

# Applied Policy Research: Facilitated Consultation Process for MPO Designation

## FINAL REPORT February 13, 2004



Process designed, implemented and report prepared by  
**The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium**  
(under Contract #BD543-01)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SUMMARY OF FINAL REPORT</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>MPO CONSULTATION SUMMARIES</u>	<u>5</u>
District 1	
<u>Lee &amp; Collier County MPO Consultation</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Sarasota/Manatee &amp; Punta Gorda/Charlotte County MPO</u>	<u>6</u>
District 2	
<u>First Coast and St Johns County-St. Augustine MPO Consultation</u>	<u>6</u>
District 4 (part)	
<u>St. Lucie &amp; Martin County MPO Consultation</u>	<u>7</u>
Districts 4 & 6	
<u>Broward, Miami-Dade &amp; Palm Beach County MPO Consultation</u>	<u>7</u>
District 5	
<u>Lake, Marion and Sumter Counties St. Augustine MPO Consultation</u>	<u>7</u>
District 7	
<u>Hillsborough, Pasco and Pinellas Counties MPO Consultation</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>APPENDIX A – LEE/COLLIER WORKSHOP AND MATERIALS</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>APPENDIX B – SARASOTA/MANATEE/CHARLOTTE WORKSHOP</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>APPENDIX C – SARA/MANA/CHARL. INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT</u>	<u>37</u>
<u>APPENDIX D – ST.LUCIE/MARTIN CO. WORKSHOP AND MATERIALS</u>	<u>45</u>
<u>APPENDIX E – LAKE/SUMTER/MARION CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES, WORKSHOP AND MATERIALS</u>	<u>74</u>

# **SUMMARY OF FINAL REPORT**

## **Problem Statement**

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) faced numerous challenges in coordinating designation of new metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) after the most recent decennial census. The Governor requested that FDOT consult with representatives of newly designated urbanized areas and existing MPOs prior to the Governor's request for membership apportionment plans, a boundary map identifying the metropolitan planning area boundary and all entities eligible for MPO membership pursuant to statute. A push for more regionally focused MPOs, made the recent round of designations even more challenging. Therefore, FDOT requested assistance through applied research to help define and develop approaches to integrate best practices for collaborative planning, consensus building and conflict resolution for this critical piece of the decision-making process.

## **Objective**

The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium (FCRC) worked with the FDOT through consultation with its District offices and the respective MPOs and local governments to develop model approaches to facilitated consultations for possible MPO redesignations. The model included the following services and products:

- Contacted each District and engaged in initial interviews with key contacts
- Designed a consultation MPO designation process to fit the needs of each District that requested assistance.
- Developed meeting agendas and related materials for consultation designation meetings.
- Facilitated consultation meetings.
- Drafted and conducted surveys of participants on concerns and on examples of successful regional transportation cooperation.
- Drafted a summary process report for each designation consultation meeting.

## **Findings and Conclusions**

1. The model meeting process was an effective means for FDOT to respond to the Governor's request for consultation with affected parties on MPO redesignation issues, to solicit the views of MPO board members and staff on the relative merits of potentially consolidating MPOs as a means of achieving effective transportation planning for their urbanized area, to identify and review alternative means of achieving effective transportation planning, and to explore possible next steps.
2. The model process was most effective when neutral facilitators were enlisted early in the consultation process to engage key participants in the development of the agenda, related meeting materials and issues to be discussed as part of the process. This early engagement established trust and commitment to the process.

3. The model process was less effective when MPOs had already formally adopted positions in opposition to the consultation process prior to the neutral facilitators participation in the process. But even in these cases the model was flexible enough to allow for productive discussions between key participants that expanded the opportunity for future development of regional joint planning.
4. Written participant surveys conducted during or at the conclusion of the meetings on concerns and on examples of successful regional transportation cooperation was of limited value in establishing opportunities for future joint planning. Facilitated discussions during the meetings offered better input in identifying effective future opportunities.

## **Benefits**

The applied research helped define and develop a conflict resolution process that provided a variety of benefits, including: 1) more effective and efficient use of FDOT resources, especially personnel; 2) opportunities to build essential new relationships and mend existing relationships between key participants; 3) identified opportunities for effective regional transportation cooperation; and 4) a process model flexible enough to meet the varying needs of participants and situations. A facilitated consensus building process, if applied early, can be an effective tool for FDOT in coordinating future MPO designation consultations.

The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium, a neutral center with offices at Florida State University and the University of Central Florida, conducted this research. For more information contact Hal Beardall, Project Manager, at (850) 644-6320, <mailto:hmb5609@fsu.edu>

## **Introduction**

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) faced numerous challenges in coordinating designation of new metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) after the most recent decennial census. A push for more regionally focused MPOs, made the recent round of designations even more challenging. Therefore, FDOT requested assistance through applied research to help define and develop approaches to integrate best practices for collaborative planning, consensus building and conflict resolution for this critical piece of the decision-making process.

The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium (FCRC) worked with the FDOT through consultation with its District offices and the respective MPOs and local governments to provide the following services and products:

- Contacted each District and engaged in initial interviews with key contacts to determine the number and level of services each district required.
- Designed a consultation MPO designation process to fit the needs of each District that requested assistance.
- Developed meeting agendas and related materials for consultation designation meetings.
- Facilitated consultation meetings.
- Drafted and conducted surveys of participants on concerns and on examples of successful regional transportation cooperation.
- Drafted a summary process report for each designation consultation meeting.

The following is a summary of services provided to each FDOT District. Additional information in the form of workshop summaries (including agenda packets), process summaries and an interlocal agreement are provided in the respective Appendices for those process with the highest level of FCRC involvement.

## **MPO Consultation Summaries**

District 1

### *Lee & Collier County MPO Consultation*

After extensive consultation with the District staff and key contacts, FCRC designed a process and meeting materials to the requested needs of the District for a consultation workshop. The Lee and Collier County Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) convened a joint workshop of their board members, their Technical Advisory Committees (TAC), and their Citizen Advisory Committees (CAC). Participants also included staff from both MPOs, FDOT District 1 and FDOT Central's Office of Policy Planning.

The purpose of the meeting was to review the process being used by FDOT to respond to the Governor's request for consultation with affected parties on MPO redesignation issues, to solicit the views of MPO board members and staff on the relative merits of consolidating the Lee and Collier County MPOs as a means of achieving effective transportation planning for their urbanized area, to identify and review alternative means of achieving effective transportation planning, and to explore possible next steps. A summary report of the process and of the key points made during discussions at the workshop is included as Appendix A of this report.

All of the MPO participants agreed that this workshop offered sufficient opportunity to voice their concerns and explore the possibility of MPO consolidation and coordination, and they did not foresee any need for additional workshops at that time. The participants agreed to submit a joint letter to the FDOT District 1 Secretary outlining future joint efforts to coordinate regional transportation planning. As of this final report the letter was still pending.

### Sarasota/Manatee & Punta Gorda/Charlotte County MPO

After extensive consultation with the District staff and key contacts, FCRC designed a process and meeting materials to fit the District's need for a consultation workshop. The Sarasota/Manatee and Charlotte County-Punta Gorda Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) convened a joint workshop of several of their board members and their staff directors to consult with staff from FDOT District 1 and FDOT Central's Office of Policy Planning regarding mechanisms for achieving effective transportation planning for the urbanized area. The purpose of the meeting was to review the process being used by FDOT to respond to the Governor's request for consultation with affected parties on MPO redesignation issues, to solicit the views of MPO board members and staff on the relative merits of consolidating the Sarasota/Manatee and Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPOs as a means of achieving effective transportation planning for their urbanized area, to identify and review alternative means of achieving effective transportation planning, and to explore possible next steps.

A summary report of the process and of the key points made during discussions at the workshop has been drafted and is included as part this final consultation report in Appendix B.

The participants agreed to have the staffs for each MPO draft a joint letter that lays out how the MPOs will enhance coordination of future transportation planning for the region. The FDOT staff agreed to extend the original April 30 deadline for concluding the consultation process to allow for drafting and approval of the joint letter. The participants agreed that they did not foresee a need for additional workshops at that time.

An interlocal agreement for joint regional transportation planning and coordination between the Sarasota/Manatee and Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPOs was signed in January, 2004, and submitted to FDOT District 1. A copy is included as Appendix C of this report.

## **District 2**

### First Coast and St Johns County-St. Augustine MPO Consultation

After extensive consultation with the District staff and key contacts, FCRC designed a process and meeting materials for a possible consultation workshop with the affected stakeholders. The

District instead pursued separate discussions with the different stakeholders.

FCRC staff members subsequently attended and offered its services both during and following a contentious meeting of the First Coast MPO. In further discussion with District staff, FCRC offered possible alternative process designs for conducting a consultation between the stakeholders.

This particular consultation eventually resulted in the expansion of the First Coast MPO to include the St. Augustine urbanized area as well as the establishment of an independent staff housed outside of the City of Jacksonville's administrative control.

District 4 (part)

*St. Lucie & Martin County MPO Consultation*

After extensive consultation with the District staff and key contacts, FCRC designed a process and meeting materials to fit the District's need for a consultation workshop. St. Lucie and Martin County Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) convened a joint workshop of their advisory committees. Participating were the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of each MPO, the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) of the St. Lucie MPO, the Citizens' Involvement Roundtable (CIR) of the Martin MPO, and as staff from both MPOs and FDOT.

The purpose of the meeting was to review the process being used by FDOT to respond to the Governor's request for consultation with affected parties on MPO redesignation issues, to solicit the views of MPO advisors and staff on the relative merits of consolidating the St. Lucie and Martin MPOs as a means of achieving effective transportation planning for their urbanized area, to identify and review alternative means of achieving effective transportation planning, and to clarify next steps and preparations for a proposed joint MPO workshop. A summary report of the process and of the key points made during discussions at the workshop has been drafted and is included in this final report as Appendix D.

Following the initial workshop and further discussion with District staff, the District staff did not convene another joint MPO workshop and pursued resolution through direct discussions between the District Secretary and representatives of the MPOs.

**Districts 4 & 6**

*Broward, Miami-Dade & Palm Beach County MPO Consultation*

After extensive consultation with the staff in each District, FCRC designed a process and meeting materials to fit the District's need for a consultation workshop. The District staffs, led by the respective District Secretaries, pursued resolution through direct discussions with representatives of the MPOs drawing upon existing examples of partnering on regional transportation planning between the three MPOs.

**District 5**

*Lake, Marion and Sumter Counties St. Augustine MPO Consultation*

After a series of assessment interviews and meetings were conducted with stakeholders, the FCRC designed a process and meeting materials to fit the District's need for a consultation workshop. The District then convened a meeting of representatives from FDOT Office of Policy Planning, the Marion County MPO, Sumter County, Lake County and other key local governments to explore the implications of several possible MPO designation options available to participants. The purpose of the discussion was to explore as fully as possible the pros and

cons of each option, to identify questions that remained unanswered about any of the options, and to obtain a preliminary sense of the groups' reaction to each option.

Following the meeting, the FCRC staff continued to play a key role in facilitating discussions and the sharing of information between the various stakeholders as additional options unfolded. These efforts included not only keeping key parties in constructive contact with each other but also soliciting input on new options through surveys.

Through the consultation process a final agreement was reached among all of the participants. A new MPO will be created to include Lake and Sumter Counties, including the portion of Lady Lakes in Lake County with the portion of that municipality located in Marion County remaining with the Marion MPO. Additional information is available in a summary report of the consultation process attached as Appendix E.

## **District 7**

### **Hillsborough, Pasco and Pinellas Counties MPO Consultation**

After limited consultation with the District staff, FCRC offered a description of the various processes and meeting materials being utilized in the other Districts. The District staff pursued resolution through direct discussions with representatives of the MPOs and the existing Chairmans Coordinating Council.

## **Overall Process**

All of the activities listed above included extensive efforts to work with District staffs and reflect adjustments to meet the needs of all of the stakeholders involved in each consultation. Due to the size and complexity of each of these facilitated processes, the FCRC involved multiple staff members in assisting each District with its respective designation consultation with MPOs and local governments.

**APPENDIX A**

**LEE AND COLLIER COUNTY  
JOINT MPO REDESIGNATION WORKSHOP**

**Workshop Summary**

Workshop facilitated and report prepared by  
The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Lee and Collier County Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) convened a joint workshop of their board members, their Technical Advisory Committees (TAC), and their Citizen Advisory Committees (CAC). Participating also included staff from both MPOs, FDOT District 1 and FDOT Central's Office of Policy Planning.

The meeting was convened at the request of District 1 of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). The purpose of the meeting was to review the process being used by FDOT to respond to the Governor's request for consultation with affected parties on MPO redesignation issues, to solicit the views of MPO board members and staff on the relative merits of consolidating the Lee and Collier County MPOs as a means of achieving effective transportation planning for their urbanized area, to identify and review alternative means of achieving effective transportation planning, and to explore possible next steps.

This report presents a summary of the key points made during discussions at the workshop. It is not a verbatim record of those discussions, and does not include the presentations that were part of the workshop.

## **II. PROCESS**

All discussions were facilitated and notes of the key points were captured on flipcharts. Transcripts of the flipchart records form the basis of this report. A more detailed account of the process used for each discussion appears in the corresponding section of this report. The agenda used in the workshop is part of the this report as appendix A.

## **III. MPO STRUCTURE OPTIONS**

Following introductions and an overview of the consultation process, FDOT staff presented information about the effect of consolidated or separate MPOs on the issues of transportation funding, membership, project priorities, and certification (see the matrix on pages 4-8 of Appendix A). Participants were then asked if they had any questions for clarification of the information in the matrix. Their questions are presented below.

### Questions for Clarification:

- Effect of consolidated MPO on county-wide transportation planning and concurrency?
- Consolidation would complicate things – MPO would have to know and apply to county plans.
- What is the problem that would be solved?
- (Discussion of need for regional planning.)
- Why are we addressing this if we have adopted and signed resolutions?
- (It was recognized and copies offered of a joint resolution adopted by the Lee County MPO earlier on March 21 and by Collier County MPO on February 14. See Appendix B)

Participants were asked to offer their concerns and comments about possible consolidation of the two MPOs. Their concerns are presented below.

### Comments and Concerns about Consolidation:

- Concerned there will be a disconnect from local concerns if the public input process is done jointly

- If it ain't broke don't fix it
- We do not have to combine everything when we can coordinate on the issues we need to.
- Current mechanisms necessary are already in place. Project prioritization is the most difficult issue to consolidate. Is something in one county more important than in the other?
- I am concerned about the lack of familiarity with the other county. How many people would it take to make decisions? Best to let staff work it out.
- Board members are local representatives best able to address local issues and concerns. How would representation between the two counties be divided equitably?
- Local boards represent small cities. Small cities would be pushed further away. Transportation issues are primarily local concerns. There is no dissent on need for coordination, but it should be to the degree set out in the joint resolution. No need to fix it if it is not broken.
- I still question about what the consolidation concept is about. Local officials need more information. We want to contain what works now.
- Just because both have grown we still have different needs. In the matrix it is recognized that local concerns need to be addressed. What are we trying to fix? Where are we not working well now?
- What is the fundamental advantage of consolidating? Consolidation will dilute the knowledge and expectation of the public for looking at micro not macro view. The RPC addresses region issues.
- We know what we need to know about consolidating the MPOs and we have already decided not to consolidate
- Existing MPO's are thinking regionally and acting locally
- The state has already said in the SIS designation process that local facilities are not significant regionally

#### **IV. CURRENT MECHANISMS FOR TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION**

In order to identify existing mechanisms utilized by the two MPOs to coordinate regional transportation planning needs, participants were asked to list what transportation coordination mechanisms Lee and Collier Counties were currently using successfully. Their replies and comments were as follows:

- Coordination of 5 yr plans (CAP transportation components) through DOT Liaison
- Monthly discussions at RPC meetings, not just on road building, but also on things like workforce, housing & their effects.
- Quarterly coordination meetings
- Cross membership on TACs
- Annual/Joint meetings between the Boards
- Coordinated staff efforts
- Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC)
- Future reciprocal membership of staff on each other's TAC's
- Regional transportation subcommittee of RPC which discusses policy issues
- Bi County study of Bonita Area through committee of both MPO's. The recommendations went to both MPO's
- We have created mechanisms when needed

- SWFTI; supported each other in the state legislative session
- Modification of I-95 PD&E in response to Collier’s concerns
- Joint work on I-75 by pass responds to many regional needs such as traffic, hurricane evacuation, airport
- Current coordination by FDOT staff
- Regular freight study
- Model and data efforts

**V. OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADDITIONAL TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION**

As a point of departure for a discussion of alternative means (other than consolidation) of achieving more effective regional transportation planning cooperation, participants were asked to respond to the statement that follows, using the four point scale that appears below.

*Transportation cooperation mechanisms currently in place between the Lee and Collier MPOs are fully capable of meeting current and future needs.*

Agree	4
Minor Reservations	3
Major Reservations	2
Disagree	1

Their responses were as follow.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
No. of Participants	14	5	0	0

Participants were then asked if there were any additional coordination mechanisms that the two MPOs should explore collaboratively to meet future transportation planning needs. Their suggestions were as follows:

- Regional models and needs plan
- Regional Planning Council provides ongoing coordination
- Future needs to coordinate with Charlotte and the private sector.

Collier MPO representatives offered a list of current regional coordination efforts between the two MPOs along with recommendations for both joint coordination and separate actions in the future (see Appendix C). Lee County MPO officials indicated they would need to review the list before responding to the recommendations

**NEXT STEPS**

All of the MPO participants agreed that this workshop offered sufficient opportunity to voice their concerns and explore the possibility of MPO consolidation and coordination, and they did not foresee any need for additional workshops at this time.

**APPENDIX A – WORKSHOP AGENDA PACKET**  
**Joint Lee and Collier County MPO Workshop Session**  
**March 21, 2003**

**Proposed Workshop Objectives**

- ❑ To review the context for the Governor’s request for a consultation with affected parties on post-census MPO redesignation issues.
- ❑ To review consultative process roles and components.
- ❑ To review and discuss characteristics for urbanized areas in Lee and Collier Counties and the implications for MPO structures.
- ❑ To identify and review alternative means of achieving effective transportation planning for the urbanized area.
- ❑ To clarify next steps and assignments.

**Draft Agenda**

- 2:00 Welcome, Review of Agenda and Ground Rules for Workshop**
- 2:10 Overview of the Consultation Process, Respective Roles of MPOs, FDOT and Governor, and Next Steps in MPO Redesignation Process**
- 2:30 Presentation on MPO Structure Options**
- 2:50 Review and Discuss Characteristics for Urbanized Areas in Lee and Collier Counties and the Implications for MPO Structure**
- 3:15 Break**
- 3:30 Identify Alternative Means of Achieving Effective Transportation Planning for Urbanized Areas in Lee and Collier Counties**
- ❑ Identify and evaluate regional coordination mechanisms currently used in urbanized area
  - ❑ Identify and discuss mechanisms necessary to ensure effective regional coordination
- 4:30 Next Steps in the Consultation Process.**
- 4:45 Review and Summarize the Workshop Results and**
- 4:55 Complete Workshop Evaluation and Input Survey Form.**
- 5:00 Adjourn.**

## GROUND RULES

This workshop is an opportunity to explore possibilities. Offering or exploring an idea does not necessarily imply support for it.

Listen to understand.

State and test your assumptions.

We are many, we have a lot to discuss, and we have limited time. Say everything that needs to be said, concisely. Share the airtime.

Please look to the facilitator to be recognized.

Speak one person at a time. Please don't interrupt each other. Feel free to interrupt the facilitator.

Focus on issues, not personalities.

## **FACT SHEET**

### **MPO Consultation Process on Designation/ Re-Designation**

1. Federal and state law requires that an MPO shall be designated for urbanized areas of more than 50,000 population. More than one MPO may be designated if the size and complexity of an existing metropolitan planning area warrant that course of action.
2. Metropolitan planning area boundaries include within it the “urbanized area” and the contiguous area that is expected to become urbanized within 20 years. Metropolitan planning area boundaries cannot overlap.
3. State law (339.175 FS) requires the Governor to review the composition of MPO membership in conjunction with decennial census and reapportionment membership to comply with statutory requirements.
4. Governor has requested FDOT to consult with representatives of newly designated urbanized areas and existing MPOs prior to the Governor’s request for membership apportionment plans, a boundary map identifying the metropolitan planning area boundary and all entities eligible for MPO membership pursuant to statute.
5. Secretary Tom Barry sent a February 27, 2003 letters to [Insert relevant individuals] with an initial request that consideration be given to consolidation of two MPOs into a single one, over a period of up to three years. Alternatively, if it can be substantiated that more than one MPO is appropriate due to the size and complexity of the area, the redesignation of separate MPOs would be contingent upon the development and implementation of certain regional coordination mechanisms.
6. Governor Bush is interested in addressing how regional issues and regional transportation systems are “supporting Florida’s international and inter-regional goals while ensuring a continued sensitivity to our environment and communities.” This is consistent with the 2020 FTP and the SIS proposals.
7. February 27, 2003 letter from Secretary Tom Barry to MPOs notes that the Districts will be conducting the consultation process with MPOs on behalf of FDOT. The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium a neutral center based at Florida State University, has been asked to assist in designing and facilitating the consultation process.
8. FDOT will develop final recommendations identifying MPO institutional and outcome oriented process improvements needed to address regional issues and regional transportation systems to the Governor by April 30, 2003 based on this consultation input.
9. Outcome oriented process improvements may include: inter MPO agreements; cooperatively developed products from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues; regional LRTPs; regional project priority process; regional public involvement process; coordinated regional air quality planning;; and other mechanisms that address regional transportation issues.
10. Governor ultimately must reach “agreement” on boundary maps and membership apportionment plans with local governments representing 75% of the affected population including the central city or cities. The Governor will approve the plans if they meet the equitable geographic-population ratio and other applicable requirements of state and federal law.

## WORKSHEET 1

*MPO Structure Options by Issue*

*Cape Coral and Bonita Springs-Naples Transportation Management Areas (TMA)*

Issue	Consolidated MPO	Multiple MPOs
<b>Transportation Funding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Amount of federal and state funding available for transportation projects is independent of MPO structure.</li> <li>▪ Federal and state funds allocated by District 4 are distributed on equitable (population) basis over time and tracked by county. Three northern counties receive larger share of these funds than required by population (statutory formula). See Exhibit A tables.</li> <li>▪ The new TMA designation for new Bonita Springs/Naples urbanized area resulted in loss of flexibility to use federal Section 5307 funds for transit operating assistance.</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recent revision to FDOT formula for distributing federal metropolitan transportation planning (PL) funds would hold consolidating MPOs harmless.</li> <li>▪ MPO consolidation would not affect PL fund carryover balances.</li> <li>▪ Presents opportunities for staff efficiencies, diversification and recruitment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Projects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ May offer advantage in fundraising from enhanced regional identity.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inclusion of base allocation in revised FDOT formula prevented reductions in PL fund allocations for existing smaller MPOs. Future increases in PL funds to be distributed among MPOs based on population.</li> <li>▪ Each MPO responsible for full complement of transportation plans, programs and processes required under federal and state law.</li> </ul> <p><b>Projects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No change</li> </ul>

Issue	Consolidated MPO	Multiple MPOs
<b>Membership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MPO is defined in federal law as forum for cooperative transportation decision making for metropolitan planning area (MPA).</li> <li>▪ MPO has five to 19 members apportioned to ensure equitable geographic and population representation within MPA.</li> <li>▪ MPO has flexibility in choosing voting mechanism used (e.g., one vote per member, weighted votes).</li> <li>▪ Except on decisions relating to MPO designation and membership apportionment, county commissioners on MPO are deemed to represent population in incorporated and unincorporated portions of MPA.</li> <li>▪ Federal law requires additional members for MPOs in TMAs (officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation, appropriate state officials).</li> <li>▪ State law allows member of planning board, official of agency that operates or administers major mode of transportation, or official of Spaceport Florida Authority to be voting member of MPO.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number and distribution of county commissioners on MPO covering all or parts of multiple counties subject to negotiation within limits of state statute.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number of county commissioners on MPO governed by state statute.</li> </ul>

Issue	Consolidated MPO	Multiple MPOs
<b>Project Priority Setting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Primary basis for project priority setting is long range transportation plan (LRTP), which has planning horizon of at least 20 years. LRTP must provide for interconnected, multimodal transportation system and emphasize projects that serve important regional and national transportation functions.</li> <li>▪ MPOs prioritize projects within their metropolitan planning area boundaries (MPAs).</li> <li>▪ Transportation, capital improvements, future land use and intergovernmental coordination elements are among required elements in local government comprehensive plans. LRTPs and Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) must be consistent with comprehensive plans to maximum extent feasible.</li> <li>▪ Appropriate dispute resolution processes should be identified and available independent of MPO structure.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MPO has MPA boundary for entire urbanized area.</li> <li>▪ Provides for project priority setting from regional perspective with input from local elected officials.</li> <li>▪ Efficient for purposes of identifying, prioritizing and implementing projects within metropolitan area.</li> <li>▪ Have established regional transportation model for identifying transportation needs (Lee and Collier).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Each MPO has MPA boundary for its portion of urbanized area. Coordination required to ensure no overlap of MPA boundaries.</li> <li>▪ Local input into project prioritization process maximized.</li> <li>▪ Need mechanisms for cooperating on development of regional LRTP and TIPs, project prioritization and project implementation.</li> <li>▪ Need mechanisms for coordinating input on model and use of model results as relate to metropolitan area.</li> </ul>

Issue	Consolidated MPO	Multiple MPOs
<b>Regional Planning/ Coordination</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Appropriate dispute resolution processes should be identified and available independent of MPO structure.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Best match to intent of federal and state law (one MPO per urbanized area or group of urbanized areas).</li> <li>▪ Efficient for purposes of developing and implementing plans, programs and processes for metropolitan area.</li> <li>▪ MPO could be structured to ensure local concerns are addressed. Existing intergovernmental coordination mechanisms could be more effectively implemented.</li> <li>▪ Conducive to regional planning more generally (e.g., Regional Transit Development Plan).</li> <li>▪ Consistent with land use and traffic patterns in metropolitan area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need mechanisms for cooperating on development and implementation of regional plans, programs and processes, and ensuring consistency of other plans, programs and processes across MPOs.</li> <li>▪ Need mechanisms for coordinating data collection and analysis efforts relevant to metropolitan area.</li> <li>▪ Responsive to local concerns.</li> <li>▪ Can coordinate to develop regional plans and promote regional planning.</li> <li>▪ Reflect differing approaches to growth management.</li> </ul>

Issue	Consolidated MPO	Multiple MPOs
<b>Certification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MPOs in TMA are subject to two certification reviews: (1) annual reviews conducted by FDOT, and (2) triennial reviews with focus on TMA conducted by FHWA and FTA.</li> <li>▪ Certification reviews involve determination of whether MPOs are addressing major transportation issues facing urbanized areas/TMAs and meeting metropolitan transportation planning requirements in federal and state law.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Federal review of consolidated MPO, one certification and one report for TMA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Federal review of each MPO, individual certifications and joint report for TMA.</li> </ul>

**EXHIBIT A**

<b>Federal (X) and State (D) Funds Allocated by District 1</b>					
<b>Highways &amp; Public Transportation Projects</b>					
<b>Urban</b>					
<b>County</b>	<b>Percentage of Distribution by Population (Statutory Formula)</b>		<b>Percentage of Distribution in Work Programs</b>		
	<b>100%</b>	<b>80% (minimum)</b>	<b>5 Yr History</b>	<b>5 Yr Plan</b>	<b>10 Yr</b>
<b>Charlotte</b>	7.022%	5.617%	7.209%	6.459%	6.933%
<b>Collier</b>	11.663%	9.330%	8.557%	12.893%	10.154%
<b>Lee</b>	21.037%	16.830%	18.999%	20.552%	19.571%
<b>Polk</b>	23.309%	18.647%	24.047%	20.906%	22.890%
<b>Sarasota</b>	14.364%	11.491%	13.208%	12.634%	12.997%
<b>Manatee</b>	11.662%	9.330%	8.146%	12.749%	9.841%

<b>Federal (X) and State (D) Funds Allocated by District 1</b>					
<b>Highways &amp; Public Transportation Projects</b>					
<b>Rural</b>					
<b>County</b>	<b>Percentage of Distribution by Population (Statutory Formula)</b>		<b>Percentage of Distribution in Work Programs</b>		
	<b>100%</b>	<b>80% (minimum)</b>	<b>5 Yr History</b>	<b>5 Yr Plan</b>	<b>10 Yr</b>
<b>Desoto</b>	1.234%	.987%	3.542%	2.470%	3.148%
<b>Glades</b>	.443%	.355%	2.086%	1.709%	1.947%
<b>Hardee</b>	1.244%	.995%	2.381%	2.496%	2.423%
<b>Hendry</b>	1.897%	1.518%	2.203%	1.875%	2.082%
<b>Highlands</b>	3.921%	3.129%	5.170%	2.836%	4.311%
<b>Okeechobee</b>	2.214%	1.771%	4.458%	2.428%	3.710%

Source: FDOT District 1, Amounts by County (Highways and PTO Components)  
 FY 1998/99 to  
FY 2007/08 (2/10/03).

## WORKSHEET 2

Please rank the potential for enhancing regional cooperation of the following cooperative product and process oriented strategies

<b>Product-Oriented Strategies</b>	<i>High Potential</i>			<i>Low Potential</i>	
<b>Cooperatively developed planning products from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues;</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Regional LRTPs;</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Regional project prioritization</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Coordinate data collection and analysis</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Joint Technical Modeling</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Regional transit organization</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Regional transit plan</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Other_____</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Other_____</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Other_____</b>	5	4	3	2	1
 <b>Process-Oriented Strategies</b>	 <i>High Potential</i>			 <i>Low Potential</i>	
<b>Cooperatively developed planning from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues.</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Quarterly joint meetings</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Inter-MPO coordinating structure (e.g. coordinating committees, alliances)</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Regional public involvement process;</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Cross membership/staffing (TAC/CAC)</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Other_____</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Other_____</b>	5	4	3	2	1

**Lee and Collier  
MPO DESIGNATION CONSULTATION PROCESS  
INPUT SURVEY**

*Please complete the survey below and hand it in to the meeting facilitator before leaving. Your responses will be compiled with others in the region and captured in the Consultation Report to the FDOT produced by the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium.*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**Check which apply:**

Lee \_\_\_\_\_ Collier \_\_\_\_\_

Board member \_\_\_\_\_ TAC member \_\_\_\_\_ CAC member \_\_\_\_\_ MPO Staff \_\_\_\_\_

Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Note your level of agreement with the following three statements:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Agree      Minor      Major      Disagree

**Reservations Reservations**

1. The Lee and Collier MPOs should engage in a process to consolidate over the next 3 years.	4	3	2	1
--	---	---	---	---

*Comments:*

2. The Lee and Collier MPOs should further explore the implementation of high-potential coordination strategies.	4	3	2	1
--	---	---	---	---

*Comments:*

3. Transportation cooperation mechanisms currently in place between the Lee and Collier MPOs are fully capable of meeting current and future needs.	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

*Comments:*

4. Rank the potential for enhancing regional cooperation of the following cooperative outcome and process oriented strategies

<b>Product-Oriented Strategies</b>	<b>Higher Potential</b>			<b>Lower Potential</b>	
<b>4a. Cooperatively developed planning products from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues;</b> <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>4b. Regional LRTPs;</b> <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>4c. Regional project prioritization</b> <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>4d. Coordinate data collection and analysis</b> <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>4e. Joint Technical Modeling</b> <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>4f. Regional transit organization</b> <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>4g. Regional transit plan</b> <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Other _____</b>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Other _____</b>	5	4	3	2	1

5. Rank the potential for enhancing regional cooperation of the following cooperative outcome and process oriented strategies

<b>Process-Oriented Strategies</b>	<b><i>Higher Potential</i></b>			<b><i>Lower Potential</i></b>	
<b>5a. Cooperatively developed planning from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues;</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b><i>Comments:</i></b>					
<b>5b. Quarterly joint meetings</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>5c. Inter-MPO coordinating structure (e.g. coordinating committees, alliances)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>5d. Regional public involvement process;</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b><i>Comments:</i></b>					
<b>5e. Cross membership/staffing (TAC/CAC)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b><i>Comments:</i></b>					
<b>Other _____</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Other _____</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

- **List the most pressing challenges or issues for regional transportation cooperation:**
  
- **List any past successful examples of regional transportation cooperation between the Lee and Collier MPOs.**

**Other Comments:**

## **APPENDIX B**

### **JOINT WORKSHOP OF THE COLLIER AND LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS AND ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

**MARCH 21, 2003**

**2:00 P.M.**

**Bonita Springs Community Center  
10520 Reynolds Street  
Bonita Springs, Florida 34135**

#### **Dear MPO Board Members:**

**It is anticipated that FDOT seeks to either consolidate the Collier and Lee MPO's or to consolidate the Collier and Lee MPO staff. In anticipation of the topics that may be discussed tomorrow, we would offer the following summary of the current regional coordination efforts and recommendations for additional regional coordination. The current regional coordination efforts and the recommendations for additional regional coordination fully address the issues provided by FDOT for consolidation.**

Current Regional Coordination Efforts between Lee MPO and Collier MPO:

- Attendance at the quarterly Coordinated Urban Transportation Studies (CUTS) meetings.
- Attendance at the monthly Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council (SWFRPC) meetings.
- Serve as voting members on each MPO's monthly Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings.
- Annual Joint Meeting of the Collier MPO and Lee MPO (The March 21, 2003 Joint Workshop is the second meeting in the past 6 months, previous meeting October 2002 also included a joint TAC meeting).
- Continue the current regional coordination transportation planning by Lee and Collier Transportation Staff.
- Attendance at the quarterly Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC)—  
Statewide representation

Recommendations:

- Development of a regional model for the Long Range Transportation Plan to be funded, scoped and maintained by the FDOT, with assistance of staff members of both the Collier MPO and the Lee MPO.
- Development of a regional needs plan, to be individually accepted by each MPO Board. Include joint public involvement for the development of the regional needs plan.
- Collier MPO Staff to attend monthly Lee MPO Board meeting.
- Maintain a local cost feasible plan.
- Maintain a local Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).
- Maintain local project prioritization and selection process.

**\*Directions to joint MPO meeting attached.**

cc: Citizens Advisory Committee (by phone)

**APPENDIX E – MEETING EVALUATION SUMMARY**  
**Joint Lee and Collier County MPO Workshop Session**  
**March 21, 2003**

**Meeting Evaluation Form**

**Information from this evaluation will not be reported in a way that individuals or organizations can be identified.**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** PLEASE USE A 0 TO 10 RATING SCALE WHERE A 0 MEANS TOTALLY DISAGREE AND A 10 MEANS TOTALLY AGREE. PLEASE PLACE YOUR RATING IN THE SPACE TO THE LEFT OF EACH QUESTION

**1. Please assess the overall meeting.**

— The groundrules for the meeting were clearly stated.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	2	4	7.92

— The background information was very useful.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
1	0	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	2	6.17

— The agenda packet was very useful.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
1	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	2	6.50

— The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	2	2	2	7.67

— All of the participants fully agreed with the objectives for the meeting.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
1	0	2	3	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	4.92

— The objectives for the meeting were fully achieved.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	6.75

(Please specify any objectives that were not fully achieved.) \_\_\_\_\_

- None, entirely, especially the first
- More [background information] beforehand
- Didn't have anything to prepare with beforehand [in regard to agenda packet]
- Whose [objectives were we agreeing with for this meeting]?
- Problem not stated [in regard to groundrules]
- Questions confusing-if doing something do you say it by how potential for better regional coordination? [?]
- Don't fix something that's not broken

**2. Please tell us how well the facilitator(s) helped the participants engage in the meeting.**

— The participants followed the direction of the facilitator.											
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	4	8.59
— The facilitator made sure the concerns of all participants were heard.											
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	9.34
— The facilitator helped us arrange our time well.											
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	6	9.09
— Participant input was documented accurately.											
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	5	8.75

**3. What is your level of satisfaction with the meeting?**

— Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.											
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	2	2	7.28
— I was very satisfied with the services provided by the facilitator.											
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	8.46
— I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.											
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	3	3	8.17

**4. What progress did you make?**

— I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.											
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
0	1	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	1	2	6.40
— I know who is responsible for the next steps.											
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AVG
0	1	1	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	2	5.70

Do you have any other comments that you would like to add? We are very interested in your comments. Please use the back of this page.

- **4 on [first bullet on] 3 because meeting was redundant to past meetings. Facilitators were great and swiftly handled what we felt was redundant.**
- **Thank you**

**APPENDIX B**

**SARASOTA/MANATEE & CHARLOTTE COUNTY-**  
**PUNTA GORDA**  
**JOINT MPO CONSULTATION WORKSHOP**

**Workshop Summary**

Workshop facilitated and report prepared by  
The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Sarasota/Manatee and Charlotte County-Punta Gorda Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) convened a joint workshop of several of their board members and their staff directors to consult with staff from FDOT District 1 and FDOT Central's Office of Policy Planning regarding mechanisms for achieving effective transportation planning for the urbanized area. The meeting was held at the request of District 1 of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). The purpose of the meeting was to review the process being used by FDOT to respond to the Governor's request for consultation with affected parties on MPO redesignation issues, to solicit the views of MPO board members and staff on the relative merits of consolidating the Lee and Collier County MPOs as a means of achieving effective transportation planning for their urbanized area, to identify and review alternative means of achieving effective transportation planning, and to explore possible next steps.

This report presents a summary of the key points made during discussions at the workshop. It is not a verbatim record of those discussions, and does not include the presentations that were part of the workshop.

## **II. PROCESS**

All discussions were facilitated and notes of the key points were captured on flipcharts. Transcripts of the flipchart records form the basis of this report. A more detailed account of the process used for each discussion appears in the corresponding section of this report. The agenda used in the workshop is part of this report as Appendix A.

## **III. MPO STRUCTURE OPTIONS**

FDOT District 1 Secretary Langley welcomed the MPO Board members and staff. Following introductions, Kathleen Neill from FDOT Central's Office of Policy Planning provided participants with an overview of the consultation process. FDOT District 1 MPO Liason Frank Meares presented information about the effect of consolidated or separate MPOs on the issues of transportation funding, membership, project priorities, and certification (see the matrix on pages 4-8 of Appendix A). Participants were then asked if they had any questions for clarification of the information in the matrix. The subsequent questions developed into a discussion between participants on the pros and cons of consolidated or separate MPOs relative to issues of funding, membership representation, board size, quality of service and project priorities. Their comments, listed by issue, are presented below.

### Possible Savings

- Administrative saving will still be available to both MPOs if consolidated
- Who saves? Any economy of scales will be reinvested

### Transit Funding

- What happens with transit money tied to population? Will each receive the same \$ if consolidated?

- Transit money is tied to urbanized area, not MPA, so merger would not affect the transit \$ each receive
- For new urbanized area, there needs to be negotiations of allocations
- Need to address the allocations of transit dollars

#### MPO funding

- Each MPO receives a base of \$275,000, or a combined \$550,000 for both
- Remainder of funding is population based
- I am concerned that we become one MPO and the formula is later changed and we lose money due to consolidation
- Such a change in the formula would need to go to federal highway and would be difficult to change.
- Concern that consolidation increases the risk for a reduction of funds by the state legislature?
- Funding of MPOs is important for FDOT. It would not be fair to take away money after merger.
- In a consolidated MPO how do we control where the funding goes? Won't the larger County control the funding of projects?
- Priorities for program in the 5 year program direct the funding

#### Membership/Representation

- Current state law limits board membership 19 (1/3 of them must be county commissioners) This creates a problem if the two existing Boards would be a combined 22 members. So some existing members would lose out.
- Important to address the board representation issue for fairness
- Good synergy of existing board (Sarasota/Manatee) would be lost
- Cities, Airport Authority-require more coordination
- Would like to see a cash flow diagram for DOT
- Will not be cost-effective-travel distances (add cost)
- Not less expensive to do planning (one merge)
- Different membership make-up
- Level of collaboration
- DOT District Secretary is ex officio and not part of 19 maximum members
- Polk County is an example of how membership breakdown can be accomplished
- Equitable ratio-population
- Keeping balance (if Charlotte adds) will be difficult

#### Size of Board

- If merged the increased size of the board and of the geographic area would make it more difficult to coordinate. It might require satellite offices, negating any savings from an economy of scale.
- I do not see any reason for consolidation
- The two Boards have a different perception about airports
- We do not need to merge simply because of size. Look at Tampa Bay area and the Chairs Coordinate Committee idea

- Physical size would require satellite offices making it more difficult
- Why consolidate? This process is the result of the census showing how urbanized areas are jumping across county lines. The reality is that more regional transportation planning will be required through better coordination either through mergers or additional coordination mechanisms
- Even with more urbanization and increasing need for coordinating connectors, etc, independent MPOs can achieve it.
- If we merge, the larger geographic area would make public involvement/outreach more difficult and increase related costs

#### Quality of Service

- Whenever coordination is needed, it is being done between the two MPOs
- Board members are local officials with personal knowledge of the local area. That experience is lost if the area is too large
- Manatee County is the service provider to the MPO. What role would the County staff play in a joint MPO?
- Administrative issues-operating MPO (e.g. procurement)
- The board members of a merged MPO may be foreign to an issue or problem in the other county. I do not know the issues and concerns of the other county

#### **IV. CURRENT MECHANISMS FOR TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION**

In order to identify existing mechanisms successfully utilized by the two MPOs to coordinate regional transportation planning needs, participants were asked to list what transportation coordination mechanisms the two MPOs were currently using. Their replies and comments were as follows:

##### Current coordination

- CUTS Committee for MPOs in District 1.
- Through the MPOAC (Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council)
- Regional Planning Councils Transportation Committee
- Ad-hoc meetings for issues, projects
- Transportation system coordination
- Regional model overlapping (tech)
- Through the District 1 MPO Liaison
- The necessary communication between the two MPOs is there
- Coordination is not a problem

## V. OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADDITIONAL TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION

As a point of departure for a discussion of alternative means (other than consolidation) of achieving more effective regional transportation planning cooperation, participants were asked to respond to the statement that follows, using the four point scale that appears below.

*Transportation cooperation mechanisms currently in place between the Sarasota/Manatee and Charlotte-Punta Gorda MPOs are fully capable of meeting current and future needs.*

- 4 = Agree**
- 3 = Minor Reservations**
- 2 = Major Reservations**
- 1 = Disagree**

Their responses were as follow.

<u>Ranking</u>	4	3	2	1
No. of Participants	5	5	2	0

Participants were then asked if there were any additional coordination mechanisms that the two MPOs should explore collaboratively to meet future transportation planning needs. Their suggestions were as follows:

### Potential Coordination Mechanisms

- Annual or semi-annual MPO joint meetings (ad-hoc)
- Coordinate data collection (already preparing)
- Tie in the transportation disadvantaged systems
- Coordination of the LRTP (possible with other counties too like Hillsborough)
- I am satisfied with the way coordination is working now
- We need formalized interlocal agreement to document current coordination efforts
- We need to work together to find new funds for transit projects

### **NEXT STEPS**

The participants agreed to have the staffs for each MPO draft a joint letter that lays out how the MPOs will enhance coordination of future transportation planning for the region. The letter will be addressed to District 1 Secretary Langley. The MPOs will review and approve the letter at their next respective board meetings on April 28 (Sarasota/Manatee) and May 12 (Charlotte-Punta Gorda). The FDOT staff will extend the April 30 deadline for concluding the consultation process to allow for drafting and approval of the joint letter. The participants agreed that they did not foresee a need for additional workshops at this time.

**APPENDIX A – POST MEETING INPUT SURVEY**

**Sarasota/Manatee & Charlotte/Punta Gorda  
MPO DESIGNATION CONSULTATION PROCESS  
INPUT SURVEY**

*Please complete the survey below and hand it in to the meeting facilitator before leaving. Your responses will be compiled with others in the region and captured in the Consultation Report to the FDOT produced by the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium.*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

- Stephen Fabian
- Mark Gumula
- Gary D. Harrell
- Rich Weingarten
- Mac V. Horton
- Don Lee
- McClash
- Shannon Staub

**Check which apply:**

Sarasota/Manatee 2                      Charlotte/Punta Gorda 6

Board member 5 TAC member 1 CAC member 0 MPO Staff 2

Other: Transit manager, County Commissioner District 3

Note your level of agreement with the following three statements:

	Agree	Minor	Major	Disagree	
	<b>Reservations Reservations</b>				
4. The Sarasota/Manatee and Charlotte/Punta Gorda MPOs should engage in a process to consolidate over the next 3 years.	4	3	2	1	
	0	0	0	1	Avg: 1.00
<i>Comments:</i>					
5. The Sarasota/Manatee and Charlotte/Punta Gorda MPOs should further explore the implementation of high-potential coordination strategies.	4	3	2	1	
	4	2	1	1	Avg: 3.13
<i>Comments:</i>					
6. Transportation cooperation mechanisms currently in place between the Sarasota/Manatee and Charlotte/Punta Gorda MPOs are fully capable of meeting current and future needs.	4	3	2	1	
	7	1	0	0	Avg: 3.88
<i>Comments:</i>					

4. Rank the potential for enhancing regional cooperation of the following cooperative outcome and process oriented strategies

<b>Product-Oriented Strategies</b>	<b>Higher Potential</b>			<b>Lower Potential</b>		
<b>4a.</b> Cooperatively developed planning products from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues;	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
	2	2	1	0	1	3.67
<i>Comments:</i>						
<b>4b.</b> Regional LRTPs;	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
	2	2	1	1	1	3.43
<i>Comments:</i>						
<b>4c.</b> Regional project prioritization	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
	2	2	1	1	1	3.43
<i>Comments:</i>						
<b>4d.</b> Coordinate data collection and analysis	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
	2	1	3	0	1	3.43
<i>Comments:</i>						
<b>4e.</b> Joint Technical Modeling	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
	2	1	3	0	1	3.43
<i>Comments:</i>						
<b>4f.</b> Regional transit organization	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
	1	1	2	0	3	2.57
<i>Comments:</i>						
<b>4g.</b> Regional transit plan	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
	1	1	3	0	2	2.86
<i>Comments:</i>						
<i>Comments (on 4):</i>						
<input type="checkbox"/> Already doing them						
<input type="checkbox"/> The above rankings mean we are already doing these things and further enhancement is limited!						
<input type="checkbox"/> [Above] already being accomplished						
Other _____	5	4	3	2	1	
Other _____	5	4	3	2	1	

5. Rank the potential for enhancing regional cooperation of the following cooperative outcome and process oriented strategies

Process-Oriented Strategies	Higher Potential			Lower Potential		
	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
<b>5a.</b> Cooperatively developed planning from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues;	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
<i>Comments:</i>	2	3	1	0	1	3.71
<b>5b.</b> Quarterly joint meetings	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
<i>Comments:</i>	0	2	1	2	1	2.67
<b>5c.</b> Inter-MPO coordinating structure (e.g. coordinating committees, alliances)	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
<i>Comments:</i>	1	3	0	2	1	3.14
<b>5d.</b> Regional public involvement process;	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
<i>Comments:</i>	1	3	0	1	1	3.33
<b>5e.</b> Cross membership/staffing (TAC/CAC)	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
<i>Comments:</i>	1	2	1	1	1	3.17

*Comments:*

*Comments (on 5):*

- Above rankings mean we are already doing these things and there is little room for enhancement.
- [Above] already being accomplished
- Regional planning is important. I question if it going to be best accomplished by consolidation
- Already doing informally

Other \_\_\_\_\_ 5 4 3 2 1

Other \_\_\_\_\_ 5 4 3 2 1

- **List the most pressing challenges or issues for regional transportation cooperation:**
  - Lack of money
  - Maintaining excellent coordination we have now
  - Money
  - Membership and funding
- **List any past successful examples of regional transportation cooperation between the Sarasota/Manatee and Charlotte/Punta Gorda MPOs.**
  - Both have high priority road project on list. Both coordinate road, trails, transit, taxes.
  - Greenways/Englewood interstate con US 41
  - EIC/Winchester Blvd; Char Harbor Heritage Trails Master Plan
  - Winchester Blvd-Charlotte County sales tax to build a road in Sarasota County meeting their construction criteria

**Other Comments:**

- ❑ No need to merge until formalize things we are already doing
- ❑ Please don't fix what works today
- ❑ More money is needed rather than a lot more coordination!
- ❑ Englewood Interstate connector
- ❑ Regional Heritage Trails (Greenways)

APPENDIX C

JANUARY 15, 2004

**INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR JOINT REGIONAL  
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND COORDINATION BETWEEN  
THE SARASOTA/MANATEE AND CHARLOTTE COUNTY-PUNTA GORDA MPOs**

This INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT (hereinafter the Agreement) is made and entered into by and between the Sarasota/Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization (herein, the Sarasota/Manatee MPO), and the Charlotte County-Punta Gorda Metropolitan Planning Organization (herein, the Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO).

WHEREAS, Federal Law requires that Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) be designated for each urbanized area with population of more than 50,000 persons as determined by the United States Bureau of the Census, and

WHEREAS, Section 339.175, Florida Statutes, requires the Governor to review the composition of each MPO membership in conjunction with the decennial census and reapportion, if necessary, said membership to ensure compliance with statutory requirements, and

WHEREAS, the 2000 Census, while still reflecting distinct and separate urbanized areas of Sarasota-Bradenton and North Port-Punta Gorda; the Census does indicate these urbanized areas have grown into the metropolitan study areas of the respective contiguous Sarasota/Manatee and Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPOs, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to letters dated February 27, 2003 (attached and incorporated herein

1 by reference as Exhibit "A": Note, all subsequent references to Exhibits are similarly attached and  
2 incorporated herein by reference), from the Florida Department of Transportation, the  
3 Sarasota/Manatee and Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPOs each were requested to consider  
4 consolidating the two now separate MPOs into a single MPO, and

5 WHEREAS, consistent with FDOT's request, the two MPOs through appointed members of  
6 its governing bodies collaborated at a joint workshop facilitated by FDOT on March 31, 2003, and

7 WHEREAS, it was the collective consensus of the two MPOs at the workshop that while the  
8 time for consolidation was not now ripe because of the size and complexity of the two MPO planning  
9 areas, it would be beneficial to formalize and solidify joint regional cooperation between the MPOs,  
10 and

11 WHEREAS, based upon the workshop consensus, a joint response letter dated May 13, 2003  
12 (Exhibit "B") was prepared, reviewed and approved by the MPO Boards of Sarasota/Manatee (April  
13 28, 2003) and Charlotte County-Punta Gorda (May 12, 2003), and transmitted to FDOT District One  
14 Secretary via correspondence dated May 14, 2003 (Sarasota/Manatee) (Exhibit "C") and May 13,  
15 2003 (Charlotte County-Punta Gorda) (Exhibit "D"), and

16 WHEREAS, FDOT District One in a letter dated July 21, 2003 to the FDOT Office of Policy  
17 Planning (Exhibit "E") transmitted the joint response letter and referenced follow-up consultations  
18 between District staff and the two MPO Directors and staff on June 12, 2003 regarding specific joint

1 authority of Sections 339.175 and 163.01, Florida Statutes, relating to interlocal agreements.

2           **Section 2. Purpose.** The purpose of this Agreement is to promote and establish a forum for  
3 communication and coordination between the Charlotte and Sarasota/Manatee MPOs and to foster  
4 joint regional cooperation and conduct regarding transportation planning in accordance with Section  
5 339.175, Florida Statutes, 23 C.F.R. §450.312 and the goals and requirements of the Transportation  
6 Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century and its successor legislation. More specifically, this Agreement  
7 establishes the commitment by each party to develop joint regional transportation planning products  
8 and processes for the tri-county region of Manatee, Sarasota and Charlotte Counties and provides  
9 targeted timeframes for the accomplishment of these products and processes.

10           **Section 3. Planning Products and Timeframes.** The parties hereby agree to coordinate  
11 and collaborate in good faith and with due diligence to develop the following joint regional planning  
12 products by the target dates set out by each product described below:

13           **(a) Joint Regional Transportation Model**

14           The parties have already commenced development of a tri-county model  
15 validation using the same consultant to assist in this critical planning product  
16 which will form the basis of the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan Update  
17 by the two MPOs for December, 2005. This effort consists of regular model  
18 validation committee meetings by representatives of the member jurisdictions  
19 of the Charlotte County-Punta Gorda and Sarasota/Manatee MPOs. The  
20 completion date of the validated model is anticipated by July, 2004.

1                   **(b) Joint Regional Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Component**  
2                   This will involve identification and designation by the two MPOs of the Joint  
3                   Regional Multi-Modal Transportation System as a component of each MPO's  
4                   LRTP. Specifically, this exercise will identify regionally significant corridors  
5                   and facilities. This should be accomplished with endorsement by the  
6                   respective MPO Boards within six (6) months of the execution of this  
7                   agreement (Summer, 2004). This identified System will be studied and refined  
8                   as necessary as part of each MPO's LRTP update and considered throughout  
9                   the LRTP process and analysis and each MPOs Long Range Plan will be  
10                  consistent with this regional plan.

11                  **(c) Joint Regional Project Priorities**  
12                  Based on the determination of the Joint Regional Multi-Modal Transportation  
13                  System described in paragraph 3(b) above, the MPOs annually will identify  
14                  those priorities on the identified Regional Multi-Modal Transportation System  
15                  and include said projects in the respective MPO's Transportation  
16                  Improvement Programs (TIP) adopted in summer, 2004. In addition, the  
17                  parties will collaborate and prioritize projects on the Regional Multi-Modal  
18                  Transportation System for inclusion in the adopted Project Priorities of each  
19                  MPO in summer, 2004. Each MPOs TIP and Project Priorities will be  
20                  consistent with the identified Regional Priorities and project. This  
21                  collaboration and the products developed will reoccur each subsequent year

1                                    during the duration of this agreement and will be a continuing obligation and  
2                                    commitment.

3                                    **(d) Joint Regional Public Involvement Process Component**

4                                    The parties will collaborate to develop and adopt a Joint Regional Public  
5                                    Involvement Component for inclusion in each MPO's existing Public  
6                                    Involvement Plan. This Joint Regional Component will prescribe public  
7                                    notice and outreach actions and measures to assure public access and  
8                                    involvement for all Joint Regional activities including development of the  
9                                    Regional Long Range Plan component and annual Regional Priority list within  
10                                    the tri-county area. Adoption is anticipated in winter, 2004.

11                                    **Section 4. Staff Services and Costs.** The Directors and staffs of each MPO will be  
12                                    responsible for development of the joint regional products identified in this Agreement with review  
13                                    and final approval by each MPO Board. In this regard, each MPO will cooperate to equitably assign  
14                                    and share in the needed staff resources to accomplish these regional efforts as specified in their  
15                                    respective Unified Planning Work Programs (UPWP). Similarly, non-MPO staff services and costs  
16                                    for the joint regional efforts and products identified in this Agreement will be borne by each individual  
17                                    MPO as described in its UPWP with deference to the size and budgets of the respective MPOs. The  
18                                    parties agree, as may be necessary in order to carry out the terms and commitments of this  
19                                    Agreement, to cooperate in seeking Federal, State and local funding for the joint regional products  
20                                    to be developed.

1 This Agreement shall automatically terminate as described in Section 6 should either of the MPOs  
2 not be redesignated as individual MPOs.

3 **Section 9. Liability.** The parties agree that nothing created or contained in this Agreement  
4 shall be construed, interpreted or inferred to establish any joint liability amongst or between the  
5 parties by the actions or omissions of its individual employees or agents acting pursuant the terms of  
6 this Agreement. In this regard, each party agrees that it shall be solely responsible and bear its own  
7 cost of defending and/or payment of any claim or litigation arising out of the acts or omissions of its  
8 employees or agents for actions or omissions in carrying out the terms and provisions of this  
9 Agreement. Finally, each party agrees to indemnify, hold harmless and defend the other party against  
10 any claims or causes of action based upon the individual acts or omissions of its own employees or  
11 agents.

12 **Section 10. No Joint Employment.** The parties agree that this Agreement is not intended  
13 nor does it create any joint employment agreement status between the employees of the other party.  
14 And further, it is agreed that each employee of the respective parties shall remain under the sole  
15 direction, control and employment of only that employer.

16 **Section 11. Notice.** Any official notice, including the written notice referenced in "Section  
17 8. Termination - Recission," provided for in this Agreement shall be provided by US Mail to the  
18 other party's representative listed below at the following addresses:

1           **Section 5. Conflict Resolution.** The parties to this Agreement mutually commit to  
2 development and adoption of a Conflict Resolution Process to resolve any conflicts related to issues  
3 covered in this Agreement by winter, 2004. Notwithstanding any such resolution process, the parties  
4 to this agreement do not waive their respective rights to seek declaratory judgementS as provided in  
5 Chapter 86, Florida Statutes.

6           **Section 6. Duration of Agreement.** This Agreement shall have a term of 5 years and shall  
7 automatically renew at the end of said 5 years for another 5-year term and every five years thereafter  
8 unless terminated or rescinded as set out in Section 8, herein. At the end of the 5-year term and at  
9 least every 5 years thereafter, the parties hereto shall examine the terms hereof and agree to amend  
10 provisions or reaffirm the same. However, the failure to amend or reaffirm the terms of this  
11 Agreement shall not invalidate or otherwise terminate this Agreement. As a condition subsequent  
12 to the approval of this Agreement, this Agreement shall be null and void and of no effect should the  
13 Governor not issue a letter designating Sarasota/Manatee and Charlotte County-Punta Gorda as  
14 individual MPOs.

15           **Section 7. Modification.** This Agreement may only be modified with the approval of both  
16 parties by adopting a new or Addendum Interlocal Agreement in the same form and manner as this  
17 Agreement.

18           **Section 8. Termination-Rescission.** This Agreement shall continue in force unless terminated  
19 with or without cause by either MPO by providing thirty (30) days written notice to the other MPO.

1 Michael W. Guy  
2 Executive Director  
3 Sarasota/Manatee MPO  
4 7632 15<sup>th</sup> Street East  
5 Sarasota, Florida 34243

Mark Gumula  
Executive Director  
Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO  
28000 A-6 Airport Road  
Punta Gorda, Florida 33982

6 As required by Section 163.01(11), Florida Statutes, this Interlocal Agreement shall be filed  
7 with the Clerks of the Circuit Courts of Manatee, Charlotte and Sarasota Counties, Florida.

8 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties herein have executed this Agreement by their duly authorized  
9 officials as of the day and year written below, and this Agreement shall be effective upon the last  
10 dated execution.

11   
12 Joe McClash, Chair  
13 Sarasota/Manatee MPO

  
Stephen M. Fabian, Jr., Chair  
Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO

14 Date 1-23-04

Date 1-23-04

15 a:\Staff\Howe\Regional\_Interlocal1-2004

**APPENDIX C**

**ST. LUCIE & MARTIN MPOS**  
**JOINT TAC/CAC MPO REDESIGNATION WORKSHOP**

**March 19, 2003**  
**Port St. Lucie Community Center**

**Workshop Summary**

**Workshop facilitated and report prepared by**  
**The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>MPO STRUCTURE OPTIONS</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>CURRENT TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>ADDITIONAL TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>CONSOLIDATION/COORDINATION STATEMENTS</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>OTHER QUESTIONS</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>APPENDIX I – INPUT SURVEY</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>APPENDIX II – WORKSHOP PACKET</u>	<u>X</u>

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **BACKGROUND**

On March 19, 2003 the St. Lucie and Martin County Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) convened a joint workshop of their advisory committees. Participating were the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of each MPO, the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) of the St. Lucie MPO, the Citizens' Involvement Roundtable (CIR) of the Martin MPO, and as staff from both MPOs and FDOT. (For a more detailed list of participants see Appendix III).

The meeting was convened at the request of District 4 of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). The purpose of the meeting was to review the process being used by FDOT to respond to the Governor's request for consultation with affected parties on MPO redesignation issues, to solicit the views of MPO advisors and staff on the relative merits of consolidating the St. Lucie and Martin MPOs as a means of achieving effective transportation planning for their urbanized area, to identify and review alternative means of achieving effective transportation planning, and to clarify next steps and preparations for the joint MPO workshop.

This report presents a summary of the key points made during discussions at the workshop. It is not a verbatim record of those discussions, and does not include the presentations that were part of the workshop.

### **PROCESS**

All discussions were facilitated and notes of the key points made on flipcharts. Transcripts of the flipchart records form the basis of this report. A more detailed account of the process used for each discussion appears in the corresponding section of this report.

## **AGENDA**

The following agenda was used at the workshop.

10:45 Welcome, Review of Agenda and Ground Rules for Workshop

10:50 Overview of Consultative Process and Roles of MPOs, FDOT and Governor

11:00 Key 2000 Census Results and Next Steps in MPO Redesignation Process

11:10 Key Findings from Regional Land Use/Transportation Study

11:30 Presentation on, MPO Structure Options and Case Studies

11:50 Review and Discuss Achieving Effective Transportation Planning for the St. Lucie Urbanized Area through MPO Consolidation

12:20 Identify Alternative Means of Achieving Effective Transportation Planning for Port St. Lucie Urbanized Area

### **12:50 Test Level of Support For Further Exploration of Consolidation or Coordination**

1:05 Review and Summarize Workshop Results, Next Steps and Draft Agenda for the MPO Workshop

1:10 Complete Workshop Input Survey and Evaluation

1:15 Adjourn

## MPO STRUCTURE OPTIONS

Participants were asked to reflect on the information just presented by FDOT staff in the MPO Structure Options matrix (see Appendix II), about the effect of consolidated or separate MPOs on the issues of transportation funding, membership, project priorities, and certification. They were then asked to suggest some of the pros and cons, from their perspective, of either consolidated or separate MPOs relative to each of these issues. Their comments, listed by issue, are presented below.

Issue: Transportation Funding

Consolidated MPO

Pros

1. Attract more funding for large regional projects.
2. Combining bicycle plans, other plans, and management would save money for transportation planning.

Cons

3. Is there a negative in terms of attracting large scale – funding?
4. Support for large projects may detract from support for smaller projects.
5. Currently money is allocated by county. Under consolidation the money would go to area as a whole. It may be dominated by more the more powerful area, if there are no checks & balances.
6. Longer travel times for meetings.

Multiple MPOs

Pros

7. This is the established structure. It is understood.
8. Local control.
9. More precise knowledge of the transportation need at the local level.

Cons

10. Differing priorities.
11. Each MPO has a smaller pot of funds than the consolidated one would.
12. It may effectively mean you pass the buck to other authorities to decide between you if you cannot agree.

Issue: Membership

Consolidated MPO

Pros

13. Efficiencies in staffing, meeting needs, means you can use staff for other new programs. \*
14. Easier to come to a common understanding at what both communities are thinking regarding transportation.
15. There can be flexibility in apportionment. \*

Cons

16. Fewer members, staff.
17. High growth areas dominate membership.

18. There would be so much disagreement, we would forever be going to arbitration.
19. Will require an adjudicator.
20. The current structure allows smaller communities to be represented. In a consolidated MPO, these would fall out.

Multiple MPOs

Pros

21. Local knowledge of the issues.

**Cons**

Issue: Priorities

Consolidated MPO

Pros

22. Regional projects might move towards top of the priorities list.
23. May be able to serve multiple (local and regional) purposes, as in the Puget Sound example.

Cons

- 24. Regional projects may move to the top of the priorities list.**

Multiple MPOs

Pros

25. Local Projects get dealt with more quickly.

Cons

26. Regional projects get less attention than they need.
27. The availability of funding for large ticket items may be less.

Issue: Regional Planning

Consolidated MPO

**Pros**

28. Regional perspective.
29. Forces entities to work together.

**Cons**

30. Regional perspective.
31. Local projects bumped down.

Multiple MPOs

Pros

32. None.

Cons

33. Difficult to achieve good planning with two systems.
34. Requires additional layer to coordinate.
35. Potential for DOT to put funds elsewhere in case of disagreement.

Issue: Certification

Consolidated MPO

Pros

36. Less Paperwork.

Multiple MPOs

Cons

37. More Paperwork.

## CURRENT TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION

As a point of departure for a discussion of alternative means (other than consolidation) of achieving more effective regional transportation planning cooperation, participants were asked to respond to the statement that follows, using the four point scale that appears below.

*Transportation cooperation mechanisms currently in place between the St. Lucie and Martin MPOs are fully capable of meeting current and future needs.*

<b>Agree</b>	<b>4</b>			
Minor Reservations	3			
<b>Major Reservations</b>	<b>2</b>			
Disagree		1		

Their responses were as follow.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
No. of Participants	0	10	7	1

Discussion of the responses suggested that participants perceived a need for using additional coordination mechanisms in order to meet future transportation planning needs.

## ADDITIONAL TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION MECHANISMS

Participants were first asked to review the list of potential additional coordination mechanisms found on Worksheet 2 of their packet, and individually rank them on a five point scale according to their potential to improve coordination between the St. Lucie and Martin MPOs.

Each participant was then given a total of four votes to select items from the lists for discussion in the limited time available in the workshop. (two votes for product-oriented strategies, two for process-oriented strategies).

The results of this selection poll are presented below. Participants' comments on the strategies receiving the most votes follow the results of the selection.

### Selection of Items for Discussion

<i>Product – Orientated</i>		<i>Votes</i>
Cooperatively developed plan		8
Regional LRTP	4	
Regional Transit Plan	4	
Coordinated prioritization	3	
Coordination of data		12
Joint Technical Committees	3	
<i>Process - Oriented</i>		
Cooperative planning		5
Quarterly joint meetings		1
Inter-MPO structure	2	
Regional		0

### Discussion of Additional Coordination Mechanisms

Participants were asked what it would take to implement each of the strategies they selected for discussion. Their comments are presented below.

#### ***Cooperatively Developed Planning Products***

38. Cooperative effort in LRTP planning process to identify and address regional issues. We could both include identical language to this effect in our scopes.
39. Acceptance of common goal.
40. Coordinated data collection. Both MPOs need to acknowledge the validity of the data they each use.

#### ***Coordinated Data***

41. This would take similar technology structures, databases. This is already in the works to a degree
42. Time and money.

#### ***Cross Committee memberships***

43. We would need to coordinate dates, logistics.
44. Commitment of members.
45. We are already spread thin, drawn to different things.
46. Staff would need to get things out clearly and concise ahead of time

### ***Regional Transportation Organization***

47. Political will.
48. Commitment.
49. Edict.
50. Review timeframes for this. Three years is too quick . Five-ten years may be better, with a prescribed program of implementation. Maybe at the end of that we would be ready for consolidation.
51. Gradually, incrementally increase the scope of the implementation effort.

### ***General Comments***

- 52. This was sprung on us by the census. Most communities where MPOs merged had one census cycle of warning.**

## CONSOLIDATION/COORDINATION STATEMENTS

At the end of the workshop, participants were asked to respond to two statements, using the following four-point scale, as a way of summarizing the results of their discussion.

<b>Agree</b>	<b>4</b>
Minor Reservations	3
<b>Major Reservations</b>	<b>2</b>
Disagree	1

The statements appear below, followed by the participant responses from the group as a whole and broken out by county.

*The St. Lucie and Martin MPOs should engage in a process to consolidate over the next 3 years.*

Ranking	4	3	2	1
No. of Participants	0	2	12	2
From Martin MPO	0	2	5	2
From St. Lucie MPO	0	0	8	0

*The St. Lucie and Martin MPOs should further explore the implementation of high-potential coordination strategies.*

Ranking	4	3	2	1
No. of Participants	14	2	0	0
From Martin MPO	8	0	0	0
From St. Lucie MPO	5	2	0	0

## **OTHER QUESTIONS**

The following questions were presented by participants to FDOT for later clarification.

53. What would be the role of County Commissioners in the MPO, especially those representing rural parts of the County? Whom do they represent? [This comment will be clarified by the participant who offered in the final draft of this report.]
54. The questions outlined in the County letters to FDOT will need to be clarified.
55. Would consolidation of the MPOs lead to combined or fewer FDOT work programs throughout the state, or to any other structural changes to how FDOT does business?

**APPENDIX I – INPUT SURVEY RESULTS**

**St.Lucie/Martin MPOs Redesignation Consultative Process Input Survey “Master”**

	Agree	Minor Reservations	Major Reservation	Disagree
	4	3	2	1
<b>1) The St. Lucie and Martin MPOs should engage in a process to consolidate over the next 3 years?</b>				
<i>Martin TAC Members</i>	1	1	2	1
<i>Comments: Workshops w/both should be held prior to forming conclusions. More 3 yrs?</i>				
<i>Martin CAC/CIR Members</i>			2	1
<i>St. Lucie TAC Members</i>			4	
<i>Comments: the period is too short. If the political decision is made to consolidate it should be implemented in a 10 yr period to end in 2010. Concern over loss of control.</i>				
<i>St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members</i>			3	
<i>Martin County MPO Staff Members</i>				1
<i>Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council</i>		1		
<b>Grand Total</b>	1	2	11	3
<b>2) The St. Lucie and Martin MPOs should further explore the implementation of high-potential coordination strategies</b>				
<i>Martin TAC Members</i>	5			
<i>Martin CAC/CIR Members</i>	2	1		

St. Lucie TAC Members	3	1		
St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members	2		1	
Martin County MPO Staff Members	1			

**Comments: A # of Coordination/Cooperation strategies already exist**

Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council	1			
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

**3) Transportation cooperation mechanisms currently in place between the St. Lucie and Martin MPOs are fully capable of meeting current and future needs**

Martin TAC Members		2	3	
Martin CAC/CIR Members		2	1	
St. Lucie TAC Members		3	1	
St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members			3	
Martin County MPO Staff Members		1		
Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council				1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>

**4) Rank the potential for enhancing regional cooperation of the following cooperative outcome and process oriented strategies**

<b>Product-Oriented Strategies</b>	<b>Higher Potential</b>			<b>Lower Potential</b>	
	5	4	3	2	1

**4a Cooperatively developed planning products from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues**

Martin TAC Members	1	3	1
Martin CAC/CIR Members	1		1

<i>St. Lucie TAC Members</i>	1	1	1	1	
<i>St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members</i>		1			
<i>Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council</i>	1				
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

**4b**  
**) Regional LRTP**

<i>Martin TAC Members</i>	2	3			
<i>Martin CAC/CIR Members</i>			2		
<i>St. Lucie TAC Members</i>	2	1		1	
<i>St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members</i>		1			
<i>Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council</i>	1				
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

**4c**  
**) Regional Transit Development Plan**

<i>Martin TAC Members</i>	3	1	1		
<i>Martin CAC/CIR Members</i>			2		
<i>St. Lucie TAC Members</i>	2	1	1		
<i>St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members</i>	1				
<i>Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council</i>	1				
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**4d**  
**) Coordinated project prioritization**

<i>Martin TAC Members</i>	1	2	2		
<i>Martin CAC/CIR Members</i>			1	1	
<i>St. Lucie TAC Members</i>		1	1	2	
<i>St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members</i>				1	
<i>Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council</i>		1			
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

**4e**  
**) Coordinated data collection and analysis**

<i>Martin TAC Members</i>	3	2			
<i>Martin CAC/CIR Members</i>	1		1		
<i>St. Lucie TAC Members</i>	1	2	1		
<i>St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members</i>		1			
<i>Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council</i>		1			
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**4f) Joint Technical committee**

<i>Martin TAC Members</i>	2	1	2		
<i>Martin CAC/CIR Members</i>		1	1		
<i>St. Lucie TAC Members</i>	1	1	2		
<i>St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members</i>			1		
<i>Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council</i>		1			
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Rank the potential for achieving effective transportation planning of**

**5) the following**

**process-oriented cooperation strategies:**

**Product-Oriented Strategies**

**Higher Potential**

**Lower Potential**

5      4                      3                      2                      1

**5a Cooperatively developed planning processes from**

**) MPOs**

**that share common regional transportation issues**

<i>Martin TAC Members</i>	2	2	1		
<i>Martin CAC/CIR Members</i>	1		1		
<i>St. Lucie TAC Members</i>	2	1	1		
<i>St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members</i>			1		
<i>Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council</i>	1				
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**5b**

**) Quarterly joint meetings**

Martin TAC Members	2	2	1		
Martin CAC/CIR Members		1	1		
St. Lucie TAC Members		3			1

**Comments: Quarterly is to frequent - Semi annual is max.**

St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members		1			
Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council	1				
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

**5c Inter-MPO coordinating structure (e.g. coordinating ) alliances)**

Martin TAC Members	1	2	2		
Martin CAC/CIR Members		1	1		
St. Lucie TAC Members	1		2	1	
St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members			1		
Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council		1			
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

**5d ) Regional public involvement process**

Martin TAC Members	1	2	2		
Martin CAC/CIR Members			2		
St. Lucie TAC Members		1	1	2	
St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members			1		
Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council			1		
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

**5e ) Cross Committee membership (TAC/CAC)**

Martin TAC Members	1	2	1	1	
Martin CAC/CIR Members			2		
St. Lucie TAC Members	2		2		
St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members			1		

<i>Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council</i>				1	
<b>Grand Total</b>	3	2	7	1	0

**5f) Joint Committees (TAC/CAC)**

<i>Martin TAC Members</i>	1	2	1	1	
<i>Martin CAC/CIR Members</i>		1	1		
<i>St. Lucie TAC Members</i>	2	1		1	
<i>St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members</i>		1			
<i>Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council</i>	1				
<b>Grand Total</b>	4	5	2	2	0

**5g**

**) Shared staff under MPO or RPC**

<i>Martin TAC Members</i>		3	1		1
<i>Martin CAC/CIR Members</i>		1	1		
<i>St. Lucie TAC Members</i>	1		2	1	
<i>St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members</i>		1			
<i>Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council</i>	1				
<b>Grand Total</b>	2	5	4	1	1

**5h**

**) Regional Transportation Organization**

<i>Martin TAC Members</i>		4	1		
<i>Martin CAC/CIR Members</i>		1	1		
<b>Comments: 3 years too short an horizon</b>					
<i>St. Lucie TAC Members</i>		1	2	1	
<i>St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members</i>		1			
<i>Other: Staff of Regional Planning Council</i>				1	
<b>Grand Total</b>	0	7	4	2	0

**List the most pressing challenges or issues for regional transportation**

**6) cooperation.**

**St. Lucie TAC comments:** Political will.

**Martin TAC comments:** Public Transit, Political Concerns  
Increasing population in SLC with continued cross country travel

**Martin CAC/CIR comments:** differing growth mgt approaches.

**Regional Staff comments:** The us us philosophy, One jurisdiction

blaming another for problems instead of looking at the region

as a whole.

Key Reuse vision & goals of localities.

**St. Lucie CAC/CIR Members comments:** local concerns may get lost, impersonal view of needs.

### List any past successful examples of regional transportation

#### 7) cooperation between the

##### St. Lucie and Martin MPO's.

**Martin TAC comments:** Can't recall any  
Regional Land Use/Transportation Study  
Regional DRI Transportation Study (ongoing)  
U.S./Transit Project - Treasure Coast Connection  
Becher Road Interchange

**Martin CAC/CIR comments:** US1 Connector

**Regional Staff comments:** Regional Land Use Study

**St. Lucie MPO comments:** Regional land use study

#### Other Comments:

**APPENDIX II – WORKSHOP PACKET**  
**St. Lucie & Martin MPOs**  
**JOINT TAC/CAC MPO REDESIGNATION WORKSHOP**  
**Proposed Workshop Objectives**

- To review the context for the Governor’s request for a consultation with affected parties on post-census MPO redesignation issues.
- To review consultative process roles and components.
- To solicit the views of MPO advisors and staff on the relative merits of consolidating the St. Lucie and Martin MPOs as a means of achieving effective transportation planning for the Port St. Lucie urbanized area.
- To identify and review alternative means of achieving effective transportation planning for the urbanized area.
- To clarify next steps and preparations for the joint MPO workshop.

**10:30 Call Meeting to Order, Roll Call, Approve Agenda, Minutes, Comments from the Public, Martin TAC Agenda Items**

**10:45 Welcome, Review of Agenda and Ground Rules for Workshop**

**10:50 Overview of Consultative Process and Roles of MPOs, FDOT and Governor**

**11:00 Key 2000 Census Results and Next Steps in MPO Redesignation Process**

**11:10 Key Findings from Regional Land Use/Transportation Study**

**11:30 Presentation on, MPO Structure Options and Case Studies**

**11:50 Review and Discuss Achieving Effective Transportation Planning for the St. Lucie Urbanized Area through MPO Consolidation**

**12:20 Identify Alternative Means of Achieving Effective Transportation Planning for Port St. Lucie Urbanized Area**

12:50 Test Level of Support For Further Exploration of  
Consolidation or Coordination

**1:05 Review and Summarize Workshop Results, Next Steps and Draft Agenda for the MPO Workshop**

**1:10 Complete Workshop Input Survey and Evaluation**

**1:15 Adjourn**

## **GROUND RULES**

This workshop is an opportunity to explore possibilities. Offering or exploring an idea does not necessarily imply support for it.

Listen to understand.

State and test your assumptions.

We are many, we have a lot to discuss, and we have limited time. Say everything that needs to be said, concisely. Share the airtime.

Please look to the facilitator to be recognized.

Speak on person at a time. Please don't interrupt each other. Feel free to interrupt the facilitator.

Focus on issues, not personalities.

## FACT SHEET

### MPO Consultation Process on Designation/ Re-Designation

10. Federal and state law requires that an MPO shall be designated for urbanized areas of more than 50,000 population. More than one MPO may be designated if the size and complexity of an existing metropolitan planning area warrant that course of action.
  11. Metropolitan planning area boundaries include within it the “urbanized area” and the contiguous area that is expected to become urbanized within 20 years. Metropolitan planning area boundaries cannot overlap.
  12. State law (339.175 FS) requires the Governor to review the composition of MPO membership in conjunction with decennial census and reapportionment membership to comply with statutory requirements.
  13. Governor has requested FDOT to consult with representatives of newly designated urbanized areas and existing MPOs prior to the Governor’s request for membership apportionment plans, a boundary map identifying the metropolitan planning area boundary and all entities eligible for MPO membership pursuant to statute.
  14. Secretary Tom Barry sent a February 27, 2003 letters to [Insert relevant individuals] with an initial request that consideration be given to consolidation of two MPOs into a single one, over a period of up to three years. Alternatively, if it can be substantiated that more than one MPO is appropriate due to the size and complexity of the area, the redesignation of separate MPOs would be contingent upon the development and implementation of certain regional coordination mechanisms.
  15. Governor Bush is interested in addressing how regional issues and regional transportation systems are “supporting Florida’s international and inter-regional goals while ensuring a continued sensitivity to our environment and communities.” This is consistent with the 2020 FTP and the SIS proposals.
  16. February 27, 2003 letter from Secretary Tom Barry to MPOs notes that the Districts will be conducting the consultation process with MPOs on behalf of FDOT. The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium a neutral center based at Florida State University, has been asked to assist in designing and facilitating the consultation process.
  17. FDOT will develop final recommendations identifying MPO institutional and outcome oriented process improvements needed to address regional issues and regional transportation systems to the Governor by April 30, 2003 based on this consultation input.
  18. Outcome oriented process improvements may include: inter MPO agreements; cooperatively developed products from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues; regional LRTPs; regional project priority process; regional public involvement process; coordinated regional air quality planning;; and other mechanisms that address regional transportation issues.
- 
10. Governor ultimately must reach “agreement” on boundary maps and membership apportionment plans with local governments representing 75% of the affected population including the central city or cities. The Governor will approve the plans if they meet the equitable geographic-population ratio and other applicable requirements of state and federal law.

**WORKSHEET 1**  
**MATRIX**  
**[TO BE ADDED BY THE DISTRICT 4 OFFICE]**

## WORKSHEET 2

Please rank the potential for enhancing regional cooperation of the following cooperative product and process oriented strategies

<b>Product-Oriented Strategies</b>	<b><i>High Potential</i></b>			<b><i>Low Potential</i></b>	
------------------------------------	------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------------	--

Cooperatively developed planning products from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues;	5	4	3	2	1
Regional LRTPs;	5	4	3	2	1
Regional project prioritization	5	4	3	2	1
Coordinate data collection and analysis	5	4	3	2	1
Joint Technical Modeling	5	4	3	2	1
Regional transit organization	5	4	3	2	1
Regional transit plan	5	4	3	2	1
Other_____	5	4	3	2	1
Other_____	5	4	3	2	1
Other_____	5	4	3	2	1

<b>Process-Oriented Strategies</b>	<b><i>High Potential</i></b>			<b><i>Low Potential</i></b>	
------------------------------------	------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------------	--

Cooperatively developed planning from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues.	5	4	3	2	1
Quarterly joint meetings	5	4	3	2	1
Inter-MPO coordinating structure (e.g. coordinating committees, alliances)	5	4	3	2	1
Regional public involvement process;	5	4	3	2	1
Cross membership/staffing (TAC/CAC)	5	4	3	2	1
Other_____	5	4	3	2	1
Other_____	5	4	3	2	1

**Joint St. Lucie and Martin MPOs**  
**MPO Designation Workshop**  
**March 28, 2003**

**Proposed Workshop Objectives**

- To review the context and process for the Governor's request for consultation with MPOs on the MPO designation process required by Federal and state law.
- To review the respective roles of the Governor, FDOT and MPOs in the consultation process.
- To present the results of the joint MPO TAC/CAC workshop
- To solicit the views of MPO members of the relative merits of consolidating the MPOs as a means for achieving greater regional cooperation on the transportation system.
- To review and test support for strategies and options for achieving greater regional transportation cooperation;
- To clarify next steps in the consultation process.

*Draft Agenda*

**11:30 Introductions, Review of Agenda and Meeting Guidelines**

**11:40 Overview of the Consultation Process and Respective Roles of MPOs, FDOT and the Governor**

**11:50 Overview of the Results of the Decennial census**

**12:00 Presentation of the Results of the Joint MPO TAC/CAC workshop**

**12:10 Review, Discuss and Refine the Pros/Cons of MPO Consolidation as a means of Regional Transportation Cooperation.**

Review consolidation pros and cons re: funding; project priority setting; planning/coordination, membership, TMA status

**12:40 Review Other Strategies of Achieving Regional Transportation Cooperation**

Present examples, lessons learned and ingredients of successful transportation system cooperation in the region and in other regions.

Review TAC/CAC ranking of strategies/options for enhancing MPO regional cooperation

**1:00 Test Level of Support For Further Exploration of Consolidation or Coordination**

Test for support for further exploration of MPO consolidation

Test for MPO member support for further exploration of coordination strategies

**1:15 Next Steps and Possible Assignments to TAC/CAC Regarding**

Strategies for Regional Cooperation through joint TAC/CAC workshop process.

**1:25 Review and Summarize the Workshop Results and Next Steps in the Consultation Process**

**Complete Workshop Evaluation**

**1:30 Adjourn.**

**St. Lucie & Martin  
MPO DESIGNATION CONSULTATION PROCESS  
INPUT SURVEY**

*Please complete the survey below and hand it in to the meeting facilitator before leaving. Your responses will be compiled with others in the region and captured in the Consultation Report to the FDOT produced by the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium.*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**Check which apply:**

St. Lucie \_\_\_\_\_ Martin \_\_\_\_\_

TAC member \_\_\_ CAC member \_\_\_ MPO Staff \_\_\_

Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Note your level of agreement with the following three statements:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Agree      Minor      Major      Disagree

*Reservations Reservations*

7. The St. Lucie and Martin MPOs should engage in a process to consolidate over the next 3 years.	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

*Comments:*

8. The St. Lucie and Martin MPOs should further explore the implementation of high-potential coordination strategies.	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

*Comments:*

9. Transportation cooperation mechanisms currently in place between the St. Lucie and Martin MPOs are fully capable of meeting current and future needs.	4	3	2	1
--	---	---	---	---

*Comments:*

4. Rank the potential for enhancing regional cooperation of the following cooperative outcome and process oriented strategies

<b>Product-Oriented Strategies</b>	<b>Higher Potential</b>			<b>Lower Potential</b>	
<b>4a.</b> Cooperatively developed planning products from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues; <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>4b.</b> Regional LRTPs; <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>4c.</b> Regional project prioritization <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>4d.</b> Coordinate data collection and analysis <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>4e.</b> Joint Technical Modeling <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>4f.</b> Regional transit organization <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>4g.</b> Regional transit plan <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
Other _____	5	4	3	2	1
Other _____	5	4	3	2	1

5. Rank the potential for enhancing regional cooperation of the following cooperative outcome and process oriented strategies

<b>Process-Oriented Strategies</b>	<b><i>Higher Potential</i></b>			<b><i>Lower Potential</i></b>	
<b>5a.</b> Cooperatively developed planning from MPOs that share common regional transportation issues; <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>5b.</b> Quarterly joint meetings	5	4	3	2	1
<b>5c.</b> Inter-MPO coordinating structure (e.g. coordinating committees, alliances)	5	4	3	2	1
<b>5d.</b> Regional public involvement process; <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<b>5e.</b> Cross membership/staffing (TAC/CAC) <i>Comments:</i>	5	4	3	2	1
Other _____	5	4	3	2	1
Other _____	5	4	3	2	1

- **List the most pressing challenges or issues for regional transportation cooperation:**

- 56. List any past successful examples of regional transportation cooperation between the St. Lucie and Martin MPOs.**

**Other Comments:**

## APPENDIX III – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**APPENDIX E**

**LAKE, MARION, SUMTER MPO  
CONSULTATION PROCESS**

**March-August, 2003**

**Summary of Florida Conflict Resolution Consultation  
Assistance Activities**

Prepared by  
The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITIES</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>ACTIVITIES</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Initial consultations with District 5</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Assessment</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>April 21, 2003 meeting</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Informal communications with affected jurisdictions</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Updates</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Meetings with Lake County jurisdictions</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>July survey</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>APPENDIX A – APRIL 21 MEETING REPORT</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>APPENDIX B – UPDATE MEMOS</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>APPENDIX C – SURVEY MATERIALS</u>	<u>23</u>

# INTRODUCTION

## BACKGROUND

From March through August of 2003, the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium assisted District 5 of the Florida Department of Transportation to design and conduct a consultation with local governments on MPO designation issues. This consultation prepared the way for the District's recommendations to the Office of the Governor on MPO designations reflecting year 2000 census results. Consortium assistance was provided pursuant to a contract with the Florida Department of Transportation, Office of Policy Planning.

## OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITIES

Consortium assistance included the following.

- Initial consultations with District 5 representatives.
- An assessment of the then-current state of discussions regarding MPO designation.
- Design and facilitation of an initial meeting of all jurisdictions involved or affected by the designation process.
- Informal communication with representatives of Sumter, Marion and Lake Counties and jurisdictions within Lake County.
- Meetings with representatives of Lake County and cities within the County.
- A survey of Lake County jurisdictions regarding their preferred options for structuring a new MPO.

## **ACTIVITIES**

### **INITIAL CONSULTATIONS WITH DISTRICT 5**

The Consortium met with District 5 representatives on March 7 and March 11, 2003 to develop an initial approach to consulting with and promoting agreement among jurisdictions affected by the upcoming MPO designations. In these meetings, DOT and Consortium staff reviewed the history of MPO designation discussions within the District, as well as the District's desired outcomes for the consultation process. As a result of these initial meetings, the Consortium recommended an assessment to help determine how best to proceed.

### **ASSESSMENT**

The Consortium conducted an assessment consisting of interviews and a review of documents related to earlier discussions of MPO designation. In the interviews, the Consortium sought to identify issues and options that would need to be addressed during the MPO designation process, and to explore the current state of discussions regarding designation, appropriate ways to proceed with the consultation, and perceptions regarding the likelihood of agreement.

As part of the assessment, Consortium staff interviewed representatives of Lake and Marion Counties, and the cities of Lady Lake, Eustis, Tavares, Mt. Dora, Leesburg and Clermont in Lake County. Consortium and District 5 staff, including District Secretary Mike Snyder, also met with representatives of Sumter County and The Villages on April 8, 2003.

### **APRIL 21, 2003 MEETING**

Based on the assessment interviews, the Consortium designed and facilitated a meeting to explore and evaluate possible MPO designation options for the urbanized areas in Lake, Marion, and Sumter counties, to highlight the need for regional transportation planning mechanisms if more than one MPO were designated within the three counties, and to review the process being used by FDOT to consult with affected parties. Participants included representatives of FDOT District 5, the FDOT Office of Policy Planning, Federal Highway Administration, Marion, Sumter and Lake counties, and the cities of Eustis, Tavares, Mt. Dora, Leesburg, Lady Lake and Clermont within Lake County. The cities Astatula, Fruitland Park, Groveland, Howie in the Hills, Mascotte, Mont Verde, Minneola and Umatilla participated as observers.

The results of this meeting provided the groundwork for subsequent discussions in this process. A detailed report of the discussions and conclusions at this meeting is attached as Appendix A of this report.

### **INFORMAL COMMUNICATIONS WITH AFFECTED JURISDICTIONS**

After the April 21 meeting and throughout the remainder of the consultation process, the Consortium maintained frequent, informal telephone contact with representatives of participating jurisdictions. This contact was intended to foster, and remain apprised of, communications among jurisdictions that were in effect a continuation of discussions begun at the April 21 meeting.

### **UPDATES**

The Consortium provided written updates on May 12 and July 1, 2003 to all participants in the April 21 meeting regarding the continuing informal communication among key jurisdictions. Copies of the updates are attached as Appendix B of this report.

#### **MEETINGS WITH LAKE COUNTY JURISDICTIONS**

During June and July of 2003, the Consortium convened and facilitated a series of informal meetings among representatives of Lake County, Lady Lake, Eustis, and Leesburg. These meetings were intended to develop a series of more detailed options for structuring a Lake County MPO or Lake County participation in multi-county MPO. These meetings took place on June 24, June 27 and July 1, 2003.

#### **JULY SURVEY**

The options developed during the June and July meetings were presented and explained at the July 11, 2003 meeting of the Lake County City and County managers. They were then presented to Lake County jurisdictions in the form of a survey. The responses demonstrated a high degree of agreement regarding the basic configuration of a future Lake-Sumter MPO. The survey materials are attached as Appendix C of this report. Survey responses are on file at District 5.

**APPENDIX A – APRIL 21 MEETING REPORT**

**LAKE, MARION, SUMTER MPO  
CONSULTATION PROCESS  
WORKSHOP**

**April 21, 2003**  
**Lake – Sumter Community College**

**Workshop Summary**

Workshop facilitated and report prepared by  
The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>MPO DESIGNATION OPTIONS</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>PRELIMINARY PREFERRED OPTIONS</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>NEXT STEPS</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>APPENDIX A – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>APPENDIX B – INVITEES</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>APPENDIX C – MEETING EVALUATIONS</u>	<u>14</u>

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **BACKGROUND**

On April 21, 2003, representatives from Lake County, Sumter County, the Ocala - Marion MPO, and the cities of Clermont, Eustis, Lady Lake, Leesburg, Mt Dora, Tavares, Groveland, Minneola and Fruitland Park met to participate in a workshop at Lake Sumter Community College. Representatives from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Office of Policy Planning, the FDOT District 5 Office, and the Federal Highway Administration also attended. The meeting was facilitated by the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium. Forty-four people attended the meeting. A list of participants who signed-in is included as Appendix A of this report.

The meeting was convened at the request of FDOT District 5. The purpose of the meeting was to explore and evaluate possible MPO designation options for the urbanized areas in Lake, Marion, and Sumter counties, to highlight the need for regional transportation planning mechanisms if more than one MPO is designated within the three counties, and to review the process being used by FDOT to consult with affected parties as it prepares recommendations on MPO designation issues. The results of the meeting and of subsequent steps in the consultation process will provide input to FDOT in the formulation of its recommendations. A list of jurisdictions invited as participants or observers is included as Appendix B of this report.

This report presents a summary of the key points made during discussions at the workshop. It is not a verbatim record of those discussions, and does not include the presentations that were part of the workshop.

### **PROCESS**

All discussions were facilitated and notes of the key points made on flipcharts. Transcripts of the flipchart records form the basis of this report. A more detailed account of the process used for each discussion appears in the corresponding sections of this report.

## **AGENDA**

The agenda as modified in the course of the meetings is presented below.

9:30 Welcome and introductions

Agenda review

9:45 Review of MPO designation process

Review of FDOT consultation process

10:00 Review, and discussion of MPO structure options.

For each option

Identification of concerns and questions

Identification of needed information

Identification of pros and cons

Which options are preferable and why?

10:45 Break

11:00 Review, and discussion of MPO structure options (continued).

11:45 Preliminary evaluation of MPO structure options.

12:00 Next steps

12:15 Adjourn

## MPO DESIGNATION OPTIONS

Participants reviewed an initial list of potential MPO designation options and discussed each of the options in turn. The list of initial options was compiled by the meeting facilitators based on suggestions offered by the participants during interviews prior to the workshop. At the beginning of the discussion, participants were asked if any additional options should be added to the list. Option eight was added.

The options are listed below followed by the concerns, questions, and comments participant's offered for each of the options.

### MPO Structure Options

1. A full three-county MPO incorporating all of Lake, Marion, and portions of Sumter County.
2. A smaller three-county MPO consisting of the existing Ocala/Marion MPO and the portions of Lake and Sumter comprised of Lady Lake and the Villages, and a Lake MPO consisting of the other urbanized areas and other portions of Lake County.
3. The existing Ocala/Marion MPO and a Lake-Sumter MPO including all of Lake and portions of Sumter County.
4. The existing Ocala/Marion MPO and a Lake-Sumter MPO including all of Lake and the Villages portion of Sumter County.
5. The existing Ocala/Marion MPO, a Lake-Sumter MPO including only the portions of each county comprised of the Villages and Lady Lake, and a third MPO consisting of the other urbanized areas and other portions of Lake County.
6. A Lake County countywide MPO and a Marion – Sumter MPO.
7. The existing Ocala/Marion MPO, a Lake-Sumter MPO including only the Villages in Sumter, and the Northern half of Lake County (Lady Lake, Eustis, Leesburg.) A portion of south Lake County would join Metroplan.
8. The existing Ocala/Marion MPO, a new Lake County MPO, and Sumter County develop other regional transportation planning arrangements.

### Participant Comments, Questions and Concerns

#### Option 1

- This option would dilute our city's voice.
- The areas have differing levels of experience with transportation issues.
- Being a small county, this option raises concern about how much input we will have.
- We will coordinate with those not included in the MPO as needed.
- How does membership work in an MPO?
- How would it be distributed in a multi-county MPO?
- How is membership distributed between counties and cities?
- How do counties select representatives if all commission members cannot serve on an MPO Board?
- Marion doesn't want Lake County problems.
- Lake County doesn't want Marion's problems
- Each have their own multiple traffic problems.
- An MPO means one more level of bureaucracy.

- The County can do the planning and does not need the MPO structure.
- There is a concern that funding will not cover the costs of MPO administration.
- An MPO alliance will help with planning coordination among multiple MPOs.
- Central does have enough money to fund the staff needs of MPOs.
- How does an MPO grow?
- When population grows, how do you adjust the membership?
- The Villages in Sumter County does not have a jurisdictional representative. Perhaps a Sumter County commissioner official could represent that area.

### **Option 2**

- The Villages are unique as a new urbanized area in three counties.
- Where are the traffic patterns and impacts?
- Dilutes voice of municipalities.
- Sumter's traffic concerns may be north and west rather than with Eustis, Mt. Dora, and southern Lake County.
- We are concerned about splitting Lake County. The traffic flow does go through Eustis toward Orlando in the 441 corridor.
- Can an urbanized area be split between two MPOs? Could we split the Villages at county line?
- Lady Lake representation would be diluted.
- There is some traffic flow between Lake and Sumter.

### **Options 3 and 4 (These options were considered together because of their similarity)**

- Options 3 and Option 4 are linked and address 20 year growth – including Wildwood.
- What would be the board make-up and membership?
- Don't like one more layer of bureaucracy between Sumter and FDOT.
- Don't see the advantages from joining an MPO.
- Lake County likes this option because of continuity along major highways.
- Options 3 and 4 are more reflective of other MPO options in Central Florida.
- Sumter County is concerned about a lack of representation and power.
- How much emphasis does DOT place on MPO requests and priorities versus a county's requests and priorities?

### **Option 5**

- DOT has concerns about creating two new MPOs.
- Lake County feels all the Lake cities are connected and would not want Lake County split.

### **Option 6**

- Sumter traffic goes toward northwest Lake County.

### **Option 7**

- Clermont is not interested in joining Metroplan. It does not have a formal position yet.

- Lake County does not want to split the county.

### **Option 8**

- Concern because this option is not legal under federal law.
- This option will jeopardize federal funds.
- Is the 75% calculation based on population? (Concurrence of elected officials representing 75% of the urbanized area required for agreement)
- What is the timeframe for establishing a new MPO?
- What census numbers will be used to establish boundaries?
- What if Sumter doesn't sign on to an MPO?
- If northeast Sumter is in an MPO, what happens to the rest of Sumter? How would it be represented?
- Do counties get the same attention as the MPOs for priority funding?
- The central city must be in agreement.
- Fifty percent of the Villages is in Marion County so they must be in agreement with the final plan.
- The Ocala/Marion MPO is willing to keep their boundary lines where they currently are.

## PRELIMINARY PREFERRED OPTIONS EXERCISE

Following the discussion of the eight options, representatives from all jurisdictions at the meeting were asked to tentatively evaluate each of the options using the following scale. Participants were asked to indicate their individual, informal reactions based on the morning's discussion, and not necessarily the formal positions of their jurisdictions.

Comfortable (reflected on chart as none)

Minor reservations

Major reservations

The following chart reflects the results of the evaluation exercise.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3/4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8
<b>Lake Co.</b>	7 minor	5 major	9 none	6 major	6 major	6 major	5 major 2 minor
<b>Sumter Co.</b>	5 major	5 major	5 major	5 none	5 major	5 minor	5 none
<b>Lady Lake</b>	3 major	3 major	3 none	3 major	2 major 1 none	2 major 1 minor	3 major
<b>Eustis</b>	1 major 2 minor	1 major	2 none	1 none		1 major	
<b>Leesburg</b>			2 minor			2 minor	2 minor
<b>Mt. Dora</b>	3 major	3 major	3 none	3 major	2 major 1 minor	3 major	2 major 1 minor
<b>Tavares</b>	3 major	3 major	3 none	3 major	3 minor	3 major	2 minor
<b>Clermont</b>	1 major	1 major	1 none	1 major	1 major	1 major	1 minor
<b>Ocala, Marion MPO</b>	3 major	3 none	3 minor	3 minor	3 minor	3 minor	3 major
<b>DOT</b>	1 none	1 major	1 none	1 major	1 minor	1 major	1 major
<b>Minneola</b>	1 major	1 minor	1 minor	1 minor	1 minor	1 major	1 major
<b>Groveland</b>	2 major	1 major 1 minor	2 none	1 major 1 minor	1 major 1 minor	2 major	2 major

## Comments Following the Preliminary Preferred Options Exercise:

Following the preliminary evaluation exercise, participants were asked to discuss any remaining concerns about those options that received the most support, and any perceived benefits to those options that did not receive general support, but were still preferred by some participants. The reason for soliciting these comments was to lay the groundwork for addressing the concerns and incorporating the benefits, to the degree possible, in the development of a final recommendation.

### Option 2

- If you look at traffic patterns, it makes sense.

### Option 3/4

- Separates the Villages, highlighting the need to address cross border issues.
- Presents concerns about equitable representation. Need to discuss further.
- If Option 8 is out, then this is next best option along with Option 6 (Lake County alone option).
- Makes sense to include Wildwood if any portion of Sumter County is included with Lake County.
- It will be important to discuss Highways 470, 44 and 48 in this planning process.
- Language on Option 3 is better than on Option 4.
- Does the 75% rule relate to urbanized areas or planning areas?

### Option 5

- This option accounts for traffic commonality.

### Option 6

- Good rapport with Marion. Takes into account traffic sheds and twenty year plans.

## **NEXT STEPS**

At the end of the meeting, participants offered closing comments and suggestions for next steps. Their comments and suggestions appear below.

- It will be imperative to have an extension of time to discuss this further.
- The group agrees to request a ninety day extension.
- The legal status of Option 8 needs to be clarified.
- Are there any of these options that the Governor's Office would find acceptable more acceptable? (It was clarified that the Governor's office will give great weight to any option that has a consensus in the group.)
- The immediate next steps should be discussions between Lake and Sumter to explore ways to address the remaining concerns. All jurisdictions at today's meeting will be notified of these discussions. There may be a need to bring the results of these discussions back to the full group, either at a meeting or in other ways.

**APRIL 21, 2003 MEETING REPORT APPENDIX A  
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FROM SIGN-IN SHEET**

Ron Stock	Leesburg
Bob Lovell	Leesburg
Michael Francis	Lady Lake
Jim Coleman	Lady Lake
Jim Stivender	Lake County
Welton Cadwell	Lake County
Jennifer Hill	Lake County
Debbie Stivender	Lake County
Bill Neron	Lake County
Jim Yatsuk	Mount Dora
Mark Reagentin	Mount Dora
Bernice Brinson	Mount Dora
Gwendolyn Manning	Eustis
Michael Stearman	Eustis
Greg Slay	Ocala Marion MPO
Andy Kesserling	Ocala Marion MPO
Aaron Mercer	Tavares
Dottie Keedy	Tavares
Ted Wicks	Tavares
Wayne Saunders	Clermont
Lennon Moore	FDOT
Carolyn Hyland Ismart	FDOT
Stacy Blizzard	FHWA
Sharon Farrell	Clermont
Fred Schneider	Lake County
Noble Olasimbo	Lake County
Gregg Welstead	Lake County
Jeff Shrum	Ocala Marion MPO
David Marsh	FDOT
Susan Sandihi	FDOT
Sam Slaughter	Minneola
Jason Yarborough	Groveland
Larry Walker	Groveland
Linda Rodrick	Fruitland Park
Michael Szunyog	FDOT
Clif Tate	Kimley Horn and Associates
Matt Brady	FDOT
Nancy Liman	Carlton Fields (Sumter County)
Benny Strickland	Sumter County
Garry Breeden	Sumter County
John Parker	The Villages

**APRIL 21, 2003 MEETING REPORT APPENDIX B**  
**List of Jurisdictions Invited to Workshop**

**List of Participants**

Lake County  
Sumter County  
Ocala Marion County MPO Urbanized Area Subcommittee  
City of Clermont  
City of Eustis  
City of Lady Lake  
City of Leesburg  
City of Mt Dora  
City of Tavares

**List of Observers**

City of Astatula  
City of Fruitland Park  
City of Groveland  
City of Howie in the Hills  
City of Mascotte  
City of Mont Verde  
City of Minneola  
City of Umatilla

## APRIL 21, 2003 MEETING REPORT APPENDIX C

The following Meeting Form is an aggregate of the meeting evaluation forms collected at the meeting.

### LAKE, MARION AND SUMTER MPO WORKSHOP SESSION

April 21, 2003

#### Meeting Evaluation Summary

Information from this evaluation will not be reported in a way that individuals or organizations can be identified.

**INSTRUCTIONS:** PLEASE USE A 0 TO 10 RATING SCALE WHERE A 0 MEANS TOTALLY DISAGREE AND A 10 MEANS TOTALLY AGREE. PLEASE PLACE YOUR RATING IN THE SPACE TO THE LEFT OF EACH QUESTION

#### 1. Please assess the overall meeting.

Average

9.37 The groundrules for the meeting were clearly stated.

8.29 The background information was very useful.

8.75 The agenda packet was very useful.

9.25 The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.

8.60 All of the participants fully agreed with the objectives for the meeting.

7.09 The objectives for the meeting were fully achieved.

8.68 The consultation process being used by FDOT to respond to the Governor's request for consultation with affected parties on PO redesignation issues was fully reviewed.

8.47 Affected parties identified and preliminarily evaluated all relevant options for MPO designation or redesignation.

8.82 Affected parties had a fully adequate opportunity to identify coordination needs to address regional transportation planning.

9.00 Next steps needed to develop recommendations were adequately identified.

#### 2. Please tell us how well the facilitator(s) helped the participants engage in the meeting.

Average

9.39 The participants followed the direction of the facilitator.

9.45 The facilitator made sure the concerns of all participants were heard.

9.33 The facilitator helped us arrange our time well.

9.00 Participant input was documented accurately.

#### 3. What is your level of satisfaction with the meeting?

Average

8.78 Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.

9.47 I was very satisfied with the services provided by the facilitator.

7.78 I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

#### 4. What progress did you make?

Average

8.69 I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.

8.69 I know who is responsible for the next steps.

#### 5. Do you have any other comments that you would like to add? We are very interested in your comments. Please use the back of this page.

*The following comments were given from the question above:*

- It was not the process I was dissatisfied with, it was the outcome.
- Lake Co. w/cities need to make future plans for future.
- Meeting needed to be a little longer
- Excellent

## **APPENDIX B – UPDATE MEMOS**

### **MEMORANDUM**

TO: Participants in the April 21, 2003 MPO designation workshop  
From: Rafael A. Montalvo, FCRC  
Date: May 12, 2003  
Re: Follow-up to April 21 MPO designation meeting.

Enclosed please find a summary of the April 21, 2003 MPO designation workshop.

Since the workshop, informal discussions have been underway among several of the participants at the meeting to further explore various MPO designation options. In order to give these discussions time to reach a conclusion, we have decided to delay scheduling more formal follow-up meetings. We will report back to you on the status of the informal discussions by mid-June, and will recommend additional follow-up steps then, as needed.

In addition, we would like to keep open the possibility of a second meeting by mid-July to, at a minimum, review and refine or further develop potential recommendations. We will be communicating with each jurisdiction in the next week to explore possible dates for this meeting. Once we have a date, we would request that you hold it open until we know if a meeting will be needed.

If you have any questions about the report or potential follow-up activities, please feel free to call us at (407) 835-3443.

### **MEMORANDUM**

TO: Participants in April 21 MPO Designation Meeting  
FROM: Rafael A. Montalvo, Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium  
DATE: July 1, 2003  
RE: MPO designation discussions update

This memo provides a brief update on activities related to the MPO designation process since the April 21 meeting, and on the current state of discussions regarding MPO designation.

Shortly after the April 21 meeting, discussions resumed between Sumter County and the Ocala-Marion MPO to further explore the possibility of Sumter County participating in an expanded Ocala-Marion MPO. Beginning in June, representatives of Lady Lake joined in these discussions. Currently, these jurisdictions are continuing to explore several possible MPO configurations involving the participation of some or all of them in an expanded Ocala-Marion MPO. Lady Lake is scheduled to reach a conclusion regarding its participation by July 21. The Ocala-Marion MPO and Sumter County hope to reach conclusions regarding their participation no later than August 26. (This date may be moved up if the Ocala-Marion MPO is able to schedule a discussion of the issue in July.)

Discussions have also taken place more recently among representatives of the urbanized areas in Lake County. Sumter County is also participating in these discussions, and a meeting of the Sumter and Lake County BCC chairs is currently scheduled for July 18. Based on these discussions, Lake County has prepared three apportionment options that would implement the preference expressed by many Lake County jurisdictions for a Lake County MPO. Each of the options has been applied to scenarios reflecting the possibility that Lady Lake and Sumter County might participate in such an MPO, should they choose to do so.

The Consortium will distribute a survey to all Lake County jurisdictions within the next few days, requesting an informal sense of the acceptability of these options, and asking whether jurisdictions prefer one or another of them. The survey will also ask whether jurisdictions would like to suggest additional options. It is important to note that the survey will not result in a decision on the question of apportionment. It is intended instead to provide FDOT with input on the issue, and to provide a point of departure for a Lake County discussion on apportionment. The Consortium will compile the results of the survey and any

conclusions of the Ocala-Marion/Sumter/Lady Lake discussions and deliver them to FDOT by the end of July.

**FDOT currently anticipates being able to develop draft recommendations based on the outcome of the discussions and the results of the survey. If it appears that the discussions between the Ocala-Marion MPO, Sumter County and Lady Lake will not reach a full conclusion before the end of July, FDOT may make a decision whether to submit preliminary recommendations to the Governor's office by the July 31 deadline, with the understanding that they may be contingent on the ultimate outcome of the discussions, or to request an additional extension of the deadline.**

Please feel free to give us a call at (407) 835-3443 if you have any questions regarding the developments described in this update.

## **APPENDIX C – SURVEY MATERIALS**

### **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Chief Administrative Officers, Lake County Jurisdictions  
**FROM:** Rafael A. Montalvo, FCRC  
**DATE:** July 11, 2003  
**RE:** MPO apportionment options

Attached please find a survey of apportionment options for a future Lake County MPO. The survey requests informal input from the council or commission of each Lake County jurisdiction on a number of apportionment options that may eventually be used in establishing a Lake County MPO. The options were developed by County staff based on discussions between Lake County representatives and representatives of the designated urbanized areas within the County. The options are presented in the context of scenarios reflecting three possible sets of boundaries for a future MPO. Please note that we are not requesting preferences regarding the boundary scenarios. The boundaries recommended by FDOT for the future MPO will be influenced heavily by the outcome of discussions currently underway between Sumter County, Lady Lake, and the Ocala-Marion MPO. It is also important to note that this survey is NOT requesting formal action by your council or commission. Formal action will be appropriate later as the MPO designation process moves forward. The Consortium will compile the results of the survey and make them available to FDOT and all participants in the MPO designation discussions. FDOT will use this input on apportionment, together with input on boundaries from the April 21 MPO meeting and subsequent meetings and discussions, to develop recommendations regarding MPO designation which it will submit to the Governor's office in the near future. Although the recommendations may not address apportionment, FDOT has indicated the input on that issue will be helpful in developing recommendations. In addition, the results of the survey will provide a point of departure for later discussion of apportionment by Lake County jurisdictions as the MPO designation process proceeds.

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SURVEY USING THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS, AND RETURN THE SUMMARY, VIA FAX, EMAIL OR REGULAR MAIL BY JULY 25 TO THE FOLLOWING.  
The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium  
36 West Pine Street, Suite 201  
Orlando, Florida 32801

Email: [rafaelm@mail.ucf.edu](mailto:rafaelm@mail.ucf.edu)

Fax: (407) 417-7815

If you have any questions regarding the survey, please call us at (407) 835-3443.

**SURVEY**  
**APPORTIONMENT OPTIONS FOR A LAKE OR LAKE-SUMTER MPO**

**INSTRUCTIONS**

(For use during regularly scheduled board meeting.)

Review, clarify and discuss scenarios and apportionment options to ensure that board members understand each scenario and option.

For Scenario 1:

Board members individually fill out evaluation of each option, using the Board Member Survey sheet and the 3, 2, 1 scale provided.

Staff tallies the results of board members' evaluations on Survey Summary sheet. (Indicate the number of board members giving each option a 3, 2 or 1).

Board discusses the pros and cons of each option.

Staff takes a straw poll regarding preferred option for that scenario.

(Please note that we asking for both a reaction to each option and an indication of preference among options.)

Collect individual or collective board member comments on options. Comments may also be offered on the scenario, if desired.

Repeat for Scenarios 2 and 3.

PLEASE RETURN THE SURVEY SUMMARY AND ANY BOARD COMMENTS TO THE FLORIDA CONFLICT RESOLUTION CONSORTIUM BY JULY 25, 2003, BY EMAIL, FAX OR REGULAR MAIL.

The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium  
36 West Pine Street, Suite 201  
Orlando, Florida 32801

Email: [rafaelm@mail.ucf.edu](mailto:rafaelm@mail.ucf.edu)

Fax: (407) 417-7815

**SURVEY SUMMARY**

**JURISDICTION**

**APPORTIONMENT OPTIONS FOR A LAKE OR LAKE-SUMTER MPO**

Scenario 1 – Lake County, including Lady Lake area and Sumter County Urbanized Area  
 Comfortable                      Minor Reservations                      Major Reservations

Option A	3 ___	2 ___	1 ___
Option B1	3 ___	2 ___	1 ___
Option B2	3 ___	2 ___	1 ___
Option C	3 ___	2 ___	1 ___
Board preference (if any)	A ___	B1 ___	B2 ___      C ___

Scenario 2 – Lake County, including Lady Lake area, without Sumter County Urbanized Area  
 Comfortable                      Minor Reservations                      Major Reservations

Option A	3 ___	2 ___	1 ___
Option B	3 ___	2 ___	1 ___
Option C	3 ___	2 ___	1 ___
Board preference (if any)	A ___	B ___	C ___

Scenario 3 – Lake County, without Lady Lake area or Sumter County Urbanized Area  
 Comfortable                      Minor Reservations                      Major Reservations

Option A	3 ___	2 ___	1 ___
Option B	3 ___	2 ___	1 ___
Option C	3 ___	2 ___	1 ___
Board preference (if any)	A ___	B ___	C ___

**LAKE SUMTER METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
**Scenario #1 MPO Membership Voting Structure**  
**(Lake County with Lady Lake Area and Sumter County Urban Section)**

**DRAFT**

Local & Counties Government	2000 Populations	Total Pop Percent	Option A	Option B1	Option B2	Option C
			Vote Counts	Vote Counts	Vote Counts	Vote Counts
<b>LAKE</b>	<b>210,528</b>	<b>95.33%</b>				
Astatula	1,298	0.59%				
Clermont	9,333	4.23%		1	1	1*
Eustis	15,106	6.84%	2	1	1	2
Fruitland Park	3,186	1.44%				
Groveland	2,360	1.07%				
Howey-in-the-Hills	956	0.43%				
Lady Lake	11,828	5.36%	2	1	1	1
Leesburg	15,956	7.22%	2	1	1	2
Mascotte	2,687	1.22%				
Minneola	5,435	2.46%			1	
Montverde	882	0.40%				
Mount Dora	9,418	4.26%		1	1	1*
Tavares	9,700	4.39%		1	1	1*
Umatilla	2,214	1.00%				
<b>INCORPORATED TOTAL</b>	<b>90,359</b>	<b>40.91%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>UNINCORPORATED</b>	<b>120,169</b>	<b>54.41%</b>				
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1	1
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1	1
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1	1
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1	1
Commissioner Lake County			0	0	1	
Lake County BCC			**4	**4	5	**4
<b>SUMTER Urban Area</b>	<b>10,324</b>	<b>4.67%</b>				
Commissioner Sumter BCC			1	1	1	1
<b>2 COUNTIES TOTAL</b>	<b>220,852</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>

**Note:**

\* In Lake County, these cities will share one vote on a yearly basis, beginning with the largest city first, followed by the next largest, until each city has voted.

\*\* Lake County BCC will share or rotate 4 votes within the BCC 5 members on yearly basis.

\*\*\* Non Voting Member Cities :Input from non voting member cities during deliberation on MPO issues shall be considered before voting members cast their vote.

**LAKE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**Scenario #2 MPO Membership Voting Structure**

**(Lake County with Lady Lake Area and No Sumter County Urban Section)**

**DRAFT**

Local & Counties Government	*2000 Populations	Total Pop Percent	Option A	Option B	Option C
			Vote Count	Vote Counts	Vote Counts
<b>LAKE</b>	<b>210,528</b>	<b>100.00%</b>			
Clermont	9,333	4.43%		1	1*
Eustis	15,106	7.18%	2	1	2
Lady Lake	11,828	5.62%	2	1	1
Leesburg	15,956	7.58%	2	1	2
Minneola	5,435	2.58%			
Mount Dora	9,418	4.47%		1	1*
Tavares	9,700	4.61%		1	1*
Sub Total	76,776	36.47%	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
Astatula	1,298	0.62%			
Fruitland Park	3,186	1.51%			
Umatilla	2,214	1.05%			
Sub Total	6,698	3.18%			
Groveland	2,360	1.12%			
Howey-in-the-Hills	956	0.45%			
Montverde	882	0.42%			
Mascotte	2,687	1.28%			
Sub Total	6,885	3.27%			
<b>INCORPORATED TOTAL</b>	<b>90,359</b>	<b>42.92%</b>			
<b>UNINCORPORATED</b>	<b>120,169</b>	<b>57.08%</b>			
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1
Commissioners Total			<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>210,528</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>

**Note:**

\* In Lake County, these cities will share one vote on a yearly basis, beginning with the largest city first, followed by the next largest, until each city has voted.

\*\*\* Non Voting Member Cities :Input from non voting member cities during deliberation on MPO issues shall be considered before voting members cast their vote.

**LAKE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
**Scenario #3 MPO Membership Voting Structure**  
**(Lake County without Lady Lake Area and No Sumter County Urban Section)**  
**DRAFT**

Local & Counties Government	*2000 Populations	Total Pop Percent	Option A	Option B	Option C
			Vote Count	Vote Counts	Vote Counts
<b>LAKE</b>	<b>198,700</b>	<b>100.00%</b>			
Clermont	9,333	4.70%	1+	1	
Eustis	15,106	7.60%	2	1	2
Leesburg	15,956	8.03%	2	1	2
Minneola	5,435	2.74%	1+	1	
Mount Dora	9,418	4.74%	1*	1	1
Tavares	9,700	4.88%	1*	1	1
Sub Total	64,948	32.69%	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
Astatula	1,298	0.65%			
Fruitland Park	3,186	1.60%			
Umatilla	2,214	1.11%			
Sub Total	6,698	3.37%			
Groveland	2,360	1.19%			
Howey-in-the-Hills	956	0.48%			
Montverde	882	0.44%			
Mascotte	2,687	1.35%			
Sub Total	6,885	3.47%			
<b>INCORPORATED TOTAL</b>	<b>78,531</b>	<b>39.52%</b>			
<b>UNINCORPORATED</b>	<b>120,169</b>	<b>60.48%</b>			
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1
Commissioner Lake County			1	1	1
			<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 COUNTIES TOTAL</b>	<b>198,700</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>

**Note:**

\* and + In Lake County, these cities will share one vote on a yearly basis, beginning with the largest city first, followed by the next largest, until each city has voted.

\*\*\* Non Voting Member Cities :Input from non voting member cities during deliberation on MPO issues shall be considered before voting members cast their vote.