

Florida High Speed Rail Authority
Meeting Minutes
May 8, 2002
Orange County Convention Center, Room 305
9800 International Drive, Orlando, Florida

Call to Order: Chairman Frederick Dudley called the meeting of the Florida High Speed Rail Authority (FHSRA) to Order at 9:08 a.m. Members in attendance were: John P. Browning, Jr., Vice Chairman; Norm Mansour, Secretary; Lee Chira, Treasurer; Heidi Eddins; C.C. "Doc" Dockery; William Dunn, P.E.; Skip Fowler, Esq.; Leila Nodarse, P.E.; and Transportation Secretary Tom Barry, who arrived at 10:15 a.m.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chairman Dudley welcomed all attendees and thanked Mr. and Ms. Fowler, on behalf of FHSRA Board members, for graciously hosting a reception the previous evening.

2. Meeting Minutes from April 9, 2002

The minutes from the previous meeting, held on April 9, 2002 were reviewed. On a motion made by Mr. Dunn and seconded by Mr. Fowler, the meeting minutes were approved unanimously without correction

3. Old Business

A. Letter to Governor Bush

Chairman Dudley directed the Board members attention to tab 3.a, which included a letter from the FHSRA Chairman to Governor Bush extending an open invitation for him to address the Board at an upcoming meeting. Chairman Dudley commented that he has not received a response to the correspondence, however he reminded the Board that the letter was sent during the convening of a special session and a response is likely to be delayed.

B. Letter from CSX

Chairman Dudley called the Board members attention to tab 3.b., which included a letter from the CSX Corporation addressed to Mr. John Beck outlining the concerns of CSX with regards to operating high speed rail within CSX owned right-of-way (ROW). Mr. Haddad stated that the letter listed four primary concerns including safety, capacity, indemnification for accidents and compensation for the property.

Chairman Dudley directed staff to prepare a letter of response acknowledging the CSX correspondence and thanking them for their comments. However, Mr. Adrian Share commented that this letter does not adequately address the two issues previously identified by the Board with regards to CSX. He explained that these include the potential costs

involved with the use of the ROW and the possible terms and conditions of this use. Mr. Beck stated that CSX requested information regarding details of the proposed rail operation under high speed rail; however, little information is available at present. He stated that this is the reason the letter is somewhat non-specific. Mr. Beck commented further that CSX is very interested in maintaining open communications as the project evolves. Chairman Dudley commented that he perceives the letter as an indication that the “door is open” for additional discussions.

Mr. Fowler commented that he believes the opposite. He stated that while he has great respect for CSX, he thinks this letter is an indication of future obstacles to the project. Ms. Eddins commented that the issues identified in the letter are exactly the issues that need to be identified and that she believes that they are solvable. She stated that she interprets this letter as an indication of their interest to learn more about the project and be a potential participant. Mr. Fowler responded that he doesn’t think all of the issues can be satisfied.

Chairman Dudley stated that investigating alternative alignments for high speed rail operations is required in the EIS process. He commented that the CSX response allows the Board to consider the use of CSX ROW as an alternative to the I-4 median and thus the letter is helpful in meeting these federal requirements. Chairman Dudley restated his recommendation for staff to draft a letter of acknowledgement to CSX rather than a request for further information.

Chairman Dudley reminded the Board that Mr. Dockery recently traveled to Washington DC to lobby on behalf of the FHSRA. He recognized Mr. Dockery and requested that he provide a summary of events from his trip.

Mr. Dockery informed the members that he traveled to Washington DC along with Representatives Paula Dockery and Dennis Ross. The group attended a small breakfast meeting with several members of the Florida Delegation to discuss high speed rail efforts within the state and potential funding issues. Mr. Dockery stated that discussions with Congressman John Mica at this meeting indicated that a program of capital funding involving a 60% federal match might be a reasonable expectation for high speed rail.

Mr. Dockery stated that they later met with the entire Florida Delegation and that the group showed a great deal of interest in high speed rail. Mr. Dockery indicated that he encouraged the Chief Council for Representative Don Young to include grant-funding options in the federal legislation for high speed rail. He added that they also met with Senator Bill Nelson and staff members from Senator Bob Graham’s office. Mr. Dockery stated that both offices indicated that the Senate Bill would likely carry the same funding levels as included in the House legislation.

Given the topics being discussed, Chairman Dudley suggested that it might make sense to address agenda item 11 at this time.

11. Washington Update

Peter Peyser addressed the Board regarding the success of Mr. Dockery's visit commenting that it was very clear that the Florida Delegation had a strong interest in high speed rail and the activities of the FHSRA Board. He also informed the Board that a subsequent meeting in the Senate considered the National Defense Rail Act, which includes \$12.9 billion in funding for Amtrak with an additional \$1.4 billion for security upgrades. He stated that the legislation also includes \$9 billion in grant money for the development of high speed rail over the next six years. He explained that this is an authorization bill, meaning that it would be subject to annual budget approval, however it did receive strong support. Mr. Peyser explained however that it would likely be blocked on the Senate floor.

Mr. Peyser also informed Board members that the House of Representatives is considering legislation including a one year authorization for Amtrak operations and a separate measure including authority for states to issue tax exempt bonds along with a grant program that includes tax credit bonding. Mr. Peyser stated that the legislation reflects the recommendations of this Authority, which indicates that there is support and sensitivity in the House for high speed rail. He commented however that it is unlikely for this to be addressed this session due to higher priority concerns.

Chairman Dudley questioned Mr. Peyser about financial support of Amtrak. Mr. Peyser responded by updating the Board regarding recent correspondence from Amtrak indicating the possibility of a reduction in services. Discussion on this topic continued and Chairman Dudley commented that it might be wise at some point for this Authority to indicate its support of passenger rail services that provide connections to Florida. Mr. Peyser replied that he agrees that it is important to support a strategy for maintaining a national passenger rail system.

Chairman Dudley provided Mr. Peyser with an update regarding recent funding authorization for continued FHSRA activities. He then requested that Mr. Dockery discuss potential funding issues for the next fiscal year. Mr. Dockery explained the funding levels presently being considered in the Florida House and Senate. He stated that although the funding levels continue to vary, the latest indication includes \$5.8 million in the state budget with \$3 million in "proviso" funding that would address any additional federal funding that may be allocated to high speed rail in Florida. Chairman Dudley cautioned that this is all subject to approval by Governor Bush. Chairman Dudley and Mr. Dockery both indicated that they did not believe that the Governor would veto these funds. Discussion continued regarding the allocation of funding for the FHSRA.

Mr. Dockery recognized the efforts of Chairman Dudley who lobbied for additional funding to support the activities of the FHSRA. Chairman Dudley stated that he simply explained to the legislators that they had a very important decision to make and that they would be better positioned to make that decision if they are equipped with adequate information. He further explained that providing them with that information is the goal of this Board.

Vice Chairman Browning asked for clarification regarding the allocation of funding and expenditures of the FHSRA to date. Mr. Haddad explained that \$3.2 million in state funding and \$3 million in federal funding has been allocated thus far. He further explained that \$2.2 million has actually been spent thus far. Mr. Haddad added that the FHSRA budget includes a two-year time frame, totaling \$16 million. Discussion continued and the Board agreed to re-visit this topic at the June 6 meeting under the appropriate agenda item.

3. Old Business

C. Audit Requirement and Selection of CPA

Mr. Haddad explained to the Authority that they have two options for selecting an auditing firm: 1) Through a formal RFP process; or 2) Through an informal process that includes extending an "invitation to negotiate" to several widely recognized auditing firms. He requested guidance from the Board on this topic.

Ms. Eddins suggested that the FHSRA Chairman undertake the selection activity with staff support from Mr. Haddad. Mr. Dunn further suggested that it would be more appropriate for Mr. Chira, the FHSRA Treasurer, to be involved in this selection. Mr. Dunn offered this in the form of a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Eddins. The Board approved the motion without exception.

4. Rule Making Process

Chairman Dudley requested that Mr. Bottcher address the FHSRA Board regarding the information included in tab 4 of the agenda package pertaining to the Rule Making process. Mr. Bottcher began by explaining that the FHSRA has limited Rule-making authority, which is primarily pertaining to procurement issues. Although there is still some question about whether this will ultimately need to be addressed, he suggested that, due to the time constraints of this effort, the Board continue to pursue these rule-making activities until and unless they are determined to be unnecessary.

Mr. Bottcher continued to state that authorization exists under FS 341.830 to either use existing procurement rules and statutes or to "enhance the ability to use best management practices, to adopt by rule, those procurement methods used by the private sector." He explained that this gives the Board a great deal of flexibility to develop innovative procurement methodologies and that staff is recommending that the Board initiate this process according to the schedule outlined under tab 4. Mr. Bottcher explained that this would include a workshop in early June 2002, at which time the options will be presented and the Board would determine whether or not it will continue to pursue this option.

Mr. Chira offered a motion to authorize legal staff to continue work necessary to draft a rule or rules that would incorporate innovative procurement methodologies and present these at a workshop concurrent with the next FHSRA meeting scheduled for June 6, 2002. Mr. Dockery seconded the motion. Mr. Chira further requested that staff provide

comparative documentation showing the existing statutory rules as well as the proposed private sector methodology. The motion was approved without objection. Mr. Bottcher further explained that public notice for this has already been arranged and that it will be listed as an agenda item rather than a separate activity of the FHSRA. Chairman Dudley encouraged participation by all parties interested in this process.

6. Consideration of Options for Authority's actions on proposals received in response to the Invitation to Prequalify (ITP)

Mr. Bottcher began a discussion outlining the four options available to the FHSRA Board with regards to the responses received to the ITP. He explained that the ITP included two solicitations: 1) a request for information and 2) a request for qualification.

The request for information Mr. Bottcher explained was an effort by the FHSRA to collect the data needed to pursue legislative support for high speed rail. He stated that this request requires no further action. Mr. Bottcher then went on to explain that the request for pre-qualification does require some action by the Authority. He explained that the four options include:

- 1) Making a determination of which entities are qualified and which ones are not qualified, based on the information provided;
- 2) Withdrawing the ITP and avoid pre-qualifying or disqualifying any entities;
- 3) Take advisory action only, which means taking no official action but providing an advisory assessment to each of the applicants regarding whether they are considered to be qualified; or
- 4) Leave the applications pending further consideration during the RFP stage.

Mr. Haddad stated that staff recommends option #3 as the most appropriate way to proceed. Chairman Dudley commented on the actions included under option #3 and questioned whether it would prevent other applicants from entering the proposal process. Mr. Bottcher responded that it would not bar additional applicants under the RFP phase. He further explained that option #1 is the only option that closes the process to additional responders.

Chairman Dudley requested comments from Mr. Share regarding these options and he indicated that he is in agreement with the recommendations from staff regarding option #3. Mr. Share further stated that this allows the Board to recognize strong applicants and provide feedback to those submissions that were considered to be weak.

Mr. Mansour asked whether the current matrix regarding responders is the same as the one provided previously. Mr. Share stated that it has been refined and directed the Boards attention to the new handout.

Mr. Dunn observed that the NEPA process would be jeopardized if the Board chose option #1, which involves "short listing" applicants. He further stated that he supports option #3 or #4. Ms. Eddins agreed with Mr. Dunns comments and further emphasized that option #3

does not preclude future applicants from entering the process. Chairman Dudley acknowledged the firms that responded to the ITP and recognized their contribution to furthering the goals of FHSRA.

On a motion made by Mr. Chira and seconded by Mr. Mansour the Board unanimously approved pursuing option #3 to take no official action, but to advise each applicant whether it is considered to be qualified.

7. Presentation of Request for Proposals (RFP) Outline

Mr. Adrian Share provided a handout to the Board and the audience regarding the proposed Implementation Plan for high speed rail. He stated that the key element of this plan is the RFP, which consists of three parts: 1) Items to be provided by the FHSRA; 2) Information to be provided by the respondents; and 3) the Evaluation criteria. Mr. Share stated that the focus on this date would be Part 1. He explained that the FHSRA will provide environmental impact documents, engineering documents, ridership information, funding and financial information, service expansion information, development opportunities, operating and performance criteria, a marketing plan, and a schedule of requirements, all as part of the RFP. Mr. Share turned the presentation over to Mr. David Miller, of Public Financial Management (a subconsultant to HNTB), for a more detailed review of the funding and finance issues that must be considered by the FHSRA.

Mr. Miller reviewed the financial information that should be requested by the FHSRA and explained that a set of minimum standards or qualifications will be developed to measure this information against. Chairman Dudley commented that some of these issues would have to be answered during the June 6, 2002 meeting of the FHSRA. Mr. Miller responded that the information presented at this meeting could be further detailed in preparation for the June 6, 2002 meeting. He went on to explain that a financial evaluation methodology would be developed. He explained that this will consist of a financial cash flow model based on standard financial assumptions along with information provided by the FHSRA and each proposer.

Mr. Miller went on to review a series of questions and issues that must be considered by the FHSRA. He explained that these issues have been framed with the consideration for public versus private interests. Mr. Miller presented the first question involving ownership of assets such as ROW, track, station, rolling stock and so on. He explained that certain assets must be publicly owned such as the ROW in the I-4 median, while other assets such as rolling stock may be privately owned. He explained that tax-exempt bonding would require public ownership, while private ownership, on the other hand, would help facilitate private sector financing.

Mr. Miller went on to consider the development and funding of rail stations. He explained that the FHSRA does not have authority to grant development rights, tax or grant taxing power to another entity as suggested in some of the ITP responses. He went on to state that the FHSRA can pursue this legislatively or they may want to guide applicants away from those issues during the RFP phase. Chairman Dudley commented that there is tax-exempt

language in the current legislation and that the Board might choose to recommend changes to that language in the future at the discretion of the legislature.

Mr. Chira commented that another consideration concerns zoning requirements around a particular station. He stated that coordination would be required with local governments to address this. Mr. Share responded by pointing out that this will be considered later in the presentation.

Mr. Miller emphasized that these are complicated issues and that the question that needs to be answered for the RFP is “how involved will the FHSRA be with regards to funding and how much of a responsibility will be placed on the private sector?” He went on to say if the FHSRA relies on the private sector, then they must determine how much information will be required regarding the funding sources.

Chairman Dudley commented that the discussion among Board members involves granting development rights around the rail stations and whether or not the local government has zoned the land for the land uses desired by the rail contractor. Mr. Chira further questioned whether each local comprehensive plan would require a land use amendment to include high speed rail. Board members indicated that this would be required.

Mr. Dockery read Florida Statute 341.836 that states that these plans must be “consistent to the extent feasible with applicable local government comprehensive plans and local land development regulations.” Mr. Chira question whether this meant that they would not have to get comprehensive plan amendments. Mr. Bottcher stated that plan amendments would be required at the local level, but that the comprehensive plan would not stop the development process. Mr. Dockery stated that the Board was getting bogged down unnecessarily over this issue. Mr. Fowler commented that he believes that rail development should not attempt to bypass the established planning process and that he is looking forward to the partnership of local governments in this effort.

Mr. Miller continued by reviewing the considerations pertaining to the operating terms. Minor discussion occurred and Mr. Miller explained that they are looking for feedback regarding all of these topics.

Mr. Share stated that another important aspect to consider for the RFP are the constraints or limitations that may exist at the various station locations. He stated that the basis for selection regarding station location include: results of the PD&E process, political influences, results of the ridership study, costs, and development opportunity or funding. Mr. Share introduced Evan Supcoff who led a discussion regarding the future development opportunities that may be associated with the development of each station. He explained the various levels of development that may be expected beginning with the core station elements and building up to the maximum potential build out. Mr. Share explained that a concept level study will be performed at each station location to identify the development potential of the location. He further explained that this information will be provided along with the RFP to help guide and inform the proposers about potential development opportunities.

Mr. Share went on to briefly discuss the operating and performance criteria and the marketing plan. He stated that considerations with regards to marketing include advertising rights as well as the eventual role of the FHSRA and the proposer in marketing the system. Mr. Share also discussed the schedule requirements including the phase 1, part 1 construction and the future system expansion. He closed his presentation by stating that these are the issues that they recommend addressing through this process.

Ms. Eddins questioned the timing for the “screening of corridor alternatives” and asked what would be done at that point in time knowing that the EIS has not been completed. Mr. Share explained that the process that has been agreed to by the lead agencies is to utilize the responses submitted to the RFP as part of the environmental process. This way, the environmental issues associated with a particular proposal can be assessed based on environmental information provided by the proposer along with the particular impacts of each specific technology identified. He further explained that this is an ongoing parallel process that has been agreed to by both FRA and FHWA.

Mr. Dunn commented that it might be possible to provide guidance to developers by emphasizing perhaps that an airport model is a preferred option of the FHSRA. Mr. Fowler questioned whether that means that the Authority or some entity would require hiring staff and would they be responsible for security, facility maintenance, and so on. Mr. Dunn replied affirmatively. He further stated that these responsibilities could be contracted out to other organizations as is typically done in airport operations. Chairman Dudley suggested that this topic might be better addressed during an upcoming strategic planning workshop.

Mr. Mansour commented that, while he agrees with the comments of Mr. Dunn, he is not certain that this model will necessarily assist the DBOM contractor in proposing a scenario that will ensure the greatest level of profitability. He reminded the Board that they have been consistent in their goal to place the greatest financial burden on the private sector and that they should not limit or influence the responses at this point because they may omit the opportunity for a private sector firm to identify the most innovative ideas. Mr. Share stated that he agreed with Mr. Mansour's comments. He also stated that industry will see a draft in July and the FHSRA Board can test these ideas at that time. This way, he continued, the private sector can provide some early feedback to the Board.

5. Strategic Plan

Chairman Dudley suggested that, given the complexity of the issues surrounding the future of high speed rail, staff organize a strategic planning workshop to fully consider the future possibilities of the program. He stated that the workshop should include guest speakers, and evaluate long-term system development plan, operations, the Authority's structure and future role, contract administration and other considerations.

Mr. Haddad commented that the FHSRA is operating under an extremely accelerated schedule for developing the RFP. He continued to state that this effort requires a tremendous amount of coordination among the support staff and they would like to present

a task order for the General Consultant to outline that work over the next several weeks. Chairman Dudley stated that this can be re-visited under item 8 of the agenda.

Mr. Chira suggested that industry professionals from around the nation be invited to the strategic planning session to share their real world experiences in developing and implementing a rail system. Mr. Fowler added that this should include European rail authorities as well. Chairman Dudley further stated that these professionals should attend the FHSRA meeting as well as the planning session.

Ms. Eddins stated that Secretary Barry would not be returning for the afternoon session; therefore, it might be wise to consider agenda item 9 prior to the lunch break. Chairman Dudley recognized Secretary Barry and stated that they will address this issue after completing the current discussion.

Mr. Tom Biggs addressed the Board regarding the future outlook for high speed rail over the next five years with regards to the FHSRA's mission and potential staffing requirements. He presented a time line that listed the possible activities and resources during the planning phase, the procurement phase, the construction phase, the operations phase and continuing operations. Mr. Biggs went on to discuss possible organizational models that the FHSRA may follow including the Expressway Authority and the Turnpike Enterprise. He went on to outline recommendations for a draft strategic plan, which include: 1) developing a written strategic plan; 2) consideration for hiring and executive director in 2003; and 3) to retain legal counsel in early 2003.

Chairman Dudley requested that the Board agree to task HNTB with arranging a strategic planning workshop in the Fall and to continue detailing the strategic planning issues that will be a part of this session. Mr. Mansour offered that suggestion as a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Chira and approved unanimously by the Board.

Chairman Dudley also suggested that the FHSRA consider tasking the sub consultants to develop very brief, mid-year report to help educate the political candidates for the Florida House and Senate on the activities, purpose and goals of the Authority. He stated that this report would not be meant to promote high speed rail, but rather would provide a factual update regarding the activities of FHSRA and the evaluation process. He further stated that this would give the candidates the best available information as they enter the political arena and provide them with factual material so that they may discuss high speed rail with a more complete understanding of the process. Mr. Dunn suggested adding gubernatorial candidates to the list as well. Mr. Chira provided an additional suggestion that the FHSRA extend an invitation to the future leadership of the House and Senate to attend an upcoming meeting of the Authority.

On a motion by Mr. Dunn and seconded by Mr. Chira the proposal to draft a mid-year report and invite the House and Senate leadership to an upcoming FHSRA meeting was approved without objection.

9. Consideration of FDOT Recommendations for TEA-21 Reauthorization

Mr. Haddad explained that the Transportation Commission and the FDOT held a forum on April 15, 2002 to discuss the recommendations that would be offered by the Department regarding TEA-21 Reauthorization. He directed the Board members attention to the information included in tab 9 of the agenda package and informed them that Mr. Mansour, Ms. Eddins and Ms. Nodarse attended that meeting.

Chairman Dudley opened the discussion with a recommendation that the FHSRA promote the addition of language that would “Preserve and Enhance Intermodal Flexibility.” He read aloud a handout that included “Among the most important provisions of TEA-21 – and its predecessor legislation (ISTEA) – were those that gave the states, at their option, the ability to use Federal Aid Highway and Transit funds for a variety of projects. In particular, TEA-21 created an innovative finance program that ensured that highways, bridges, transit and intercity passenger rail would all be eligible for assistance. New Federal legislation should continue to trend towards flexibility by giving states maximum flexibility to develop surface transportation projects using a broad array of Federal finance assistance.”

Secretary Tom Barry stated that the intent of the FDOT is to recommend continuing some of the beneficial features of TEA-21 regarding transfer capabilities of funding. He further stated that the intent of the language recommended by the FHSRA will be embodied in future documentation from FDOT. He further stated that rail options are typically covered under other legislation.

Chairman Dudley commented that the Governor has previously indicated that he does not want to see a commitment of state dollars, however federal funding would not be dismissed.

Secretary Barry responded that the flexibility applies to funding that is already expected to be allocated to the state rather than new or additional dollars that may be included in other legislation. He further cautioned the Authority against advocating a diversion of funding away from other transportation programs to high speed rail.

Vice Chairman Browning asked Secretary Barry about the status of Florida as a “donor” state in terms of the allocation of transportation tax revenue. Secretary Barry replied that the return is approximately 86% for the state. Vice Chairman Browning suggested it might be beneficial for the FHSRA to work towards increasing the level of dollars returned to Florida and advocate using a portion of those additional funds for high speed rail.

Mr. Mansour stated that he understood that the surface transportation program and other programs for rail systems are not actually in competition. He further stated that he believes that the high speed rail project in Florida is so significant that it deserves a special place in FDOT’s position. He added that the FHSRA should request assistance from the Department in drafting language that is more appropriate than what they have developed previously. Secretary Barry stated that the list of recommendations is intended to assist

legislators, however he cautioned that Florida has not made a decision regarding high speed rail and therefore it may be premature to make any recommendations at this time. Chairman Dudley explained that this is why their language is worded in a very broadly. Secretary Barry replied that he believes that the comments recommended by the FHSRA are already embodied in the recommendations from FDOT and he offered to work with members to provide some background information as well as potentially rewording some of the items on the list to ensure that that is the case.

Mr. Chira commented that the FHSRA has not taken a position on high speed rail; therefore he believes that it is premature for the Board to recommend that Congress provide flexibility in funding the program.

The FHSRA broke for lunch at this time and re-convened at 1:50 pm.

8. Staff and General Consultant Report

A. FRA/Authority Cooperative Agreement

Mr. Haddad directed the Board members attention to the “Cooperative Agreement for High Speed Rail Project” between FRA and the FHSRA included in tab 8a. Minor discussion occurred.

B. Amendments to HNTB and Parsons Contracts

Mr. Haddad explained that two contract amendments were required. The first amendment decreased the HNTB contract amount by \$100,000, an amount equal to the reverted funding. The second amendment increased the funding allocated to HNTB by \$1.5 million in new funding that has been made available. Additionally, he stated that AECOM Consulting was added to the HNTB team and the contract with HNTB was extended until June 30, 2004. Chairman Dudley further explained that the additional \$3 million in funding was split evenly to support the work being performed by the two lead consultants, HNTB and Parsons Transportation Group (PTG).

Mr. Dunn questioned whether these allocations would remain flexible in response to future needs. Chairman Dudley responded affirmatively, providing that there are funds sufficient for covering the task orders that have been issued. Mr. Dunn further questioned whether these funds would be subject to reversion. Mr. Haddad stated that they are not.

Mr. Haddad went on to explain that an additional amendment included in tab 8b. reduced the PTG contract amount by \$985,905, an amount equal to the reverted funding and another amendment increased the funding allocated to PTG by \$1.5 in additional funding.

Mr. Dunn motioned to approve the amendments. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mansour and approved unanimously by the Authority.

C. Ridership Task Orders

Mr. Haddad directed the member's attention to the two Letters of Authorization and Scopes of Service for the Investment-Grade Ridership Study between Tampa and Orlando with a future extension to St. Petersburg. One was directed towards the work required by HNTB staff and the other involves work required by PTG. Chairman Dudley requested that these be handled individually.

Mr. Dockery motioned to approve the HNTB contract. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dunn and approved unanimously by the Authority.

Mr. Dunn motioned to approve the PTG contract. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dockery and approved unanimously by the Authority.

Chairman Dudley then directed the Board members attention to an additional contract with HNTB to complete a ridership study from Miami to Orlando. Mr. Dunn motioned to approve the additional ridership study. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Browning and approved unanimously by the Authority.

D. Updated Two-Year Authority Budget

Chairman Dudley recommended that the Authority defer this item until the June 6, 2002 meeting so that the FHSRA Treasurer would have an opportunity to review this budget. Board members agreed without discussion.

E. General Consultant Progress Report

Mr. Share explained that a detailed progress report is included in tab 8e and that he would entertain any questions from the Board regarding this information. Chairman Dudley questioned Mr. Share about the estimates to coordinate the strategic planning session. Minor discussion continued and Chairman Dudley stated that he will authorize this work as soon as a task order is developed. Mr. Share stated the more important concern is the development of the RFP as outlined earlier, however he stated that they do not have an estimate developed for this work. He continued to state that these costs might be considerable. Chairman Dudley asked Mr. Share to prepare a general estimate of expenditures that will be required between now and the next FHSRA meeting.

F. Status Report on the Authority's Expenditures

Mr. Haddad directed Board members attention to a brief table provided outlining the expenditures through April 30, 2002. Chairman Dudley briefly reviewed this along with the additional funding that was allocated as a result of earlier actions at this meeting. Minor discussion continued.

G. Future Board Meeting Schedule

Mr. Haddad stated that the next meeting would be held in the Canaveral Port Authority Board Room in Port Canaveral, Florida. Chairman Dudley asked if Board members had any suggestions regarding the schedule. Mr. Dunn suggested hosting the August meeting that is scheduled for Orlando to be held at the Orlando International Airport. Chairman Dudley directed staff to arrange this.

Mr. Share addressed the Board regarding the budget requirements for developing the RFP. He indicated that initial preparation of the RFP for the next month is estimated to be \$180,000 and he requested the Board approve funding to accomplish this task. Mr. Haddad explained that this figure would provide a ceiling for expenditures. Discussion continued regarding the near term funding that would be required to commence with this task.

Mr. Dockery motioned to approve authorization for the Chairman to sign a task order allocating \$180,000 to HNTB for the development of an RFP. Mr. Dunn seconded the motion and Board members approved it unanimously.

Chairman Dudley restated his desire to have staff organize a strategic planning session concurrent with the September FHSRA meeting.

10. PD&E Consultant Report

Mr. Howard Newman directed the Board members attention to a progress status report included in the meeting handouts. He then called their attention to a package that shows the material that is being distributed during the public meetings attended by PTG. Mr. Newman also pointed out the display materials that indicate the alignments as they are identified at present. He further explained that the design criteria for these alignments were selected to accommodate the restrictions of any particular technology.

Mr. Newman stated that these alignments are broken into 96 separate segments that will each be evaluated for engineering issues, environmental constraints, ROW requirements and so on. This way, he explained that the best combination of segments could be identified and narrowed down to two best-case corridors, which will be included in the RFP package issued to proposers.

He summarized the ongoing public involvement activities for the Board and Chairman Dudley requested that Mr. Newman develop a general summary of public comments for the Board members. Mr. Newman indicated that the comments they have received are generally supportive of the project. He continued that some concern has been voiced regarding safety issues and the proximity to existing structures and residences. He further stated that a compilation of the comments is provided in today's meeting package and a summary will be provided to Board members in the near future. Mr. Newman added that station locations and development is also a topic of interest to the public

12. Public Comment

Chairman Dudley opened the floor to public comments. Mr. Dunn stated that several industry professionals voiced their concern regarding the Board's earlier action to pursue option #3 to take advisory action regarding the Request for Qualification. Chairman Dudley responded that this would be an appropriate time for these industry representatives to voice their concerns to the entire Board.

Mr. Jan Zicha from the American Railworld Corporation commended the Board on its accomplishments to date. He stated that because they are a young company, they do not have previous experience to include in a proposal and their financing is currently shown as zero. He stated that this is not entirely accurate however, because they do have secured backing from Lloyd Fund International. Chairman Dudley explained that the information provided by proposers could be updated to include additional financial details or any other data that a firm believes will be helpful to their position.

Mr. Bill Ham from the Florida Transportation Commission addressed the Board regarding TEA-21 authorization. He stated that he thinks the additional language recommended by the FHSRA during the discussion under agenda item 9 is a worthwhile pursuit for the Board and he looks forward to future actions by the Board in this respect.

Mr. Ronald Chance from the Washington Group explained to the Board that his firm supports option #1 regarding the future actions in response to the RFQ. He explained that a firm has limited project development funding and selecting option #1, which has more structure than option #3 would allow their management feel more comfortable in pursuing this project relative to others. Chairman Dudley responded by explaining that the FHSRA was not actually authorized to issue an ITP, therefore it would be difficult for them to choose option #1, which shortlists applicants and closes the door to other firms to enter the proposal process. Mr. Chance reminded the Authority that this project is competing against other major infrastructure projects to attract the attention of a limited field of qualified applicants. He stated that the Authority should remain cognizant of this fact and attempt to provide additional structure to the RFP process.

Mr. Lee Dowden from Arcadis went on record stating that his firm also prefers option #1, but he further commented that they understand the needs for the Board to select option #3

Mr. Newman reminded the Board and audience about the High Speed Ground Transportation Association International Conference scheduled for May 21-24. He added that a handout is available including the most recent agenda for this event.

Chairman Dudley asked for additional comments and hearing no further business, adjourned the meeting at 3:05 p.m.