



St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization (TPO)  
Martin Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 21, 2010  
St. Lucie County BOCC Chambers  
2300 Virginia Ave  
Fort Pierce, FL

(Note: Motions are bolded and Staff/Member action items are underlined)

**Members in attendance**

Darrell Drummond  
Michael Mortell  
Kathryn Hensley  
Doug Smith  
Edward Ciampi  
Patrick Hayes  
Sarah Heard  
Chris Dzadovsky  
Patricia Christensen  
Edward Becht  
Chris Cooper  
Paula Lewis  
Michelle Berger  
Jack Kelly  
Charles Grande

**Representing**

Council on Aging/Community Transit, TPO Chair  
City of Stuart Mayor, MPO Chair  
St. Lucie County School Board, TPO Vice Chair  
Martin County, MPO Vice Chair  
Martin County Commission  
Martin County Commission  
Martin County Commission  
St. Lucie County Commission  
City of Port St. Lucie Mayor  
City of Fort Pierce  
City of Port St. Lucie  
St. Lucie County Commission  
City of Port St. Lucie Commission  
City of Port St. Lucie Vice-Mayor  
St. Lucie County Commission

**Others in attendance**

Peter Buchwald  
Beverly Austin  
Marceia Lathou  
Neelam Fatima  
Ed DeFini  
Heather Young  
Beth Beltran  
Boyd Lawrence  
Lisa Sanders  
Lisandra Bonet  
Arlene Tanis  
Herb Hiller  
Julie Preast  
Joseph DeFronzo

**Representing**

St. Lucie TPO  
St. Lucie TPO  
St. Lucie TPO  
St. Lucie TPO  
St. Lucie TPO  
St. Lucie County Assistant Attorney  
Martin MPO  
Martin MPO  
Martin MPO  
Martin MPO  
FDOT  
East Coast Greenway Alliance  
MPO CAC  
Martin BPAC/CAC

Corine Williams	St. Lucie County Community Services
Marianne Arbore	Council on Aging of St. Lucie
Kim Graham	City of Port St. Lucie
Etienne Bourgeois	Captec
Ron Marovich	MTM

**Recording Secretary:** Sarah J. Howard

**Agenda Item 1 & 2 Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Drummond called the meeting to order at 2:16 pm.

**Agenda Item 3 Roll Call**

Upon calling the roll, it was determined a quorum was present.

Mr. Drummond explained I apologize to everyone for our delay but we had a slight problem with directions. It seems as though we are now all in place.

**Agenda Item 4 Approval of the Agenda**

**Mayor Mortell moved approval of the agenda, seconded by Mayor Christensen, which passed unanimously.**

**Agenda Item 5 Approval of Minutes of October 22, 2009**

**Ms. Hensley moved approval of the minutes of October 22, 2009, seconded by Mayor Mortell, which passed unanimously.**

**Agenda Item 6 Comments from the Public**

Mr. Herb Hiller from Georgetown, South Putnam County, Florida explained I represent the East Coast Greenway Alliance, which is a 501(c) not for profit, that since the early 1990's has sought to generate a multi-purpose recreational, tourism, and economic development trail, paved and off-road, between Calais, Maine and Key West, Florida. It is an urban trail by design. The trail seeks to be what some people refer to as an urban counterpart of the Appalachian Trail, a very much rural hiking trail, this an almost 3,000 mile long multi-use trail that would include bicycling, walking, hiking, other types of recreation. But some of its chief values are that it stands to take people out of cars for short distances and it has considerable significance for multi-modal transportation. Some of you may be aware of bikes on buses, a popular program for many years now. When I lived in Miami-Dade County, I was an early proponent of that formulation and, as a result, many people in our time now ride bicycles for portions of their journeys and put their bicycle in the front of buses for the rest and it takes cars off the road. It is safe and not insignificantly also allows people to make use what is often the downtime of a commute and instead turn it into active, physical recreation and so it abets health and fitness. I have worked with many of you over the years. Indeed, the East Coast Greenway through Florida is now almost 30% complete, which is to say off-road and paved, completely so, for example, through Indian River County; through portions of Martin County; all together through Flagler, north of us, and in

---

---

various other stages of completion up and down the 15 east coast counties. Some counties have been higher proactive. Nassau County, up at the top of the line, not only is currently building 5 miles of trail that we will designate the East Coast Greenway but in Nassau County, in order to link the Greenway between Nassau and Camden County in Georgia, for the first time in 92 years successfully attracted a ferry operator to link Fernandina Beach and St. Mary's. That started as a two day a week schedule. It is now at six - highly popular and wonderful for people for a day's recreation. It works very well for tourism in those two counties. So we see a lot of innovation that is happening. The most important thing to which I could direct your attention now for advancing the Greenway through our counties here would be to encourage DOT in its work on the corridor study for the FEC railroad to encourage the fulfillment of an expressed interest already in the pertinent documents to combine rail with trail. The corridor, almost its entire way, would accommodate a paved, off-road trail so that the same way that people today use bikes on buses, we could organize feeder trails into the FEC stations. Let people ride their bicycles or use the trail for other modes of transportation parallel to the train and get on the train when that suits their needs. This is what multi-modal is all about. We successfully championed this with Tri-Rail, or I should say with Metro-Rail, going back into the 1980's when I headed a committee for this purpose there. It was accepted. First, you had to get a license and we eliminated the license. There were a limited number of bikes allowed. That has been worked out. People are very happy with it. It solves many purposes that I suggested earlier. I would encourage the Joint Martin County/St. Lucie County MPO to view favorably the development, the assurance of that trail already, as part of the working documents, is in fact realized as part of the start-up, the restart of passenger service along the FEC corridor. As I understand it, perhaps first between Jupiter and Miami but we know it will come into Martin County. We know it will come into St. Lucie because we live at a time when that challenge is very much in front of us and we can't say no to it, whether we have the funds for it immediately or not. It has to be part of our plan. Finally, I will only mention that in early January 2011 there will be a ride between Jacksonville and Miami along the route of the East Coast Greenway. It is not a tourism thing. It is to establish that the route is there and why is it important? Because in October of this year, Visit Florida, which is the state tourism marketing agency, will launch a website for Florida trails, that will be comparable to the existing website for Florida golf. It will be a game changer in Florida tourism. But its impact will spin over to trails for commuting and so on. So that tour in January, roughly 90 days after launch of the website, will further establish that route. I would encourage you to pay attention to it when I come knocking on your door to help me make sure that happens in the most auspicious way. Thank you for your attention. I am happy to answer any questions I may.

Mr. Drummond responded thank you. We may want to direct staff to agenda this item to come back to us if we want to take some formal action in the future. Thank you very much. Is there anyone else from the public that would like to be heard at this time? Seeing no one...

**Agenda Item 7 Comments for Advisory Committee Members (TAC/CAC)**

There were none.

---

---

## Action Items

**Agenda Item 8a 2010 Legislative Priorities:** A review and discussion of the Legislative Priorities for the Joint St. Lucie TPO/Martin MPO for 2010.

Mr. Buchwald explained welcome and thank you for all of your patience. As Chairman Drummond alluded to earlier, we did have some challenges this morning with the power outage in these chambers at 11 o'clock. Luckily, power was restored at 1 o'clock and we are all here to conduct business. Also I want to thank all the staffs from St. Lucie County who were able to mobilize to the Fenn Center in the event that power wasn't restored here. They were very responsive and helpful. I also like to welcome Beth Beltran as the Martin MPO Acting Director and co-pilot for today's flight. I look forward to working with her. For this item, it was initiated at the Joint Board meeting in August of last year. (*A copy of this presentation is available on request.*) The process for adoption then was approved at the last Joint Board meeting in October of last year. That process included that legislative priorities would be developed and recommended by the individual Boards. Then the recommended legislative priorities would be adopted by the Joint Board, if approved by a majority of this Board. So each of the Boards recommended priorities at their December meetings. You have the Martin MPO recommendations on the left and the St. Lucie TPO recommendations on the right on your screen. Now, although both of the lists had many of the same priorities, because of the formatting differences, the attempts to merge the lists were feudal and two separate merged lists resulted. Here is an example using the Martin MPO or the MPOAC formatted merged list and here is an example of the TPO formatted merged lists. Now, in the MPOAC formatted joint lists, the legislative priorities that were exclusive to the St. Lucie TPO list were added at the end of the list under miscellaneous, as you can see on the left hand of your screen. Now, in the TPO formatted joint list, those legislative priorities that were exclusive to Martin MPO lists were incorporated throughout the TPO formatted joint list and are underlined. So, the alternatives now appear to include approval of one of the merged lists or consider the individual lists that were originally recommended by the individual Boards or consider the Boards move forward with their own legislative priorities. Now, when deciding on the priorities, it may be appropriate to consider the attributes of the lists, of your priorities, of where you want to go. Would you like to have a state-wide type of list of priorities or would you have more regional or more local in flavor priorities? Also, would you desire to have priorities that are more general in nature or would you rather be more specific? And then finally, the number of priorities that you want to adopt – do you want to have a large number of priorities, encompassing a broader agenda or would you rather have a small, select list of priorities? Now, the different attributes can be reflected in the legislative priorities of other organizations around the state. On your left hand side of the screen are the Volusia County MPO and the right hand screen is the Metroplan Orlando legislative priorities. As you can see, the Volusia County MPO has eight priorities that carry over into two lists. The Metroplan Orlando has chosen to have a single list of just five priorities but both of them are specific in nature, as you can see. Both of them make reference to passenger rail in Central Florida or the Central Florida commuter rail project as opposed to our rail project that both of the Boards have endorsed which is along the FEC line. So now as this is somewhat new territory for the Joint Board as to whether the Joint Board

wishes to discuss the list or the alternatives, the formats, or the individual priorities. We look for your direction and I'll ask of Beth is there anything she wanted to add?

Ms. Beltran explained I wanted to point out that the Martin MPO Board supported the MPOAC legislative priorities. That is what the Martin MPO Board approved at their last meeting.

Mayor Mortell commented I wasn't exactly sure when I was reading the agenda but as I look through and obviously there was underlined legislative priorities that I now, after your presentation, understand were the TPOs insertions and I, for what it's worth, nothing in there is - I don't find any of it to be that I disagree with one way or the other so it doesn't bother me that it would be a legislative priority; however, with that being said, also when I think in terms of the legislative priorities, I don't put on my City of Stuart hat, I put on an MPO hat and it seems to me that, like for example, and I am just picking out because it is easy to see here, the text messaging prohibition. Does that mean that we also have a legislative priority as it relates to child car seats? That seems like we are getting awfully specific and we are getting off the path of transportation and planning for future transportation. I get the gross weight, I'm OK with that. The eminent domain action is a summary. I am not sure whether it works or not but, in terms of roads and that, it plays a role in this so I don't have much problem with that but when you start getting into driver education programs, I start thinking that we are starting to meander outside of the scope or charge of our particular Board because I don't think it is up to us to determine whether the drivers license age is 16 but I do think that we keep track of whether cars are on roads. So, with that being said, I think that the Martin County adopted the MPOAC simply as a broader spectrum. Again, I don't know that I am too concerned. I just don't want to also pigeonhole us and commit to - one in particular was the lease or sale of public transportation facilities. I am not sure what the priority is and maybe you guys want to explain that to me but I don't want to add another level of bureaucracy for us to do a private/public partnership if it doesn't already exist. The rest of them I am totally fine with but I am concerned in the event that you wanted somebody to run a rickshaw in your downtown and they were going to use a transportation depot and we had to have a concurrency study done for it. Whether or not it would really benefit us one way or the other to have legislation prohibiting that when, in fact, no one stepped up to it yet. I just look at it as are we supporting stuff that we really don't need.

Mr. Drummond responded very good. I guess for my benefit, Peter, the St. Lucie County TPO adopted the MPOAC recommendations as well as part of their priorities?

Mr. Buchwald responded no, the TPO Board took a little different route where at first it was developed and provided to you some selected priorities were chosen from that list and from some other lists around the state and then given a little local flavor and brought to you in draft form. Then back, I want to say your October meetings or November meetings, then it was brought in front of our advisory committees for additional input and then it went to you finally at your December

meeting for adoption. That is kind of the difference in the two lists. The St. Lucie one is a little more local, more regional in flavor whereas the MPOAC list is more state-wide because that is how it was developed. By nature, it was a consolidation of all the MPOs and their priorities so it going to have a more state-wide perspective.

Mr. Drummond explained from my perspective, our big concern today would be those items that were adopted by the St. Lucie TPO because those would be different from the MPOAC as part of it and then I guess the other question was with regard to the priority and the number that we might want to suggest as a part of it.

Commissioner Dzadovsky questioned Mr. Buchwald, hearing Mr. Drummond's presentation, isn't there, in looking at it, the combined list of the MPOAC and the St. Lucie's TPO – isn't there one of those that is combined?

Mr. Buchwald responded that was at the beginning of the presentation. These are the two combined lists side-by-side. We tried to merge both with MPOAC format and the St. Lucie TPO format on one side. OK, let's see if we can do a merged list but because of different formats and the different basis by which they were developed, it was difficult to do so we tried one in an MPOAC format and one in a TPO format and the results are there on the screen. Again, the differences that were in the original lists are indicated, in the St. Lucie format, by underline so that came from the MPOAC format. If we go the third page of the MPOAC list, those from St. Lucie that weren't on the MPOAC list are added at the end as miscellaneous. As we talked about earlier, the other option is to go back to the original lists now on your screen. You can see MPOAC's on the left. It is a three page list. The TPO version is on the right and is a shorter list of two things including the headings. Again, it goes back to what is the desire of the Board? To have more concise, regional list in flavor, even if you want to take the first 5 or 5 of them and say let's concentrate on those and see how far we get with those. See if we can knock those off the list. Add to them next year or, if we haven't made any progress on those, those remain as priorities. Because this is all new territory for the Joint Board, really, it is a kind of a wide open field in terms of where you want to go with this.

Commissioner Dzadovsky explained yes, that is one of the things I wanted to bring forward to. This is the first time that we are looking at legislative items as an MPO, correct?

Mr. Buchwald responded well, certainly since May '08. From what I understand from the former Director Ann, that was the first time, too, other than looking at maybe some of the MPOAC priorities. But developing your own, much like Volusia County has their own, Orlando Metroplan, so when each of you or your respective lobbyists up in Washington have a question – should we support this legislation or not? And, also, it helps as a reminder of whether this is something that is consistent with the efforts of the both TPO and MPO Boards. So, I think it can be very helpful to you in terms of discerning all the different questions that you may ask. When you go, make trips to Washington, like the County is going to make in the next month or

so, take the list with you and say yeah, this is something that we've already supported, we've already looked at, and it would be helpful to us. It is meant to be a help to the Joint Boards so that is why we are really looking for your input. What is going to help you the most?

Commissioner Dzadovsky explained many of us were at the summit just recently held in Port St. Lucie at Tradition. It was a great summit. The transportation summit and largely what I was hearing there was the regionalization was a great opportunity for all of us in which to be able to acquire funding. We are better suited if we regionalize our approach to transportation activities. I have heard comment earlier about the text messaging. I think that is a good idea. That may not be one of the priorities of this combined Board but if we take the combined list of the MPOAC and the TPO and scratch through the combined list and say what is a priority, what is not. I think that you are going down the right path. Do we need to be involved in the text messaging prohibition? I think you are right in that the larger issues are more important.

Commissioner Smith questioned who is going to be lobbying this? Are you going to be doing this? Who?

Mr. Buchwald responded unfortunately, you can't use PL funding for lobbying as we've talked about. We haven't really determined who would be but if you have lobbyists - I know the County is...

Commissioner Smith explained I guess my reason for the question is similar to the Association of Counties or the League of Cities in terms of how we kind of blend our prioritization together for the year is to what rises to the level. We start off with 5, at least in the County, 5 or 6 subcommittees that end up having in each of them probably 12 to 15 to 10 type of legislative policy statements. Those committees boil them down to their top 3. Those top 3 are then brought before the full sort of joint, if you want to call it that, commission. Those policies are then boiled down to eventually top 3 of all 5 committees. Then we have a full staff, and I suspect the League of Cities does as well, that takes all of those priorities, really slams the first 3 to 5, because that is the full body's focus of what we are going to work on and then, subsequent to that, there are all these other policies statements that if a question arises during legislative session, there is a statement that you don't have to go back to your respective Boards to find out where you are on this issue. So, and the reason why I asked if you were going to go do it or not - I understand you are not going to...

Mr. Buchwald responded I would be happy to.

Commissioner Smith explained but if we don't have a staff similar to the Association of Counties or the League of Cities that is out there fully working this thing to begin with, to some extent, short of us going up there individually here amongst us and going and lobbying these positions, whichever is going to be the most important thing to those of that are lobbying, at this point I would collectively put together the list so there is a statement that covers the actions of both St. Lucie County and

Martin County. You might try, as Mike said, if there is some issues in there that really don't maybe rise to the level of is this really what the MPO should be focusing on, particularly. You might pull some them out, you might not, but you have got them and there are policy statements anyway. They are not going to hurt anything, but then, at the end of the day, the two groups, I think, should probably prioritize our top 5, top 3 issues that, if we are going to talk to our lobbyists, if we are going to be up there, we are jointly sending the same message so that the effect of having this joint policy group really does have some merit behind it and to the extent that also lines up with the League of Cities and the Association of Counties and FDOT and every other effort that is going on. The strongest kind of position we all can kind of put ourselves together might make the most sense. As to the format, to me, it makes no difference whether it's the TPO format or MPO's format - no offense, I could care less. A collective list and then maybe as a starting point for next year or for future times. We do kind of find a way to prioritize between the two bodies. What are the top 3 or 4 items that we are going to actively pursue?

Mr. Drummond explained I agree that this is probably the first time that we have, as a joint group, looked in terms of prioritizing those legislative priorities and that is a good thing but it would be my thought that since both Boards have already adopted a priority list, there is no harm in forwarding both of those. If there is something that we as a combined group believe is important enough that we want to give it regional weight, we may want to pull it from this item, as you are suggesting Commissioner, and to me that would be the easiest way to handle it.

Commissioner Smith explained again, just from a structural perspective for us to do that, it would also be helpful to really understand and I suspect the MPOAC's list is probably where you are going to see a state effort put because they understand what they think legislatively is going to happen one way or the other. And, again, sometimes having all these things are important and we got to cover ourselves, but knowing the feedback, both from you all, from the state and from the feds, as to where they think things are really going to go would also help us prioritize so we fully understood. At least, with the Associations of Counties, we get a tremendous amount of input from our staffs, and I don't mean this in any ill way to our staff here, but they pretty much can tell us where they think legislation is going - at least, what are going to be those hot bed items and we best have a statement that covers us so the Boards have representation when it is being talked about.

Mr. Drummond questioned is there an attempt at a motion?

Commissioner Dzadovsky explained before we go on a motion, I just want to ask a question in that how much time do we have before the legislative session to have a sub-committee setup? Doug, I appreciate that thought process of having a sub-committee that work on the details of this and bringing it back to us. It would probably have to be in short order, I am guessing. I don't have the dates with me as to when the legislative session occurs but I think I am going...Commissioner Becht, help me out, we just talked about this yesterday...March 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> because we had a conflict with Fire Board. Are we able to put together sub-committees first of all?

Mr. Buchwald responded if we follow Commissioner Smith's direction in terms of staff providing even more greater input in terms of these priorities, being able to identify where some legislation is moving and we do have those resources through our fellow MPO directors and the MPOAC itself that is based in Tallahassee. For your February Joint meeting, we could prepare one final list and just one list, if you agree on a format. OK, we want a more regional, local in flavor format. We want to have it with captions then we could bring a list, one list, for your endorsement at the next Joint Board meeting in February.

**Mayor Mortell explained I don't have any objection to that. I also agree with Mr. Drummond to the extent that it may be that this is a great fundamental concept that, in the future, we should probably utilize a system but to try and put it together this year when, in fact, a lot of these legislative issues are going to be resolved by the time we got that list up there at the end of February. It may be that we are better off sending both lists this year but having staff, as a consensus, saying that we are going to follow maybe what Commissioner Smith's comments were and dwindle it down and start a little bit earlier and come up with it and deal with what next year's list is going to look like but for this year let's just pull the trigger and send the lists so that there is something in place.**

**Councilwoman Berger explained that I supports Mayor Mortell's motion and I prefer the format on the right hand side of the screen to the bullet points because taking into account who our audience is, if they take a look at that and see as many bullet points as are on these three pages, they may feel intimidated and not what to read that many bullet points. I find the format on the right hand side seems to be very smooth.**

Commissioner Smith explained for clarification – doing that is fine. Does that mean it goes out as one list, under one sort of joint title?

Mr. Buchwald responded well, it would be like the one on the right, then, it could look like the one on the right. We will remove the underlines and have both logos and has all of the legislative priorities from both, merged and that were exclusive and then we will start with that list, on the right hand side, for the next year and refining that list. That is one option.

Commissioner Smith explained my only question – that is fine and only because I think that now sends a message to our legislators that we are joining and we are united in terms of our approach.

Mayor Christensen explained I concur with just about everything that has been said here but I would also like, in the future, that, Peter, if you could get the priority list from both the Association of Counties and Florida League of Cities because there are several items that are on this priority list and I will tell you the MPOAC and the Florida League of Cities and I am sure the Association of Counties, as well, have been working very closely together on a lot of these transportation issues and some of them are the priorities that are on the MPOAC list. The fact that we may have

them on our priority list just re-emphasizes that we support these same issues but, at the same time, I also agree that if there is local issues that are important to us regionally that we need to also have a separate priority list that as we go up to either Tallahassee or we go to Washington, we can also be lobbying for those efforts aside from what is being lobbied state-wide or nationally.

Ms. Hensley explained may I suggest that we start on next year's very, very early in the game. Committee meetings have already been held. They were held in December. Bill filing - this week was the cutoff. So, if there is anything we would ask for legislation, we would have already missed the mark. I think the suggestions made for this year are great but I would suggest that we start very early on next year. Be proactive. As soon as we get our briefing from the results of this year's legislative session that we actually have some thought given into what we are going to do going forward.

Mayor Christensen explained to continue that because I know Florida League of Cities, our priorities were finalized in November and sent on to Tallahassee and the MPOAC's actually was before that because we had their priorities at our November meeting so this is something that we probably want to be working on starting in like August and September and working up so that we have this complete at least by the end of the calendar year.

Mr. Drummond requested any other comments? **The motion passed unanimously.**

### **Discussion Items**

**Agenda Item 9a Merging the St. Lucie TPO and the Martin MPO:** A discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of merging the St. Lucie TPO and the Martin MPO into a single organization.

Mr. Buchwald explained at the joint meeting in October of last year, the Joint Board directed the staffs to initiate at the next respective Individual Board meetings discussion on merging the two organizations into a single organization. (*A copy of this presentation is available on request.*) The discussions were conducted by both organizations last month and both Boards agreed to explore the advantages and disadvantages of merging the two organizations with the discussion starting at this meeting. The results of the initial discussions in December are reflected in the correspondence that both Boards exchanged with one other that are also in your packets. During the discussion, several of the potential advantages identified included funding - will there be an increase in funding with a merger on the two organizations? Attention and exposure - is there a strength in numbers? Will there be an opportunity to become more progressive as an organization and bring even more attention to the organization? Is there efficiency in economy with merging the organization? Will both staffs working together be able to accomplish more? Will they be able to expand their efforts - lead the way in addressing climate change and congestion management and other hot ticket items? Also, will they be able to provide greater assistance to local jurisdictions with the combined efforts now of a staff? Will they be able to have greater public involvement? Maybe a dedicated

---

---

public involvement officer. Perhaps somebody to assist with local jurisdictions in identifying grant opportunities, assisting in completing those grant opportunities, is that possible with a merged organization? There are also potential issues that were identified at both Boards. Some of the potential issues include – will there be decreased representation on the part of the local jurisdictions? What about the hosting arrangements? Will there be an impact on the staff benefits? Who is going to host the organization? What about public participation? Will that suffer because of a greater organization – will it be unable to outreach to the furthest borders of the organization? What about the separation of transit planning? Is that an issue – whether the transit planning will need to be separated from the organization? Finally, the results of the 2010 Census – how is that going to affect things?

Ms. Beltran explained there is also the possible inclusion of Indian River County MPO, as well. That is also an issue.

Mr. Buchwald explained should Indian River County be included? If we are merging now, maybe we should merge all three organizations? Desire was expressed also at both Boards to explore case examples of if there are any similar type mergers and the success or the failures of such. Are there any models out there which this organization, or the potential organization, could follow? As we begin to address these issues, there are several information sources and opportunities for guidance. First, DOT's Central Office in Tallahassee was contacted to identify how would this be accomplished? Unfortunately, they referred us to the Federal and State regulations and the MPO handbook itself as they spell out how a reapportionment or how an apportionment, a designation of an MPO would. That is United States Code Title 23 Section 134 – they point out, also, just follow Florida Statutes Chapter 339. At the Martin MPO meeting, though, District 4 offered to utilize one of their consultants, the Renaissance Planning Group, to initiate some research efforts. Also, the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, Michael Busha, has contacted me and has offered to assist and you have already entrusted with him the Regional Long Range Transportation Plan. Perhaps that is an appropriate source for guidance and information. Finally, a joint sub-committee has been suggested to be comprised of members of both Boards to review and examine all the information, to address this information and provide a recommendation then to the Joint Board. If there are no objections, I would like to invite Lois Bush from District 4 to present to the Board the findings of their initial research and then I would like to invite Michael Busha from the Regional Planning Council to provide some of his thoughts, if there are no objections, if that is OK with Board.

Ms. Bush explained for some of us, this is *déjà vu* sort of. We are a numbers farther down the road, so to speak, or the rail, got to change that adage, listening to you all. (*A copy of this presentation is available on request.*) The title of this presentation is M/TPOs in and for Florida's Treasure (Research) Coast – that is certainly an important focus of this area. What I plan to cover, because there is a mix of people who have been here awhile and been through this sort of thing before and some new members, these issues - MPO designation, where do they come from? Why do we have the current landscape and so forth? – try to cover some of that and give some background. Starting off with the basic question – what is the

role of MPOs? And the landscape of MPOs in Florida and how is it evolving? Focusing on your MPOs, including Indian River, MPO merger considerations which Peter touched upon, and then suggesting some next steps. MPOs are multi-jurisdictional creatures of federal and state law designated for census urbanized areas. Those red marks are the census urbanized designated after the 2000 census. Each one of those areas has at least 50,000 people. Role of an MPO – are charged with planning for and participating in delivery of a multi-modal transportation system to move people and goods at the metropolitan/regional level within and through those urbanized areas shown on the prior map. They are also required, under federal and state law, to give emphasis to facilities that serve national, regional, and state transportation functions. And the 3 C's – MPOs are expected to maintain a continuing, comprehensive and cooperative process for developing the plans and programs. This map shows the census urbanized areas plus every MPO has what is calling a metropolitan planning area. For Martin and St. Lucie, each of your areas is the county boundary. Indian River – they have the urbanized area of Vero Beach – Sebastian Urbanized area plus the area they expect to be urbanized within 20 years. When looking at this map, there is a lot of abutting metropolitan planning area boundaries, MPO to MPO. There are 26 MPOs in Florida all together. This is a close up of this part of the world – the Port St. Lucie Urbanized Area in the middle, the Miami Urbanized Area extending from Miami-Dade up into that corner of Martin. But for Jonathan Dickinson State Park, you all would have been part of the Miami Urbanized Area after the 2000 Census. To the north is Vero-Sebastian Urbanized Area that extends into both Brevard County to the north and also into the Lakepark area and down A1A in St. Lucie County. And, these urbanized areas aren't based on jurisdictions. They are based on where people lived in the year 2000. One other thing to highlight here is there is discussion of what is you region? That came up at the regional Transit Summit. Okeechobee was mentioned. Your state college is Martin, St. Lucie, Indian River, and Okeechobee, as is your social service and work force development and other things. So they are part of your orbit as well. Every state is different. MPOs are creatures of federal law but every state has certain provisions that apply to MPOs and, compared to other places in the country, Florida was late to urbanization and the typical practice of the State of Florida up through the 2000 Census was, well, here's some new urbanized area, here is a new MPO. We ended up, as shown, with a lot of MPOs – 26. Quite a few of those MPOs have abutting planning areas. One sort of factor – Florida has big counties and the urbanized areas tended to start out within single counties so this sort of orientation to counties developed. Even though as I have mentioned, MPOs are planning for urbanized areas, not counties, per say. After the 2000 Census, Florida has learned along the way. There were four new urbanized areas but only one new MPO was formed and that MPO, the Lake-Sumter MPO, covers two of the new urbanized areas. I mentioned 26 MPOs. For comparison, in the entire state of California, there are 18. In New York, there are 13. In Florida, there is a mix of MPOs characterized as independent, regional planning council (RPC) staffed and local government affiliated or embedded. Independent examples are Metroplan Orlando, North Florida TPO. They are stand alone. They have their own staff, buildings, no host. They are fully independent. Regional planning council staffed - there are 5 MPOs out of those 26 that use RPCs to staff them. Local government affiliated – examples are St. Lucie TPO is a separate department. Martin MPO is an example of an embedded

MPO. It sits within the county engineering department. One of the concerns is if we merge, do we lose a voice? I think one powerful thing already here is, within Florida, there are 7 MPOs that serve more than one county – Metroplan Orlando, North Florida TPO, Lake-Sumter MPO, Sarasota-Manatee, which shares your differing approach to growth crossing a county boundary. They are always had an urbanized area crossing the county line so they were never two MPOs in that situation. Up in the panhandle, there is an urbanized areas that cross the state line after the 2000 Census – the Florida – Alabama MPO, Okaloosa-Walton and Capital Region. This map shows MPOs in Florida that serve more than one urbanized area. So, when you talk about should you merge with Indian River as well as each other, there is precedent in the state for MPOs to serve more than one urbanized area. In this case, it would be Port St. Lucie Urbanized Area and the Vero Beach-Sebastian Urbanized Area. I mentioned the evolving landscape – if you start drawing circles and seeing how they overlap, you see these regions – up the southwest coast, across the I-4 corridor, down to South Florida and then up into the Jacksonville area and then looking over to the panhandle. I mentioned the expansion and merger of urbanized areas. Also the emergence of regional economies – you talk a lot now about how does your work relate to economy prosperity and development. Things are changing somewhat but there is still a lot of cross county commuting for workers and regional business strategies. As a planner, glad to see, this increase I call silo busting. People use the work silo a lot and it is across issues – transportation and land use. It is also across institutions. I recently sat in on a webinar with USDOT, HUD and EPA with their Sustainable Communities partnership. Also, increasing talk about MPOs role relating to climate change. There was a peer exchange on climate change for Florida MPOs in September. There was talk about MPOs being involved in setting greenhouse gas emission reduction targets and also DOT role. Another thing – it is not only mitigation. That is where you were transit, things to reduce vehicle miles traveled and emission and so forth. There is also adaptation and that is not talked about a lot. Are we going to have to retreat from some areas over time because they will be adversely affected by sea level rise? Or in South Florida with the water coming up as well as in. A lot of challenges ahead and obviously you want your transportation systems to fit within this evolving landscape and throw in the challenges and changes involving transportation funding. It is pretty complex picture but it is the picture in front of us. Part of this I mentioned the last time I gave you a presentation. It was shortly after the Florida’s Urban Transportation Coalition was formed. As you see there, it is a mix of public and private stakeholders with a focus on common interests in these four major urban markets in Florida – Jacksonville, Central Florida, Tampa Bay and South Florida. It first met in November 2008 - last met in October of last year. And three of those regions already have a regional transportation authority. The fourth is pursuing one and you heard Scott Clem from the Jacksonville area talk about their efforts to pursue a RTA, whether 7 counties or starting with 5, but they are exploring that option at this time. The others – South Florida RTA is Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach. The Central Florida RTA is obviously the TBARTA – Tampa Bay Area Regional Transit, which are 7 counties on the west coast. I mentioned this to you before and I think the map here really highlights it – you all are in the elbow between these major urbanizing regions – South Florida, Central Florida and so forth. Opportunities there but fate can take you unless you chose

your own. I think Michael is going to talk a bit about trying to resurrect or get moving Southeast Florida 2060 Regional Visioning which would come from Monroe up through Indian River County. Those of you who participated in Committee for Sustainable Treasure Coast – that was the regional visioning type effort and you can see there are quite a few other ones across the state. At the peer exchange I mentioned there was a representative from Puget Sound Regional Council. Because a picture speaks 1,000 words, I would encourage you, if you are interested in MPO, this both has a region that is linear and has really tackled a number of things at once. But this Council which serves as the MPO serves four counties, two urbanized areas and has over 90 member agencies and organizations. One question I asked of the representative from Puget Sound - how do you do that? Do you have functional relationships? And they said they are very highly developed – it works. You have to set it up carefully and work at it but it works. And you see the number of major cities there, a lot of the state's population and they have got geography boundaries like we do. We have the Atlantic Ocean, the Everglades. They have mountains ranges and Puget Sound. One thing to stress about them – they have a nice structure. They don't look at transportation in isolation. They plan for transportation, growth management and economic planning. This is their Vision 2040 which looks at all those things together. You see regional growth centers, the rural area protected and they have concerns about their water bodies the way you have concerns about the Indian River Lagoon and so forth. They have a transportation plan, Destination 2030, which they are updating now to be the 2040 transportation plan. They have a prosperity partnership and all these things are linked together. There are, I believe though I don't know if it has changed, but one thing I would encourage you to read is their frequently asked questions. It is very elucidating the kind of issues they are covering and there is no point reinventing wheels. We can learn from other people that have taken steps ahead. These are the different alternatives that came out of their transportation 2040 process. They incorporated climate change - the most aggressive for reducing greenhouse gas emissions is alternative 5 and widely accepted by all the partners - largest expansion of high capacity transit, bus service, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Funded by freeway and arterial tolls and I will emphasize the arterial tolls part. Uses traditional strategies plus tolling to reduce carbon emissions. Guess what? The most aggressive alternative there will not even get close to meeting greenhouse gas reduction targets and they also have vehicle miles traveled reduction targets. That adaption piece – all these challenges ahead. But it is not a bad thing to do these because it increases transportation choice and so forth, over and above the climate change objectives. I have mentioned this to you before – these megaregions, these networks. There are about 10 or 11 in the country that have been identified and that is where they expect 70-80% of population growth and economic activity to occur through 2050. There is a website there if you are interested in learning more. Here is the map. Florida started out with a line across I-4 and down into South Florida and it has emerged into most of Florida. There was some meeting at South Florida Regional Planning Council a couple of years ago and the discussion was will this megaregion probably also includes the Caribbean and northern South America. Again, if you are focusing on where do people live? Where is the economic activity? Where will resources ultimately go? You talked about being able to attract resources. This how the Florida Megaregion is defined – 21.3

million people. This is one of their recent reports. They do interesting work – High Speed Rail and you will see Florida, fortunately, on the map as a part of that picture. I don't know if you all subscribe to Citywire.net. This just came up January 16<sup>th</sup> and Neal Pierce is a national known speaker on metro regions. He is pretty direct here about the future being an "overwhelmingly metropolitan nation...and the existing MPO model for transportation choices needs a serious shake-up-starting with fair apportionment and demanding only one MPO in each metro region, not the splintered structure some regions now exhibit." And that second part is a statement from Parris Glendening – some of you may have heard him speak, he is the former Governor of Maryland who promoted smart growth. His point – "it is only at the metro level that there can be truly effective links of transportation" which you all do "with housing, economic competitiveness, carbon reduction, reducing vehicle miles traveled and promoting national security by reducing energy consumption." Peter mentioned the redesignation process for MPOs. After each Census, it is automatic. After the 2000 Census, we went through a consultative process. That was started off by letters from our former FDOT Secretary who sent letters to groups of MPOs saying we think you should consider consolidating and if you want to make a case to stay separate, you have to show you have the size and complexity to warrant having more than one MPO. FDOT District 4 – some of you remember our former District Secretary Rick Chesser got up and said well, we will have to agree to disagree, we don't not think that your Martin/St. Lucie area has the size and complexity to warrant designation of two MPOs. At the end of the day, you all were redesignated separately and you took enhanced regional coordination commitments in trade. These terms are familiar to you – the minimum requirements for enhanced regional coordination – the regional long range transportation plan (LRTPs), prioritization of regionally significant projects, regional public involvement, regional air quality where is applies – and that is another moving target, what about air quality in Florida since the EPA is revisiting what standard it is going to use to identify non-conforming areas for ozone and so forth. District 4 added a regional performance measurement as your enhanced regional coordination – delivering improvements to your regional transportation system. Lip service isn't going to work for anyone. We do assess the progress you are making in meeting your commitments and this evolving landscape through development of regional reports. Along the way, you all formed the Treasure Coast Transportation Council (TCTC) with members from Martin, St. Lucie and the Indian River MPO and also the Regional Advisory Committee. I have given you kudos before on behalf of the Department. You all did some really bang up work in the 2030 round of LRTPs. The three MPOs developed a regional multi-modal transportation network. You identified regional goals and objectives based on your Committee for Sustainable Treasure Coast final report. You developed a regional project prioritization based on those regional goals. You used it and you developed the 2030 Regional Project Priority List. I don't think any other group of MPOs in the state has accomplished that. You also developed the plan amendment process – what is local, what is regional, how do you make sure those are clear. Here is your regional multi-modal map – Martin, St. Lucie, Indian River. This one doesn't show up very clearly with all the light behind it but most of these maps I have seen in Florida, anyway, are just lines on a map. You are showing where the environmental areas are, where activity is, where employment centers are, back to linking transportation and land use. And places

you want to avoid with transportation and land use. Here is a copy of what's affectionately called the 'Rainbow Table.' This is that 2030 list of regionally prioritized projects. Look at the first priority - it a transit project. We are in the process. We've started development of the 2008-2009 regional report. A 2008 one was started but not finished, the year got late, so we are going to make it a 2008-2009. One issue we'll be handling in that is how you all have addressed your 2035 long range transportation round. In the materials I gave you is a copy of the interlocal agreement for Treasure Coast Transportation Council (TCTC) and also a copy of the last regional report, the 2007 regional report, and in that, regarding the regional long range plan, we indicated the bar of one fully integrated plan remains in place whether it takes the form of the three MPOs doing one together or the form of four plans - one stand alone regional plan, so you have regional story and MPO focused plans because if they are local plans, it should be clearly presented as a local plan. But all of them would be based on regional level analysis. You share a regional travel demand forecasting model. One of the recommendations in that 2007 report was to work with your regional partners and transit agencies to define that next generation plan and promote and participate in regional visioning efforts in conjunction with development of this plan. So that is still on the table in terms of the visioning part. The interlocal agreement I mentioned calls for the TCTC to meet at least twice annually. This will come out in the regional report that the Regional Advisory Committee and the TCTC were not engaged in the process of defining your next plan. So it is unclear where you are going with that but you are still encouraged to build upon that great work you did together. It really showed you working together as a region. This is not completely the same list as Peter shared with you but concerns I have heard over the years, because I am one of the old timers, I was here in 2002-2003 when all this was discussed, concerns - loss of a local minority voice and clout, impact of distance on participation by board and advisory committee members and the public, less informed decisions making by board and advisory committee members unfamiliar with the whole region, differing approaches to growth across the county lines, more structure to maintain, over-regionalization - Commissioner Ciampi, I heard you mention that at the Martin MPO - and impacts to existing to MPOs staff and would there a loss of federal planning funds? One side story - after the 2000 Census, one of those new urbanized areas was St. Augustine Urbanized Area in St. Johns County. At the time, it was the First Coast MPO served Duval County, part of Clay and St. Johns. St. Johns was not satisfied with the staffing of the MPO so the solution not to create a new MPO but to change the staffing and North Florida TPO became independent. People get repotted. There is some much work to do. That is the good news. But that was the solution. So there are ways to make sure that staff gets taken care of as structures evolve. In response, at least as a start to these concerns, I thought it was important because you are starting these discussions, particularly with the mix of who has been here a while and who has not. To give you a kind of setting the stage, as you start your in detail discussions. But the good news is MPOs have a lot of flexibility in determining how you structure, vote, staff yourselves and so forth. No federal planning funds would be lost if the MPOs merge. And you have many existing MPOs with metropolitan planning areas encompassing more than one county and some with differing approaches to growth so you can consult people who have already been through these types of things. Another part is the

technological advances that can minimize the impacts of distance and provide for more robust participation by the public. I am helping with the 2060 Florida Transportation Plan efforts in partner and public involvement and hearing other districts – I guess, TBARTA had i-meetings with 80,000 people participating. It is really very exciting some of these other ways that we can engage people on these matters. Benefits – again, not necessarily comprehensive, it has been mentioned, a regional voice, a regional story to tell. It is also tied to being relevant, to being effective and to being competitive - economy development, climate change, funding and so forth. And it is a better match, these regional MPOs, to your desired transportation services. For example, re-introduction of passenger rail on the FEC corridor. That is not county by county, that is a corridor. Better able to address and integrate issues. One thing, if you are able to look at these frequently asked questions on the Puget Sound plan, they use their plan to protect rural areas, as I mentioned, and to protect water quality. It is clear if you start to integrate these issues how all this planning activity can work together for common ends. Also, enhanced ability to meet and capitalize on changes in the landscape at the federal and state level. This has been mentioned, too. We are facing a new federal surface transportation service act authorization reauthorization. FTA just announced that they are changing the guidelines for New Starts funding to address livability. That's a change that has been welcomed by many corridors. Climate change, energy legislation, I mentioned, sustainable communities, all of these things. I will share with you, FDOT discretionary grants, we do give weight to projects that are regional. That is one example of a funding sources already that does that. Peter mentioned this; it provides efficiencies – less staff redundancies, fewer committees to support. You have no need for TCTC if you have one MPO. Your federal dollars can go farther. This is an example I have prepared a chart for Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach – they quite a bit more money that you all but they have quite a few more people – but those three MPOs, Martin, St. Lucie and Indian River, in fiscal year '09-'10 received \$1.6 million of federal planning funding funds including local match for your transit funding. The Florida-Alabama TPO, Okaloosa-Walton TPO and Bay County TPO – pretty close \$1.8 million. Those three MPOs pool their federal planning funds and are served by one staff out of the West Florida RPC – a staff of 23. Next steps – these are suggested for you, if you want to consider them. Define your region. That was brought up at the regional transit summit. It is consulting with the Indian River MPO and one thing, just to remember, that you plan for the long term so your solutions should also be long term. Consult with MPOs with experience operating in a multi-county environment. That is rather obvious. This one, I particularly encourage you, consult with other MPOs on the cutting edge of regional transportation planning, integrating those issues, transportation, land use, transportation, water quality, and so forth. Stay tuned on what's happening at state and federal levels. Be in a position to identify the key attributes that you need to have as an MPO to be on the new playing field and capitalize on it. On other thing to throw out here is to consider there is a down side to waiting to act until after the 2010 Census. I don't know – it was 2002 after the 2000 Census, whether it will 2011 or 2012. Look at Puget Sound – it is not to say that you all have not made progress and are not doing good things here. It means others are ahead of you and there are a lot of challenges and they are not very patient. They need to be addressed. Here are some examples of some near term,

next steps for FDOT. We will continue our research and we were going to provide some of the details. It got very complex so what we decided to do is all the tables, with all the details on MPOs, we are going to develop a resource booklet or white papers to share that information so it is not unloaded to you in presentation but you can review it at your leisure. We will also provide more information on the process issues relating to merger. If you were to merge, there would be a redesignation of the MPO which involves the Governor. We will be completing that 2008 report I mentioned and I will be back presenting that. I have my contact information. I have given you a lot of information. I am sorry for the small slides, I tried to print two page but printer would not cooperate with me. I will make sure that your Directors have the full size presentation. I think the maps might be useful to you. I included in your package the 2060 Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) brochures hot of the press. Some more information will be coming. I encourage you to participate. The MPOAC has a representative on the steering committee for this FTP update. This has a vision part and it's jumping to 2060 of the 2060 Southeast Florida regional visioning. Michael, didn't that 2060 from the 1,000 Friends of Florida study that showed if we continue with our current comprehensive plans and so forth, the state heartland will be paved over by 2060? But there are ways to avoid that, which is the good news. I would be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. Drummond responded before we do that, from a housekeeping standpoint, I want to comment that both Commissioner Heard and Vice Mayor Kelly came in since we called a quorum. She came in and left. That being said, are there any questions for Ms. Bush? Thank you, Lois. At this time, we are going to get additional information from Mr. Busha.

Mr. Busha explained I want you to know that the Regional Planning Council and I will just get right to point because one of my sons has drum and piano lessons in about 45 minutes. The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council has stayed out this. We've never had a dog in this hunt and, frankly, we have always felt that, because it was Martin County, St. Lucie County, it was your decision. That the federal government, unless they change their rules, isn't going to make you do it. DOT really can't decide for you. The Regional Planning Councils can't tell you that you have to be merged. You folks have to decide what is best for your two counties or three counties, however it may be. This isn't like deciding what refrigerator to buy or what phone, although most of us spend a lot more time figuring out what phone we are going to buy then on other, more important things. What I would propose to you that before you and also one thing I wanted to tell you about rushing in to a decision like this, that you don't do that. What I want to offer to you, what I would like to offer to you, is a chance to get some of all the questions that you all have answered in a slow, methodical way with a committee - sort of a combination approach. What I would propose is similar to what you did with your regional Transit Development Plan. B the way, congratulations on your Transit Summit. I did not attend. I was out of town but I heard it was very good. My staff said it was very good and, in fact, Senator Negrón called the Council offices asking about it and asking for some presentation materials, which I think Marceia helped us get them for him. I don't know what he is going to use them for but, hopefully, for good things. I would offer you a similar process to that - where you had, at the

---

---

end of the day, a kind of an action plan that was developed with a committee. You guys figured out if you want to use a committee or not to go through this and vet these questions and answers – things like what process you have to go through? What would be the organizational structure and size of the operation? Location of the your operation, if you were going to merge? Voting, membership, do you weight voting, don't your weight voting? Public access, participation – I wrote a long list – do you do revenue sharing? Project prioritization, operational budget, meeting locations – a long, long list, all the way down to even continuing to remain separate. What are the pluses and minuses for doing that? A lot of this was based on the minutes that I received from the last joint meeting. There were a lot of concerns. The only way you are going to figure it out is if you actually get the details on it. It is not enough, I think, it is nice to hear about what others have done, but this region is a little special, not just geographically, but the people and everything else about the region make it special and I think it is special. We need to take a close look at it. So, what I would propose to you is that we are in the middle of doing your doing Regional Long Range Transportation Plan (RLRTP) for 2035. There is a regional component that the Department certainly is going to be looking at and commenting on to see how well we have done in terms of making improvements on the regional side. One way to deal with this would be to amend that contract with us and over the next 11 or 12 months we would work with your staff. If you choose to set up a sub-committee of the cities and towns and the counties who are in the MPO and TPO that would be great, too. We could report back to them with a lot of this detailed information so slowly but surely you would get your questions answered and you'd have, I think, a better understanding about what it is, it means to merge. What are the benefits and the details, too, because you need the details to make this kind of decision. It is a big deal for you. I think the best thing that would happen, at least for me, if you both merged is that I would not longer have to write MPO/TPO – just MPO. Anyways, that is what I would offer to you. Again, I can work with Peter and Beth, if that is something you are interested in, if pursuing this kind of an action plan, through the Long Range Transportation Plan. Again, either working with a sub-committee or not but bring back to you, in bits and pieces, some of the answers. I don't have all the answers for you because I don't know how the merge would occur so it would be fair to everybody and it would get everybody's questions answers. I just leave that on the table for you.

Commissioner Grande explained there is one item that is of particular significance for me. We've heard several times that there is monies available regionally that are not necessarily available to the individual MPOs but that seems to be anecdotal information. What I would really like to know if anybody has an answer. I think it is clearly true that a regional MPO will probably be looked upon more favorably or get more money than one of our county MPOs. The real question is will a regional MPO consisting of the two or three of us get more money than the two or three of us combined get as individuals because we do submit prioritized lists of projects for funding and we do each get, hopefully, our top projects funded and if we, as a regional MPO, were submitting the regional prioritized list, whereas Martin and St. Lucie County might each get there first two or three projects funded, will the

---

---

regional then only get three or four and the total amount be less or more? That is a big question for me and everybody seems to dance around that.

Mr. Busha responded because they don't know. They can't tell you for sure.

Commissioner Grande questioned is there any way that we get to know that?

Mr. Busha explained one of things I put down here is opportunities for additional funding. I can tell you the way things are going in Washington, although yesterday because of the election maybe they are not going that way, that we are going regional. Everybody is going metro. There are lots of programs out there. Whether is the livable communities initiative which is still a bill and not approved or whether it's HUD's sustainable communities initiative which has a lot of money right now that certainly the Regional Planning Council is going to be applying for, as well, to bring some money back to the region. But I would be lying to you if I told you yes, you get more money as a region. One of things we would look into, I can tell you, your chances are better and here are the pots of money you can go after that you couldn't go after because you were individually working on it. One thing I can tell you, it has got to be more efficient - I'll go way out on a limb here - and more cost effective to operate one office verses three. Instead of having three meetings and joint meetings and TAC and CAC meetings, a million different meetings, you have less. That is what I can tell you probably for sure that you'll save some money. But this other question, yes, there is a lot of speculation, you can think you are going to get more, but that really depends on the regulatory climate out there and how the country is working and if they ever reauthorize the surface transportation act, which I was told is 24 months away because the new surface transportation act is the stimulus money. They are not going to reauthorize anything unless they want to raise federal gas taxes by 40¢. I don't think they are going to do that because it is unfunded right now, totally unfunded. I'm sorry.

Commissioner Ciampi explained my question, and I am not opposed to a merge, the economy of scale is obvious, would be in Martin County last year we received funding for the Indian Street Bridge based on the fact that we were independent of each other. If we had already merged, what would the likelihood of been of that project and those funds coming our way? For us, it has becomes a matter of the distribution of funds. And let me just finish because even when we have our own Martin MPO, Mary Hutchinson does a very good job of making sure that the City of Stuart is in the pie in the percentages of the money that came to the county. Now, granted if it goes to the city, the city is in the county whereas if the three counties - Indian River, St. Lucie and Martin - merged, certain projects I get the regional aspects on larger projects that would benefit the three of us regionally but there are smaller projects that could happen here or in St. Lucie or up in Indian River that will have no benefit for us and not that I don't wish you guys to have those projects. It is just - where does the distribution of funds go? Obviously, St. Lucie is larger so they will have more projects, more infrastructure needs and are they more powerful in terms of luring or diverting the money to specific county projects because I love the regional aspect of it but, at the end of the day, we are three independent counties.

Ms. Bush responded I happen to be involved in the economic stimulus, working with the MPOs on TIP and STIP amendments and so forth. The Indian Street Bridge was funded out of ARRA funds, stimulus funds that came to the State of Florida and the criteria they had to meet federal requirements, they had to be able to be let. The list of candidates, we went through the whole, regardless of county boundary, we said what projects can meet these requirements and those are the ones that District 4 put forward to the state level for a shot at those state funds. Indian Street Bridge got funds. St. Lucie got a State Road 70 project. Indian River County didn't have any projects that met the requirements. It wasn't whether you were a county; it was meeting those requirements, meeting those timeframes. Commissioner Grande - there is a Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP). It has been attacked, in terms of revenue shortfalls or so, but it is still a program and there is still TRIP funds in the revenue forecast. Those are funds that go to regional entities - the TCTC. The St. Lucie TPO on its own is not eligible for it, Martin MPO is not eligible for it nor is Indian River. The three MPOs working together, they had to come up with that regional network, those regionally prioritized projects to be eligible to tap into those TRIP funds. And guess what? You all had your act together and in the early TRIP rounds, some money came north from Broward and Palm Beach. Don't tell 'em - I guess I am on television, they'll know. But, again, it has to do, at least at this point, what are the programs? What are the constraints? And what is the best use of those funds? And in the case of Indian Street Bridge, it was a state decision with input from the district level.

Commissioner Ciampi explained right, my concern there, Ms. Bush, though is the fact that our local MPO - Ms. Perrotta and her team - worked on preparing all of that information. Really worked very diligently every time there was a question, every time there was a challenge, every time there was new round of paperwork responsibilities and that was their primary focus because it was the county's primary focus. If you merge three offices into one and St. Lucie had their project and Indian River I am sure had projects, they didn't qualify, but they were working on things - where would that diligent effort have gone? Because their project was just as worthwhile and then if you have fewer people, then my concern was, and I am just using Indian Street Bridge as an example because for us as a relatively small county to get that percentage of the funds was pretty amazing for us and we were happy and we complimented our staff. If you had universal staff, could they have dedicated that type of time and effort to our specific project?

Ms. Bush responded I think that is one of the questions that Mr. Busha was talking about - talking through the details. How would such situations as this one example be handled?

Commissioner Becht explained I am on a very steep learning curve here. Mr. Busha, you mentioned that the Regional Planning Council might be able to, as an outside agency, provide us with some analysis of the benefits and negatives of going forward with the merger. I have a couple of questions relative to that and some other comments as well. First off, do you have any ballpark idea on what the cost would be, when we haven't even set the role of it? And then, if you did, Mr. Buchwald, do we have any money in the budget for it? Before you got to those

questions, which I really don't expect you to answer, what can you do that my own competent staff can't do? What do you bring to the table that they don't have? And maybe I should ask that privately, but...

Mr. Busha responded I don't know what to tell you about that. We bring, I think, an objective, sort of unbiased, opinion about things and we would work with the committee that way. You have two counties, and cities, who obviously many times jealously protect their interests. Peter works for St. Lucie County MPO. I work for all of you. That is the short answer.

Commissioner Becht explained the objectivity would obviously be important to me. I think this question got answered - someone said that there might be opportunities for funding because we were larger. I think it was hinted to by the Martin County Commissioner that we might be excluded from funding where we were too large. He mentioned that it just happened by chance but I am wondering if we applied for certain grants than you have to be smaller than 250,000 people or whatever. Wouldn't we also simultaneously miss out on certain types of funding? Can anybody answer that?

Mr. Busha responded don't know.

Mr. Buchwald responded it depends on the grant program. One of the legislative priorities that you just approved was, right now, there are over 100 types of funds that fund different transportation programs and projects. One of the priorities you approved was to streamline, consolidate that so, yes, there are funds that are earmarked for smaller, rural areas because St. Lucie now is ineligible. Indian River is eligible for some now that either Martin or St. Lucie is ineligible. So, yes, there are some that you wouldn't be eligible; however, there are some you would be eligible for because you are larger that you weren't eligible for before. So, it will take a detailed investigation of each of the funds and quantifying how many more funds do we become eligible for? And, of course, this all is thrown up in the air when they do the new authorization and they change the fundings and requirements. But that is one of the efforts that would need to be taken.

Commissioner Becht explained I am guessing that we might be heading in the direction of a sub-committee. Would you or the sub-committee come up with the parameters if we wanted Mr. Busha of the Regional Planning Council to do an analysis for us? Or would that be in concert with the sub-committee?

Mr. Drummond explained I think that would be something that we would set out ourselves if we actually wanted to create a sub-committee and then charge them. Very quickly, Commissioner Dzadoovsky and Commissioner Lewis.

Commissioner Dzadoovsky explained I think this exercise that we are going through actually magnifies what you are telling us, Mr. Busha, in that we do have a myriad of questions. Having attended the transportation summit, the panel that was put together, I think it was out of Miami-Dade, the metro group, they have probably some of this historical data as to when they formed their regional group. This

information might be available to us through them, so I think there is historical data that we can actually take part in. Also, I am leaning to the possibility of sub-committees for us to get down and talk about these things amongst ourselves in an informal setting so we can really hash out some of these ideas. But, one of the things they talked about at the regional summit was you can have a board with as many as, I think, 19 people – correct me if I am wrong, Peter, I can't remember what the number was...

Mr. Buchwald responded the Florida Statutes allow, I think, it is 6 but up to 19 for MPO/TPO board.

Commissioner Dzadoovsky explained so, in essence, we could all be represented as the regional board. I am leaning in favor of going forward with an entity that will educate us to all the questions that we need answered.

Commissioner Lewis explained as the risk of setting us back. I looking down the Board here and seeing quite a few people that, like me, were veterans of the original war that took place when the State announced that we needed to get together, there was only one person that liked the idea, as I recall, between both Boards. I wasn't going to mention any names but he is being upfront about it. Quite honestly, what I asked staff to do and what might be helpful especially for those who weren't here is to go back to the original request that we made to remain separate. That will tell you what the issues were. I've looked at it. That was then, this is now but I am not sure a lot of those issues have been resolved and, quite honestly, Mr. Buchwald answer on funding sources was excellent – you lose some, you gain some. Things like TRIP, we did find a way to access it anyway. We did the TCTC. I know Mr. Drummond has sat on that. I did at one point in time. I think every Chair has. Once again, give you more stuff to do, but I really think it would be a good concept for staff to provide everybody with a copy of that final document we sent to the State telling them why we should not be combined and I would like to take it from there because I have looked at it and I have some thoughts and I kind of like the benefit of other people telling me if they agree with me. Some things may have changed but some things are still a lot the same. When I agreed to look at it, I did it on the basis that I will discuss anything. If someone had a concept that this might benefit us, I am not going to say let's not look at a way access more funds. We all know our transportation needs far outstrip the availability but I think we all should maybe take a step back to where we were, look at that and move from there. That requires a sub-committee. I am open to that, too, but I really like some feedback from everybody on the point of that is where we were, that is why we didn't want to do it and what has changed.

Councilwoman Berger explained well, what works slower than government? Sub-committees and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council apparently. Just having fun with Mike Busha while he is up there. You raise go points and questions but the reality is that is his business and that is a service that we would have to pay for so let's keep our mind open that if that is a service we want, that may need to go out bid and, certainly, if there are other members in the audience that want to solicit there programs, we should listen to them as well.

Mr. Drummond explained I think clearly what this is demonstrating is there are a tremendous number of questions and that there is different ways of getting at answers. I think when it came before the St. Lucie County TPO last time what the direction was to staff was we would like to look at the possibility of merger. I don't think there was any indication that we wanted to move forward with it. There has been some discussion that there may be precedent or a need to create some sort of sub-committee made up of both Boards or including staff than that could have a greater charge in looking in terms of individuals like the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council or others so if we are not of a mindset just to kill it, then I think more answers would have to be forthcoming before we take formal action.

Commissioner Smith explained I have listened to everything everybody said, Michael and Lois, I think we have had these conversations a lot and unfortunately we never seem to get past this point where we are. If it didn't cost a lot, Mike or anybody else that was planning on helping us through this process, it might be really helpful if the full Boards would agree to go along with it and I would bring Indian River County into the discussion. I think to leave them out causes a whole other conversation to be had again if we ever reach some consensus on where we are. I think I would put a smaller committee together that could meet a series of times to go through the issues that Michael outlined and anybody else outlined so at least we could bring back resolution on or consensus on those issues to this full Board so that if there were 12 or 10, Mike or so, issues that you outline or whatever that we don't have answers for, if we knocked off six of them that were really not that big a deal and really didn't cause us a lot of heartburn, OK, that is six issues out of the way, now we have six left that we really kind of got to grind through. We did it with the Sustainable Treasure Coast and I don't think that we have to go through an 18 month long process to get there, quite to that kind of a length of discussion, but, at the end of the day, really that group put together a document that reflected a fair agreement amongst a very different region on all sorts of different issues and I have no doubt that this Board, this group can't get together and come up with some commonalities that make sense for us all to move forward. The money has got to be the issue. The representation has got to be the issue. It has been asked a couple of times - Paula and I have talked about it a couple times. I know I have sat in presentations. I think one of them was from Portland when they had their MPO guy out here years ago. They talked about what they were prior to merging and what they are today and the dramatic amount of dollars that they have brought down out of Washington as a result of doing what they did but, I think, members up here need to see that. They need to see and touch the tangibles. Commissioner Grande asked the same question. Until we can answer those questions, I know at least two or three Board members aren't going to feel very comfortable about this until we know what those advantages are. But I think that will come out of a discussion if a smaller group can really kind of get down to the process of committing to meet over a series of months and kind of answer as many questions as possible so we can bring back good answers to this Board so we can get more comfort trying to move forward. I wish we could do it today, Mike, but I don't think we can do it today, Mike, Lois, whoever...

Mr. Busha responded I am not asking to do this today.

Commissioner Becht explained I am hearing answers referenced by Commissioner Smith and Chairman Drummond. Commissioner Lewis brought up that the questions have already been laid out at least as it relates to this discussion that took place in the past and I don't know how many years ago took place but, in my business you identify the questions first so that the questions that have been identified, at least as it relates to the idea in a timeframe less than 10 years ago, I would like to see the questions before I start tasking staff for a sub-committee to move forward with it. I am not saying it is a bad idea to move forward with it but I would like to know, I mean, if I see there are 10 questions and it appears obvious to me that three of them can never be answered to the satisfaction of the interest of Fort Pierce, then I don't know that it makes sense for us to hire somebody to spend money but that would be a decision we could bring back. But identifying the questions – if they are already identified, that is a big step forward and then we can decide if we want the sub-committee or not.

Commissioner Grande explained what I would like to do as step one, which I think is paraphrasing what Commissioner Lewis said, was can we have staff include in our packet for our next meeting a copy of the report that prepared last time with those questions. I think the suggestion that Commissioner Lewis made, if I understood correctly, that each of us should read or re-read, as the case may be, that report before we decide where to go from there. So, if we could have that included in our next packet, I think we would be a whole lot better shape to decide what step two should be. My suggestion, though, is that should step one.

Mr. Drummond requested I think we can just go ahead and ask staff to go ahead and make that a part of it. I think Ms. Bush has indicated she has copies of it.

Councilman Cooper explained I am fine with continuing to look into merger. Personally, I think it is a good idea and it works. I think that we should alert somebody, though, at Indian River County that we are doing this and may be that they want to participate or at least have somebody monitor what we are trying to do and is there a reason why we would exclude Okeechobee County? There is a reason why, for lack of a better thing, the 19<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit includes the four counties. Why aren't we operating all the time or most of the time as a region of the four counties on everything that we do? Not just this but, to me, there is a reason why they set it up that way and, again, I am fine at least at the moment with the direction we are headed but maybe it isn't St. Lucie County and Martin County. Maybe it is St. Lucie County and Indian River County or the other three counties. If there are issues out there that we can work through them and then bring them back in.

Mr. Drummond responded sounds like another good question.

Mr. Buchwald explained in regard to Councilman Cooper's question – why not Okeechobee County? Well, there are two things that come to mind that would have to be addressed. One, it is not in District 4. It is a whole different DOT district so we have to look at if there is any such thing as an MPO crossing district lines. Second thing, Okeechobee County is not an urbanized area. It is simply not big enough

---

---

unless the 2010 Census designates it an urbanized area. That would be another issue in which to address. With regards to funding, if I may just ask one thing – would it be more easily digested by the Board, more palatable, the funding if we would ask would there be any objections from the Board if we asked DOT, perhaps, to contribute to some of the funding of this because they are so supportive of this effort. Perhaps they would be willing to contribute some of the funding to the Regional Planning Council from some of their own funds.

Mr. Drummond explained I think it is a given that we always be supportive of requesting additional funding from FDOT but if we could get some sort of motion and I think Vice Mayor Kelly had a comment.

Vice Mayor Kelly explained I have to agree with Commissioner Smith and he was the only one that, at that time, and I think Commissioner Coward also was interested in it and I turned around abruptly myself when I went over to Tampa for that 3 or 4 day MPOAC school and I think one of things, and this is only aesthetics probably, but I am kind of disappointed that you say the name TPO is going to become MPO and I am looking at this sheet here on page 18 and three of the ones that Lois put up there they are all TPOs. The thing was to go to TPOs because nobody knew what MPO stood for. They didn't know metropolitan planning stood for. I don't need a comment because that is not really why I took the microphone but transportation planning organization, the general public knows what that means. They don't know what MPO means and that is why we changed our name by super majority to a TPO so I just putting that on record. I think that is a bad thing and, from that school, it looked like the federal government was going to go to transportation planning organization and they were allowing the name change. So, that is disappointing. As far as what Commissioner Smith said, I still think we should move forward. After going to that school, it is the way it was going to be. The powers that be were there and those people that were there. They're experts on MPO and they know that is the way it was going to go. It was going to go regional. Commissioner Lewis is right. There were a lot of questions I think it was 6 years ago but it was at least that. The questions were there. They are the same questions. Most of the questions were in Lois' presentation. The other questions are who is going to be on staff, those kind of things, but the only way we are going to ever get those...we never tried to answer the questions. We have never gone one step further, as Commissioner Smith said. We need to take that step. Can we form a committee today? Now it is 4 o'clock. But to take one or two people or three people – take the Chairman and two other people from each MPO, including Indian River. Councilman Cooper is correct. They included them in the presentation so, obviously, they want all three counties but if you took 3 people from each county, pair them up, and had a meeting with our administrators, yourself, and somebody from FDOT and put these questions before them and brought it back to this assembly here and we can find out if it is palatable or if it is amenable if we can even keep moving forward or not but the questions have to get answered. We never tried to answer the questions but it is going to happen. It is going to go regional. We got to try to answer the questions. The next meeting is pretty quick. It is the 18<sup>th</sup> of February, is that the next meeting?

Mr. Drummond responded yes, February 18<sup>th</sup> is our next joint meeting.

Vice Mayor explained maybe then we can get our list of questions together and point some people and say here, go, go answer these questions. I think that is the next step.

Mr. Drummond explained I am working towards a motion but I am going to start with Commissioner Dzadovsky.

Vice Mayor Kelly motioned that the Joint Board come back with questions at the next meeting, put them all together in a point summary, at least, from these two MPOs and contact Indian River and see if we can get some feeling of how they feel, seconded by Mayor Christensen.

Commissioner Dzadovsky explained first of all, in the October meeting, I believe, that the Board actually asked for a letter to be written to Indian River County. Has that reply come to us? And if so, what was it?

Mr. Buchwald explained unfortunately, that was not, there was a lot of distractions between then and now, obviously, so we'll step up our efforts. We will prioritize that and so by the time we meet on February 18<sup>th</sup>, you will have response.

Ms. Beltran explained my question would also be would you like us to contact Okeechobee County? Lois mentioned an MPO in the panhandle that actually encompasses the State of Alabama so MPOs can be in more than one state. It doesn't matter that Okeechobee is a different district of FDOT. Would you like us to, also, write a letter to Okeechobee County?

Councilman Cooper explained just real quick on that issue - we have so many transportation issues with Okeechobee that I think. Whether or not, I didn't get an answer from Ms. Bush, but if it is not possible for them to be part of it, at least, perhaps, I'd let them have a seat at the table because, again, of the transportation issues that we have. We have a lot of commuter traffic going back forth and a lot of transportation that goes back and forth specifically between these two counties so if they can't physical somehow be brought into our region, at least allow them to maybe have some level of participation.

Ms. Bush responded I'll further explore that particular question. The regional partnerships, entities for transportation regional planning could include MPOs in continuous, non-metropolitan counties so let's explore the possibilities and what makes sense moving forward so that is really kind of a direction. I'll get more details.

Ms. Hensley explained just one suggestion. Mr. Kelly suggested that we bring the questions to our next meeting - may I urge that is you have significant questions that you get them to staff whenever you have those questions so maybe they could compile all the questions that they already have before the next meeting.

Mr. Drummond questioned does everyone understand the motion that is before us?

Commissioner Ciampi explained just in terms of Okeechobee, I sit on the Treasure Coast Council of Local Governments and they are included in that organization. We talk about regionalization. Yes, they have different requirements and requests being rural compared to some of the rest of us but even, from Martin County, there is a lot of cross-county, inter-county transit so I think they should at least have the opportunity to feel that they want to participate or not. They might say no, thank you but, in one regard, as the Treasure Cost Council of Local Governments, they are included in everything that we do so, in this aspect, I would be surprised that we would exclude them.

Vice Mayor Kelly explained we are going to annex them next year anyways, so.

Mayor Christensen explained as the second to the motion, I was going to ask the maker of the motion if he would include that we would also invite and explore Okeechobee County as being part of it. Like Commissioner Ciampi just said, they are part of the Treasure Coast Council of Local Governments. They are also part of the Treasure Coast League of Cities. I know in our discussions at the League of Cities, it baffled us why they never were part of the Regional Planning Council because they are part of the Treasure Coast. I would definitely include them because there is an interest on some of the elected leaders over there that they would love to continue to participate as the Treasure Coast.

Mr. Drummond questioned is the maker of the motion agreeable to that?

Vice Mayor Kelly explained I don't have a problem with Okeechobee a little bit later but what Ms. Bush said, I go to agree with her that kind of like baby steps. We didn't even have Indian River County come down here yet. We haven't got our questions answered and maybe Indian River County doesn't want Okeechobee in with us so I - can we get Indian River County down here first and see what is going on with the three of us before we go with them or does everybody want to do? I'll change the motion, if that's consensus.

Mr. Drummond explained well, I was going to ask you to repeat it so that I, at least, have an idea what we are actually going to vote on.

Mayor Christensen explained the only reason why I would consider having Okeechobee as part of the initial discussions is if we are going to be inviting Indian River as part of those beginning baby steps, let's include Okeechobee in the formation of the organization now instead of bringing them in after the fact. Then they are part of the formation. They are part of the planning. They are part of the organization.

Commissioner Ciampi responded I agree.

**Vice Mayor Kelly moved that everyone on the Board put their questions together and the questions from six years ago, the questions that were in**

**Ms. Bush's presentation and give them to staff as soon as we can; try to answer all the questions at the next meeting; at the same time, at that meeting, if possible, we put together at least two or three people from each group; send a letter to Okeechobee MPO; a letter to Indian River MPO and maybe they can even send somebody down for that meeting like we have one person go back and forth so they are part of it right at the beginning. That would be my motion to get it going. Seconded by Mayor Christensen.**

Commissioner Dzadoovsky explained I just want to add to this conversation – I can't remember who asked the question but the discussion that occurred years ago, that is all well, but the question that was raised is what is different today than it was years ago? We are in a deep recession/depression and the TABOR bill is sitting out there ready to go to the Florida Legislature. I attended a training this morning through Florida Association of Counties and they had the post mortem, I guess you will, for TABOR. The only place it was ever implemented was Colorado and largely the amount of funds for roads and road improvements and all what we are dealing with in transportation was greatly affected so that's what is different today and that is why I am supporting this move forward. My position is to look at the regionalization because if TABOR does get passed, we are going to be substantially impacted financially in the region and in the state.

Councilwoman Berger explained I also support this going forward, was not here for the wars from six or seven years ago but believe also that things are quite different now and look forward to coming in with an open mind, seeing what the concerns were back from the original war, and then trying to get those answered. I look forward to seeing what those concerns were because I just don't see as many in front of me on the surface right now as I think there may have been. Also, our taxpayers right now see this as being very smart and good use of their funds to consolidate as often as possible. Here is an opportunity for us to work together, to plan for the future together and to save a whole lot of dollars. I support that for that reason. As an incentive, as we started to speak about before, from FDOT, and I know that they are completely bought into us going in as a region, perhaps they would, maybe we could amend the motion – I hate to start it again – but maybe we could amend the motion to add in there to ask FDOT to offer as an incentive some additional funding for this study.

Vice Mayor Kelly requested can I make that a separate motion for this one?

Mr. Drummond responded let's stick with the motion we have right now. I think we are somewhat all in agreement that we understand it. Any further questions on the current motion? **The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Drummond questioned does staff pretty much understand?

Mr. Buchwald responded what I have on my notes is that for the next meeting provide what is known as the 2004 white paper. That is the paper that tried to provide us reasons for not merging. Also, the minutes from the meeting that

several of you participated in – I think they are very interesting. You will see some of the people provide some of their responses. Also, questions – we are going to have questions for the next meeting. Anybody who has questions are going to forward to us and let us know. Also, going to try and appoint a committee. So perhaps staff will put out a recommendation as how a committee could be formed. Also, contact the Indian River MPO and contact Okeechobee County for their interest in joining forces. Finally, I would suggest that we do send the letter on behalf of the Joint MPO to the DOT specifically requesting funding assistance for efforts in the future.

Vice Mayor Kelly questioned for Lois - Councilwoman Berger asked could we ask you for some more money? Are there funds, like our PL funds, that are available that we can have to proceed with this planning that you can ask for? Do you need a motion to do that?

Ms. Bush responded well, send a letter asking for assistance. We have district-wide contracts. We have a number of consultants under contract and some of the research for this presentation and we have started a table of all the MPO staffing and some of the details that can help answer the questions. That is already under way and we are using our existing district-wide resources for that. In the past, we've had a joint participation agreement with Treasure Coast to do transit oriented development type work so we figure out who is best to do what using our resources. I think the idea of sending a letter requesting assistance to answer these questions to help you move forward with the first step.

**Commissioner Smith moved recommending the Chairs jointly sign a letter requesting such assistance from FDOT, seconded by Commissioner Grande.**

Mayor Christensen questioned was that a motion?

Commissioner Smith responded yes.

Mayor Christensen questioned do you want discussion before there is a second? Because I am not seconded that.

Mr. Drummond responded there is a second.

Mayor Christensen responded oh, there is a second. Well, then under discussion, do we have a choice as to who those consultants are? Or are those consultants going to be at your choice?

Commissioner Smith explained their money, their choice.

Ms. Bush explained we go through, as you do, a contracting process. We have a prime and subs and if we don't have expertise from the prime contractor or the sub, we ask the prime to add to the talent base. We would look for a consultant that can best address this type of questions.

Mayor Christensen explained but if you pick a consultant that we don't like, does our opinion count?

Ms. Bush responded how about we start with the letter with the questions and we will put a proposal. I think the idea is get good information out there to inform decision making.

Mayor Christensen explained let me just put on the record that a name of a consultant was mentioned earlier on in her presentation that I have great concerns us doing any future business with.

Mr. Drummond explained I think Mr. Busha left too early but the question would be of the maker of the motion - wasn't it that we were just asking FDOT for additional funding? We didn't specify that they would supply that funding only if it was their consultant, wasn't it?

Commissioner Smith responded correct.

Mr. Buchwald explained with all due respect to Lois, I mean she is not in a position to be able assess whether or not there is some discretionary funding. That would be the Secretary of the District that I suggest the letter be addressed to but, also, there is historical precedence for this. Back in 2006, they did provide some additional funding as part of producing that Rainbow List that you saw so they did step up to the plate and provided some regional funding to our consultant that we had at the time, which was Renaissance Planning Group, but I would highly recommend that the letter be addressed to Secretary Wolfe and see where the chips fall.

Commissioner Ciampi explained since we are putting things on the record, unless FDOT was willing to pay for the information and research completely, I personally am not interested in - I think, if we created a subcommittee, we are the local folks. We can figure this out on our own. I am not interesting spending any money in an effort to find out if we will save money. I am not interesting in paying any money.

Vice Mayor Kelly explained my original intention was to keep this locally. I don't want to get to any state consultants or anything like that and I would have the same concerns as the Mayor but, right now, let's keep the local baby steps and try to get everybody together and answer our questions. Then we can go for that and, on top of that, we do have funds. We have PL funds. We never spend them. We had \$350,000 last year. I don't think we spent them all. They roll over and my biggest question, cause I don't think we are going to lose money, is if all three or four counties have PL funds, are we going to lose all those funds and just have one group and are they going to rollover like they used to? Peter, we still have PL funds left over, don't we?

Mr. Buchwald responded yes, we will have PL funds but my fiscal coordinator and I are looking at what we are going to have to deobligate for next year but I would

always like the opportunity to ask for a check from DOT and I don't think nothing is against sending them a letter asking for a little help, for a little check, in the way of a check.

Vice Mayor Kelly responded absolutely.

Councilwoman Berger explained I agree. I think we send a letter but we also try and state that as an incentive for us to work regionally and still keep our mindset somewhat locally that they allow us to make our local decisions and have some type of home rule when it comes to that kind of decision making process. There is no reason to consolidate and then have our hands tied. We might as well then consolidate to the federal level. I mean, if we don't have any choice and they're selection who we get to work with then why not just forgot about what we are doing now and give it to the federal level.

Vice Mayor Kelly responded well said.

Councilwoman Berger explained I also am very happy to be in alignment with, as Commissioner Ciampi was starting to say earlier, he was concerned about how much attention would be given to the different districts or to smaller levels. I am happy to be aligned with Martin County because Martin County has funded quite a few bridges during the time that we have been trying to get just one bridge built so any influence that you all have to our big district, we are welcoming you in and we look forward to working with you. Thank you.

Commissioner Ciampi responded well that is very nice. Thank you.

Mr. Drummond requested for the motion that is on the floor to send a letter to FDOT asking for financial support any other comments?

**The motion passed unanimously**

Commissioner Smith explained for clarity - that would be a joint letter from both Chairs.

Mr. Drummond explained as I understand, it was for a joint letter.

Mr. Buchwald responded yes, sir.

**Agenda Item 10 FDOT Comments:** There were none.

**Agenda Item 11 Recommendations/Comments by Members**

Vice Mayor Kelly explained I just heard something, I don't mean to take the floor again, but I heard something by Peter. When Peter was talking, he talked about appointing a committee. The committee I am talking about would be from this group.

Mr. Drummond responded that is correct.

Vice Mayor Kelly explained from this group and one member of staff. That is what I am talking about. I just want to keep it clear.

**Agenda Item 12 TPO/MPO Staff Comments:** There were none.

**Agenda Item 13 Next meeting:** The next St. Lucie TPO/Martin MPO Joint Board meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 18, 2010, at 2:00pm in Martin County - location to be determined.

Commissioner Ciampi explained we look forward to having you in Martin County.

Ms. Beltran explained the location is Indian River State College, Chastain Campus, on Salerno Road.

Commissioner Dzadoovsky explained the issues earlier about TABOR. It has not been formed into a bill yet. It is not out there. It is being talked about. I think it is in committees so in regards to Senate Bill 216, we can still talk about it. We can still talk to our constituents about the effects of what TABOR would do to local governments. I heard Councilwoman Berger talk about home rule. TABOR would certainly affect our home rule opportunities and I think that we should make it a part of our research to go to the Florida Association of Counties and National Association of Counties to look at how TABOR has resulted in Colorado. The presentation this morning was well done by the Florida Association of Counties and it is very informative and I think each of us should at least investigate that and there are some videos that you can watch online. I just want to raise that to your attention because here we are trying to figure out where the money is going to come for roads and how we are going to create our organization and TABOR could greatly devastate our ability to build roads.

**Agenda Item 14 Adjourn** – the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by:

Approved by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sarah J. Howard  
Senior Staff Assistant

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Michael Mortell  
Martin MPO Chair

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Darrell Drummond  
St. Lucie TPO Chair