

**Florida High Speed Rail Authority  
Meeting Minutes  
October 24, 2001  
Orange County Convention Center, Room 300  
9800 International Drive  
Orlando, Florida**

**1. Call to Order:** Chairman Frederick Dudley called the meeting of the Florida High Speed Rail Authority to order at 9:12 a.m. Other members in attendance included Norm Mansour, Secretary; Lee Chira, Treasurer; Heidi Eddins, Esq.; Leila Nodarse, P.E.; William Dunn, P.E.; C.C. "Doc" Dockery; and Skip Fowler, Esq. Vice Chairman John P. Browning, Jr., was absent. A quorum was present.

**2. Minutes:** The minutes of the previous meeting, held on September 28, 2001, were reviewed. On motion made by Mr. Dunn, seconded by Mr. Fowler, the minutes were approved unanimously. There were no corrections or omissions.

**New Agenda Items:** Chairman Dudley announced the addition of two agenda items:

- Discussion of the activities of CUTR (Center for Transportation Research) in relation to the Authority's consultants.
- Discussion of the FDOT, Amtrak, and Florida East Coast Railroad (FEC) application for Transportation Outreach Program (TOP) matching funds for conventional passenger rail service along the FEC rail line from Jacksonville to Miami. The Chairman explained that he has been given the opportunity to speak at the TOP Advisory Council's meeting on Friday, October 26, 2001, to address any concerns that the Authority may have about the project.

Vice Chairman John P. Browning, Jr., arrived at 9:20 a.m.

**3. Pending Motion on common subconsultants to PD&E and General Consultant Contracts.**

At the September meeting Ms. Nodarse moved, and Mr. Dockery seconded, approval of a rearrangement of the subconsultants to the Authority's general and PD&E consultants. The consultants had jointly recommended that of the three common subconsultants, Public Financial Management would remain with the general consultant team; and then Geotechnical Environmental Consultants and Quest Corporation will be assigned to the PD&E consultant. This arrangement leaves both consulting groups with no overlapping members. Because of the absence of two Authority Members at the September meeting, the motion had been deferred for action at this meeting.

Mr. Adrian Share, Project Manager of HNTB Corporation, the Authority's general consultant, and Mr. Howard Newman, Project Manager for the Authority's PD&E consultant, the Parsons Transportation Group (PTG), again presented their recommendation contained in a joint letter dated September 24, 2001, that had been presented to the Authority at its previous meeting. Ms. Nodarse moved, seconded by

Mr. Dunn, that the recommendation be accepted.

In the selection of the consultants at earlier meetings, members of the authority had expressed the desire that there be no overlap of subconsultants working for the general consultant and PD&E consultant. This would prevent any appearance of conflict of interest for the general consultant in its oversight of the PD&E consultant.

Some Authority members stated their position that the team that was in place at the time of the selection of the prime consultant should remain as the team for the consultants. Other members expressed the opinion that the consultant's recommendation was a natural "sorting out" of the subconsultants as result of the scopes of service being more clearly defined-- that the firms were more appropriately placed as recommended.

The Authority asked for a legal opinion as whether it was proper to change the team members listed in a proposal for consultant services submitted in response to an RFP.

John Bottcher, FDOT Special Counsel for Administrative Law, offered the opinion that the propriety of changing team members listed in a consultant's proposal, would depend on the terms of the solicitation for the proposal. In the case for the general consultant and the PD&E consultant, the Authority used DOT's standard RFP for consulting services. Those solicitations call for a prime consultant who would be responsible for the proposal. Subs are listed as appropriate for the solicitation. However, the contract is with the prime, and that contract, which holds the prime responsible for performance, provides the prime with the latitude to change, with approval, subs as needed to achieve contractual objectives. The standard for approval is whether there is a rational basis for the change.

The Chairman asked for a roll call vote on the motion to approve the recommendation of the consultants as set forth in the joint letter. The motion carried six to three. Yeas: Browning, Dockery, Dunn, Eddins, Mansour, and Nodarse. Nays: Chira, Fowler, and Dudley.

#### **4. Staff Director's Report.**

Mr. Nazih Haddad reported that the PD&E consultant contract with PTG had been executed. For the services authorized, the total maximum limiting amount is not to exceed \$3,275,000. The total cost of the contract is estimated to be \$8,250,000. The funds in excess of the \$3,275,000 are subject to further appropriation. Chairman Dudley pointed out that the contract is a task assignment agreement. While the contract authorizes the \$3,275,000, no funds are obligated until a task order is negotiated and executed. Mr. Haddad reported that these funds have been encumbered, but not obligated.

Mr. Haddad reported, as approved by the Authority at its previous meeting in Tampa, that Task Order # 1 under the PD&E contract had been issued for the amount of \$111,237.

Mr. Mansour raised an issue with the terms of the PD&E consultant contract. In the second paragraph of the "Scope of Services" for the contract there is reference to "the initial segments of the system will be developed and operated between Orlando, Tampa and St. Petersburg, with future service to Miami. However, in the third paragraph, the specific objective of the preliminary engineering and environmental study is for an assessment of the Orlando to Tampa segment, and in the fourth paragraph, the consultant is to study the alignments for Orlando to Tampa. Mr. Mansour questioned this apparent inconsistency and queried whether the contract conformed to the statute. He stated that the statute gives the general impression that the first segment of High Speed Rail would be connecting with St. Petersburg. He understood that it may not be feasible from a time standpoint because of the environmental constraints for crossing the Bay, but if this connection is not in the initial PD&E work, the public should be aware of it.

Chairman Dudley recited the relevant provisions of the statute:

341.823(1) The following criteria shall apply in developing the preliminary engineering, preliminary environmental assessment, and recommendations required by this act:

. . .

(b) The initial segments of the system will be developed and operated between St. Petersburg, Tampa, and Orlando, with future service to Miami; . . .

Chairman Dudley explained that he uses the term Tampa-St. Pete area, referring to it as one area, because the Authority has not made a recommendation on this issue. He opined that the Legislature would make the decision on what is built, but that the contract needed to be clear on what the PD&E consultant was to report.

Howard Newman of PTG explained that after discussing the issue with HTNB, the PD&E team, and staff, that it became apparent that within a two-year time frame a record of decision (ROD) could not be obtained because of agency coordination and environmental reviews of the crossing of Tampa Bay. However, within this time frame, the analysis of the alignments going into Tampa would be completed with the understanding that alignment going to St. Petersburg would not be precluded by the analysis. The report due in January will address the opportunity to continue the alignment into St. Petersburg.

Adrian Share noted that the extension to St. Pete, as well as the extension to Miami will be included in the January report as to what is implementable within the two-year time frame. His belief is that within this time the Orlando to Tampa segment is implementable.

Chairman Dudley suggested that the scope of the contract be amended to reflect the precise statutory language-- St. Petersburg, Tampa, and Orlando, but that the January report to the Legislature explain that within the constitutional time frame, an EIS can only be completed for the Orlando to Tampa segment.

DRAFT MINUTES, FLORIDA HIGH SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY, OCTOBER 24, 2001

Both consultants raised the issue that if the scope is amended then the ceiling amounts in the contracts would have to be increased.

The Authority discussed whether the contract needed to be clarified to ensure compliance with the statute. They came to the understanding that the January report will encompass all the all the statutory geographical areas, but with the acknowledgment that within the Constitutional time frame of two years, an EIS can be completed only for the Tampa to Orlando segment, and that the EIS for the St. Petersburg and Miami extensions would be completed at a later date. The Authority took no action to change the contract.

On further discussion of the PD&E Task Order # 1, Mr. Dunn asked about status of the work under the task order. Mr. Newman replied that PTG has started that task and will have it completed in due course. They are working out the details for Task Order # 2, but it is not ready to be presented to the Authority today. It will be ready by November 13th Authority meeting. Mr. Dunn expressed concern about schedule slippage.

**Amtrak Contract**

Mr. Haddad reported that a purchase order had been issued to Amtrak for a lump sum amount of \$25,000 for Amtrak travel costs for assistance in the development of the Authority's Report to the Legislature. The work plan for this effort had been previously approved by the Authority. The only change in the contract was that instead of a cost reimbursable contract subject to a maximum limiting amount, the Chairman, in the interest of efficient administration, had agreed to a lump sum amount. Mr. Dunn moved that the Authority ratify the Chairman's action. Seconded by Mr. Fowler. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Haddad reported that Chairman Dudley has sent a letter, dated October 15, 2001, to Congressman Young, Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, in support of federal funding for high speed rail and the RIDE21 legislation.

The Chairman reported that he had also sent a letter to Senator Graham inviting him to attend an Authority meeting on January 10 or 11, 2002.

Mr. Chira asked for clarification on the air fares being used by Amtrak. The Chairman stated that none of the flights are first class, but he asked that the confusion about the air fares be clarified.

Mr. Haddad reported that because of the Special Session of the Florida Legislature, the Department's financial analysts were unavailable to be in attendance to explain funding and revenue sources for airports and other modes of transportation. He suggested that for the next Authority meeting that panels of representatives of the Tampa and Orlando Airports give a presentation on airport funding, and a panel on public transit financing be presented with representatives of the HART line and LYNX.

The Chairman emphasized the importance of the Authority to learn the extent to which

other modes of transportation, such as roads, airports, etc. are subsidized. He proposed that panel discussions of the other modes be a method to establish a record for the Authority's report and for the Legislature's use. The Authority concluded that at its next meeting it wanted panel discussions on the financing of highways, airports, seaports, and public transit including commuter rail.

**Future Meetings.** Mr. Dunn reported on the results of polling the members in an effort to establish a regular meeting time and explained the various dates available. Mr. Dunn moved that the Authority meet the first Thursday of each month. Mr. Dockery seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The Chairman explained that the meetings for the remainder of the year have already been set; that the meeting in January is being proposed for January 10th or 11th in the Tampa area, which is the meeting to which Senator Graham has been invited, and that the Authority should meet in Tallahassee in February to coincide with the Florida Legislature's regular session. Starting in March, the Authority would meet on the first Thursday of each month. He also stated that for the convenience of the most of the Authority and the consultants that the meetings will be located in the Tampa - Orlando corridor for the most part.

**Presentation on TOP Program and FDOT's application for funding the expansion of Amtrak service to Florida's east coast**

Nazih Haddad gave a presentation on the TOP program. He indicated that 206 projects totaling \$708 million were submitted to the TOP Council. The Council has \$91 million in funding to award and is scheduled to meet on October 26 to review and select projects to submit to the Legislature. Mr. Haddad went on to present the FDOT proposal for expansion of passenger rail service along the east coast of Florida.

The proposal is cosponsored by FDOT, Amtrak, FEC and several cities and counties throughout the corridor area. Mr. Haddad explained that the restructuring of Amtrak service will include the splitting of all Silver Service trains in Jacksonville resulting in six Amtrak trains coming through the State in each direction instead of the current three. Two of these trains would operate along the Florida east Coast Railway providing service to east coast communities including St. Augustine, Daytona Beach, Titusville, Cocoa, Melbourne, Vero Beach, Fort Pierce and Stuart. Additional train service would be provided between Orlando and Tampa and between Jacksonville and Central Florida as a result of this restructuring.

The total capital costs associated with this restructuring is \$82.6 million including \$55.5 million for additional track, signal and bridge work, \$10.7 million for building eight new stations along the east coast and \$14.9 million for train equipment. The Department is requesting \$45.5 million from the TOP program over a two-year period including \$23 million this year. FDOT would provide an additional \$15.5 million with Amtrak, local communities and the FEC contributing the remainder of the needed amounts. Mr. Haddad indicated that the new service is expected to generate approximately 313,000 riders per year in the fifth year of operation and that local governments have estimated that the service would generate \$80 million in additional tourist spending which

DRAFT MINUTES, FLORIDA HIGH SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY, OCTOBER 24, 2001

translates into an average annual return on investment of 19.24%. Mr. Haddad also indicated that this project has received a high level of local support and that hundreds of resolutions and letters of support has been received from local governments, State Legislators, businesses and citizens throughout the corridor.

David Carol of Amtrak explained that this project would complement any future high speed rail, and its implementation would encourage and expand the ridership market for rail. The project would provide rail service to the Florida east coast communities, which are not currently being serviced.

Judy Parish, Mayor of Cocoa, who represented that she spoke for a group of mayors from the communities that would be served by the project as well as the 3.5 million people who live along the Florida east coast. She presented numerous resolutions from various counties and cities, as well as letters from citizens, that expressed support for the project. She said costs for the project are minimal in comparison to the benefits to be derived by the communities. In response to a question by the Chairman, she stated that the City Council is in favor of high speed rail, and that other local governments on the east coast were supportive of high speed rail. She also said that many local communities were financially participating beyond the specific match for the project's stations by improving streets, and expending other funds for connecting transit systems and intermodal links to airports and seaports.

The Chairman opined that there is a perception that this TOP's application would have a negative impact on high speed rail. He added the item to agenda for a discussion of how this project would impact high speed rail-- whether that impact would be negative or otherwise.

Mr. Mansour stated that if this item was brought on the agenda because of a perceived conflict, that he had not heard any testimony that there is a conflict, that this is a worthy project for the TOP, then the Authority needs to clear the air that it sees no conflict. He further stated that the Authority should not endorse the project. He then moved that the Authority communicate to the TOPAC that the Authority sees no conflict between the FEC's TOP project and high speed rail. Mr. Dunn seconded the motion.

After significant discussion that any rail service enhances high speed rail; that the FEC project would not conflict with high speed rail; that the benefits to Florida for this rail passenger service would benefit high speed rail; but that the Authority did not have sufficient information to speak in support of the project; the Chairman called for a vote on the motion.

Heidi Eddins abstained from voting. With the one abstention, the motion carried unanimously.

**5. Update on proposed federal funding for HSR.**

Mr. Peter Peyzer gave a status report on federal funding. Because of the September 11 incident, Congress has had to reschedule consideration of funding for high speed rail. He had hoped to report that the \$4.5 million for Florida high speed rail had been

approved. The transportation appropriation spending bill is being held up by a matter unrelated to September 11--- the regulation of trucks coming in from Mexico. In reference to the \$4.5 million, the matter is still pending, the Senate is strongly in favor of that amount, which is contained within its bill. The House version is silent. However, he expects that the conference committee will include a significant portion, if not all of the \$4.5 million. In reference to the economic stimulus package-- the strongest likelihood is that there will be no spending, only tax breaks. Therefore, this may not be a vehicle for major investment for high speed rail.

Chairman Young's staff has responded positively to the Authority's suggestion that grant funding be included in his \$71 billion proposed legislation, which includes loans and credits for high speed rail. Other proposals are floating around Congress for investment in high speed rail. He expects these and reauthorization of Amtrak will come together next year, which means next year is crucial for the Authority to present its federal legislative agenda. He stated that the trend for federal funding on major investment projects is a partnership-- the states are expected to provide a significant share of the funding. For any legislative proposal, the Authority's report and the Florida Legislature's action on it should provide Congress with good numbers on costs and revenue, as well as, a policy framework on the revenue sources for Florida high speed rail, such as private sector contributions, ridership revenues, and state funds. This will present an opportunity to lock-in long term funding for Florida high speed rail. In response to a question by Mr. Dockery about the availability of grants and financing under existing laws, Mr. Peyzer stated that the financial plan for the Florida project will need to include all grants, loans, or other financing available under existing laws.

Chairman Dudley announced that lunch, which is being provided by Walt Disney World, is available for all persons in attendance. The Authority recessed for lunch at 12:09 p.m.

The Authority reconvened after lunch at 1:20 p.m. Heidi Eddins, Esq., was absent for the remainder of the day.

**High Speed Ground Transportation Association Presentation.** Mark R. Dysart, President and CEO of the High Speed Ground Transportation Association (HSGTA), gave a brief presentation. The HSGTA was organized in 1983 to advocate the integration of high-speed ground transportation service in North America and worldwide as a necessary addition to existing transportation networks. It is the only international organization with the sole purpose to promote the design, construction, and operation of high-speed ground transportation systems. High-speed ground transportation is a generic name for a family of high speed train technologies, both steel-wheel on rail and magnetic levitation (maglev) systems.

He announced that the HSGTA will be having its 2002 International Conference and Expo in Orlando. It will be at the Wyndham Resort Hotel on May 21-24, 2002. He asked for help in preparing for the conference and suggested that the Authority may want to have a meeting in conjunction with the conference.

## **6. General Consultant Report**

**Status of Subcontract discussions with Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR).** A subcontract will be entered into within a few days that will bring CUTR on board.

**Status of Partnership discussions with Coast to Coast and 2012 Olympics--** A draft partnership agreement with Coast to Coast was presented. Because Mr. Turanchik was busy with the Olympic committee on the Florida proposal, discussion on a partnership agreement 2012 Olympics had been deferred. That committee is meeting this week and a decision on whether the Tampa-Orlando proposal made the short list will be announced Friday.

In that the Authority members had not had an opportunity to review the draft agreement with Coast to Coast, and that they would need to know whether the Olympics bid was successful, consideration was deferred until next meeting.

**The Governor's Stimulus Package.** The reconstruction of I-4 in Polk County is being proposed to be advanced in the Governor's Stimulus Package. Mr. Share brought this to the attention of the Authority because of the need to coordinate any construction of the high speed rail project in I-4. Mr. Haddad reported that the general consultant for the Department's Public Transportation Office is reviewing the I-4 reconstruction package to ensure that all bridges over I-4 will include an envelope capable of allowing the construction of a high speed rail system in the medium. This envelope, which would be at least 44 feet wide by 17½ feet high, would accommodate two tracks for electrified and diesel systems and maglev technologies. Mr. Share pointed out that if the I-4 construction is accelerated to begin in 2002, the construction would be ongoing during the time the Authority could be constructing a high speed rail system.

**Request for encumbrance of additional budget.** Mr. Share presented a request for the encumbrance of the remainder of the \$1 million general consultant budget. Mr. Share proposed that the vehicle for additional encumbrance be for the general consultant to continue to support the Authority after the first of the year. Mr. Dockery moved that the additional funds be encumbered. Seconded by Mr. Browning. Further discussion and consideration of the motion was deferred until after completion of the consultant's report.

### **Presentation on airport financing.**

Mr. Steve Peters gave a brief overview of financing for large public airports. He reported that the business of airports are just to provide the physical structures on the ground for air navigation services, and their business does encompass air transportation or connecting ground transportation. Of all the economic activity at an airport, less than 5% of all revenues and expenditures are for the capital and operating costs of the airport. The major sources of airport revenues are debt, grants, passenger facility charges, airline rent and charges, concessions, parking, and land rental. The major airport expenses are cash procurement, debt service, salaries, utilities, and

services. He provided two examples to illustrate airport financial structures-- the Florida Regional Southwest Airport in Ft. Myers, and Dallas - Ft. Worth. In response in a question, he stated that the general view is that intermodal stations at an airport are an eligible expense for use of the airport revenues. He suggested looking at the airports in San Francisco, St. Louis, and Newark, which currently have or are constructing rail stations in the airport, for the details of the financing for the rail links. When asked about legislative appropriations for Florida Airports, such as Orlando, Ft. Myers, and Lakeland. He replied that Florida is exceptional because many of its airports including large airports receive direct state grants. In other states the large airports receive less direct state funding.

**Presentation on Report outline and progress.** Mr. Share presented a draft outline for the January 2002 Report. The report will have Two Parts-- a "Summary Business Plan", and a "Technical Report & Analysis in support of Business Plan." Discussion of the outline was deferred until to the next meeting with the understanding that bulletized content for each item will be provided.

The report will provide an infrastructure assessment and identify the alignments to be studied. The general consultant discussed the routes between Orlando and Tampa. Alex Metcalf presented general characteristics of the operating plan determination, including technology, train schedules, operating costs and rolling stock costs. He presented general characteristics of the planning ridership study, including calibration procedures, the study zones being looked at, origin-destination data, Florida travel markets, and the socioeconomic database development process. Mr. Metcalf presented the evaluation approach, financial analysis, economic cost/benefit considerations, and community benefit evaluations being undertaken. Sources of funding are: net operating revenues, project revenue bonds, rolling stock lease, operating revenue enhancements, advertising, merchandising/vending, naming rights, parking, and freight parcels. Non-traditional funding sources are: tax increment, benefit assessment, impact fees, local public partnership, and private contribution. Traditional federal & state funding sources include grants, joint participation agreements, and gas tax. The outline also provides for the delineation of economic incentives currently provided by law that could be used to help finance the system.

In the course of discussing the CSX alignments going from Orlando to Tampa, Mr. Chira mentioned that there needs to be an early understanding of the costs to use the CSX. If CSX does not agree to a reasonable cost there is no point in any further consideration of that alignment. The actual cost that CSX is going to charge needs to be including in the analysis of the alternatives. Both he and Mr. Fowler suggested that CSX must be given a deadline for an agreement on price.

Mr. Share stated that the at the November 13th meeting, the outline will be presented with bulletized content. An initial draft will be completed by December 1, 2001. At its December 10th meeting, the Authority will review the draft in detail. The final version will be prepared shortly thereafter for final review and approval by the Authority at its

telephone conference scheduled for December 20, 2001.

Mr. Share asked for any suggestions on future consultant presentations. Although the Authority members stated that were generally satisfied with the presentations and found them helpful, they offered a few suggestions-- Handouts needed to be in the same order as slide presentations. Page numbers on handouts would be useful. Materials, or at least an outline, should be provided to the members well in advance of the meeting. Those items that need an Authority decision need to be isolated and highlighted. The Authority also suggested that the report for the Legislature needed to have an executive summary. Mr. Share explained that the Summary Business Plan, which would be about 15 pages, would provide a good summary. Mr. Chira and the Chairman suggested that an executive summary of two pages, or not more than three, had to be produced.

**Continuation of Motion on Request for encumbrance of additional budget.**

The chair opened the floor for further consideration of the pending motion for encumbrance of additional budget that had been deferred earlier in the meeting. Mr. Haddad stated that the budget balance that had not been encumbered was \$365,750 out of the \$1 million set aside for general consultants. The Authority had previously approved that the \$4.5 million budget be allocated as \$200,000 for travel and expenses of the Authority and the remaining \$4.3 million for consultants. Out of the \$4.3 approved for consultants, \$3,275,000 had been encumbered for the PD&E consultant, and \$25,000 for Amtrak-- for a total of \$3.3 million. Out of the remaining \$1 million, \$634,250 has been encumbered for the general consultant. This leaves \$365,750 unencumbered.

Mr. Dockery restated that his motion was to encumber these funds for the general consultant. The motion had been seconded by Mr. Browning for discussion purposes. Mr. Browning suggested that the Authority needed to reserve some of the budget to hire an independent staff.

Mr. Fowler moved to amend the motion to allot \$75,000 for hiring staff, with the remaining \$290,750 be for the general consultant. Mr. Browning seconded the motion. After some discussion as to whether \$75,000 would be sufficient for the remainder of the fiscal year, Mr. Fowler asked to substitute for his motion to amend, \$100,000 for hiring staff, with \$265,750 for the general consultant. Mr. Browning accepted the substitution and seconded it as substituted. The motion to amend carried seven to one. Mr. Dunn voted no. The Chairman then called for a vote on the amended motion, which was to encumber the remaining \$365,750 with \$100,000 allocated to the hiring of staff and \$265,750 allocated for the general consultant. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Browning moved that the Authority hire staff. The Chairman suggested that an advertizement be published soliciting interested parties to submit proposals by December 15, 2001. Mr. Chira moved that the Chairman publish such an advertizement, and that the Chairman present at the Authority's January meeting a list

of not less three or more than five proposals for consideration. The motion carried seven to one. Mr. Dunn voted no.

Vice Chairman John P. Browning, Jr., left at 3:42 p.m.

**7. PD&E Consultant, Parsons Transportation Group, (PTG) Activities:**

**Progress Report on work activities under task order 1.** Howard Newman reported that work on the tasks was underway and encompasses five key elements- data research and review of existing documents, public involvement outline, program management plan, working on the scope for the final project, and getting aerial flights so that the PD&E work can be done on an expedited bases. The signed contract and task order have been received and subcontracts will be executed shortly.

**Presentation on proposed scope, schedule and cost for remainder of PD&E activities.** Mr. Newman presented the status of defining the scope, which will be presented to the Authority in November. Although the scope for the overall project is divided into phases, the discussion centered on future task orders. Task Order 2 will include concept alignment analysis with basic environmental evaluation in the nature of a fatal flaw analysis, which may result in an recommended alignment. This should be accomplished in four to six months. Task Order 3 will be for the completion of the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) for the Orlando to Tampa segment, but will include conditions that do not prohibit the system from extending across Tampa Bay to St. Pete. This will take sixteen to eighteen months. Task Order 4 will include the review of the DEIS, the public hearing process, and the finalization of the EIS for a record of decision (ROD). This will take four to six months. The Chairman pointed that this totals twenty to twenty-four months, which is cutting the schedule close for the November 1, 2003 start date.

Mr. Mansour, again pointed out the PD&E work did include the connection to St. Petersburg in the initial environmental impact review segment. This puts St. Petersburg in the future service category among with Miami. Although this may be all that can be done, he recited that there are many people in Pinellas County that believe that St. Petersburg is included in the initial segment. The consultant advised that in the course of doing the EIS, initial review of alignments to connect with to St. Pete will be included, with the understanding that promptly after the ROD for the Orlando to Tampa segment, a supplemental EIS would be pursued for the connection into St. Pete.

The Chairman asked that for the next meeting a PERC chart be provided that shows the Task Orders, the tasks to be performed, and the time frames for completing the EIS, including showing when the EIS will be completed for the St. Pete connection.

**Discussion of Attachments to Task Order.** Authority members pointed out what appeared to be errors or confusion in the projected expenditure tables attached to the PD&E Task Order. After some discussion, it was determined that there were no errors. Mr. Haddad offered to prepare spreadsheets that more easily show the projected costs for task orders.

**8. Other business**

Mr. Dockery announced that the evening before the November 13th Authority meeting there will be a reception for the Authority at the Lakeland Terrace Hotel.

Mr. Dunn gave a status of his efforts to arrange a trip to Europe for on-site visits to existing high speed rail and maglev systems. He suggested the availability of members for a week in March or early April. He will be asking for letters of interest from the industry, so as to narrow the systems to be visited. It was also suggested that the group plan to go to Washington D.C. to see the Acela maintenance yard and then take the high speed train to New York on its way to Europe.

**9. Public comment** There were no comments from the public.

**10. Adjournment** The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.