



**2020
Florida Federal
Planning Finding
(Statewide Annual
Assessment)**

Federal Highway Administration

**Federal Transit Administration
Region 4**

September 2020

Table of Contents

I. Background.....	3
II. Format.....	4
III. Topics of Interest.....	4
A. Findings and Recommendations from the 2019 Statewide Annual Assessment....	4
B. FY 2021 - FY 2024 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.....	8
C. Summary of the FY 2020 Annual MPO Certifications by FDOT.....	13
D. Summary of FY 2020 FHWA/FTA Certification Reviews of the TMAs	14
E. Performance Year 2020 Program Accountability Review Results	15
F. Training/Technical Assistance Needs	15
IV. Findings and Recommendations.....	16
Appendix A – Meeting Agenda	24
Appendix B – Summary of Discussions that Supported the 2019 Planning Finding.....	25
Appendix C – List of Meeting Participants	37

I. BACKGROUND

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have joint stewardship responsibilities to ensure that both the statewide and metropolitan transportation planning processes satisfy the requirements of 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135, 49 U.S.C. 5303-5305, 23 CFR Part 450 and 500, and 49 CFR Part 613. From a statewide planning perspective, the State certifies the process through the submittal of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), while Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and the State jointly certify the metropolitan transportation planning processes through the submittal of the MPOs' Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs). Based on our review of the STIP, TIPs, our annual program and risk assessments, and our day-to-day stewardship and oversight activities, FHWA and FTA are responsible for issuing the following types of planning findings and approvals:

- A. *Metropolitan planning findings based on review of MPO TIPs and certification statements.* Pursuant to 23 CFR 450.328(a), the FHWA/FTA must jointly find that each metropolitan TIP is based on a "3-C" (continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative) planning process by the MPO, State Department of Transportation, and transit service provider(s). In Florida, this finding primarily has been based on the annual MPO/Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) joint certification statements on the respective metropolitan planning processes. Information collected from the quadrennial FHWA/FTA certification reviews of the planning processes in Florida's Transportation Management Areas (TMAs), pursuant to 23 CFR 450.334(b), also has provided substantial input for FHWA/FTA to issue these annual "3-C" planning findings.
- B. *FHWA/FTA review of the statewide planning process and issuance of a related statewide planning finding to support FHWA/FTA approval of the STIP.* As outlined under 23 CFR 450.218, the FHWA/FTA statewide planning finding, made in conjunction with the FHWA/FTA approval of the STIP, ensures, at a minimum, that the process from which the STIP was developed is consistent with the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135 and 49 U.S.C. 5303-5305. A joint FHWA/FTA planning finding accompanies the annual FHWA/FTA approval of Florida's STIP. In Florida, this process was formerly known as the "annual assessment" of the statewide planning process. It is now known officially as the "Federal Planning Finding" to better align with the regulatory responsibilities.

The primary objective of this report is to substantiate the issuance of the FHWA/FTA Statewide Planning Finding for supporting FHWA/FTA approval of Florida's Fiscal Year (FY) 2020/21 - 2023/24 STIP.

II. FORMAT

The findings in this report are based in part on the information received during the annual statewide assessment meetings held on July 7-8, 2020, with the FDOT staff responsible for the topic area activities. The numerous topics discussed are related to FDOT's statewide planning process and are listed in the Meeting Agenda, shown in Appendix A. A summary of the information conveyed during and after the meeting is provided in Appendix B. The list of meeting attendees is provided in Appendix C. Documentation received from FDOT on the topics covered during the Statewide Assessment Review process meeting was used to support the findings and is on file at the FHWA Division Office.

III. TOPICS OF INTEREST

A. Findings and Recommendations from the 2019 Statewide Annual Assessment

Provided below are the overall findings from the 2019 Annual Assessment Report, and the status of the corrective actions and recommendations.

Corrective Actions

1. Documentation of TPM Coordination

Corrective Action: 23 CFR 450.314(h) requires the MPO(s), State(s), and the providers of public transportation to jointly agree upon and develop specific written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO, and the collection of data for the State asset management plan for the NHS in certain circumstances. These provisions shall be documented either: (i) As part of the metropolitan planning agreements required under paragraphs (a), (e), and (g) of this section; or (ii) Documented in some other means outside of the metropolitan planning agreements as determined cooperatively by the MPO(s), State(s), and providers of public transportation. **For the MPOs that have not adopted the Consensus Document or other coordination documentation, beginning October 1, 2019, FHWA/FTA will not approve S/TIP or LRTP amendments for those MPO areas until they take the appropriate action and provide the documentation to FHWA/FTA.** FHWA/FTA have reached out to the individual MPOs affected to make them aware of this corrective action.

Status: Working through the MPOAC, FDOT and the MPOs agreed that the Consensus Document would be submitted as part of the MPO TIP process. This action would provide the assurance required by the FHWA that the Consensus Document was reviewed and approved by each individual MPO Board. Sixteen MPOs followed this course and included the Consensus Document in their TIPs. Six MPOs adopted the Consensus Document by Resolution or separate Board action. The

remaining five MPOs took no action prior to the beginning of the adoption of the STIP on October 1, 2019. FDOT's Office of Policy Planning (OPP) notified and worked with the five non-conforming MPO/TPOs to seek Board approval as soon as possible. Each non-conforming MPO/TPO adopted the Consensus Document by October 23, 2019. The OPP provided the documentation to FHWA/FTA. FDOT and the MPOs took necessary actions to resolve this corrective action. FHWA/FTA sent a letter dated June 19, 2020, confirming that the corrective action had been satisfied.

For the FY2020/21 TIPs, all MPOs that did not adopt the Consensus Document by resolution or separate Board action included the Consensus Document in the TIP.

2. Transfer (flexed) funds to FTA in STIP

Corrective Action: FDOT and its respective metropolitan planning organizations and transit providers must develop a process and procedure for administering federal transportation funding by March 18, 2020. This should be conducted in a manner that does not require continual amendments and updates to the STIP, particularly if funding is not carried over from the prior year. FDOT and its planning partners must coordinate to make sure that projects proposed to use federal funding, either from FHWA or FTA, are identified in the STIP and implemented in a timely manner, and identify all local, state, and federal funds, consistent with 23 CFR 450.218(f), the STIP shall contain all regionally significant projects requiring an FHWA/FTA action. Currently, there are long standing issues where projects are dropped from the STIP in subsequent updates, before local agencies may apply for the funds, preventing FTA from issuing a grant in a timely manner.”

Status: The Federal Aid Management Office (FAMO) within the Office of Work Program and Budget in consultation with the Department's Public Transit Office developed a Federal Aid Technical Bulletin 20-02 to address this corrective action. FAMO had presented draft Bulletins to FTA for review. In order to allow FAMO additional time to address their review comments, FTA extended the deadline in which to satisfy this Corrective Action to March 31, 2020. FDOT took necessary actions to resolve this corrective action. FTA sent email correspondence in March 2020 confirming that the corrective action had been satisfied

Recommendations

1. Outreach and Consultation with Partners and Stakeholders

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team recommends that FDOT provide training and QA/QC on consultation requirements of PPPs, TIPs and LRTPs to all MPOs. Recent examples of MPOs who have developed new PPPs that exemplify consultation with partners and stakeholders include Heartland and Florida-Alabama. Peer exchanges where these exemplary PPPs can be shared may also be helpful.

Status: FDOT Office of Policy Planning, FHWA Florida Division, and FHWA Federal Lands provided PPP training at the annual Florida Metropolitan Planning Partnership Meeting (FMPP) meeting on December 5-6, 2019. FDOT Office of Policy Planning

also shared Florida-Alabama / Heartland PPPs with the all the MPO/TPOs as good examples. FDOT has offered technical guidance and training to any and every MPO/TPO and will continue to provide this upon request.

2. Partner Communication

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team recommends that this collaborative consultation process for communication, as noted in the FHWA/FTA Stewardship and Oversight Agreement, be further enhanced by –

- Including the Federal partners on draft changes to the MPO Program Handbook so that we can similarly coordinate and adjust our procedures, or, if needed, notify FDOT of any concerns regarding the draft changes that could affect an approval process; and
- Provide the final MPO Program Handbook change (or provide notification thereof) to the Federal Review Team so there is a shared understanding of procedural expectations.

Status: The Office of Policy Planning has committed to coordinating with FHWA and FTA prior to publishing an updated MPO Program Management Handbook if the changes are to a process or procedure that will affect them.

The Office of Policy Planning states that they will always notify FHWA and FTA when there are quarterly updates to the Handbook at the time of its release.

No handbook changes were provided to the federal agencies in 2019-2020.

3. ADA Transition Plan

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team appreciates these monitoring commitments and recommends that OPP continue to work with other FDOT offices to ensure that the Roadway Characteristics Inventory (RCI) data base update is sufficient to provide an annual statistically significant sampling of the state's inventory of pedestrian facilities to verify ADA compliance. We recommend that FDOT provide this verification to FHWA/FTA in a timely manner to allow sufficient review and consideration prior FDOT's requested annual STIP approval.

Status: FHWA sent formal correspondence to FDOT on December 16, 2019 that FDOT complies with the ADA and 504 programs.

4. Tracking of STP and Other Non-PL Planning Funding

Observation: In response to the 2018 Planning Finding Corrective Action and Recommendation on this issue, FDOT worked with FHWA and FTA to develop a process for tracking PL and non-PL funding using the STIP tool. This process was rolled out through issuance of a Federal Technical Memorandum in June 2019. FDOT also committed to additional process enhancements in the coming months. There have been at least two instances in which a District and the Work Program staff were

unaware of, or did not understand the new process of having the STIP modified or amended before the UPWP amendment is submitted to FHWA/FTA for approval.

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team recommends additional clarifications be made to the Federal Technical Memorandum as discussed with FDOT as the Federal Technical Memorandum was being finalized. There is still a need for further refinement, particularly with understanding of next year's 1st year UPWP adoption.

- FDOT has an 80/20 spend rule that has resulted in FDOT denial of MPO requested authorization of some non-PL funded tasks in the approved UPWPs. When UPWPs are presented for federal approval, the Federal Review Team considers funding in the UPWP to be approved and available for tasks identified. FHWA and FTA strongly recommend that FDOT apply any additional State criteria as part of their UPWP approval recommendation, rather than after UPWP approval.
- FHWA and FTA recommend that the Federal Technical Memorandum be updated to specify FDOT's role and timing of any needed STIP changes, with training provided to those involved in UPWP, STIP and FMIS approval requests at both Central Office and the Districts.
- FHWA and FTA recommend after concurrence by the federal agencies, the Federal Technical Memorandum should also state what STIP documentation is needed for the initial UPWP approval (i.e. at the start of each new UPWP).
- FHWA and FTA further recommend clarification between the Closeout Deobligation Process and the process to reduce roll forward funds from the second year UPWP before June 30 (or April, if that is FDOT's deadline for roll forward amendments).
- Finally, the Federal Review Team recommends that the FTA program processes and associated coordination that specify roles and responsibilities be included in the Federal Technical Memorandum.

Status: FDOT issued Technical Memorandum 19-03 REV to address this recommendation. They also have been refining tracking mechanisms of the different funds on a monthly basis. FHWA noted that the revised memo was still not clear in a number of areas, and FDOT committed to additional process enhancements in the coming months. Please see Section IV for additional information.

5. Programming of FTA Capital and Operating Activities

Recommendation: To address inconsistencies in the next STIP (FY20/21), the Federal Review Team recommends FDOT identify and document a policy or policies, either Statewide or by FDOT District, to better clarify where and when capital and operating funds are merged. Such efforts will provide greater transparency and understanding to federal partners and the public alike of how and where federal funds are utilized.

Status: Currently, the FDOT Work Program instructions do not indicate the capital and operating be broken into separate categories. Each MPO and transit agency develop their own approach as appropriate for their local conditions; therefore, variability exists in the TIPs and STIP. FDOT will update the Work Program instructions to note that a description be provided to indicate whether capital and

operating are grouped together or are separate.

Collectively, FTA and FDOT will work with our Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC) and Florida Public Transportation Association (FPTA) counterparts to remind/educate on how to collect/provide better information to the MPOs for inclusion in the TIPs.

6. **Tracking of Large and Small Urban Apportionment Activities**

Observation: It appears that certain FDOT Districts combine both large urban and small urban capital and operating into one project. It is not clear when this occurs, as the project descriptions appear to only include the County of the proposed activity.

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team recommends that FDOT include the relevant urbanized area(s) for each project/FM number.

Status: FDOT will update the Work Program instructions to ask that a description be provided to indicate the breakdown of large and small urban apportionments. Collectively, FTA and FDOT will work with our MPOAC and FPTA counterparts to remind/educate on how to collect/provide better information to the MPOs for inclusion in the TIPs.

7. **Sufficient Descriptive Material – FTA Programs**

Recommendation: As the STIP is inclusive of capital and non-capital surface transportation projects (or phases) proposed for funding under title 49 USC Chapter 53, the Federal Review Team recommends the STIP projects fully reflect the FTA funding program associated with an activity or activities.

Status: Collectively, FTA and FDOT will work with our MPOAC and FPTA counterparts to remind/educate on how to collect/provide better information to the MPOs for inclusion in the TIPs. FDOT will better reflect FTA funding programs, without losing flexibility by providing guidelines with too much specificity. At a minimum, the TIPs need enough detail to be informative to FTA. Please see Section IV for additional information.

B. FY 2021 - FY 2024 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program

Title 23 U.S.C. requires the State to develop a STIP. The portion of the Program that is urbanized must be developed in cooperation with the MPOs. The State must also have a process for developing priorities with local officials in the rural areas. The STIP is a list of priority projects for the next four fiscal years. The projects are expected to be consistent with the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP), which serves as the statewide plan, and to incorporate the TIPs as adopted from within each metropolitan area. The STIP document has been submitted in Adobe PDF format and is available on the FDOT website at: http://www.dot.state.fl.us/OWPB/Federal/STIP_ProjectDetailListing.shtm. STIP modifications are also captured daily and displayed in the current STIP document as noted online.

Before the STIP was required under Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, the state of Florida had developed a process for having a statewide improvement program. This document is the Five-Year Work Program and essentially serves as the STIP. Section 339.135, Florida Statutes, authorizes and sets the guidelines for the FDOT to develop a State Transportation Five-Year Work Program. It is the State's project-specific list of transportation activities and improvements that meets the goals and objectives of the FTP. Although FDOT's Five-Year Work Program serves as the basis for creating the STIP, it is important to note that FHWA and FTA only recognize the four-year element of the STIP, which is derived from FDOT's Work Program, for the purposes of programming federal funds.

Since the FDOT Work Program serves as the basis for creating the STIP, FHWA, and FTA look to the FDOT's Work Program development process to ensure compliance with Federal law. There are summary documents that are helpful in understanding how the Work Program is developed and financed and more detailed documents and procedures that provide specific instructions for Work Program development. Some of these documents are located on FDOT's website: <https://www.fdot.gov/workprogram/WorkProgramResources.shtm>. Other resources are also available upon request from FDOT's Work Program Office.

Public Participation is also a major component in the development of the STIP. The Work Program is developed by the Districts and Central Office, working with the MPOs and local governments. Input is also included from the Legislature, Governor's office, and public hearings. More detailed information related to the Public Involvement Process, utilized by FDOT to develop the Work Program and the STIP, can be found in the STIP Public Involvement Process pdf found at: <https://www.fdot.gov/workprogram/Federal/stip.shtm>

On April 24, 2020, FHWA notified FDOT that they did not meet the Transportation Performance Management (TPM) safety targets for 2018. As such on August 31, 2020, FDOT submitted an implementation plan that addresses the use of Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds to meet or better the baseline data for the 5 safety targets. FHWA is current reviewing the implementation plan.

In July 2019, FHWA provided national technical assistance regarding the flexibilities currently in place related to fiscal constraint. FHWA, FTA and FDOT have been periodically meeting over the past year to collaborate on how best to address the technical assistance. FDOT confirmed that Florida was not taking advantage of the additional flexibilities afforded by the technical assistance which stated "Documentation of administrative modifications that adjust the funding amount, sources, or categories that have occurred can be provided after the project(s) are obligated in FMIS." In Florida, the Current STIP is published online and is updated to incorporate administrative modifications before a project is initially authorized in FMIS. As a result, administrative modifications will always be reflected in the Current STIP and this flexibility provided in the technical assistance is not needed.

FDOT updated the STIP website to add language that documents how Advanced Construction (AC) conversions are handled in the STIP. FDOT also added the current PAR Rollup Report as one tool which documents the planned use of AC. We are still working on a mutually agreeable method to document the actual amount of AC conversions in the STIP.

One process change that was made is in regard to the STIP and FMIS modification requests. FHWA identifies FMIS modification requests that are \$2M or greater in change and whether those requests are more than or less than 20% of the project cost. For FMIS project change requests that are greater than \$2M and 20% of the project cost, FHWA will check the STIP at the time of the request to ensure the STIP has enough funds to support the request. For FMIS project change requests that are greater than \$2M and less than 20% of the project cost, at a point post FMIS approval, FHWA will do a spot check to ensure the STIP supports the FMIS modification request. FHWA is currently conducting a review of the 2020 FMIS modifications that are \$2M and less than 20% to assess the magnitude and frequency of the changes.

As part of FHWA's routine oversight activities for the statewide planning process, and in accordance with the Division's Standard Operating Procedure for the STIP, the planning unit conducts both an overall checklist review of the STIP and a spot check review of a few randomly selected projects from each MPO area to assess the consistency in project information between the STIP, TIP, and LRTP planning documents. FHWA randomly reviewed 54 projects in the proposed STIP, at least two from each MPO throughout the State, for general consistency between the TIP, STIP, and LRTP documents. The preliminary results of this year's review indicate that emphasis is still needed in this area to ensure that projects are accurately reflected in both the TIP and STIP and that these projects are flowing from and are found to be consistent with the MPO's LRTP. Consistency between the TIP and STIP was noted in 96% of the projects reviewed which was higher than the findings from the previous year. Identifying/locating an LRTP project or phase associated with a particular STIP project or project phase continues to be a challenge in that only 83% of the projects reviewed were deemed consistent with the LRTP. It is important to note that all the inconsistencies identified were found in three of the seven districts. FHWA has shared the information with the applicable Districts and MPOs.

FTA, responsible for federal review and oversight of transit-related activities, also reviews the STIP to ensure regulatory compliance, in partnership with FHWA. The results of FTA's STIP review are reflected in the appropriate areas of Section IV.

The FY 2020/21-2023/24 STIP needs to be fiscally constrained by year. In an effort to demonstrate how much funding is available for projects, FDOT has developed a process and summary table to show the available funds including balance forward, estimated new funds, and the programmed projects. The 2021 STIP Production Accomplishment Report (PAR) is developed annually by FDOT to demonstrate financial constraint for the new STIP. Ending balances in each of the major categories are positive in each of the years of the STIP. The summary is located in the following table.

Please note the following points regarding these summaries:

1. The FY2021 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is based on the Adopted Work Program as of July 1, 2020.
2. Annual funding amounts are presented net of Obligation Authority Constraints.
3. Funding levels are reasonably expected to continue at the FFY 2020 levels consistent with the FAST Act throughout the four years of the STIP (2021-2024).
4. Once a full year extension or new multi-year Transportation Act is in place, allocations will be adjusted to the levels authorized into law. FDOT will adjust the project programming accordingly if the new act has decreased funding levels below the levels authorized in the FAST Act, to ensure fiscal constraint of the STIP is preserved.
5. Included is a breakout, by major fund rollup category, of the estimated Advanced Construction (AC) conversions anticipated to be done each year to fully consume the annual Obligation Limitation subject to lapse at each fiscal year end.

Based on the summaries and other documentation received throughout the year, the FY 2020/21 – FY 2023/2024 STIP is shown to be fiscally constrained by year given the funding levels that are reasonably expected to be available over the timeframe of the STIP. FDOT has also indicated for FY2019/20, that they converted \$1.4B of AC, which is consistent with the \$1.355B that was planned for AC conversions at the beginning of the FY2019/20.

2021 STIP P.A.R. Rollups

	Fiscal Years			
	2021	2022	2023	2024
Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Program				
Balance Forward from Prior Year	4,501,697	207,113	-	-
Net Annual Allocations Available	13,509,072	13,481,509	13,476,881	13,475,828
Less: Program of Projects	(17,803,656)	(13,688,622)	(13,476,881)	(13,475,828)
Balance Forward to Next Year	207,113	-	-	-
Discretionary and Other Programs				
Balance Forward from Prior Year	170,081,954	63,086,732	1,067,059	1,067,059
Net Annual Allocations Available	5,198,524	6,291,994	3,566,994	3,566,994
Less: Program of Projects	(112,193,746)	(68,311,667)	(3,566,994)	(3,566,994)
Balance Forward to Next Year	63,086,732	1,067,059	1,067,059	1,067,059
National Freight Program				
Balance Forward from Prior Year	77,402,574	54,500,801	30,711,754	15,711,754
Net Annual Allocations Available	66,144,989	66,010,039	65,987,381	65,982,220
Less: Program of Projects	(61,046,762)	(74,799,086)	(65,987,381)	(65,982,220)
Funds Available before AC conversions	82,500,801	45,711,754	30,711,754	15,711,754
Planned AC Conversions	(28,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)
Balance Forward to Next Year	54,500,801	30,711,754	15,711,754	711,754
National Highway System Performance Program				
Balance Forward from Prior Year	432,963,109	426,638,955	279,005,585	199,102,642
Net Annual Allocations Available	1,113,342,976	1,114,610,945	1,114,823,835	1,114,872,326
Less: Program of Projects	(19,667,130)	(62,244,315)	(94,726,778)	(54,720,784)
Funds Available before AC conversions	1,526,638,955	1,479,005,585	1,299,102,642	1,259,254,184
Planned AC Conversions	(1,100,000,000)	(1,200,000,000)	(1,100,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)
Balance Forward to Next Year	426,638,955	279,005,585	199,102,642	259,254,184
Planning and Research Programs				
Balance Forward from Prior Year	30,430,253	8,797,502	3,501,018	3,501,018
Net Annual Allocations Available	63,436,378	63,436,378	63,436,378	63,436,379
Less: Program of Projects	(65,069,129)	(68,732,862)	(63,436,378)	(63,436,379)
Balance Forward to Next Year	8,797,502	3,501,018	3,501,018	3,501,018
Safety Programs				
Balance Forward from Prior Year	106,976,444	61,314,810	17,524,090	3,427,939
Net Annual Allocations Available	145,213,920	105,213,919	115,548,919	115,548,915
Less: Program of Projects	(22,875,554)	(14,004,839)	(9,645,070)	(9,645,070)
Funds Available before AC conversions	229,314,810	152,524,090	123,427,939	109,331,784
Planned AC Conversions	(168,000,000)	(135,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(109,000,000)
Balance Forward to Next Year	61,314,810	17,524,090	3,427,939	331,784
Surface Transportation Block Grant Program				
Balance Forward from Prior Year	293,392,938	48,942,878	283,032	284,625
Net Annual Allocations Available	567,435,470	566,330,015	566,144,404	566,102,136
Less: Program of Projects	(766,885,530)	(605,489,861)	(540,642,811)	(540,600,543)
Funds Available before AC conversions	73,942,878	9,783,032	25,784,625	25,786,218
Planned AC Conversions	(25,000,000)	(9,500,000)	(25,500,000)	(25,500,000)
Balance Forward to Next Year	48,942,878	283,032	284,625	286,218
Grand Totals - All Programs				
Balance Forward from Prior Year	1,115,748,969	663,488,791	332,092,538	223,095,037
Net Annual Allocations Available	1,974,281,329	1,935,374,799	1,942,984,792	1,942,984,798
Less: Program of Projects	(1,250,665,953)	(1,028,266,413)	(901,837,223)	(850,782,748)
Funds Available before AC conversions	1,984,488,791	1,691,592,538	1,483,595,037	1,414,652,017
Less: AC Conversions	(1,321,000,000)	(1,359,500,000)	(1,260,500,000)	(1,149,500,000)
Balance Forward to Next Year	663,488,791	332,092,538	223,095,037	265,152,017

C. Summary of the FY 2020 Annual MPO Certifications by FDOT

Each FDOT District and MPO must jointly certify annually that the transportation planning process is addressing the major issues facing the metropolitan area. The purpose of the MPO certification review is to establish that the MPO's planning process is being conducted in accordance with 23 CFR 450.334. The reviews also provide the opportunity

to recognize noteworthy practices, provide recommendations for consideration, and identify corrective actions needing resolution within the timeframe specified in the Certification Report. Many of the joint certification statements listed findings, such as noteworthy achievements and areas for future emphasis. A general compilation of the topic areas from the FDOT/MPO certification reviews conducted this year are noted and do not necessarily apply to every MPO. The following are the findings from the 2019 Certifications.

FDOT/MPO Identified Best Practices/Noteworthy Achievement Areas

- TIP project sheet improvements
- TPM - reporting in Annual Report to the Board and use of TPM in TIP priorities
- Public Outreach/Engagement to assess priorities and update plans via social media, electronic surveys and website updates
- Innovative projects: Installation of a Two Stage Left Turn Bicycle Box; Micro-transit pilot
- Community partnerships and student involvement initiatives
- Resiliency Study with performance metrics/projects for the LRTP, and pilot projects
- Transportation Alternatives application assistance
- Safety: Vision Zero Action Plan, Continued collaboration for reliable, safe and efficient transp. Projects; and Sponsorship of safety summits/conferences and safety target setting
- Environmental Justice National Workshop participation
- Mapping and data efforts for project needs and demonstrating success (TIGER project)
- TMA Certification outreach, noteworthy practices identified and findings
- QA/QC process for invoicing
- Coordination with Turnpike, regional and local planning agencies and regional model partners

FDOT Identified Corrective Actions

A total of five corrective actions were issued during the 2019 annual joint FDOT/MPO certification process. These corrective actions are outlined below.

1. "Please Explain."
2. "The *(redacted)* TPO submits their invoices on a monthly basis and has improved tremendously."
3. MPO should submit complete invoices with all supporting documentation.
4. MPO should work with County to rectify issues concerning direct/indirect charges. They will need to define direct charge vs. indirect charge and explore options for reimbursement (Direct charge, De Minimus, or Indirect Rate).
5. MPO should work with County on timely submission of charges for invoices.

FDOT Identified Recommendation Topics

- Rental car size justifications
- Travel voucher documentation
- Noting percentage billed on direct expense invoices
- Use of schedule milestone tracking in LRTP development
- Stakeholder engagement and local plan coordination
- Development of contingency plans for delayed or frozen federal funds

- Update website to include amendments and other needed documents
- Spending SU funds to avoid possible redistribution or loss of funds
- Regional TSMO Program
- Elevated review of invoices due to drafts often being submitted
- Need for invoice submittal within 90 days of last invoice date
- List of Priority Projects by rank, group, and funding, with old removed
- Mutually agreed upon ratio for transit v. highway priorities in the LOPP
- Appropriate signatures for consultant work authorizations
- Timely use of PL and FTA funds
- MPO to remain in low category for risk assessment
- Use of spreadsheet software for UPWP task and summary budget tables
- Use single priority list and minimize changes from year to year
- Consolidate UPWP tasks to reduce need for many revisions
- Work with local agencies to submit timely applications for high priority projects

D. Summary of the Fiscal Year 2020 FHWA/FTA Certification Reviews of the Transportation Management Areas

During State FY 2020 (May 2019 – June 2020), FHWA/FTA conducted TMA Certification Reviews for River to Sea TPO, Miami Dade TPO, and Polk TPO. The results of these FHWA/FTA TMA certifications were summarized at the 2020 Florida Federal Planning Certification (Statewide Annual Assessment) Meeting on July 2, 2019. There were three corrective actions identified during these three FY 2020 certifications. These corrective actions relate to document accessibility for ADA Section 508; fiscal constraint – missing 1st 5-year band of projects; and fiscal constraint – need for project costs in year of expenditure.

In the July 2020 Joint Statewide Planning Finding meeting, FDOT indicated that they are working closely with the MPOs on 508 plans. Further, FDOT indicated that they will add the corrective actions to the next FMPP agenda and discuss recommendations for statewide consistency.

E. Performance Year 2020 Program Accountability Review Results

For FY20, the Florida Division Planning and Civil Rights staff conducted (3) Program Accountability Results (PAR) reviews on three of the State's non-Transportation Management Area (TMA) Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). The purpose of these reviews was to assess the MPOs' self-certification processes to determine their compliance with 23 CFR 450.334 (a). Based on an analysis of the TMA Certification

Reviews' corrective actions and recommendations, this topic was one of the top 3 issues for TMAs and thus selected for this non-TMA review.

FY20 was the third and final year that the annual PAR reviews were geared exclusively towards the non-TMA MPO self-certification processes to ensure that applicable federal requirements are being met. The PAR reviews largely indicate that two of the MPOs reviewed are satisfactorily carrying out the requirements for self-certifications set forth specifically in 23 CFR 450.334(a). One of the MPOs was not consistent in addressing these requirements and could be better focused to identify MPO process refinements to address planning and civil rights requirements. Specifically, one MPO had deficiencies related to not having the self-certification signed by the MPO Chair, not having documentation to support the self-certification, and not having an accessible Title VI/Nondiscrimination complaint filing procedure and an updated LEP Plan. FHWA provided this report to FDOT and the MPOs to encourage these refinements in process and a greater focus on these processes as part of the self-certifications. FHWA will also work with FDOT to ensure technical assistance is provided to the MPO to address the specific deficiencies.

The completion of the FY20 Planning PAR completes the FHWA-Florida Division's focused review of the self-certification process of the nine non-TMA MPOs in Florida. PAR reviews are an effective tool to complete a quick and focused review of various program elements. Beginning in FY21 as part of the FY21 Program and Risk Assessment process, a review of fiscal constraint in each LRTP will be completed for the nine non-TMA MPOs over a three-year period (FY 21, FY 22, and FY 23).

F. Training/Technical Assistance Needs

During the certification review site visits this year, the following technical assistance/training needs were identified:

- Overview of 5303 and 5305 funding programs from FDOT to MPOs
- Title VI (this request was accommodated)
- Automated, Connected, Electric, and Shared vehicles (ACES)
- TPM (data collection)
- Innovative financing and ways to sustain TSMO
- Virtual engagement
- Eligibility and pre-award authority for flexing federal funds

Upcoming training offerings include a statewide truck parking plans and inland ports class. A peer exchange in District 6 for express lanes, and a tolling peer exchange were also recently held. The FDOT and MPOs were asked to send any additional training requests to the FHWA/FTA team by July 30th. No additional training requests were received.

IV. 2020 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FHWA/FTA highlight the following Noteworthy Activities underway by FDOT this year:

- 1. Public Involvement and Outreach** –In response to the Governor issuing a series of executive orders that prohibited public gatherings as well as orders to provide alternatives for local officials to vote remotely as part of administrative actions, FDOT had to develop expectations for when they would conduct public meetings. In addition to developing a new public involvement web page with video tutorials for conducting public meetings, FDOT developed public meeting guidelines for the Districts. These instructions were very much needed by the Districts who were still responsible for holding public outreach for programs and projects. These enhancements to their procedures were also helpful for MPOs, who were also trying to maintain their public outreach compliance during the pandemic in a manner that was considered the safety for all participants. We commend FDOT for acting quickly to provide an enhanced direction for public outreach in Florida.
- 2. Emergency Response:** The Federal Review Team commends FDOT for providing support to transit agencies and MPOs while agencies found a new way to do business. FDOT’s coordinated response with the FPTA and the Commission for Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD) were particularly helpful to ensure timely and uniform communications, as well as ensuring that critical needs were met amidst these changing conditions.
- 3. FDOT-CUTR Transit Partnership:** The FDOT-CUTR transit partnership is an excellent step forward to assist and enhance coordination between the State, transit agencies, and MPOs. The Federal Review Team commends FDOT for the recently completed transit research and look forward to learning more about implementation. Furthermore, the transit planning network and virtual professional development workshops, such as the “Current Practices in the Use of Onboard Technologies to Avoid Transit Bus Incidents & Accidents”, “Segmenting the Market to Affect Travel Behavior & Increase Ridership”, “Transit Automation & Shared Mobility in Florida”, and “Emergency Preparedness” are innovative techniques for enhanced coordination between a State DOT, transit agencies, MPOs, and other transportation stakeholders.
- 4. Annual Planning Award** – In 2020, FDOT developed a new recognition for transportation planners that is presented at the annual TRANSPLEX meeting. This award recognizes transportation planning professionals for excellent work and achievements in Florida, providing inspiration to others in the transportation planning field. The Federal Review Team commends FDOT for developing this program and recognizing these deserving Florida professionals in their achievements.

The following Corrective Actions require action for compliance with the federal planning regulations and must be completed within the timeframes noted:

No corrective actions identified.

The following Recommendations are made to continue implementing improvements to the transportation planning process within the State of Florida:

1. Tracking of STP and Other Non-PL Planning Funding

Observation: In response to the 2018 and 2019 Planning Finding Corrective Action and Recommendation on this issue, FDOT worked with FHWA and FTA to develop a process for tracking PL and non-PL funding using the STIP tool. This process was rolled out through issuance of a Federal Technical Memorandum in June 2019. FHWA noted that the new process was still not clear in a number of areas, and FDOT committed to additional process enhancements in the coming months, such as adding additional needed clarifications to the Federal Technical Memorandum to address FDOT's 80/20 spend rule, FDOT's role and timing of any needed STIP changes, STIP documentation needed for initial UPWP approval, Closeout Deobligation Process, the process to reduce roll forward funds from the second year UPWP, and roles and responsibilities for FTA program processes. The MPOs are still unclear in their ability to fully use their authorized funds, so the additional clarifications and process enhancements are very much needed.

Recommendation with Deadline: The Federal Review Team strongly recommends that FDOT puts a priority on clarifying the Technical Memorandum and refining tracking processes to provide these needed enhancements that will provide clarity and transparency for MPOs and the federal partners. **If FDOT has not adopted an updated Technical Memorandum by January 30, 2021, then FHWA/FTA may not be able to approve year 2 of the current UPWPs in a timely manner.**

2. UPWP

a. UPWP Template

Observation: For several years, FHWA has been working with the MPOs to better show how regional tasks are reflected in the UPWPs for both the contributing MPO, and the receiving MPO (or FDOT). There is no consistency between MPOs in how these regional task transfers are reflected, making it difficult to track the funds, identify each MPO's invoice responsibilities, and to easily understand what each MPO is authorized to spend. In the 2020 UPWP approvals, FDOT Central Office

and Districts participated in the review and discussions with FHWA and the MPOs on the UPWP regional transfers and also had difficulty with understanding the documentation when transferring funds for regional tasks. Some of the MPO UPWPs had to be conditionally approved until their budget tables could be amended to more clearly reflect these transfers. In working with FHWA on this issue, FDOT concluded that a UPWP template is needed to provide transparency and consistency to ensure that tasks and funds associated with regional tasks can be tracked and accounted for. FDOT committed to working with FHWA/FTA to jointly develop a UPWP template for the FY22 UPWP submittals for the MPOs to use to not only identify the tasks and funds used in the regional task transfers but to also provide consistent information where needed.

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team recommends that FDOT continue to recognize the importance of this issue and work with FHWA/FTA to develop a schedule and mutually agreeable FY22 template as soon as possible for the MPOs to use that will provide clear budget tables so that all funds and tasks can be adequately tracked and UPWP review and approvals can be streamlined.

b. UPWP Amendment Thresholds

Observation: The Federal Review Team notes that there is no threshold in Florida to distinguish whether a revision to the UPWP should be processed as an amendment or modification. As a result, each MPO uses their own determinations, with no consistency among the Florida MPOs, and no assurance between all parties that the procedure being used is reasonable.

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team recommends that FDOT work with the MPOs and the Federal partners to identify a monetary threshold for UPWP amendments and update the UPWP revision form to reflect the agreed upon threshold to ensure a process that is reasonable and consistent across the State for UPWP revisions.

3. STIP Documentation

a. Sufficient Descriptive Material

Observation: Similar to previous years, there appear to be inconsistencies with how STIP information is presented statewide, resulting in insufficient descriptive material. Instances exist where capital and operating assistance activities are unclear, such as operating assistance included in a “capital” line item. Other observed inconsistencies include not including the urbanized area(s) for which FTA funds are apportioned to, not including the FTA funding program, as well as inaccurately or

insufficiently describing proposed activities. FDOT has recently advised FTA that the work program instructions have been revised to mitigate this challenge by adding this information in the project description, however improvements associated with past recommendations do not appear to be reflected in the FY20/21 – FY23/24 STIP.

Recommendation: To address inconsistencies in the next STIP (FY21/22), the Federal Review Team recommends FDOT confirm that work program instructions include clear direction for describing capital, operating, or other activities (where applicable), as well as the FTA program and corresponding urbanized area(s). Any other details needed to sufficiently describe project activities should also be included. Further, standardized and recurring communication between central office and districts is recommended to ensure district staff understand process and associated requirements. These efforts should ensure adequate coordination between FDOT Central Office and Districts, as well as between Districts, MPOs and transit agencies so that activities are correctly recorded and reflected in the STIP. Additional measures FDOT may explore at their discretion include supplementing the MPO handbook with FTA-specific details, leveraging MPOAC for certain coordination efforts, or others that FDOT deems helpful.

b. Flexibilities in Fiscal Constraint

Observation: As noted previously, FHWA, FTA and FDOT have been periodically meeting over the past year to collaborate on how best to address the July 2019 FHWA national technical assistance regarding flexibilities in fiscal constraint.

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team recommends that the agencies work together on a mutually agreeable method to document the actual amount of AC conversions in the STIP. The Federal Review Team also recommends that the 2020 FMIS modification review be completed by FHWA to assess the magnitude and frequency of the changes. Based on the results of the review, FHWA, FTA and FDOT should also jointly determine if the current process is sufficient or if enhancements for transparency are needed. The agencies previously agreed that the STIP website will be updated to document the mutually acceptable process for changing the STIP post letting and to also think about ways to potentially enhance the transparency for post letting STIP changes.

4. Review Portal

Observation: The review portal continues to be refined to meet the needs of FDOT, the MPOs and the federal agencies. Users continue to experience problems with the portal, however, in uploading information, retaining information that has been uploaded, and notifying those who need to take an action in the portal. Additionally, there is inconsistency in use of the portal. Specifically, many MPOs still forward documents directly to the federal team rather than have the documents

uploaded to the portal for tracking and review. FDOT states that a rollout of Portal 2.0 is in the works.

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team recommends that FDOT clarify policy regarding the use of the portal, prioritize portal improvements to address the identified issues, and provide the necessary training to all who use the portal to ensure consistency in implementation.

5. Transportation Performance (TPM)

a. Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) Final Rule

Observation: on July 19, 2019, FTA published the PTASP Final Rule, which requires certain operators of public transportation systems that receive federal funds under FTA's Urbanized Area Formula Grants to develop safety plans that include the processes and procedures to implement Safety Management Systems (SMS). The final rule also outlined the establishment of transit safety targets by qualifying transit agencies and MPOs, for each performance measure, coordination with State DOTs, and integration of PTASP into the planning process.

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team recommends FDOT coordinate with MPOs and Transit Providers to ensure that by January 20, 2021 (or not later than 180 days after receipt of the Agency Safety Plan from public transit providers), MPOs set their initial transit safety targets. By July 20, 2021, specific written provisions for the transit safety measure should be jointly agreed upon and adopted by the MPO(s), State, and providers of public transportation. Please also note that transit safety measures and targets should be included in all LRTPs and TIPs updated or amended after this date. Additional information may be found at FTA's PTASP website: <https://www.transit.dot.gov/PTASP>.

b. Transit Asset Management (TAM) Final Rule

Observation: On July 26, 2016, FTA published the TAM Final Rule to help achieve and maintain a state of good repair for the nation's public transportation assets. The final rule also included the establishment of TAM targets by qualifying transit agencies and MPOs, for each performance measure, coordination with State DOTs, and integration of TAM into the planning process.

Recommendation: As applicable, FDOT should coordinate with MPOs and Transit Providers for any TAM-related updates to the LRTPs and TIPs, including noted progress towards achieving targets. Although MPOs need not update targets annually, they may do so at their discretion and in coordination with the transit agencies, to the maximum extent practicable. Additional information may be found at FTA's TAM website: <https://www.transit.dot.gov/TAM>.

6. FDOT Stewardship and Oversight

a. Planning Products

Observation: The FDOT MPO Liaisons are very involved with the MPOs in helping to ensure that the financial requirements of 2 CFR 200 are met. This is evident in the FDOT Risk Assessment for the MPOs. There does not seem to be a similar level of stewardship and oversight for ensuring that the requirements of 23 CFR 450 are met, particularly related to LRTP, TIP and Public Involvement Plan development. From reviewing corrective actions from federal TMA certifications and conducting PAR reviews, the Federal Review Team observes that the MPO planning products required under 23 CFR 450 are repetitively noncompliant with certain requirements. The Federal Team relies on FDOT's stewardship and oversight of the MPO planning products (LRTPs, TIP, PIPs) to ensure that requirements are being met, particularly since we do not conduct certification reviews on non-TMAs, and may not be involved in the planning products for TMAs until their federal certification review. The continuing noncompliance findings on the same issues from federal certifications and federal PAR reviews indicate a need for additional FDOT stewardship and oversight of the MPO planning products required by 23 CFR 450.

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team recommends that FDOT expand their Risk Assessment beyond topics related to 2 CFR 200 and ensure their stewardship and oversight responsibilities areas clearly defined as to what is a District responsibility. Additional oversight and training on planning product requirements may also clarify expectations. Assisting MPOs in ensuring that the federally-funded planning products, such as LRTPs, TIPs and Public Involvement Plans meet the 23 CFR 450 federal requirements, may eliminate the same corrective actions that are issued across many TMAs during federal certification reviews, as well as federal PAR findings of noncompliance.

b. FDOT Findings in Annual Certifications

Observation: A summary of the 2019 FDOT/MPO Annual Joint Certifications is provided in Section C of this report. The first two corrective actions identified as part of these joint certifications do not seem to provide a clear action to correct a specific problem. These could be written more clearly to ensure understanding in what is needed to meet Federal and State requirements. In addition, one of the recommendations from these annual joint certifications stems from FDOT's opinion that the MPO is prioritizing too many transit projects over highway projects, and further requests the MPO to develop a mutually agreed upon ratio for transit vs. highway project priorities in the annual List of Project Priorities. This recommendation may be counter to Federal requirements to require TMAs to develop project priorities off the NHS through consultative process with the State DOT. State DOT's, on the other hand, are required to set the priorities on the NHS in collaboration with the MPOs. FDOT's recommendation appears to provide judgement on the MPO priorities.

Recommendation: When writing corrective actions, FDOT Districts should be very clear in identifying the problem and the needed solution, and clearly tie to a

requirement. Additionally, FDOT recommendations should be limited to enhancements that fall within the Federal requirements.

7. Partner Communication

Observation: In their written response to the 2018 and 2019 recommendations, FDOT identified a number of strategies they have instituted, many of which have already resulted in improved communication between FDOT, the Federal partners, and the MPOs. FDOT provides notification to the federal agencies, for example, of MPO Handbook changes, and has worked with the federal partners on Fed Tech Bulletins. There are some initiatives underway, however, that had limited federal collaboration such as Consolidated Planning Grants proposals and tracking non-PL funds, including CMAQ, in UPWPs. These initiatives would also benefit from a collaborative consultative process with other program offices within FDOT (i.e., Work Program, Transit Office, and Transit and MPO liaisons, etc). There are also specific directions that FDOT Office of Policy Planning provides to the FDOT liaisons, but which are not copied to the federal partners for their awareness.

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team recommends that FDOT continue to find ways to further enhance this collaborative communication consultation process for all initiatives that affect the federal planning partners, regardless of which program areas within FDOT are leading the initiative.

8. Consultation with MPO Partners

Observation: The Federal Review Team have noted many instances of projects included in the STIP and TIP, but which are not found in the LRTP. Further, several MPOs have expressed concern that they are being asked to include projects in their TIP, even though these projects did not come from a process that first includes these projects in the MPO's LRTP. MPOs have also expressed concern regarding sub-allocated funds and the programming process for TMA TIPs.

Recommendation: The Federal Review Team recommends that FDOT and the MPOs discuss together how the current process is implemented, as well as how it is meeting the needs for a cooperative planning process from a TMA perspective. While the process for project prioritization, selection for funding, and sub-allocation of funds may have worked in the past for FDOT, the TMAs and the non-TMA MPOs, changing needs may require a shared update of the process to ensure that it continues to be a "3-C" process.

Conclusions

Based on routine coordination throughout the year with the various statewide planning participants, discussions at the "annual assessment" meeting, the review of statewide summary and planning documents provided by participating and affected offices, and the status of past "annual assessment" recommendations, FDOT continues to

demonstrate that they address federal questions/concerns, as such concerns are identified.

Therefore, it is hereby determined that Florida's statewide and metropolitan transportation planning processes continues to substantially satisfy the requirements of 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135, 49 U.S.C. 5303-5305, 23 CFR Part 450 and 500, and 49 CFR Part 613. FHWA and FTA will continue working with Florida's various planning partners (e.g., FDOT, the 27 MPOs, local /regional transit service providers, local governments, State/local resource agencies, and the public) to further address and complete the activities and commitments contained in this report.

Appendix A – Meeting Agenda

Meeting Agenda

Office of Policy Planning

Tuesday, July 7 and 8, 2020
Virtual Through TEAMS



2020 Florida Federal Planning Certification

The Federal Planning Certification is required for STP approval by FHWA and FTA. They have joint stewardship responsibilities to ensure that both the statewide and metropolitan planning processes satisfy the federal planning requirements.

	<p>TEAMS Meeting or 850-739-5589 Conference ID: 670 295 481# Point of Contact: Mark Reichert 850-414-4901</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Agenda - Tuesday July 7, 2020

Time	Topic	Presenter
9:00 a.m.-9:30 a.m.	Introductions	Mark Reichert, FHWA/FTA
9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m.	Status of 2019 Annual Certification Overview with Discussion on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corrective Actions • Recommendations 	FDOT, FHWA, FTA
10:30 a.m.-10:45 a.m.	Break	
10:45 a.m.-11:00 a.m.	Transportation Performance Measures (TPM)- Safety, How to Make Significant Progress Towards Achieving Targets	Lora Hollingsworth
11:00 a.m.-11:15 a.m.	Florida Transportation Plan Update	Jennifer Carver
11:15 a.m.-11:30 a.m.	MPO Risk Assessment Process and Joint Certifications	Erika Thompson
11:30 a.m.-11:45 a.m.	UPWP Revision Form/UPWP Template	Erika Thompson/Scott Philips
11:45 a.m.-12:00 p.m.	FDOT Office of Inspector General Planning Audits	Tim Crellin Michael Dean

Agenda – Wednesday July 8, 2020

8:30 a.m.-9:00 a.m.	Introductions/Recap of Day 1	Mark Reichert
9:00 a.m.-9:30 a.m.	MPO Portal Status	Samantha Parks
9:30 a.m.-9:45 a.m.	MPOAC Update	Carl Mikyska
9:45 a.m.-10:00 a.m.	Comments from MPOs	Lois Bollenback, et al
10:00 a.m.-10:15 a.m.	Break	
10:15 a.m.-10:30 a.m.	LRTP and TIP Content	FDOT/FHWA/FTA
10:30 a.m.-10:45 a.m.	Noteworthy Practices	Mark Reichert
10:45 a.m.-11:00 a.m.	Transit Update	Liz Stutts
11:00 a.m.-11:30 a.m.	Non-TMA PARS/Summary of TMA Certification Corrective Actions	FHWA/FTA
11:30 a.m.-Noon	Wrap Up, MPO Training Requests, Next Steps	FHWA/FTA

Appendix B - Summary of Discussions that Supported the 2020 Planning Finding

The meeting began with general introductions from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Transit Agency (FTA). This group met to conduct the 2020 Florida Federal Planning Finding review and discuss the status of the 2019 Corrective Action and recommendations. As noted below, the group also discussed the Work Program Integration Initiative (WPPI), Joint Certification Risk Assessment, Rural Planning Initiative, FDOT OIG General Planning Review, Quality Assurance Reviews (QARs), Transportation Management Area (TMA) Certification Review, and other items. The sections below summarize the discussion of each topic.

2020 Florida Federal Planning Certification Meeting

July 7–8, 2020
Teams Meeting

Meeting Objectives

The Federal Planning Certification is required for Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) approval by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). They have joint stewardship responsibilities to ensure that both the statewide and metropolitan planning processes satisfy the federal planning requirements.

For meeting information, please contact Mark Reichert, Administrator for Metropolitan Planning_(850) 414-4901, Mark.Reichert@dot.state.fl.us.

Meeting Summary

Day One, 9:00 am - Noon

Introductions

Those present and participating remotely announced themselves. Stacey Miller, Huiwei Shen, Alison Stettner, Karen Brunelle, Cathy Kendall, and Rob Sachnin welcomed everyone to the meeting and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to collaborate on program improvements.

Status of 2019 Annual Certification Overview

Corrective Actions

- Mark Reichert, OPP - We received confirmation that FDOT addressed the 2019 corrective actions.
- Cathy, FHWA - We are very happy with the progress on the corrective actions from last year.
- Rob, FTA - Great job, everyone. Currently FTA is satisfied with proposed solutions and recommend coordination during and after the upcoming grant cycle to assess whether or not the solutions achieved the desired result.

Recommendations

Mark, OPP reviewed the status of 2019 recommendations:

- **Recommendation 1: Outreach and Consultation with Partners and Stakeholders**
 - Mark, OPP - FDOT addressed this recommendation by providing Public Participation Plan (PPP) training at the 2019 Florida Metropolitan Planning Partnership (FMPP) meeting.
 - Cathy, FHWA - When MPOs revise PPPs, do they involve the District MPO Liaison? Are there opportunities to remind MPOs to conduct outreach?
 - Alison Stettner, OPP - District MPO Liaisons are involved in all processes and provide input when MPO's develop documents. We also have new resources on our updated public involvement web page.
 - Mark, OPP - Many MPOs are revising their PPPs due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.
- **Recommendation 2: Partner Communication**
 - Mark, OPP - OPP has committed to coordinating on MPO Handbook updates when the changes affect FTA and FHWA. We always notify federal partners when we release an updated MPO Handbook.
 - Cathy, FHWA - Please continue to communicate as much as possible. With the Unified Planning Work Programs (UPWPs) that were just completed, it shows how important communication and understanding of each other's processes are.
 - Erika Thompson, OPP - Yes, we are documenting the UPWP procedural changes now. With this MPO Handbook update, we added specific dates and clarified processes.
 - Alison, OPP - Based on lessons learned this cycle, we may want to adjust the timing of the schedule to allow more review time. A UPWP template will also help address areas of confusion.
 - Cathy, FHWA - Yes, we are looking forward to working together on the UPWP template.
- **Recommendation 3: ADA Transition Plan**
 - Mark, OPP - FDOT is compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Section 504 programs.
- **Recommendation 4: Tracking of STIP and Other Non-PL Planning Funding**
 - Erika, OPP - Technical Memorandum 19-03 has been revised and OPP tracks funds monthly.
 - Stacie Blizzard, FHWA - The last version we reviewed did not have a finalized tracking method.

- Erika, OPP - We could not fully address the recommendation because we cannot apply the 80/20 rule before the UPWP is approved due to the timing of the state and federal fiscal years. There is a delay between UPWP programming and authorization.
- Kendra Sheffield, OWPB - The OWPB tracks this regularly.
- Stacie, FHWA - We were looking for a mechanism to track planning (PL and non-PL) amounts.
 - Erika, OPP - We capture this information using the Tentative Work Program. We will add language to the technical memorandum and can reconcile programmed funds with UPWPs in July. FDOT is committed to tracking non-PL and PL funds.
 - Karen Brunelle, FHWA - We have made great strides compared to the last two years and appreciate the complexity of the different facets. FHWA still needs an understanding of when the 80/20 rule will be dealt with and how changes would occur if something did happen. There may be an opportunity to address the 80/20 rule when we do the initial authorization.
 - Alison, OPP / Kendra, OWPB - We are constantly monitoring expenditures and UPWPs to make sure PL is spent down first.
 - Stacie, FHWA - We won't know if this is an issue until the second authorization in October.
 - Mark, OPP - Let's discuss in detail later.
- **Recommendation 5: Programming of FTA Capital and Operating Activities**
 - Mark, OPP - FDOT updated the Work Program instructions.
 - Rob, FTA - Recommendations 5, 6, and 7 are all related. We agree that FDOT's approach may help address the recommendations.
 - Gabe Matthews, OPP - The MPOs and transit agencies should put the appropriate information in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). We support educating MPOs and transit agencies on the process and requirements.
 - Rob, FTA - FTA is happy to help coordinate; we appreciate efforts to make improvements.
 - Carl Mikyska, MPOAC - I am happy to facilitate coordination.
 - Mark, OPP - The MPOAC is working with MPOs to better reflect FTA programs in the TIP.
- **Recommendation 6: Tracking of Large and Small Urban Apportionment Activities**
 - No additional comments.
- **Recommendation 7: Sufficient Descriptive Material - FTA Programs**
 - No additional comments.

Transportation Performance Measures (TPM) - Safety, How to Make Significant Progress Towards Achieving Targets

Lora Hollingsworth, Safety Office provided an update on how FDOT is addressing safety targets:

- FDOT has a target of zero fatalities. This target is consistent across the Highway Safety Plan (HSP), Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), and Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). I am working with OPP on the Florida Transportation Plan updates as well.

- The HSIP annual report was provided to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) for review. We established zero as a target in 2017, but forecasting real data shows we may not hit our target.
- Most MPOs have adopted the state safety targets, but eight MPOs have developed their own targets while still supporting the state's overall goal.
- Secretary Thibault received a letter regarding performance targets from FHWA.
 - FDOT is in the process of responding to the letter.
 - States with numbered targets also received this letter.
- We want to spend safety dollars where the data show a need, and we are updating an implementation plan.
 - The updated plan will be submitted with the letter.
- We are currently updating the SHSP. Please participate and provide input.
- Complete Streets, Safe Routes to School, and other engineering countermeasures and programs also continue to improve safety.
- John Crocker, FTA - FDOT is very progressive with their targets.
- Alison, OPP - Thank you for sharing this update. The Department is very progressive with this approach.
- Cathy, FHWA - Will you provide this detail related to how FDOT is addressing safety in the letter?
 - Lora, Safety Office - Yes.
- Carl, MPOAC - Thank you for the presentation at FMPP. It was helpful for those managing local roads.

Mark, OPP shared an update on TPM integration into TIPs and LRTPs:

- Mark, OPP - Most MPOs adopted the consensus document with their TIPs this past year. We have been recommending that the MPOs adopt the consensus document as a separate board item this year. We can provide an update on which MPOs have adopted the consensus document later this year.
 - We provided updated templates/language to comply with Transportation Performance Measures (TPM) requirements in the TIP and long range transportation plans (LRTPs). We also recently updated and distributed fact sheets for each measure to the MPOs.
 - We continue to share data on the PM1, PM2 and PM3 performance measures.
- Carl, MPOAC – The senior planner is now on the distribution list for many MPOs, instead of just the Executive Director. This will help ensure that the information gets into the right hands.
- Teresa, FHWA – It would be helpful if we can be copied on what is sent to the MPOs.
- Cathy, FHWA - Can you share the revised templates and the fact sheets? That will be helpful information to have when we review the LRTPs.
 - FTA - Can you share the templates with us too?
 - Mark, OPP - Yes, FHWA reviewed the original versions and we will share the revised.
- Rob - We have a PTASP technical assistance center if there are any questions.

Florida Transportation Plan Update

Jennifer Carver, OPP shared an overview of the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) update process:

- We started the update in May 2019 with a vision zero workshop and long-range visioning session.
- We already conducted significant partner outreach and are continuing to work with statewide partners.
- We completed a values and preferences survey that showed a diverse group of responses.
- We also completed the vision element which outlines the FTP vision and its seven goals. It is on the FTP website and printed copies will be shared.
- We are working on the policy, performance management, and implementation elements.
- The public outreach approach is being reconsidered due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.
- Cathy, FHWA - It sounds like the FTP is coming together well.

MPO Risk Assessment Process and Joint Certifications

Erika, OPP provided an update of the Joint Certification Risk Assessment:

- We coordinated with District MPO Liaisons, OIG, and the MPOAC to update the risk assessment.
- Major updates included adding statutory language, converting it to a percentage-based scoring system, and updating questions to consider technical memorandums and the review checklists.
- Attachments do not have to be included with the risk assessment because they are available in the MPO Document Portal.
- We do not anticipate making major changes to the risk assessment this year. We may add new questions if there are new recommendations or findings.
- Cathy, FHWA - How do past assessment results compare to current results?
 - Erika, OPP - We applied the new criteria to last year's process. There was not much variation, and the differences that we found were appropriate.
- Michael Dean, OIG - We are auditing the Ocala/Marion Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) now and understand why their risk level may have lowered.
 - Alison, OPP - The District MPO Liaisons have been working hard to educate the MPOs. They have also improved the invoicing process by conducting quality reviews of invoices before submittal.
 - Erika, OPP - Yes, and we were dinging some MPOs more than necessary in the past because some the questions used previously resulted in materially insignificant findings, such as typos.
 - Cathy, FWHA - FHWA and FDOT use different statutes (23 CFR 450 v. 2 CFR 200) as the basis for risk assessments. We may have different findings. Having our agencies use different focus areas in their risk assessment can be good, if the MPOs understand that there are differences in the focused review, that our findings may therefore be different, and that our combined processes achieve the needed results. Alison, OPP - Yes, we should share this with the MPOs to ensure that they understand the differences between the risk assessments.

UPWP Revision Form

Erika, OPP introduced the idea of updating the UPWP Revision Form to FHWA and asked Sandi Bredahl, District 7 to review suggested updates:

- The UPWP Revision Form has been streamlined from three pages to one and is in Microsoft Excel so that checks and balances are built in.
- The form also automatically calculates the difference between original and proposed funding amounts.
- Mark, OPP - FHWA and FTA, please share comments as soon as you can.
- Sandi, District 7 - I will add all STBG options to the fund dropdown list.

UPWP Template

Mark, OPP and Scott, OPP introduced a new initiative to develop a UPWP Template for use by the MPOs.

- Scott, OPP - We are reviewing all of the recent UPWP comments to identify best practices and areas of concern. We are also collecting templates from around the country. Once we complete the preliminary research, we will share it with FHWA and begin coordinating on a template. Then, we can work with the MPOs. The goal is to have consistently formatted budget tables to make UPWP reviews and changes easier. Please send us the list of people who you would like us to work with on this effort.
 - Cathy, FHWA - We are excited about this effort. We will provide a point of contact to Scott. What is the timeframe on this?
 - Alison, OPP - January or spring of next year.
 - Greg Stuart, Broward MPO - I am glad to hear it will be a collaborative process. We appreciate consistency while considering complexities.

FDOT Office of Inspector General Planning Audits

Mark Reichert, OPP introduced Tim Crellin, OIG to discuss the on-going audits on Hillsborough MPO and Ocala/Marion TPO.

- Tim, OIG and Michael Dean, OIG - Hillsborough MPO was selected for audit for two reasons. The MPO's indirect rate was much higher than normal and has a complex government structure.
 - We have one finding and three observations that are in a draft report sent to the MPO on June 15th. The MPO must respond by July 14th. Then, we will share the draft report with OPP before it is final.
 - Finding 1: Indirect Rates: The Department found that the de minimis rate of 10 percent is now being used and is appropriate. Previously, a higher rate was used. The cause of this incorrect rate is identified in our three observations.
 - Observation 1: The indirect rate was incorrectly calculated because vacation and sick leave were double counted. The rate should have been 10.3 percent, not 30 percent. Methodology documentation was lacking, making it difficult to determine what was included in the 30 percent.

- Observation 2: The MPO is double hosted, which could result in confusing roles and responsibilities.
- Observation 3: The MPO relies on the host agency for fiscal compliance, while the MPO handles programmatic compliance.
- Tim, OIG and Keyonis Shack, OIG: The Ocala/Marion TPO was selected for audit by request, and the audit is still underway.
 - Mark, OPP - OIG audits are selected based on past experiences and by request.
 - Keyonis, OIG - Several concerns related to timesheet verification and lack of expenditure transparency lead to this audit. Though the investigation is still underway, we have been able to determine that new management, updated invoice procedures, and better communication have helped to address some concerns. Next steps include coordination with the FDOT management team and report development.

Day Two, 8:30 am - Noon

Introductions/Recap of Day 1

Those present and participating remotely announced themselves. Mark, OPP welcomed everyone back and summarized the discussion from Day 1.

MPO Portal Status

Mark, OPP - We implemented MPO Document Portal version 1.0 last year. Samantha Parks, OPP will be discussing upcoming updates that will address the hiccups in version 1.0.

- Samantha, OPP - For the updated portal, we reviewed each agency's process to determine the new design and workflow. We are wrapping up testing now and have started to develop training. Other updates include:
 - Maintained the look and feel of the portal.
 - Updated processes to allow MPOs to upload documents.
 - Notifications set for state review and federal review based on specific timelines.
- The training will cover how the portal works and the steps to conduct a review or upload a document. The training will be by audience and available online. The training will be required before gaining access and will be available sometime this fall. If possible, people should attend as many different trainings as possible – not just for their specific use – but also to understand the process the other partners will be following.
- Cathy, FHWA - Closing out of a current action to start a new action is not efficient.
 - Samantha, OPP - We resolved this.
- Cathy, FHWA - MPOs send documents to FHWA rather than through the portal.
 - Samantha, OPP - The training should improve this.
- Cathy, FHWA - Notifications do not always come through.
 - Samantha, OPP - The tool that caused this issue has been changed.
- Cathy, FHWA - Multiple/duplicative documents cause confusion in review.

- Samantha, OPP - These communication gaps are being addressed.
- Cathy, FHWA - There are plans that we do not approve, just review, that are showing up for us.
 - Samantha, OPP - This has been addressed.
- Rob, FTA - Cathy covered our comments. It is difficult to tell when action is required versus us being notified. It seems the updated version addresses this. We appreciate the intent and look forward to the updated portal.

MPOAC Update

Carl Mikyska, MPOAC introduced his newest staff member, John Waldron, and provided a quick update:

- Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, the MPOAC did not hold their last regularly-scheduled quarterly meeting but plans to hold a hybrid meeting in July.
- Carl thanked FDOT Leadership, OWPB, and OPP for their leadership, support, and coordination.

Comments from MPOs

- Lois Bollenback, Chair of the MPOAC Staff Directors - OPP is a very responsive and a great partner. The team is open, accessible, and provides guidance, data, clarification, and more. They are open to feedback, which helps us build stronger partnerships. We are happy to have Alison on board.
 - MPO Executive Directors echoed these sentiments.
- Greg Stuart, Past Chair of the MPOAC Staff Directors - We have seen vast improvements over the past 12 years. We appreciate everyone working together to find common ground when we know a “one size fits all” approach doesn’t work in Florida.
- Beth Alden, Hillsborough MPO - Thank you for pulling together the performance measures data.
- Dave Hutchinson, Sarasota/Manatee MPO - This is a review of the process, not just FDOT. We appreciate everyone working together to improve processes.

LRTP and TIP Content

Cathy, FHWA – Recently, we have started to see some issues that were addressed in the 2012 and 2018 Expectation Letters resurface. For example, some LRTPs are missing details related to total project cost and phasing, inclusion of all regionally significant projects, or don’t properly identify federal projects. We need those elements to complete planning consistency and determine fiscal constraint. This can lead to much larger issues when approving projects.

- Mark, OPP - We can re-emphasize these expectations, as well as discuss them at FMPP. We updated the TPM language.
- Jim, FHWA – Does the FDOT checklist include the items from the Expectations Letters?
- Erika, OPP - We updated the LRTP checklist in 2019 to include the new planning factors and there are references to the 2018 Expectations Letter. We share the checklist with the MPOs, and MPO Liaisons complete the checklist when they review an LRTP. We can share the checklist with you if you would like to make suggestions.
 - Cathy, FHWA - Great, thanks.

- Greg, Broward MPO - We should work together to improve communication and dissemination of the Expectation Letters. The letters were released when OPP staff was in flux and the Districts were taking a stronger role in technical support. The Districts could have interpreted the letters differently. Maybe Carl can help communicate the letters to everyone.
- Carl, MPOAC - Yes, I can help. A virtual meeting would give us the chance to invite staff level positions at the MPOs as well. The group discussed the possibility of an FMPP-like training to address the Expectations Letters.
- Karen, FHWA – Reminded everyone of the purpose of the letters (issued in 2008, 2012, and 2018). Based on what was observed during certification reviews, there were some requirements that were not being interpreted correctly at the state and/or local level. The expectations letters provided a heads-up as to what was the federal interpretation of certain requirements so that MPOs had time to make adjustments during their LRTP updates.
- Cathy, FHWA – Probably want to make sure the training covers the 90-day provision on the collation and posting of LRTP documents in the MPO website, which some MPOs have interpreted as a 90-day extension of adopting the supporting technical studies.
- Dave, Sarasota/Manatee MPO - As we prepare the LRTP, the earlier years of the planning horizon include more detail than the latter years. We support consistency but also want to ensure the appropriate level of detail is included in plans.
- Cathy, FHWA – The certification reviews show similar concerns with the TIPs as the LRTPs, and our annual STIP Check review has identified project differences between the three documents. Let's work on consistent communication of the letters. We will include Samantha in our upcoming consistency review of the LRTPs, TIPs and STIP.

Noteworthy Practices

Mark, OPP - Erika, OPP already went over the update to the risk assessment but other practices we are working on with our partners include:

- Holding monthly webinars with the District MPO Liaisons. Recent topics include the UPWP Amendment process and UPWP Closeout Process.
- Developed LRTP, TIP, UPWP, and Planning Consistency Computer-Based Trainings to train new District MPO Liaisons and partners.
- Updating Desktop Procedures for District MPO Liaisons.
- Updating the UPWP Revision Form with FHWA.
- Developing a UPWP Template with FHWA and FTA. This will help address current issues related to regional tasks and transparency.
- Updating the MPO Handbook quarterly.
- Advertising and presenting Planning Awards at TransPlex.
- Developed TPM and MPO Fact Sheets.
- Conducted research on MPO and transit agency coordination with CUTR. It was found that LRTPs and transit development plan (TDP) updates are often not coordinated. Coordinated transit systems operations planning and integration into LRTPs may be helpful.
 - Gabe Matthews, Transit Office - FFTA is accepting virtual presentations. We could submit the CUTR findings.

- Rob, FTA - Coordination with transit providers is important and helps us award funds in a timely manner. When reviewing grant applications, we need certain documentation and it helps to have that coordination up front to reduce application processing delays.
- Developing MPO guidance for ACES technologies.
 - HNTB developing ACES language for MPOs to use in their planning documents.
- Developing guidance for hybrid virtual and in person public meetings.
 - Alison, OPP - Public hearings are still postponed with the current environment. Leadership is reviewing the draft hybrid meeting guidance. We will share the guidance as soon as we can. Do you have any guidance?
 - Karen, FHWA - We have no additional guidance at this time.
 - Michael Sherman, FHWA - Are you sharing this guidance?
 - Alison, OPP - Yes, it is all available on our public involvement web page.

Transit Update

Liz Stutts, Transit Office - Thank you for the opportunity to highlight what the Transit Office has been working on.

- Liz, Transit Office - With the onset of the COVID-19 Pandemic, we activated our emergency response team to coordinate statewide transit operations and resources.
- John Crocker, FTA - Thank you for the flexibility. Please let us know if you need any assistance.

Non-TMA PARs/Summary of TMA Certification Corrective Actions

Cathy, FHWA introduced Michael, FHWA and Teresa Parker, FHWA to discuss TMA certification reviews and non-TMA PARs.

- Michael, FHWA - We have issued reports for River to Sea TPO, Miami Dade TPO, and Polk TPO. There were three corrective actions and 20 recommendations.
- Corrective actions were related to ADA Section 508 and outreach to interested parties during public outreach; fiscal constraint – missing 1st 5-year band of projects; and fiscal constraint – need for project costs in year of expenditure.
 - Alison, OPP - We are working closely with the MPOs on 504 plans and understand and appreciate your comments.
 - Michael, FHWA – Thanks, let's figure out how to collaborate to support the MPOs.
 - Alison, OPP - We will add the corrective actions to the FMPP agenda and discuss recommendations so we can be consistent statewide.
- Teresa, FHWA - The non-TMA PAR report was released in December. We pick MPOs for review based on their FHWA risk level. This year we reviewed Hernando/Citrus MPO, Bay County TPO, and Okaloosa-Walton TPO.
- Two MPOs were found to be satisfactory. One MPO was not consistently implementing the planning and civil rights requirements. The self-certification was not signed by the MPO Chair, not having an accessible Title VI/ Non-discrimination compliant filing procedure and LEP plan.

- Mark, OPP - We provided Public Participation Plan training and assistance at FMPP, but no other action by FDOT has been taken.
- Teresa, FHWA - A few MPOs reached out to Carey Shepherd (FHWA Civil Rights Program Coordinator) for training.
 - We will review the report and work with Carl Mikyska to see what actions we can take to make improvements.

Wrap-Up, MPO Training Requests, Next Steps

- Mark, OPP - We take this process seriously and appreciate the opportunity to work together to improve the planning process.
- Alison, OPP - Thank you, this dialogue helps us improve our service to MPOs and the State of Florida.
- Stacie Blizzard, FHWA - We seek to identify types of technical training needed. TMA Certifications, MPOAC, and FMPP used to identify needs. A few training needs requested by the MPOs or that we have identified include:
 - Grants (5305 and 5303)
 - Title VI (this request was accommodated)
 - ACES
 - TPM (data collection)
 - Innovative financing and ways to sustain TSMO
 - Virtual engagement
 - Flexing funds
- Stacie, FHWA - Upcoming trainings include a statewide truck parking plans and inland ports class.
 - There was recently a peer exchange in District 6 for express lanes.
 - The FDOT and MPOs were asked to consider if there are any additional training needs, other than those listed in this session, that the federal agencies should be notified of and to send those to the FHWA/FTA team by July 30th.
- Mark, OPP - I sent a save the date for resilience peer exchange.
- Michael, FHWA - Will there be a District 3 TSMO peer exchange?
 - Mark, OPP - Depends if the Emerald Coast Symposium happens.
- Cathy, FHWA - Thank you everyone for participating and addressing corrective actions and recommendations. We have just a bit of coordination left. The MPOs summed up our perception of working with FDOT. We appreciate your willingness to address issues as they pop up, and we have made a lot of progress. Your responsiveness helps us collaboratively improve the program. We will review any documentation sent to us by FDOT, complete the STIP/TIP/LRTP review, and send a report in September.

Action Items

The following table lists action items identified during the meeting, those responsible for completion of the action item, and the status of the action item.

Action Item	Staff Responsible	Status
-------------	-------------------	--------

Share TPM template and fact sheets	Mark Reichert, OPP	Completed
Share FHWA POC for UPWP Template development	Cathy Kendall, FHWA	
Reemphasize FHWA Expectation Letters	Mark Reichert, OPP	Need for meeting/training per discussion
Review non-TMA Report	OPP and MPOAC	Underway
Coordinate with MPOs on FTA Capital and Operating Activities	Carl Mikyska, MPOAC	
Share LRTP Checklist	Alison Stettner, OPP	Complete
Share UPWP Revision Form for comment	Erika Thompson, OPP	Complete
Tracking of STIP and Non-PL funding discussion	Erika Thompson, Stacie Blizzard	

APPENDIX C

2020 Florida Federal Planning Certification - Attendees July 7-8, 2020, 8:30 A.M. – Noon

The table below summarizes meeting attendees and their organization. * indicates attendees that joined on July 8th only.

Attendee	Organization
Greg Stuart*	Broward MPO
Jeff Cramer*	Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR)
Sandi Bredahl	FDOT District 7
Huiwei Shen	FDOT Office of Chief Planner
Stacey Miller	FDOT Office of Finance and Administration
Keyonis Shack	FDOT Office of Inspector General (OIG)
Michael Dean	FDOT Office of Inspector General
Tim Crellin	FDOT Office of Inspector General
Alison Stettner	FDOT Office of Policy Planning (OPP)
Erika Thompson	FDOT Office of Policy Planning
Jennifer Carver	FDOT Office of Policy Planning
Mark Reichert	FDOT Office of Policy Planning
Samantha Parks	FDOT Office of Policy Planning
Scott Philips	FDOT Office of Policy Planning
Chris Bratton	FDOT Office of Work Program and Budget (OWPB)
Kendra Sheffield	FDOT Office of Work Program and Budget
Stephanie Certain	FDOT Office of Work Program and Budget
Lora Hollingsworth	FDOT Safety Office
Chris Wiglesworth	FDOT Transit Office
Gabe Matthews	FDOT Transit Office
Liz Stutts	FDOT Transit Office
Cathy Kendall	Federal Highway Administration
Jim Martin*	Federal Highway Administration
Karen Brunelle	Federal Highway Administration
Michael Sherman	Federal Highway Administration
Stacie Blizzard	Federal Highway Administration
Teresa Parker	Federal Highway Administration
Brittney Lavender	Federal Transit Administration
Courtney Roberts	Federal Transit Administration
Holly Liles	Federal Transit Administration

Attendee	Organization
John Crocker	Federal Transit Administration
Rob Sachnin	Federal Transit Administration
Beth Alden*	Hillsborough MPO
Joe Crozier	Kimley-Horn
Macy Fricke	Kimley-Horn
Gary Huttman*	MetroPlan Orlando
Jason Loschiavo	MetroPlan Orlando
Nick Lepp*	MetroPlan Orlando
Carl Mikyska	Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC)
John Waldron	Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council
Aileen Bouche*	Miami-Dade TPO
Lois Bollenback*	River to Sea TPO
Dave Hutchinson*	Sarasota/Manatee MPO
Nancy Simpson*	Sarasota/Manatee MPO