

**MARTIN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
JOINT CITIZENS' and TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, April 4, 2012 – 1:30 P.M.
Martin County Airport Maintenance Building Conference Room
1895 Flying Fortress Way,
Stuart, FL
www.martinmpo.com
(772) 221-1498

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sam Amerson, Chairman of the TAC Committee, called the joint meeting to order at approximately 1:33pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Members in Attendance:

Sheila Kurtz, CAC Chair
Amy Eason
Joseph DeFronzo
Daniel Parz
Michael Houston (Arrived 1:49 PM)
Trent Steele
Albert Zilg
Carolyn Niemczyk
Sam Amerson, TAC Chair (Left at 3:07 PM)
Samantha Horowitz, Vice Chair
Robert Kellogg (Left at 2:58 PM)
Stuart Trent (Left at 2:45 PM)
Arlene Tanis (Participated by phone)
Mark Cocco
Paul Nicoletti (Arrived at 1:44 PM)
Terry Rauth
Lee Hoefert
Steve Braun (Participated by phone)

Members Excused:

Alex Trovato
John Patteson
Kevin Trepanier
George Stokus
Barbara Kaufmann
Rogelio Gonzalez

Members Absent

Kim DeLaney

Staff in Attendance:

Beth Beltran, MPO Administrator
Michael Malham, Planner II
Gavin Jones, Senior Planner
Margaret Brassard, Administrative Assistant II

Others in Attendance:

Krysti Brotherton, Martin County
Etienne Bourgeois, CAPTEC
Steve Driver
Julie Preast, Rio Civic Club
Greg Nolte, MC Eng.

A quorum was present for this meeting.

Ms. Beth Beltran stated that Steve Braun, Planning Representative from FDOT and Arlene Tanis from the Office of Modal Development were unable to be here in person so they will be participating by telephone.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Ms. Terry Rauth. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lee Hoefert. There were no objections. The motion passed unanimously.

4. APPROVE MINUTES

Mr. Sam Amerson requested a motion to approve the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) minutes of the February 1, 2012, meeting. **A motion was made by Ms. Samantha Horowitz. The motion was seconded by Ms. Terry Rauth. There were no objections. The motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Sheila Kurtz asked for a motion to approve the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) minutes of the February 1, 2012, meeting. **A motion was made by Ms. Amy Eason. Mr. Al Zilg gave a second to the motion. There was no discussion and no objections. The motion passed unanimously.**

5. AGENDA ITEMS

A. REVISION OF MPO BYLAWS

MEMO: temp12C/TACa02.01

Ms. Beth Beltran stated that the current MPO Bylaws show the Council on Aging as the public transportation representative on the TAC committee because for years they were the transportation provider for Martin County. However, Martin County has entered into a contract with a new public transit provider, MV Contract Transportation. Staff is recommending that the Bylaws be changed to read "Public Transit Provider" so that the Bylaws will no longer have to be changed even if the County were to take over that function in the future. Also, FDOT may choose to change their position on the MPO Board from an Ex-

Officio member to a technical advisor due to the Sunshine Law. Ms. Tanis stated that she is in contact with Central Office to confirm that this is how they wish for this matter to be handled, and she will contact Ms. Beltran as soon as she has an answer. Ms. Beltran did state that any changes in the Bylaws would have to go out for public comment prior to a change being made. She added that it would be more convenient to be able to advise the Board and have both issues go out for public comment at the same time.

Ms. Terry Rauth made a motion to recommend to the MPO that approval of the change to the Bylaws regarding removing the term Council on Aging and replacing it with Public Transit Provider, and changing the status to the Board of FDOT from Ex-Officio to an Advisory Capacity. A second was obtained by Ms. Samantha Horowitz. There were no additional discussions. The motion passed unanimously.

B. PROJECT UPDATE: SR 710 BRIDGE LIGHTING AND INDIAN STREET WIDENING/#3 PRIORITY
MEMO: temp12C/TACa02.02

Ms. Beltran gave a brief history of this item and stated that this item is multi-faceted. She advised that in February the advisory committees recommended to the MPO Board that a letter be directed to FDOT to provide, install, and maintain lights as part of the SR 710 Bridge Project. FDOT did respond stating that the MPO could use a portion of their Federal Attributable Funds (a/k/a SU funds or MPO Discretionary Funds) towards this project. Currently, the two projects which are funded by SU funds are the number one priority, CR 714 and the number three priority, which is the eastern section of Indian Street leading up to the Veteran's Memorial Bridge. CR 714 is fully funded as revealed in FDOT's presentation of the Tentative Work Program, which was approved by the Board in October, 2011. As this is fully funded it is best to leave this project alone. The number three project, Indian Street from Kanner Highway to Willoughby Boulevard is already four lanes, but will be widened to six lanes. This project will need additional ROW so the State will have to return to the property owners at The Crossings Apartment Complex who recently had property acquired through eminent domain for the current Bridge Project. In addition, Indian Street from Kanner Highway to Willoughby will still have half of the road's capacity available to absorb extra traffic once the Bridge is opened. The 2035 plan which included the volume after the bridge construction, is still below the capacity of the roadway.

Staff recommends this as a two part item. The first part would be that funds be taken from the ROW acquisition on Indian Street to pay for the lighting on the Big John Monahan Bridge with the understanding that FDOT would maintain the lighting. The County currently has a maintenance agreement with FDOT for lighting on SR 710 through Indiantown (a/k/a Warfield Boulevard) where Florida Power and Light (FPL) maintains the lights, the State pays the County

and the County pays FPL when work is performed. The second part is that the remaining funds allocated for Indian Street (the #3 Priority), be moved to the MPO's #2 Priority which is the widening of SR 76, as two segments of this road from I-95 to Monterey Road are currently failing. Ms. Beltran referred to the table in the agenda package that showed the re-distribution of funds. The Work Program is currently in lock down. Ms. Beltran stated that even if an amendment was done for this Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), according to the Public Involvement Plan (PIP), a 30 day public review period would be required so the soonest this could be accomplished would be the May MPO meeting. This could be included in the Draft TIP as May is when the Draft TIP would be presented to the Advisory Committees and the Board. Ms. Tanis, from FDOT, concurred. It was noted by Ms. Rauth, that if additional property is acquired from The Crossings to six lane Indian Street, it will eliminate a parking lot, and will place a sound wall very close to a building, which creates a major impact.

Mr. Kellogg asked if these projects could be bifurcated into two separate motions and Ms. Beltran agreed. Mr. Kellogg stated that the reason he wanted the projects split was because at the last TAC meeting, he raised the issue of getting funding for the street lights [along A-1-A] in Sewall's Point, he said that he advised Ms. Beltran that he would submit a letter to the MPO Board, requesting they support him in asking FDOT to fund this lighting project. Subsequent to that meeting, Mr. Kellogg had a conversation with Mr. Anson Sonnett from FDOT and was informed that it would be a waste of time to send a letter to the Secretary of Transportation as this request would never be approved, plus he admitted that he had not written the letter for consideration to the MPO. Now he comes to this meeting and is advised that funds are available to be transferred from Indian Street to the Big John Monahan Bridge. He indicated that he was not happy. Ms. Beltran stated that she is always available to speak with committee members once they receive their agenda package if there are any questions. She stated that she had called Mr. Kellogg after the February meeting because she didn't receive a letter. She stated that Mr. Kellogg advised that the Town was reviewing another avenue for funding the lighting. She advised Mr. Kellogg that if the Town were to write a letter she would be happy to bring it to the attention of the MPO Board and speak to the Town's representative, Mr. Bausch, regarding this matter. Ms. Beltran added that normally FDOT is very strict regarding moving funds from priorities except for the time when the Board is reviewing their annual project priorities, but in this particular case, FDOT is allowing this to be done. Ms. Tanis, from FDOT concurred, normally switching funds doesn't happen, however, this time, Mr. Wolfe did allow it to happen and that it was left up to the committees and the Board as to how they would like to divide the funds. Ms. Beltran stated that the first motion will be to move funds from the ROW acquisition of Indian Street to the SR 710 Bridge lighting. The second motion would be to move the balance of the funds from Indian Street to the #2 Priority of SR 76 from the I-95 Interchange to Monterey Road.

Mr. Bob Kellogg moved this issue be separated into two motions. A second was obtained from Mr. Michael Houston for discussion purposes. Ms. Beltran stated that the Indian Street Project is in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) which went through a public hearing workshop process and took over 18 months to develop. The Board has had SR 76 from the I-95 Interchange to Monterey Road as the #2 Priority for approximately three years. Ms. Rauth stated that they are doing prop share which are businesses that are paying in order to move their projects forward in order to help pay for SR 76. SR 710 was never on the priority list due to the fact that it is an SIS facility and Sewall's Point was never prioritized. Mr. Houston noted that this is an unusual circumstance, it was going to be the next project, but it wasn't going to be in this fiscal year. Ms. Rauth discussed details regarding the SR 710 Bridge Replacement Project. Ms. Rauth went on to say that when they had a lot of DRI's in Indiantown, they were looking into Prop sharing, but now SR710 is fine as far as capacity, other than the bridge and the bridge is being replaced because of its condition and that it needed to be four lanes. Mr. Nicoletti asked if the funds are moved what becomes of the section on Indian Street between Willoughby and Kanner. Ms. Beltran stated that that will be readdressed in September when the advisory committees and the Board look at the List of Project Priorities (LOPP) again.

The motion from Mr. Kellogg with a second from Mr. Houston is on the floor. Mr. Amerson called the question. Mr. Kellogg opposed.

There was a point of order discussed. Ms. Beltran clarified that the first motion would be moving funds from Indian Street (Priority #3), to SR 710 in Indiantown for the lighting of the bridge, and the second item would be to move the remainder of the funds from Indian Street to the SR 76 Widening Project. Sam asks if there is a motion on moving the funds to SR 710.

Ms. Rauth made a motion to move funds to SR 710 for the lighting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Samantha Horowitz. Sam asks if there is any further discussion

There was discussion as to whether or not any of these funds would be able to fund the lights requested by Sewall's Point. Ms. Kurtz inquired as to the total amount of funds which were going to be moved from Indian Street to widen SR 76. Ms. Beltran and Ms. Tanis both stated that they were unsure as to the amount [because the Work Program is in "lock down."] but Ms. Tanis stated that she would look into it. Ms. Beltran stated that if Sewall's Point were to write the letter to the MPO they can request funding, or perhaps Sewall's Point could be added to the MPO's Priority List when discussed in September. Ms. Tanis stated that the MPO does advise FDOT of their Priorities and maybe they could advise FDOT in July or August so they can look into it at their Informal Project Priority Meeting. That way, if there is no current funding available it could be placed on the future funding list. It was noted that the Sewall's Point project is scheduled

to begin in August. Mr. Amerson reiterated that the Sewall's Point request would have a better opportunity to succeed if a letter were provided to the MPO. Mr. Kellogg asked what FDOT would do if the project began construction prior to an award being made. It was stated by Mr. Braun of FDOT that the funding would have to be in place at the beginning of the construction; this is confirmed by Ms. Tanis. Mr. Kellogg added that the only option remaining would be submitting a letter to the MPO requesting that some of the funds which are being divided, and currently available, be allocated for the street lights in Sewall's Point so they could be a part of the project now. Ms. Beltran stated that would be correct. Mr. Amerson stated with an official request, the MPO can prioritize it, and should these or additional funds become available by changing the scope of a project or any other means, Sewall's Point would at least be in the queue, which is the process. Mr. Kellogg stated that he would send a letter requesting a portion of these funds and/or to get placement in the prioritization queue.

The question was called on the motion on the floor made by Ms. Rauth and seconded by Ms. Samantha Horowitz to move funds to SR 710 for the lighting.

Mr. Kellogg made a motion to table the motion which would move funds from the ROW acquisition of Indian Street to the SR 710 Bridge Lighting. The motion failed due to the lack of a second.

After discussion it was determined that **the motion on the floor moving funds from the ROW acquisition of Indian Street to the SR 710 Bridge Project lighting would be obtained via a roll call.**

Member	Yeas	Nays	Abstains
Shelia Kurtz	X		
Amy Eason	X		
Joseph DeFronzo	X		
Daniel Parz	X		
Michael Houston	X		
Albert Zilg	X		
Sam Amerson	X		
Samantha Horowitz	X		
Robert Kellogg		X	
Arlene Tanis (Alt. for Nancy Ziegler)			X
Mark Cocco	X		
Paul Nicoletti	X		
Terry Rauth	X		
Lee Hoefert	X		
Steve Braun (Alt. for Chon Wong)			X

The motion passed, twelve yeas, one nay, and two abstentions.

Mr. Amerson addressed the second portion of the bifurcated motion which would be moving the balance of the ROW acquisition funds from the Indian Street Project to the #2 Priority, widening of SR 76 from I-95 to Monterey Road.

Mr. Kellogg made a motion to set aside a portion of these funds \$144,000, [the balance of the funds being moved from the ROW acquisition funds from the Indian Street Project to the widening of SR 76], based upon the receipt of a letter from the Town of Sewall's Point for the decorative street lighting to be placed on A-1-A. Ms. Kurtz requested clarification of the motion to insure that what Mr. Kellogg is requesting is that of these funds (\$144,000) would be set aside if the MPO receives the letter from Sewall's Point, and approves same. It would still be at the discretion of the MPO Board. Mr. Kellogg concurred. **Ms. Kurtz gave a second to this motion. Mr. Amerson clarified that this motion is a recommendation to the MPO that the remaining portion, [after the reduction of the \$144,000 to Sewall's Point for street lighting] of the ROW acquisition funds from the Indian Street Project would be directed to the MPO's #2 Priority, widening of SR 76.** The floor was opened for discussion. Ms. Rauth asked Ms. Tanis, assuming this was approved by the MPO, when would the funds be available. Ms. Tanis stated that she was unable to answer that at this moment but she will get back to Ms. Rauth with an answer, however, the funding which is being redistributed is not slated for availability until the following year. Ms. Rauth remarked that DOT is building the Sewall's Point project. She asked and Mr. Kellogg confirmed that the lighting which is included in this project is being paid for by the Town of Sewall's Point. Ms. Rauth stated that unless the project is delayed, the timing for the funds will not work for Sewall's Point. Mr. Parz asked that if this motion is approved and the MPO and DOT do not approve of the funds going to Sewall's Point, could that jeopardize the funds from still being allocated to SR 76? Mr. Parz stated that since the project wasn't prioritized it is being taken out of order, to which Mr. Kellogg said that it is no different than the street lights in Indiantown. Mr. Parz stated that his concern is that making this additional change to the motion, could place all of the funds in jeopardy, if the request for the \$144,000 is rejected at either the MPO or the DOT level. He added that these items should be addressed separately. Mr. Houston didn't know how this committee could prioritize the Sewall's Point Project right now as there are other areas [Rio and City of Stuart] which may have been waiting longer or are already prioritized.

It was learned that if this motion passed, and wasn't approved by the MPO or DOT an amendment would have to be made to return these funds to SR 76 because the funds would not remain in this county. Mr. Amerson asked Mr. Kellogg if the lights are in FDOT's contract, to which he answered yes. Mr. Amerson stated that if lights are in the contract that means it is funded. Mr. Kellogg stated if the Town were to get funding for the lights, but the funding

isn't available until next year, then he would pull that portion of the plan and have the lights installed with the new funding. Mr. Amerson asked if the contract has been awarded which includes the lighting. Mr. Kellogg said no. Mr. Amerson stated that it would be a change order to the current DOT contract. Mr. Kellogg then stated that the plans are currently in Tallahassee for review and there is nothing under contract. They should be shipping them out within the next 60 days. Mr. DeFronzo asked if this lighting was desired to replace lighting, install new lighting or is it decorative. Mr. Kellogg stated that there is a major improvement project on A-1-A, a 3R project happening by FDOT. In addition to that there were Enhancement funds provided by the MPO to enhance landscaping improvements along the corridor between the two bridges on A-1-A. Currently there are four lights between the bridges, the bridges have decorative lighting on them and the Town wants to install 18 decorative lights on both sides of the road to match what is on the bridges. Mr. Houston asked if they [DOT] were going to ask for repayment since they already have it in their budget? Ms. Rauth asked Mr. Kellogg if he already had a JPA with DOT to pay for this project? Mr. Kellogg nodded his head yes. Ms. Rauth stated that it will be difficult because you will need to get DOT to agree to a new JPA. Ms. Rauth stated that the SR 710 JPA was very tough, people went to Tallahassee to get that worked out, it wasn't just writing letters. There was a lot of public involvement and political posturing in order to obtain the SR 710 lighting approved.

Mr. Amerson repeated the motion to take the balance of the funds from Indian Street Project and reallocate \$144,000 to the Sewall's Point lighting improvement project and the balance of that to the SR 76, Kanner Highway, widening project. There is a motion and a second. **Ms. Kurtz requested that the motion be amended to state that in the event diverting the \$144,000 to the Sewall's Point Project were to not be approved or accepted, that would not jeopardize the entire balance of the remaining funds from the Indian Street Project, inclusive of the \$144,000, to go to the widening of SR 76.** Mr. Amerson again stated that although the Sewall's Point Project is a very good project, he's not comfortable going back to the MPO and requesting a priority change this late in the game. He noted that Ms. Rauth explained that a lot of public effort, support and even people going to Tallahassee to get the funds for the Indian Street Project only to take away from that effort, he wonders how it will be perceived by the MPO. It was asked how much the remainder portion would be after removing \$144,000 for Sewall's Point. It was advised that it's all only an estimate, and we won't know until we receive bids to know if it is enough or not. Ms. Rauth clarified that it would be \$144,000 under the current project but if it's done as a separate project then you will have maintenance of traffic and other things. Mr. Amerson stated that the \$144,000 is a DOT estimate. Ms. Beltran clarified that the lighting estimate is \$144,000 if it is included in the current project. If it is done as a separate project, it may cost more because there may be maintenance of traffic, contractor mobilization and other issues that have to be dealt with at that time. What is currently in the Work Program for ROW acquisition of Indian Street it is \$1.8 million and if you

take out \$144,000 you would be left with \$1.7 million. Ms. Rauth noted that one of the big reasons the Board put the Enhancement Funds toward the landscaping in Sewall's Point was because it would be less expensive to do it while they are working on the 3R Project because when the County does work on a State Road they have to get State approved CEI, and a lot of additional costs. This was learned on SR 707, where the turn lane, the design, permitting and inspection cost more than the construction, because once you are on a State Road there are all kinds of rules to abide by. Mr. Kellogg stated that the design has been done, the only thing left to be done is the installation and the inspection by FDOT. Ms. Rauth stated that would have to be added on to the \$144,000 as that would not be included in the \$144,000. You would need to have a cost estimate performed and figure out what you will actually need and send that letter to the MPO, because we just don't have enough information. Mr. Amerson stated that if this motion was not voted on today, if this advisory committee voted on the recommendation as it was originally presented, it would not stop an entity from writing a letter to the MPO and presenting its case. Mr. Braun agreed that the process should be followed in order to obtain the decorative lighting. Sending a letter to the MPO would be the best way to obtain the desired result.

Mr. Houston asked Ms. Beltran if staff would recommend the motion on the floor. Ms. Beltran stated that staff's recommendation is in the Agenda Summary, and staff would not recommend this motion as a letter has not been received regarding this issue and there isn't sufficient back up for the matter at this time. **Ms. Kurtz stated that she wished to withdraw her second on the motion on the floor.** She stated that Mr. Kellogg should follow the MPO process, write a letter to the MPO requesting the necessary funds for the lighting on A-1-A and allow the process to run its course.

Mr. Michael Houston made a motion that the full remainder of the funds from the Indian Street Project be reallocated the widening of SR 76 as recommended by staff originally. This motion was seconded by Mr. Daniel Parz. Mr. Kellogg stated that effectively there is no sense in writing a letter now. Mr. Amerson stated that just as Mr. Braun, from DOT, explained that it is all the more reason why Mr. Kellogg needs to write the letter and follow the process. It was suggested that Mr. Kellogg withdraw his motion in favor of going directly to the MPO to seek out support. **Mr. Kellogg stated that he withdraws his motion. Mr. Amerson called the vote on the motion to move the full remainder of the funds from the Indian Street Project to the widening of SR 76. The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Kellogg left at 2:58 PM.

**C. FY2012/13 TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT
APPLICATIONS FOR FY2015/16 FUNDING**

MEMO: temp12C/TACa02.03

Ms. Beltran advised that there were two applications for this year's cycle of Transportation Enhancement funds, one being Baker Road, which will be presented by Mr. Amerson, submitted by the City of Stuart. Mr. Amerson gave a copy of the Resolution from the City Commission, and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Action Plan which both support this effort on Baker Road. This section, the north side of Baker Road, from Green River Parkway east to Savannah Road, was recently jurisdictionally transferred from Martin County to the City of Stuart. Mr. Amerson described the project and stated that it included landscape beautification using native plants. The project has been through the review committee process and meets all the technical sufficiency requirements, ROW, and is listed in the top ten of the BPAC Action Plan. Ms. Julie Priest, representing the Rio Civic Club, came in support this project. She stated that she has been working with Mr. Malham to complete these connections for the Rio Community. Ms. Priest said that this is a vital need for the community especially since Publix has been built as citizens with motorized wheelchairs use this crossing area. She stated that the CRA is discussing making improvements on Cardinal Avenue, in western Rio, and all of which will be connecting, making it possible to go from the Green River Parkway through to Savannah Road. She appreciates the efforts in this venture and wishes to show the Rio Civic Club's support of this project. Mr. Houston suggested there some shade trees be included in this project. Mr. Amerson stated that Oak Trees can be problematic; however they will look into other options as Mr. Houston suggested.

Mr. Amerson left the meeting at 3:07 P.M.

Ms. Beth Beltran introduced Mr. Greg Nolte to present the second application on Hutchinson Island, which is being submitted by Martin County. Mr. Nolte gave some history on the Hutchinson Island Coalition, the group for whom he is representing. Their goal is to make Hutchinson Island a tourist destination. This Coalition prioritized their projects, prepared a Master Plan and they voluntarily increased their Municipal Service Taxing Unit (MSTU) for the next five years to raise approximately \$106,000 to help fund these projects. This application consists of roadside landscaping, island and median landscaping, and crosswalks, which will promote safety by traffic calming. This project has also completed the review committee screening process and meets all the technical sufficiency requirements. All work is proposed within the ROW, so that will not be an issue. Mr. Zilg asked about the impact on the traffic near the nuclear power plant on the island as a tremendous amount of construction will be commencing in that area and lasting for a year plus. Ms. Beltran stated that these funds will not be available until FY 2016. Mr. Nolte did state that the Coalition plans to do portions of these projects between now and FY 2016 using the funds which they

have generated by their MTSU.

Ms. Eason asked the total amount of sidewalk. It was determined to be approximately 135 square yards, which encompasses from the sidewalk to the roadways and they would like to convert the existing sidewalks to have stamped sidewalks.

The vote to rank these projects was accomplished by a show of hands. The City of Stuart's Baker Road project was ranked #1 and Hutchinson Island was ranked second.

Ms. Beltran did state that in the event additional funds became available, the Hutchinson Island project would be ready to go.

Ms. Julie Priest and Mr. Greg Nolte exited at 3:23 P.M.

D. DRAFT UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP)

MEMO: temp12C/TACa02.04

Ms. Beltran advised that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is developed every two years. It is required by Federal law. It identifies the planning activities budgeted for completion within the next two fiscal years. The new UPWP begins on July 1, 2012 and goes through June 30, 2014. Several projects are included in this UPWP, one being the signature project of the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), the U. S. 1 Corridor Retrofit Study. Transportation options to enhance efficiency will be reviewed for this project instead of widening the roadway. Another project is the validation of the next version of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Model. We have been given the opportunity to participate in the validation process and it is hoped that by having local input we won't have the difficulties we experienced in the past.

The Regional Waterways Plan is also included in the UPWP. Martin wants to work with the St. Lucie TPO and the Regional Planning Council (RPC) to review the waterways as a regional transportation route for recreational, freight and commercial boating. The plan will include an inventory of accessible public shorelines, address transportation needs and economic conditions which affect the boating community.

A Household Travel Survey is another project in the UPWP which shows travel behavior in the metropolitan area such as origin/destination, trip purpose, trip length and time of day. When the results are in, we hope that it will aid effective implementation of transportation demand management strategies. The Draft UPWP is in the local libraries, the Administrative Center, and on the MPO website and it will be taken to the Board on April 16, 2012. It will return to this committee in Final form at the next meeting, and we should have input from FDOT at that time. Ms. Beltran asked Ms. Tanis if she had some input to which she stated she did. She stated that in her time with FDOT, this is the most

concise and well-organized UPWP that Martin has presented and she has heard this from others who have reviewed it.

Mr. Michael Houston made a motion to accept staff's recommendation to approve the Draft UPWP. This motion was seconded by Mr. Daniel Parz. The motion passed unanimously.

**E. CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP)
DRAFT LIST OF PROJECT PRIORITIES
MEMO: temp12C/TACa02.05**

Ms. Beltran stated that this was the result of a request from a member at the February 20, 2012 Board meeting. The Board adopted the Draft CMP and a Board member requested a Draft CMP List of Projects Priorities (LOPP) for the April meeting. Normally the LOPP comes to the committees and the Board in September, however, since the County is going through the CIP budgeting process, the member was interested in particular projects which were addressed in the CMP. The Agenda package contains the list of all projects recommended and the top six projects on the State list along with the shared projects, which are those that will be presented in September when this Advisory Committee recommends the LOPP to the MPO Board. There also is a list of Martin County projects which was provided to the Traffic Department to consider in their CIP process.

6. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

None.

7. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

8. COMMENTS FROM FDOT

There are no comments from FDOT.

9. NEXT MEETING

The next CAC meeting will be on May 2, 2012 at 9:00 AM and the TAC meeting will be May 2, 2012 at 1:30 PM.

10. ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Houston. There were no objections. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 3:32 P.M.

Recorded and Prepared by:


Margaret H. Brassard, Administrative Specialist II

Date: May 2 2012

Approved by:


Sam Amerson, Martin TAC Chair

Date: 5/02/12

And


Shelia Kurtz, Martin CAC Chair

Date: 5/1/12