in the next 2 weeks.

The meeting progressed with a discussion of each of the inflexible funding sources cost feasible project lists. The following are revisions to the respective draft cost feasible lists made by the Steering Committee.

SIS

- Note in the project descriptions for FDOT8 and FDOT30-1 that the two are companion projects.
- Split FDOT30-1 into individual parts consistent with the current SIS Cost Feasible Plan.

Turnpike

- Move TP2 to the top of the list, funding PD&E/PE and CST for this project.
- Remove ROW funding for project TP6, funding only PD&E/PE.
- The above revisions result in the infeasibility of funding CST for TP1.
- Include TP13 as a cost feasible project and note that it is cost feasible through a developer contribution via the FTE.

There was a discussion regarding TP7,11,12 and despite the fact that this project(s) is a high priority for the FTE, it is not included as a cost feasible project. There was not a FTE representative present at the meeting but Mr. Saraceno explained that this project was lumped by FTE due to the interactive nature of TP11 and TP12. He further pointed out that without separating the project into pieces, it cannot be included as cost feasible because the total cost is greater than the entire revenue projection for FTE revenue.

MDX

- Remove project XA87407 as construction is complete.
- Remove MDX14 and add it to the E+C list as it is funded for CST in the 2010 TIP.
- Include MDX6 PD&E in Priority 1 as it is funded in the 2010 TIP. Include a footnote for MDX6 stating that ROW or CST phases would require a Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) amendment.
- Remove MDX7, MDX13, and MDX15 from the cost feasible plan and include them in the unfunded category with a footnote that these projects may be funded by an unsolicited proposal (private funding venture).
- Confirm funding for MDX4 PD&E by project FDOT28 and make any necessary accounting adjustments to reflect this.

Congestion Management & Policy

- Remove project FP24 because it is neither a policy or congestion management project.
- Remove project FP27 because of its low negative score.
- Rename project FP9 northern limit to County road name (Tamiami Trail).

State Highway System

- Include PD&E funding in cost feasible plan for FDOT28.
- Remove project DT2516844 as it is complete.
- Move projects FDOT64 and FDOT65 to the top of the prioritized list because they have been “on the books” for many years and should be considered in the same category as projects that fell out of the 2009 TIP due to funding constraints.
- Remove the portion of project FDOT30-2 between SR5/US1 and SW 328th St because it is already included in project DT4055753.
- Identify I-95 Express revenue/mile to develop a capital cost reduction factor to apply to other managed lanes projects.*
- Remove project FDOT55 and add it to the E+C list as it is funded for CST in the 2010 TIP.

SFRTA

- Fund project SFRTA2 with TRIP and TMA funds rather than Other Arterials & ROW.
- Change cost of SFRTA1 to \$0.684 million: PD&E/Design, \$2.5 million: ROW, and \$2 million CST. This is to prevent double accounting with FDOT projects at the Golden Glades interchange.

Larry Foutz, MPO, suggested that Gannett Fleming analyze the usefulness of the park and ride lot projects in the draft cost feasible plan. He observed that there are 10 parking lot development or expansion projects in the draft cost feasible plan and suggested a review to assess their relative value. Mr. Roa responded that Gannett Fleming would do so.

Shari Kamali, City of Homestead, suggested a review of the limits for projects PW32, HS3, and HS6. She and Rolando Jimenez, Department of Public Works, agreed to discuss off line and provide guidance to the Steering Committee.

- * Wilson Fernandez, MPO brought up a discussion regarding the issue of managed lanes projects and their revenue generating potential. Phil Steinmiller, FDOT, agreed to provide data from the I-95 Express experience that may be used to estimate an appropriate level of revenue generated by like facilities.

IV. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for June 22, 2009; 10:00 AM; 10th Floor CITT Conference Room.