

**MARTIN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY BOARD MEETING**

Martin County Board of County Commissioner Chambers
2401 S.E. Monterey Road
Stuart, FL 34996
(772) 221-1498
www.martinmpo.com

Monday, September 19, 2011 @ 9:00 a.m.

Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Michael Mortell at 9:00 AM.

2. PRAYER – Pastor L. C. Campbell

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4. ROLL CALL

Members in Attendance:

Michael Mortell
Doug Smith
Tom Bausch
Eula R. Clarke
Edward Ciampi
Sarah Heard
Patrick Hayes
Brian Powers

Members Excused:

Jack Kelly

Members Absent:

None

Staff in Attendance:

Beth Beltran, MPO Administrator
Margaret H. Brassard, Administrative Specialist II
Gavin Jones, Senior Planner
Michael Malham, Planner II

Others in Attendance:

Reverend L. C. Campbell, Nettles Island Church
David Wartman, WGI
Carolyn Gish, FDOT

Raj Rangaswamy, Target Engineering
Kara Poderbi, MDAM
Arlene Tanis, FDOT
Joe Capra, CAPTEC
Don Donaldson, Engineering Director
Jim Mayfield, Stuart News
Kevin Freeman, Martin County

5. APPROVE AGENDA

A motion was made by Mr. Doug Smith to approve the Agenda. This motion was seconded by Ms. Sarah Heard. There was no additional discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. APPROVE MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Doug Smith to approve the minutes from the regular meeting dated June 20, 2011. Mr. Edward Ciampi gave a second to this motion. No additions or corrections were made. The motion passed unanimously.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(PLEASE LIMIT YOUR COMMENTS TO THREE MINUTES; COMPLETE CARD TO COMMENT)

None from the Public, however, Mr. Doug Smith stated that Mr. Jack Kelly did call to say that he was not going to be available at this meeting.

8. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA)

TIGER III GRANT APPLICATION

MEMO: temp12MPOa01.01

Ms. Beltran stated that the CRA will submit the first portion of the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) III Application in the beginning of October. She introduced Kevin Freeman of the Community Redevelopment Agency to discuss this grant application and how it affects the transportation network of Indiantown.

Mr. Freeman stated that he has already delivered presentations to the MPO's advisory committees, each of whom supported this application, the Neighborhood Advisory Committee (NAC) in Indiantown, and the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA). Mr. Freeman stated that now he would like to receive the support from the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Board. Mr. Freeman stated that there is an opportunity in Indiantown, which meets the definition of a rural area, to apply for a TIGER III grant. This is a discretionary program for transportation investment, aimed at transportation and multi-modal transportation systems, which bring forth the potential of economic vitality and

investment to an area. There are \$527 million available in this grant; \$140 million are available for rural areas. Indiantown has been identified as being qualified, so the CRA is now in process of putting together the application and getting support for the system which they would like to see in Indiantown. Indiantown is a small, independent, community that has a five lane State highway (known as SR 710/ Warfield Boulevard) that runs through the middle of town. The community has voiced their opinions in public workshops. They would like connectivity, linking parts of the community to be better connected to the Town Center and the facilities in the Town Center. The CRA has reviewed the areas. Indianwood is a golf community which uses a lot of golf carts to get around. They have made a point of advising the CRA that it would be very good to get the golf cart linkage to the Town Center. The CRA looked at plans that were to take place in Indiantown, however, due to the economy, it appears that these plans may not come to fruition. The bus route in Indiantown is the best used throughout the County. They are providing between 2,300 to 2,500 trips per month. The community is heavily dependent upon the bus system and modes of transportation other than personal vehicles. Mr. Freeman showed how the roads could connect in the form of loops which would allow for many areas to be accessed within these loops. A potential location has been chosen for a bus/train station, which could allow people to access public transportation easily in the central area. Some of the roads already exist, however, they are in ill repair or in need of sidewalks, bike lanes, or on-road parking. The CRA is working with FDOT regarding the redesigning of Warfield Boulevard to accommodate the rural nature desired by the people of Indiantown. The routes would accommodate bicycle, foot and golf cart traffic as well as vehicles at a reduced speed. The idea is to get the local traffic off of Warfield Boulevard and open up a discussion with FDOT to redesign that boulevard to be more accommodating of the rural community. FDOT has been very receptive of the idea and the CRA is getting confirmation that they will be in support of this application. The end of October is when the final application will be due if the CRA is approved for this pre-application. Mr. Freeman stated that the CRA is looking for support from the MPO to complete the pre-application.

Ms. Heard stated that she's concerned with the proposed changes, which should be for the existing residents. Ms. Heard believes that the benefits for the residents in the area south and the area north of Warfield Boulevard is more of a gift for the local landowners rather than an improvement for the actual community. Mr. Freeman confirmed that whatever is done out there will be a benefit for the landowners, but there will be areas which will benefit the public, and all people from Martin County could come out there and utilize these facilities. Ms. Heard stated that the landowners themselves should be the ones to provide these benefits as they will be receiving enormous economic development of those parcels. They should be using their own funding, the Board should not be using public dollars in order to provide private benefits. Ms. Heard would rather see a benefit for the local community right now.

Mr. Smith inquired if the links shown happened to connect to the current bus route. He thought that the southern loop should be connected, and even if it doesn't happen today, the loops should be linking with the bus system in the future. When the new neighborhoods are designed, there should be "pull off" areas for the busses, and this is the perfect time to be considering this type of work. Mr. Smith likes the idea of connecting the golf cart routes to downtown. He inquired if the trails that were designated more for walking and bicycling also be able to accommodate the golf cart traffic. He mentioned a few communities which allow golf cart traffic on all of their roads, which he believes is a very interesting way for people to get around. Mr. Smith asked if there are any plans to have more golf cart traffic on these trails, so people could go to the waterfront by golf cart. Mr. Smith likes that the outer portions of the community will link to the inner portions of the community, and that these loops would make the waterfront accessible to the residents of Indiantown, which has been a long term desire for many. Ms Clarke concurred that it's a good idea. She noted that it may seem a little unfair to advantage the landowners in the south area, but it's a visionary scope which in the long run will benefit the local residents. She also received clarification that the area in question is currently in the Indiantown Urban Services Area. Mr. Powers stated that he believes that this is a great idea and the people of Indiantown are thrilled. There is a golf community, Indianwood, to which the locals have wanted to have a closer connection. He also stated that the number of bicyclers in this area is huge. A lot of people currently drive to areas or parks and then ride their bikes. In order to be able to bike to these areas and parks would be great. Having a network, as Mr. Freeman has described, will be a great way to promote the sustainability in our little town. These little connections will be huge. Indiantown is grateful to the vision and leadership that Mr. Freeman and his team have put forward. The Indiantown community is in support of the CRA applying for this TIGER III grant. Mr. Smith noted that there is a 10 foot trail in the Sanibel/Captiva area off the coast of Fort Myers. He mentioned that it's a well used trail, connects all the neighborhoods, all the commercial areas and goes from one end of Sanibel to the other end of Captiva. Mr. Smith noted that he envisions the trails in Indiantown to be as successful as the "Sanibel and Captiva Trail," with a few more sections and a few more pieces, all the neighborhoods would be able to enjoy the amenities offered in Indiantown. Mr. Smith commended Mr. Freeman in his efforts bringing the project this far. Mr. Hayes stated that he watched the presentation at the Neighborhood Advisory Committee (NAC) meeting and he concurred that there is a tremendous amount of support for this project. He does not agree with Ms. Heard in her distinction between the landowner/developer. He stated that this is a partnership between the government, landowners, public interests and there are times when an opportunity avails itself to be a leader as to what is coming and what's already been zoned in Indiantown. This is a chance to enroll the landowner and developer. If the CRA has already set up some major infrastructure, when they come in for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) we will have a better opportunity to enroll and develop the waterfront. Mr.

Hayes stated that this is an opportunity to take advantage of funding that is available and it would make a large difference to Indiantown. Mr. Bausch asked for the amount the CRA is requesting for this grant. Mr. Freeman stated that the minimum amount of the grant is one million, but the CRA anticipates the cost to be around \$10 million and it's a 100 percent grant award, there is no match required. Mr. Freeman stated that the CRA is trying to create a surface that is both eco-friendly and can accommodate various modes of transportation. Mr. Bausch asked if the Postal Service had any plans of maintaining the Post Office in Indiantown or if it was slated to be nixed. Mr. Powers stated that Indiantown has not been advised as to the outcome of the Post Office retention. Mr. Powers also noted that the CRA has placed the bus/train station right where it had been in previous years.

Mr. Smith made a motion for the MPO to approve a recommendation in support of the CRA applying for the TIGER III grant, that the MPO will provide a letter of support. It will be noted and supported that the MPO sees this and reviews this as a first step in the reconnection of older neighborhood to newer neighborhood and to assets that are clearly in the interest and betterment of the community. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clarke.

Mr. Mortell asked Mr. Freeman if the CRA received the grant award, but doesn't receive 100% of the funding from the grant, would he return to the Board of County Commissioners or the Metropolitan Planning Board to prioritize the funds based upon the fact that the CRA may only receive \$8 million out of the \$10 million desired. Will the CRA prioritize it or will a Governing Board. Mr. Freeman stated that the central part of this station is phase one and out of that, the roadway elements would be the priority. The trail ways would be the second priority if they didn't receive all the funding. Ms. Heard asked if the first phase was actually making improvements for the existing residents. Mr. Freeman stated yes. Ms. Heard agreed that she's all for providing improvements to existing residents, but one of the landowners has already received a huge subsidy and she wants to insure that the people who are really going to receive the benefits, get their benefits first. Mr. Hayes is in support of this motion and hopes that the CRA keeps this Board informed as to who gets the award

There were no additional comments on the motion. The question was called for the motion on the floor. There were no objections. The motion passed unanimously.

**B. TIP AMENDMENTS: ROLL FORWARDS, CR 714,
SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL AND BIG JOHN
MONAHAN BRIDGE**

MEMO: temp12MPOa01.02

Ms. Beltran stated that there are four Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendments coming before the Board today for approval. Ms. Beltran recommended that they be approved individually as there may be discussions on some of them. The first amendment is the roll forward, which is to roll forward the previously allocated funds in order to expend them in the current fiscal year. This is an amendment which this Board does every year at this time.

Ms. Heard made a motion to approve the roll forward allocating the funds from the previous year to be utilized in the current fiscal year. Mr. Ciampi gave a second to the motion. There were no additional comments. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Beltran stated that this amendment is for CR 714. This is to program the \$2.5 million dollars for CR 714 that was originally programmed to the SR 710 Project. FDOT has made available, an additional \$4.6 million to be programmed to the CR 714 Project for fiscal year 2012 for the right-of-way acquisition phase of this project.

Mr. Ciampi made a motion to re-program the \$2.5 million dollars originally programmed to the SR 710 Project to the CR 714 Project. This motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. There were no objections. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Smith stated that he wanted to thank FDOT for moving these funds up to fiscal year 2012. He stated that when the Board and/or the County Commission gets unified and clear on their priorities, that the priorities for FDOT get clearer. Mr. Smith wanted to thank FDOT for the message and for sending the extra funds sooner rather than later.

Ms. Beltran stated that the next TIP amendment is for the Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure grant. These funds, in the amount of \$49,000, are made available by the Federal Government, through FDOT for a Bicycle and Pedestrian Program for Martin's twelve elementary schools. This program is already in other neighboring counties.

Mr. Ciampi made a motion to approve the Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure grant TIP amendment in the amount of \$49,000. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. There was no objection or additional comment. The matter passed unanimously.

Ms. Beltran stated that the final amendment concerns the Big John Monahan Bridge in Indiantown. Additional right-of-way has been acquired for this project in the amount of \$350,000. FDOT is requesting additional funds to be able to implement this project. Arlene Tanis from FDOT stated that the total cost would be \$425,000 the additional \$50,000-\$75,000 would be for the environmental study. Mr. Mortell asked why these additional funds would make this project less expensive. Raj Rangaswamy, Senior Project Engineer for the project explained that the original Request for Proposal (RFP) showed the entire length of the bridge to be about 1,900 feet. The design builder has come up with an innovative concept of purchasing some right-of-way which will reduce the span length of the bridge to about 950 feet. It's a savings of approximately \$8-\$10 million. Mr. Mortell questioned how the right-of-way shortens the bridge. David Wartman, engineer of record for the design team partnering with Cune and Graham, stated that they are working with a property owner, Buddy Gooch who owns the Shipyard Planned Unit Development (PUD) (see handout- viewed on the screen in purple.) Purchasing five acres of Mr. Gooch's property would shorten the bridge span by 700 feet. The reason is that the retaining walls get high because of the clearance over the St. Lucie Canal, and by purchasing this property the embankment can spread out more, decreasing the span of the bridge both north and south. Fill will be brought in to raise the property for the roadway, thus the roadway will be increased and the actual bridge will be decreased, and it's less expensive to build a roadway than a bridge. Mr. Hayes inquired for whom the "Big John Monahan" bridge was commemorating. Mr. Wartman stated that he was on the County Road Board years ago and Mr. Monahan was a dry cleaner from Broward County. Mr. Power's added that Mr. Monahan was instrumental in the building of Alligator Alley, and he was disappointed that Alligator Alley did not bear his name. It was quickly decided that as a project was being built in Indiantown, it should bear his name. Mr. Smith asked what happens to the property once it has been purchased for this project. Mr. Wartman stated that the five acres will then become the property of the DOT. The four acre portion on the south side of the bridge will have a pond and a maintenance road and is being purchased fee simple. The north, one acre portion, is being acquired as perpetual easement so the fee owner will stay the same. The DOT is only acquiring easement rights on the northern portion. Mr. Smith asked if public access will be made available for the southern portion of this property. Mr. Wartman stated that the property will consist of a pond and a 2-1 embankment. It will not be for public access. Mr. Randy Cropp, representative of Cone and Graham, stated that the easement was given to the Shipyard (PUD) to go under that bridge. The State of Florida and Homeland Security do not want parking and travel easements under existing bridges. Also contained on the southern portion of the property is a hot oil line which belongs to Florida Power and Light (FPL). This hot oil line basically negates any building possibilities. The original PUD had considered having parking under the bridge, but since the fill and pond are now going to be in place, the easement was removed from under the existing bridge. Also, the railroad tracks are in this area, so it was determined by the DOT, to be in the best interest of all people,

not to have public access to this area. The DOT will still have access under the bridge to facilitate maintenance on this property and pond. Mr. Smith stated that projects of this nature should be brought to the County Commissioners prior to such completion by the DOT. He stated that there is public access under all bridges in Martin County. There is a park being created under the bridge currently being built in Palm City, so the argument that the DOT doesn't want people having access under the bridge is flawed. Mr. Cropp stated that the PUD which was purchased was privately owned. Mr. Smith stated that the DOT is public and if this property was purchased by the DOT, it would then be under a public domain. Mr. Cropp stated that the landowner was approached by Cone and Graham to buy the property as Cone and Graham. The DOT noted that under the Uniform Act, the DOT has to purchase the property, but initially Cone and Graham was purchasing the property with the contract and sale for the piece of property. Mr. Smith inquired as to who is actually purchasing this property. Mr. Cropp stated that the DOT in the end, is buying the property. Mr. Smith again noted that these are the conversations which should be held with the County Commissioners prior to decisions being made when building a major piece of public infrastructure. In retrospect, the public could miss out on good opportunities for trails, parks or other locations of public interest. Mr. Cropp advised that the public wouldn't have access to this property anyway because of the constraints from the Shipyard's PUD being a private piece of property. He stated that there's really no public access to get to this piece of property. Mr. Smith added that the PUD could come back to the County Commissioners at some future date, and the standing Commission may want to negotiate that PUD for access to the water for public use. However, if the right has already been given up, there will not be any options for the public access. Mr. Smith stated that it was *assumed* by Cone and Graham, that the Shipyard PUD will never grant access to the water. A sitting County Commission may want to negotiate that deal with the developer when that time arises. If the County has already been nixed out of a deal, it could eliminate opportunities in the future. This has occurred in previous projects where the County was purchasing land with State agencies, and the County didn't take right-of-way out of the project ahead of time, costing the County majorly with future endeavors. Mr. Smith stated that he is trying to circumvent an error by this Commission in not addressing public access to this property. Ms. Heard expressed concern over the amount of fill which will be needed to increase the road portion to this very high bridge. It was advised that the fill will probably be about 30-40 feet above where it is today. Ms. Heard asked what the plan is for stabilizing the bank and if there were plans to reclaim some land from the C-44. Mr. Cropp stated that a landscape plan which has been approved by Indiantown and Martin County, is in place for the project to stabilize the embankment using sod. It was noted that the clearance will not change but will remain at 55 feet. Mr. Powers stated that there has not been a public meeting on this issue but more important to Indiantown is that it will happen. It will also expedite the matter because it is easier and faster to place fill and packing it as opposed to creating and pouring structure. To the extent that it will help move this project along, Mr. Powers

stated that there is ample fill in Indiantown which could be used to accomplish this project. Mr. Powers stated that as a community it is important to build the bridge and to expedite it would be even better.

Mr. Ciampi made a motion to approve the approximate \$425,000 in additional funds needed to purchase the additional right-of-way and the environmental study to implement the Big John Monahan Bridge Project. This motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. There were no additional comments or concerns. The motion passed unanimously.

C. CRA SIDEWALKS MODIFICATION

MEMO: temp12MPOa01.03

Ms. Beltran stated that this item is on the agenda because of the Enhancement grant which was awarded in 2010 to fund the Old Palm City sidewalks. Since that time the County staff, working with the CRA staff, has requested a scope change to the project. FDOT said that this change would need concurrence from the MPO Board. This scope change is to lengthen the sidewalk an additional 100 feet as well as removing the trail and the trees in the original scope submitted with the application. The change is needed because the CRA will be attending to the landscaping portion of this project leaving this grant to be focused on the sidewalk itself.

Mr. Smith asked if the pattern of trees which was previously begun at the north end of Mapp Road would end. Mr. Freeman, of the CRA, stated that the pattern would continue but it would be more of a partnership with the CRA and the grant working together, so the CRA will be involved with the landscaping and grant will facilitate the hardscape. Mr. Smith inquired if tree grate holes will be set aside for landscaping to be installed. Mr. Freeman stated that it is his understanding that the CRA will be responsible for the funding of the trees. Mr. Smith stated that he wants to be sure that trees will be planted and irrigation will be provided. Ms. Beltran stated yes, in the overall plan, but this particular item is requesting a scope change for this particular grant to move the money to be able to extend the sidewalk. Mr. Smith stated, without trees. Ms. Beltran reiterated that from what she understood the CRA would be responsible for the landscaping and trees. Mr. Freeman concurred. Mr. Smith stated that he wants to confirm that there is a formal linkage between the extension of the sidewalk and the CRA regarding the trees. Where's the agreement assuring that there will be a second part of this, and trees will happen. Mr. Freeman stated that once this has been taken through the MPO then it will be taken to the CRA and the neighbor committee.

Mr. Smith stated that he will make a motion for approval of this scope change with the Caveat that a formal agreement or acknowledgment is required between the MPO and the CRA for this to move forward and the

street trees will be planted in the pattern which has been previously defined, are a part of this project.

Ms. Clarke asked if the extra square footage of sidewalk is closer to the new bridge. Mr. Freeman stated that he thought it was Butler Road. Ms. Beltran referred Ms. Clarke to the map in the agenda package.

Ms. Heard seconded the motion on the floor to move staff recommendation with the contingency that it include the continuation of the street trees. There were no additional comments from the Board. The motion passed unanimously,

D. SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES GRANT CONSORTIUM AGREEMENT

MEMO: temp12MPOa01.04

Ms. Beltran stated that this is a follow up to a Memorandum of Understanding that this Board approved in the spring of 2010 in support of an application of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council and the South Florida Regional Planning Council for regional planning in the Southeast Florida area. The grant award was \$4.25 million by U. S. HUD and as part of the partnership of those Boards and agencies that entered into the Memorandum of Understanding, this is a Consortium Agreement of participating parties. As Martin didn't have a meeting over the summer, the Indian River and Palm Beach MPO's have already approved this as part of the Partnership. Staff recommends approval of this agreement as well as allowing for in-kind staff support for this effort.

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve staff's recommendation of the Consortium Agreement allowing staff to participate in that regional planning effort. The motion was seconded by Ms. Heard. There were no comments or objections. The motion was passed unanimously.

E. FY2012 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN (PIP) UPDATE

MEMO: temp12MPOa01.05

Ms. Beltran stated that staff is recommending the list of modifications which are in the agenda package. Approval will allow Staff to include and reference the 2010 Census data verses the 2000 Census data currently in the 2009 PIP; and allow staff to include and reference the 2035 Regional Long Range Transportation Plan (RLRTP) which was approved this past fiscal year, as opposed to referencing the 2030 Plan. (See agenda package for complete list of modifications.)

Mr. Clarke moved staff's recommendation to include and reference the 2010 Census data and the 2035 RLRTP in the FY2012 PIP. The motion

was seconded by Mr. Smith. There were no additional questions or comments. This matter passed unanimously.

F. NEW MARTIN MPO WEBSITE AGREEMENTS

MEMO: temp12MPOa01.06

Ms. Beltran stated that as part of the PIP contract a consultant has been working on a new website which is ready for launch. (A copy of the home page is in the agenda package.) Staff recommends that GO DADDY be the host agency for this website, at a cost of \$9 per year [month]. GO DADDY is also the agency which maintains the domain name of *Martinmpo.com*, and staff would also recommend a six month maintenance agreement with the consultant in the event that issues were to arise within the initial six months of launch. Mr. Hayes confirmed the cost to be \$9 per month.

Ms. Heard made a motion to move staff's recommendation to allow GO DADDY to be the host agency for the Martin MPO website and to approve the six month maintenance agreement with the consultant at a cost of \$9 per month. This motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Mortell stated that the consultant needs to take into consideration Apple's fight with Adobe. A lot of people have their first page of the website be maintained in "Flash" and people with I-Pads and I-Phones cannot access anywhere on the site as it will not open at all.

There were no additional comments to the motion on the floor. The motion passed unanimously.

G. 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

MEMO: temp12MPOa01.07

Ms. Beltran stated that historically the Martin MPO has supported the legislative priorities of the MPOAC. (See agenda package for the list approved last year with revisions.) The MPOAC will be considering these revisions at the Governing Board meeting at the end of October. Also included in the agenda package are the priorities which were approved last fiscal year with a few corrections. (See the four recommended changes in the agenda, which have previously been County approved.) Staff is recommending the following changes: Amtrak Service along the FEC corridor, is recommended to be termed Passenger Rail Service along the FEC Corridor; the House Bills that were in process last year were deleted from the priority supporting Federal operating assistance for smaller urbanized areas; the Agglomeration of Urbanized Areas (UZA's) combining the Counties from Titusville south to Martin opposing language will remain, however, support for the Partnership of the Consortium Agreement which was just approved with the South Florida and the Treasure Coast Planning Councils, will be added in case the possibility of future Federal

funding becomes available for such a partnership containing such a large area; and finally to support the everyday counts initiative by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). FHWA is working with FDOT in Central Office to approve road and environmental safety and shorten project delivery for projects funded with Federal funds. Staff is requesting language that would employ flexibility especially having to do with right-of-way acquisitions. Recently the local issues involving CR 714 proved that having some flexibility in right-of-way acquisitions could be helpful in expediting a project.

Mr. Smith agrees with the recommendations. He would also like to add to the Passenger service a name change to be termed *the Flagler Line*. Ms. Beltran stated that she didn't know if other places in Florida would recognize *the Flagler Line* however they would recognize *the FEC*. Mr. Smith would agree to *the FEC/Flagler Line*. The section regarding the deep water ports should also have a statement of recognition identifying the 11 shallow draft ports, one of which is in this area. There is language floating around that would allow the shallow ports to compete for a different pool of funds than the deep water ports. This shows the clarification between the two styles of ports.

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the 2012 Legislative Priorities with the inclusion of the name revision of the Passenger service to be termed the FEC/Flagler Line and adding recognition of the shallow water ports clarifying the difference between deep water and shallow water ports.

Mr. Bausch states that the boating traffic will go where the volume is largest which is not in Florida, it is in the Northeast portion of the United States. Mr. Bausch stated that with global warming, the polar ice is melting making it faster to go from the Orient through the Baring Straits over Canada and into New York. You don't have to pay the toll at the Panama Canal, the time and distance is shorter, and the costs are cheaper going to the more populous ports. If the focus is on Central and South America business, the deep water ports in the South have merit, but to the degree that funds will be spent on all the various ports, most goods don't arrive in Miami first. On the return trip, what is anticipated to be going back to the Orient from Florida which would constitute a viable trade. It would appear to be a one way trip and costs charged by the shipping company would have to cover the round trip amount. There is volume that can go back and forth from the Northeast. Mr. Mortell stated that we can move forward on it, but he is of the opinion that the Armellini's would probably disagree in light of the fact that they are a trucking company, which is one of the larger employers in Martin County, has imports in the Miami and Melbourne ports daily. These imports may not come from China, they do come from Columbia and South America, but the idea of our ports needing to be maintained for deep water transit doesn't just have to be from the Orient. There are many uses for the ports including the number one business in Florida which happens to be tourism. Cruise ships leave Florida ports everyday full of tourists, which is a huge benefit to the deep water ports. The residual effects lead to the tourists

staying in hotels a few days before and after their cruise, and the high speed rail was based upon the cruise ship people, not the freight. This needs to be viewed in a broader scope. Mr. Smith stated that his point is to make sure that wherever it can be inserted into language that will be debated both federally and statewide, that recognition for Martin's local purpose is clarified that there is a difference between deep water and shallow draft ports. From a policy maker's perspective, it is important that Martin sends a clear message that Martin is working with the ports and the Feds to identify how to move forward and how to deal with Martin's inlet in the future. This is why something should be inserted clarifying this matter. Every policy document you can have with language relating to a consistent theme, will stand out to the "ones in charge looking at the documents." They will note that there are X number of documents stating that there is clarity between *this* and *that*. Mr. Smith encouraged the Board members to attend meetings regarding the port systems and the long range transportation system to learn what is going on with the industry. The industry has changed greatly. The large corporations like Lowe's, Home Depot and Walmart are running and organizing the lion's share of the shipping world. San Diego is where the major shipping is entering the United States (U.S.) and going to the major distribution points, Chicago, and the central part of the U.S. All the containers are larger than the containers that the U. S. uses. The containers are shipped to the distribution systems where they are unloaded and returned to San Diego empty. The cost of the deadhead shipment from Chicago back to San Diego is four times the cost of coming into Florida, unloading into inland ports in Florida to the distributions here and disbursing the goods from Florida. The unloading and deadhead costs are definitely going to be affecting what is happening in Florida, from around the world. Mr. Smith wants that language in there so that at some point it may be of benefit to our shallow water ports.

Mr. Powell offered thanks to Ms. Beltran for including the local input on the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) through urbanized areas that will help Indiantown greatly.

Mr. Mortell asked if there was a second for the motion on the floor approving the 2012 Legislative Priorities.

Mr. Hayes made a second on the motion approving the 2012 Legislative Priorities with the amendments regarding the rail name change and the wording regarding the clarification between deep water and shallow water ports. There were no additional comments. The matter passed with Mr. Bausch in opposition.

H. MPO AUTHORITY AND PROCESS

MEMO: temp12MPOa01.08

Ms. Beltran stated that this was being presented because there is going to be a special meeting next month with FDOT presenting the FY 2013-2017 Tentative Work Program. (See handout) This Tentative Work Program will be based on the List of Project Priorities (LOPP) which was approved at the MPO's June, 2011 meeting. This is one of the most important meetings of the year as this will be the basis for the TIP which will be brought to this Board in the spring of FY 2012. Ms. Beltran stated that also included is an information sheet regarding the MPO, the MPO process, how the committees fit into the cyclical process, the responsibilities and roles of the committee members as well as how the MPO and the advisory committees were established and legislatively governed. Ms. Beltran went over the process in detail, including a description of various funding sources and the consultative relationship that MPO's in Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) over 200,000 in population have with FDOT.

Mr. Smith inquired how the Equity Bonus (EB) funds are distributed. Ms. Beltran stated that Florida is a donor state, where they donate funds to the Federal Government and they get approximately 92% back. At one time the percentage was 87%, but the percentage has increased during recent years and is now 92%. These are additional funds that the state gets which are allocated to the state as a bonus for being a donor state. However, they are allocated by funding source. Percentages of the returned funds are for different programs, highway or discretionary funds are examples of funding sources. This is dictated through FDOT's Central Office. Mr. Smith wants to know what the formula is that determines the funding split between Counties. Ms. Arlene Tanis stated that she will take this information to FDOT and get back with this Board with an answer.

Ms. Arlene Tanis from FDOT, complemented Ms. Beltran on the excellent presentation and requested a copy.

Ms. Beltran introduced the new Senior Planner, Mr. Gavin Jones, to the Board.

Mr. Powers commended Ms. Beltran on the clarity of the presentation. He did request that a page be included with this handout to include all the acronyms for the new committee members.

Mr. Smith asked Ms. Beltran to provide an update on the 76 Interchange.

9. FDOT COMMENTS

None.

10. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Ciampi stated that last Tuesday, the name of the Indian Street Bridge was formally changed to the Veteran's Memorial Bridge. Mr. Ciampi wanted to thank his colleges on the MPO Board for supporting this name change.

Mr. Ciampi mentioned the Value Engineering Study which was accomplished in August. Approximately 20 people worked on this project for about a week in Palm City. They returned to Ft. Lauderdale with their initial findings and took approximately 60 ideas and reduced them to about 16 recommendations which will be officially reported on at a later date. This Value Engineering has sped the start date up, and saved approximately \$4 million. The project will be able to get started quicker now and will still be a fantastic project. Mr. Ciampi extended his thanks to all the personnel involved.

Ms. Heard stated that she is pleased to know that the MPO is fully and capably staffed.

11. NOTES

- FY2011 UPWP 4th Quarter Progress Report

12. NEXT MEETING

- October 17, 2011 – Special Meeting
 - FDOT Presentation of the FY2012/13-FY2016/17 Tentative Work Program
- December 19, 2011 – Regular Meeting

13. ADJOURN

No motion was made for adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 10:38 a.m.

Recorded and Prepared by:

Margaret H. Brassard, Administrative Assistant II

Date

Approved by:

Michael Mortell, Chairman

Date