

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

**WEST CENTRAL FLORIDA MPOs  
CHAIR'S COORDINATING COMMITTEE (CCC)**

**THE POWEL CROSLY MUSEUM**  
8374 North Tamiami Trail (US 41)  
Sarasota, Florida 34206

11:00 A.M.

**MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2006**

Chair Bustle called the meeting to order at 11:12 a.m. followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. Nanette Eubanks, Office Manager, confirmed a quorum was present.

**PRESENT**

Mayor Lawrence E. Bustle, Jr., Chair, Sarasota/Manatee MPO  
Councilman Shawn Harris, Chair, Hillsborough County MPO  
Commissioner Jack Mariano, Chair, Pasco County MPO  
Commissioner Karen Seel, Chair, Pinellas County MPO  
Commissioner Gow Fields, Chair, Polk TPO

**Others**

Michael Howe, Sarasota/Manatee MPO  
Nanette Eubanks, Sarasota/Manatee MPO  
Keith Drake, Sarasota/Manatee MPO  
Bob Herrington, Sarasota/Manatee MPO  
Sue Clapsaddle, Sarasota/Manatee MPO  
Jim Van Pelt, Sarasota/Manatee MPO  
Mike Maholtz, Sarasota/Manatee MPO  
Commissioner Jane von Hahmann, Manatee County  
Councilwoman Marianne Barnebey, City of Bradenton  
Commissioner Robert Waechter, Sarasota-Manatee Airport Authority  
Representative Bill Galvano, District 68  
Howard Glassman, MPOAC  
Jeff Kramer, MPOAC, USF/CUTR  
Hugh Pascoe, Hernando MPO  
Doug Uden, Pasco County MPO  
Lucie Ayer, Hillsborough County MPO  
Sarah Ward, Pinellas County MPO  
Brian Smith, Pinellas County MPO  
Carolyn Kuntz, Pinellas County MPO  
Manon Lavoie, FDOT, District One  
Ben Walker, FDOT, District One

1 Bob Clifford, FDOT, District Seven  
2 Don Skelton, FDOT, District Seven  
3 Lee Royal, FDOT, District Seven  
4 Whit Blanton, Renaissance Planning Group  
5 Neil Spirtas, Manatee Chamber of Commerce  
6 Sandi Moody, BACS  
7 Heather Urwiller, Citrus County Development Services  
8 Avera Wynne, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council  
9 Ken Hoyt, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council  
10 Pam Dorwarth, Sarasota/Manatee CAC member

11  
12 Chair Bustle reordered the agenda to Committee Action B - Regional Public Involvement  
13 Evaluation.

14  
15  
16 **III. COMMITTEE ACTION**

17  
18 **B. Regional Public Involvement Evaluation**

19  
20 Mr. Whit Blanton, Renaissance Planning Group, presented a PowerPoint presentation  
21 of the West Central Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Chairs Coordinating  
22 Committee (CCC) Regional Public Involvement Report.

23  
24 In 2000, the CCC adopted its first Public Involvement Plan (PIP) as required by  
25 Federal and State law. The evaluation of the CCC's PIP was conducted by the  
26 Renaissance Planning Group under contract to the Pinellas County MPO.

27  
28 The PowerPoint presentation included an overview of the following information:

29  
30 Introduction

- 31  
32
- An overview of the Chairs Coordinating Committee
  - Background and Regional Context
  - Growth and Development
  - Updated Long Range Transportation Plans (LRTP)
  - Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP)
  - Regional Transit Comes Into Focus
  - SAFETEA-LU
- 33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 The Context for Regional Outreach - CCC Members Engage the Public

- 41  
42
- Hernando County MPO
  - Hillsborough County MPO
  - Pasco County MPO
- 43  
44

- Pinellas County MPO
- Sarasota/Manatee County MPO
- Polk Transportation Planning Organization
- Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)
- Regional Planning Councils
- Bay Area Commuter Services
- West Central Florida Air Quality Coordinating Committee (WCFAQCC)

Evaluation of the Existing CCC Regional Public Participation Process

- Communication Tools - Regional Partnerships
- Community Liaisons
- Data Sharing and Mapping
- Evaluation/Accomplishments
- Summary of Findings/Assessment

Recommendations for Enhanced Regional Public Participation

- Opportunities for Enhancement
- The Brand
- Contracts Database
- Partnerships
- Visualization Techniques
- Joint CAC
- Communications Strategy Process and Organization

Commissioner Mariano: I move to receive and approve the Regional Public Involvement Evaluation Report.

Commissioner Fields: I second the motion.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**I. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

No one from the public came forward to speak.

**III. COMMITTEE ACTION (Continued)**

A. Public Hearing - 11:00 a.m.

1                   1.       TRIP: FDOT District Seven (7)

2  
3                   Mr. Hugh Pascoe, Hernando County MPO, gave an overview of the  
4                   Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) and presented a  
5                   PowerPoint presentation.

- 6
- 7                   •            Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) was created by the
- 8                   Growth Management Legislation and signed into law by the Governor
- 9                   on June 24, 2005.
- 10                  •            FDOT's District Seven includes five counties with approximately \$20
- 11                  million available in each fiscal year.
- 12                  •            FDOT's District One includes twelve counties with approximately
- 13                  \$18.5 million available in each fiscal year.
- 14                  •            Eligibility for TRIP funds require projects to be regionally significant,
- 15                  identified on the CCC Regional Transportation Plan, appear in the
- 16                  local government's Capital Improvement Element (CIE), and have a
- 17                  commitment for the remaining matching funds.
- 18                  •            TRIP Working Group (TWG) of District Seven consisting of technical
- 19                  staff from each MPO as well as other public transportation
- 20                  representatives.
- 21                  •            TRIP Working Group (TWG) of DistrictOne consisting of the Chair
- 22                  and Vice Chair for the Polk TPO and Sarasota/Manatee MPO.

23  
24                  The following is FDOT District Seven's Final TRIP Project Priority List:

- 25
- 26                  A.        CR 54 and Interchange, add two lanes
- 27                  B.        US 19 Channelization
- 28                  C.        I-75 (SR 581 to CR 54), add two lanes
- 29                  D.        Bruce B Downs Palms Springs to Pebbles Creek, four to eight lanes
- 30                  E.        ITS (Fiber Optic truck line in loops of three corridors), ITS truck line
- 31                  infrastructure
- 32                  F.        George Bean Parkway
- 33                  G.        Ridge Road (Little Road to Moon Lake Road), add two lanes
- 34                  H.        Bryan Dairy Road (Starkey Road to 72<sup>nd</sup> Street), add two lanes
- 35                  I.        SR 686 ITS (Ulmerton Road to Alternate US Highway 19), fiber optic
- 36                  cable/traffic signals/CCTV/DMV
- 37                  J.        US 301, (CR 672 to Gibsonton Drive), two to six lanes
- 38                  K.        County Line Road Extension (Suncoast to US 41), new two
- 39                  lane/phased four lanes
- 40
- 41                  M.        Bryan Dairy Road (28<sup>th</sup> Street to Alternate US highway 19), fiber
- 42                  optic cable/traffic signals/CCTV/DMV
- 43                  N.        SR 580 (Race Track Road to SR 586) fiber optic cable/traffic
- 44                  signals/CCTV/DMV

- O. Sam Allen Road (Alexander Street to Park Road), two to four lanes
- P. Barclay Road (SR 50 to Elgin Boulevard)
- Q. 118<sup>th</sup> Avenue Expressway (US Hwy. 19 to East of 40<sup>th</sup> Street/CR 296/Roosevelt Boulevard Connector)
- R. SR 54 (SR 581 to CR 577), add four lanes
- S. SR 52 extensions - Clinton Avenue, redo two lanes
- T. SR 52 extension - Clinton Avenue (CR 577 to Pasadena Road), new two lanes

Others included:

- Regional Vanpool Program, fleet expansion
- US 19 Express/BRT, ITS/real time info, centers, shelters, vehicles
- Bus purchase, acquisition of buses on regional corridors for express routes

Commissioner Mariano questioned if preemption lights were considered along US 19 Express to allow fire stations the free flow of traffic lights. Mr. Skelton stated preemption lights has been used in some areas and is a topic of discussion but nothing has been implemented as yet.

Commissioner Seel stated preemption lights were studied in Pinellas County in which Optic Con 3M, provided a presentation on the GPS they have implemented in different areas. There are pull out lanes that will allow you to jump ahead of traffic that is being utilized in areas, which is also considered as a preemption device.

Mr. Skelton emphasized strongly that it is important that these projects actually have an effect on concurrence, especially on the ITS project, it is important to show what the increase and through put is actually going to be.

Commissioner Seel asked do the projects need to be qualified or pre-qualified by FDOT and the time frame for submitting them. Mr. Skelton stated FDOT is in the process of doing the Work Program Update, individual MPOs have until October 1, 2006 to submit its priorities.

Commissioner Seel stated the projects have not come before the Pinellas County MPO Board for input, and asked how will FDOT determine the ranking if Pinellas County MPO Board has a different ranking than what is presented. Mr. Skelton stated The CCC is the regional body that will determine the ranking, it is required to send the prioritization to them.

Commissioner Fields stated the Polk TPO Board has not seen the list that was

1 presented today, but has reviewed the Polk TPO and Sarasota/Manatee MPO  
2 Joint Regional TRIP list. Commissioner Fields stated he did not recall if  
3 discussion took place before or once this new legislation had passed to have  
4 each of the MPOs review the combined list.

5  
6 Mr. Skelton stated the CCC is intended to be a top down planning body, and  
7 is not sure if it is required that everything should be passed upward to the top,  
8 but hope the members of the CCC are looking at the regional emphasis and  
9 things that are priorities in their area as the projects move forward.

10  
11 Chair Bustle stated he agreed but does not think any of the members, as  
12 Chairs of their respected MPOs, want to pre-empt the action of the MPOs and  
13 lose the confidence of the Board Members. Chair Bustle also stated he is  
14 prepared to approve the list and Resolution presented and move forward. If  
15 there are changes the CCC can meet to review them.

16  
17 Chair Bustle open the meeting to the public. There were no comments from  
18 the public.

19  
20 A. TRIP: FDOT District One (1)

21  
22 Mr. Ryan Kordek, Polk TPO, concluded the PowerPoint Presentation for Polk  
23 TPO - Sarasota/Manatee MPO Joint Regional TRIP Project Priority List. The  
24 Projects are as listed:

- 25
- 26 1. US 301 (from Erie Road to Fort Hamer Road), two to four lane  
27 constructions, Manatee County.
- 28 2. Ernie Caldwell Boulevard (from US 27 to US 17/92), new four lane  
29 construction, Polk County.
- 30 3. CR 54 (from US 27 to Lake Wilson Road), two to four lane right-of-  
31 way acquisitions, Polk County.
- 32 4. Honore Avenue (from Bee Ridge Road to Fruitville Road), new four  
33 lane road construction, Sarasota County.
- 34 5. Laurel Road (from I-75 to Knights Trail Road), signal light  
35 improvement construction, City of Venice.
- 36 6. CR 54 (from US 27 to lake Wilson Road), two to four lane road  
37 constructions, Polk County.
- 38 7. US 301 (from Fort Hamer to Moccasin Wallow Road), two to four  
39 lane road design and right-of-way acquisition, Manatee County.
- 40 8. Bartow Northern Connector (from US 98 to US 17), new four lane  
41 road right-of-way acquisition, Polk County.
- 42 9. Sumter Boulevard, Phase 3 (from Heron Creek Boulevard to Morandi  
43 Drive), two to four lane road constructions, City of North Port.
- 44 10. Thompson Nursery Road Extension (from CR 655 to CR 653), new

- 1 four lane road right-of-way acquisition, Polk County.  
2 11. US 301 (from Ft. Hamer to Moccasin Wallow Road), two to four lane  
3 road constructions, Manatee County.  
4 12. I-4 Express Bus Service (from Hillsborough County to Osceola  
5 County), purchase alternative fuel, rolling stock - 3, Polk County.  
6 13. US 41 @ Fruitville Road, roundabout construction, City of Sarasota.  
7 14. University Parkway (from Lorraine Road to SR 70), new four lane  
8 road construction, Manatee County.  
9 15. Englewood Transit Hub & South County Garage (at Hosmer Avenue -  
10 east of SR 776), intermodal facility construction, Sarasota County.

11  
12 Mr. Walker stated District 1 is taking a different approach than District 7 in  
13 term of years because District 1 is a larger district, has more regional partners  
14 and some of the entities are not comfortable with a five-year allocation. They  
15 were concerned about matching TRIP programs to the Capital Improvement  
16 Program, therefore more comfortable with a three-year award.

17  
18 Commissioner Seel commended FDOT on their approach to try to do a fare  
19 share balance and stated it shows regional cooperation and recognition of  
20 each regional partner.

21  
22 Chair Bustle open the meeting to the public. There were no comments from  
23 the public.

24  
25 Mr. Uden questioned if the projects are reviewed each year and will they need  
26 to be taken out of the TIP and re-prioritized. Mr. Skelton stated once projects  
27 are in and tied to money, it will stay in the program unless there are some  
28 major reasons to remove it because FDOT is charged with stability of the  
29 Work Program and if there are issues, all the money may not be programed.  
30 Mr. Skelton reiterated the need to get the forms into FDOT.

31  
32 Mr. Skelton made a suggestion regarding the Resolution, stating the  
33 Resolution refers to FY 2007/2008 - 2010/2011 and suggested going from  
34 2006/2007 - 2010/2011.

35  
36 Mr. Howe stated for the record, there is a Resolution that reflects the  
37 respected fiscal years that is different from the one that was handed out. It  
38 reads in the final paragraph, "That the Transportation Regional Incentive  
39 Program priorities for Fiscal Years 07/08 - 2010/2011 (District 7) and for  
40 Fiscal Years 07/08 - 09/10 (District 1), after receiving public comment, is  
41 hereby adopted by the Chairs Coordinating Committee." Mr. Howe  
42 questioned if the request was to change the 07/08 to 06/07. Mr. Skelton  
43 responded yes, only for District 7, because there is money in 06/07.  
44

1 Chair Bustle called for a motion to approve the Resolution as corrected and  
2 a motion to also include a proviso that should any member MPO have  
3 changes, they will be addressed prior to the Work Program.  
4

5 Commissioner Gow: I move to approve the Resolution as corrected  
6 and a proviso that should any member MPO  
7 have changes they will be addressed prior to  
8 the Work Program.  
9

10 Commissioner Seel: I second the motion.  
11

12 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
13

14 Commissioner Gow stated in the future, a discussion is needed regarding how  
15 to stage the development of the list to ensure everyone is in agreement. Chair  
16 Bustle agreed and stated that the issue will be an agenda item at the next  
17 meeting.  
18

19 Chair Bustle reordered the agenda to the Discussion Section, due to Representative  
20 Galvano's schedule.  
21

#### 22 23 **IV. DISCUSSION SECTION/WORK SESSION ITEMS**

##### 24 25 **A. Multi-Modal Regional Transportation Strategic Initiative**

26  
27 Representative Galvano, Chair of the Bay Area Legislative Delegation, stated the idea  
28 behind the Regional Transportation Authority is to create an entity that rises above  
29 the jurisdictional lines and bring together the plans that are out there and implement  
30 them. After conversation with members of the Panhandle from Destin, Florida  
31 regarding how the Regional Transportation Authority would work, a resounding  
32 positive response was received.  
33

34 Representative Galvano stated there are currently two Bills that are in drafting, one  
35 in the Senate and one in the House. The House Bill was created to allow:  
36

- 37 • Flexibility
- 38 • Respect local government
- 39 • Ensure funding does not become competitive between local government, state  
40 or the entity proposed
- 41 • Ability to enter into public/private partnership
- 42 • Planning  
43

44 The composition of the Board has not been established as yet, but might mirror that  
45 of the Panhandle, however there have been several proposals.

1  
2 Representative Galvano stated as Chair of Bay Area Legislative Delegation, he would  
3 like to go into the session with two Bills and come out with an entity that is not going  
4 to do a long list of projects, but identify those projects that need to occur with the  
5 greatest speed and flexibility.

6  
7 Commissioner Mariano asked if the Authority would look to the private sector if they  
8 are interested in membership on the Board to possibly help fund the Authority.  
9 Representative Galvano responded yes.

10  
11 Commissioner Seel questioned the maximum or minimum number of people  
12 anticipated, according to the old Bill, it was about 33 people. Representative  
13 Galvano stated the minimum will be eight members. The County Commission from  
14 each of the eight counties will appoint someone. Therefore, it could be more than  
15 eight but less than 19.

16  
17 Commissioner Seel stated having the private sector present is very important as well  
18 as having at least one elected official from every county. Representative Galvano  
19 stated, in the Panhandle, there is one Commissioner and several Mayors in the area  
20 that would like to see City Officials involved. There is a lot of discussion regarding  
21 this issue.

22  
23 Councilman Harris stated it sounds like everything is on the right track as far as  
24 trying to win the planning function entity with the implementation functions of the  
25 entity. There are benefits in putting public and elected officials on the Board.  
26 Councilman Harris encouraged Representative Galvano to make sure there is public  
27 official representation when thinking about that composition.

28  
29 Mr. Howe questioned the funding issues and the opportunity for public type  
30 partnership. Mr. Howe stated one of the ideas the partnership has expressed was the  
31 intent to go after federal earmarked dollars with the anticipation that there are some  
32 rail dollars available, and questioned if that was the understanding and goal.  
33 Representative Galvano stated the partnership has talked a lot about funding and  
34 stated from his perspective, he wanted to make sure not to rob Peter to pay Paul and  
35 if that can be done by bringing in additional dollars that was not available but for the  
36 existence of this entity, then that is a win-win situation.

37  
38 Mr. Howe stated in the Staff Directors meeting with the partnership, a review of one  
39 version of the Bill of last sessions, questions were asked, i.e., regardless of how the  
40 composition of the Board is ultimately created, if a situation arises where you have  
41 a project, there is no local jurisdiction veto authority once you create an authority.  
42 Mr. Howe questioned if that was the goal. Representative Galvano stated yes.

43  
44 Mr. Hoyt stated when Board Members and MPO Members are on the Board together,  
45 the MPOs will be the group in which the proposal of this new authority will be

1 processed. MPO approval is needed to go to Washington for funding, which in turn  
2 creates a conflict, because this same MPO Member has to vote on whether or not to  
3 put that in the Work Plan and the Long Range Plan. Representative Galvano stated  
4 he would have a staff look at the Federal Law.

5  
6 Commissioner Fields questioned if there are any examples of other entities and how  
7 effective they have been. Representative Galvano stated the Panhandle was a model  
8 for what is being proposed.

9  
10  
11 **II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 9, 2006**

12  
13 Commissioner Seel: I move to approve the meeting minutes of  
14 June 9, 2006.

15  
16 Commissioner Mariano: I second the motion.

17  
18 A correction on page 3, should read "Heartland Coast-to-Coast Turnpike."

19  
20 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

21  
22  
23 **III. COMMITTEE ACTION (Continued)**

24  
25 C. Title VI Civil Rights

26  
27 Ms. Sarah Ward gave a brief review of the Title VI Civil Rights Discrimination  
28 Complaint Procedure. The procedure is consistent with guidance by FDOT and the  
29 Federal Highway Administration. The Pinellas County MPO will serve as the CCC's  
30 Title VI compliance officer, the procedure and forms will be posted on the CCC's  
31 web site pending approval by the CCC.

32  
33 Commissioner Mariano: I move to adopt the Title VI Civil Rights  
34 Procedure and Complaint Forms.

35  
36 Councilman Harris: I second the motion.

37  
38 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

39  
40 **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

41  
42 Ms. Ayer stated she was proud to represent the CCC in receiving the CCC National  
43 Recognition Awards from National Association of Regional Councils (NARC). The honor  
44 was awarded at NARC's 40<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference in San Antonio in June. The CCC was  
45 recognized for exemplifying regional cooperation, coordination and excellence with

1 involvement of private and civic sectors. Ms. Ayer stated the CCC competed against top  
2 names from Denver and Los Angeles.

3  
4 Mr. Glassman circulated and reviewed the MPO Advisory Council's 2007 Legislation  
5 handout which included the following:

6  
7 1. MPO Autonomy

- 8  
9
  - An MPO is a separate legal entity independent of other governmental entities
  - Governing body will designate at least a chair, vice chair and agency clerk
  - MPO powers set forth in law s. 163.01, F.S. through interlocal agreement
  - Optional participation in the Florida Retirement System
  - Authority to establish reimbursement rates for per diem and travel expenses

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 2. Voting Membership

- 16  
17
  - Excludes constitutional officers (i.e., the sheriff, tax collectors)
  - Governor and local elected officials may establish methods to appoint alternate members
  - Other non-voting advisors may be appointed by the MPO, however MPOs will seek representatives of multi-modal organizations and military installations not otherwise represented by voting members

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 3. Independent Staffs

- 24  
25
  - Each MPO will have an Executive Director (FRS Senior Management) and staff as deemed necessary who reports directly to the MPO governing board for all MPO administration and operational matters
  - Executive Director and Staff may be employed by either MPO or by another governmental entity through a staff services agreement
  - MPO may contract with public and private entities to accomplish planning duties and other administrative functions

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 4. Training MPO Members

- 34  
35
  - MPO will provide training opportunities for local elected officials
  - Training can be conducted by individual MPO or through statewide and federal training programs

36  
37  
38  
39  
40 5. Regional Transportation Planning

- 41  
42
  - Enhance MPO Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (CCC and other similar organizations created through provisions in current law)
  - Allow federal urban attributable (XU) funds to be used as the local match for regional transit TRIP projects
- 43  
44  
45

1  
2 Mr. Glassman stated number 1 through 4 of the MPO Advisory Council's 2007 Legislation  
3 generally reflects what the final bill will look like after going through an entire session  
4 modifying the bill. Number 5, and bullet 2 refers to modifying the TRIP program. Proper  
5 language needs to be drafted and brought back to include the TRIP program. Bullet one  
6 encourages this organization to work with CUTR to enhance the CCC. The draft bill has  
7 everything in it except bullet one, under number 5.  
8

9 Mayor Bustle questioned the meaning of Enhance under Number 5, bullet one and stated  
10 Representative Galvano should review this item to ensure the writer of the Bill, the House  
11 and the Senate are on board with the meaning of Enhance. Mr. Glassman stated that during  
12 the Session, Representative Gloriosa expressed an interest in an expanded enhanced role for  
13 this organization through other regional organizations to ensure that staffing issues be  
14 addressed and other issues are brought to the table, for example SAFETEA-LU and  
15 implementing regulations. There is nothing drafted at this time but is seeking the input of  
16 this organization to help guide that activity.  
17

18 Mr. Howe stated the Staff Directors are looking for direction from the Committee Members  
19 on whether or not to proceed with working with CUTR and working with MPOAC to come  
20 up with a draft bill to examine possible changes to the CCC statutes.  
21

22 Councilman Harris stated it seems the RTA Representative Galvano is working on is going  
23 to bring about something in this legislation session. If the power of this entity tries to grow,  
24 they may start to view the CCC as a competitor as opposed to a partner and that could have  
25 the effect of severely weakening the CCC.  
26

27 Mayor Bustle stated his concern was if we don't work to make sure Representative  
28 Gloriosa's language was consistent and compatible with Representative Galvano's language,  
29 there could have a problem. It might be an advantage to not just wait to see what happens  
30 but to make sure that the CCC is woven into the process.  
31

32 Commissioner Seel stated it was logical that the plans of this new authority come back before  
33 the body for approval.  
34

35 Mayor Bustle questioned if the CCC was supposed to commission CUTR to do the study.  
36 Mr. Howe stated it was an offer from Representative Gloriosa and Mr. Glassman on behalf  
37 of the MPOAC, however, the CCC can work in conjunction with the offer.  
38

39 Councilman Harris suggested scheduling CUTR, Representative Gloriosa and Representative  
40 Galvano on the December agenda to provide an update on the Bill.  
41

42 It was the consensus of the Board to place the item on the December agenda.  
43  
44  
45

**VI. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS**

1  
2 Mayor Bustle congratulated all that have been involved in the regional process.  
3

4 Commissioner Seel thanked the host of the meeting, Sarasota/Manatee MPO, and stated it  
5 is a wonderful place and job well done.  
6

7 Mr. Howe stated a letter was received from Senator Sebesta regarding not reactivating the  
8 Commuter Transit Authority, in light of the partnership efforts going forth with the Regional  
9 Transportation Bill, and encourages support of the Partnership Bill.  
10

11 Ms. Dorwarth stated she attended the CAC of the CCC meeting wherein an issue arose  
12 regarding call-ins and per the Attorney General's Office, it was stated that the language has  
13 to be added because it was not in the CCC original legislative language. It was voted on and  
14 approved to bring the issue before this Board for direction on whether the language should  
15 be added.  
16

17 Ms. Ward stated further investigation needs to be done regarding call-ins.  
18

19  
20 **VII. NEXT MEETING DATE**

21  
22 December 8, 2006 hosted by Pinellas County MPO.  
23

24  
25 **X. ADJOURNMENT**

26  
27 Having no further business the meeting adjourned at 1:48 p.m.