



Council Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, March 17, 2010
10:00 am

309 Cranes Roost Blvd., Suite 2000 Altamonte Springs, Florida 32701

- I. **Call to Order and General Business**
 - Call to Order – Chair, Mary Martin - Vice Mayor, City of Port Orange
 - Roll Call – Karen Heine
- II. **Consent Agenda**
 - February 2010 Minutes – Secretary Daniel O’Keefe (**Attachment 1**)
 - February 2010 Financial Report – Treasurer Elaine Renick (**Attachment 2**)
- III. **Osceola County Conceptual Master Plan – Jeffrey Jones –Osceola County Smart Growth Manager (20 minutes)**
- IV. **ECFRPC 2060 Plan Public Hearing (Strategic Regional Policy Plan)**
- V. **Commuter Assistance Program- Courtney Miller (w/FDOT)**
- VI. ***myregion.org* update- Shelley Lauten**
- VII. **Proposed Wekiva Trail letter- Council endorsement sought - Tara McCue (Attachment 3)**
- VIII. **Chair’s Report – Mary Martin**
 - Executive Committee replacement for Commissioner Van Der Weide
 - Brevard County member Commissioner Chuck Nelson replacing Commissioner Infantini
 - Wekiva River System Advisory Management Committee – Member needed to replace Dan O’Keefe
- IX. **Pension Language Revision – Jerry Livingston**
- X. **Executive Director’s Report – Phil Laurien**
 - Banking / Investments update
 - Legislative Bills potentially affecting RPC
- XI. **Planning Manager’s Report – George Kinney**
- XII. **Announcements/Comments**
 - An opportunity for Council members and members of the public to bring up events, issues or other items of interest to the Council.
- XIII. **Adjournment**

ATTACHMENT 1

February 2010 Minutes

EAST CENTRAL FLORIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

February 17, 2010

Chair Vice Mayor Martin Presiding

In Attendance:

County Representatives:

Commissioner Bolin, Brevard County
Commissioner Renick, Lake County
Commissioner Arrington, Osceola County
Commissioner Boyd, Orange County
Commissioner McLean, Seminole County
Commissioner Carey, Seminole County
Councilman Kelly, Volusia County
Councilwoman Northey, Volusia County

Municipal Representatives:

Commissioner Sheehan, City of Orlando
Mayor Randels, Space Coast League of Cities
Mayor Land, City of Apopka
Commissioner Grieb, City of Kissimmee
Commissioner Krebs, Winter Springs
Vice Mayor Martin, Volusia County League of Cities

Gubernatorial Appointees:

Mr. Dan O'Keefe, Orange County
Mr. Lonnie Groot, Volusia County
Mr. William McDermott

Ex-Officio Members:

Ms. Nancy Christman, St. Johns River Water Management District
Ms. Vivian Garfein, Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Ms. Cecelia Weaver, South Florida Water Management District
Ms. Susan Sadighi, Florida Department of Transportation

Other Attendees:

Mr. Robert Hamm, Wilbur Smith, Associates
Mr. Bob Wright, Kissimmee Development Services
Ms. Shelly Lauten, *myregion.org*

Members not in Attendance:

Commissioner Infantini
Commissioner Cadwell
Commissioner Brummer
Commissioner Hawkins

Ms. Jackie Colon
Mr. Al Glover
Mayor Melissa DeMarco
Mr. Jon Rawlson
Mr. Julius Melendez
Ms. Melanie Chase
Ms. Aileen Cubillos
Commissioner Jack Bridges

ECFRPC Staff:

Executive Director Philip Laurien
Attorney Jerry Livingston
Mr. George Kinney
Mr. Fred Milch
Ms. Claudia Paskauskas
Mr. Andrew Landis
Ms. Lelia Hars
Ms. Tara McCue
Ms. Elizabeth Rothbeind
Mr. Keith Smith
Ms. Gina Marchica
Mr. Chris Chagdes
Mr. Matt Boerger
Ms. Kate Hillman
Ms. Karen Heine

I. Call to Order and General Business

Chairwoman Martin called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Ms. Karen Heine called the roll and announced a quorum was present.

II. Consent Agenda

Chairwoman Martin asked for a Motion to Approve the January 2010 Minutes and the January 2010 Financial Report.

The Motion to approve the December 2009 Minutes and December 2009 Financial Report was made by Mayor Land and seconded by Commissioner Carey. All were in favor.

III. Presentation I-95 Transportation Alternatives Study- FDOT-Presentation by Susan Sadighi-FDOT and Robert Hamm-Wilbur Smith, Associates

Ms. Sadighi gave a project update on the I-95 study which is being coordinated by the District Office. She went over the general purpose of the study which is to assess travel demand against four measures: Transportation, Emergency Response, Homeland Security, and Economic Development. Ms. Sadighi then went over the deliverables of this study which included

identifying corridor need, alternative options and policy implications, all of which would be covered in the final transportation alternatives study for this corridor.

Mr. Hamm from Wilbur Smith, Associates continued the presentation. He discussed the timeline for completion of this study, saying that they are planning on completing a year and half process in 6 months, stressing the tight schedule of deliverables including the final report. Mr. Hamm gave a summary of the needs that will be assessed in this study by their categories: physical environment, demographics, mobility and traffic needs, emergency and security response needs, and economic development and tourism. Mr. Hamm then discussed each needs category individually.

Mr. Hamm stated that in terms of the physical environment, the portion of I-95 that is being assessed is a 400 mile stretch and is a key component of Florida's Strategic Intermodal System (SIS). He also described the capacity on this stretch of I-95 as varying from four to twelve lanes and that Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) coverage also varies throughout the corridor.

When speaking about the demographics of this corridor study, Mr. Hamm said that more than 8.3 million people live in the 12 counties surrounding this section of I-95 and that accounts for 45% of the total population of the state. He also mentioned that growth in this corridor occurred in spite of the economic downturn and that BEBR is projecting growth by 2035 to 10.6 million people. Mr. Hamm stressed that the 8.3 million residents currently living in this corridor are a diverse population that include many language and age barriers that could prove a challenge in planning for future growth of this corridor.

Mr. Hamm said that mobility for this corridor was very high ranging from 30,000 vehicles per day to 300,000 vehicles per day in some portions of the corridor. In spite of the high levels of capacity, Mr. Hamm stressed that there are significant portions of this section of I-95 that do not meet current level of service standards and that while future projections of vehicles per day will be much higher than current rates, the level of service standards will still not be met in 2035.

Next, Mr. Hamm spoke about emergency response and homeland security. He emphasized the key role that I-95 plays during an evacuation of this part of the state. Mr. Hamm mentioned that DEM, FDLE, DOT, and local counties all work together during emergencies to utilize this corridor for effective evacuation routes and emergency response. He also talked about the vulnerabilities of this corridor in terms of potential hazardous materials incidents that could occur and the need to mitigate the effects of such spills since this portion of the corridor is often used as the staging area for emergency response by the counties surrounding I-95.

Mr. Hamm described the economic development component of the study by mentioning that this section of the I-95 corridor is home to 32 Fortune 1000 companies, 10 Enterprise Zones, and that several rural areas of critical economic concern are adjacent to the corridor. He also talked about the high percent of tourist trips that come from the eastern seaboard and that these visitors to this part of the state primarily use the I-95 corridor.

Mr. Hamm concluded by summing up the identified corridor needs and by offering a look into the future to see how corridor will respond to the projected growth in this part of the region. He said that the technical memorandum will be posted on the website in a week or so and that the final study report will be reviewed in April and May. The final study report will be due by June

2010. He emphasized that this study will not recommend solutions but will provide options and policy implications of those options for policy makers and local planners.

Mr. Hamm asked if there were any comments or questions from the Council. Mayor Randels asked about the possibility of including managed lanes or elevated lanes as options for this part of the corridor. Mr. Hamm replied that point of document is to identify all possible options and alternatives for this corridor which includes elevated lanes similar to the ones in Tampa. Mayor Randels also mentioned that this portion of I-95 is often used as the main local road for Brevard County and wanted to know if an alternative route could be provided for local traffic. Mr. Hamm replied that there are some options to remove local traffic off of I-95 to other parallel routes, but he stressed that this report is from a state level perspective which means it won't be giving specifics for counties, even though some basic options will be talked about.

Mayor Land asked if the South Florida portion of this corridor included toll lanes. Mr. Hamm replied that there are about twenty miles that were toll roads in South Florida. He said that within those 20 miles, the I-95 lanes are free, but two interior lanes are toll lanes. Commissioner Arrington asked about the possibility of linking corridors during emergency management situations. Mr. Hamm stated that the Department of Emergency Management was currently completing a state wide study on that possibility including looking at congested locations and current facilities, but that it will not be finished until late in the summer. Chairwoman Martin asked if this presentation was available for local MPO's, and Mr. Hamm answered that his team will be meeting with the region's MPO's in March. Director Laurien mentioned that localities could require through streets and local routes to be used for local traffic which would help get that same traffic off of I-95. Mr. Hamm agreed saying that was one of the policy alternatives that would be mentioned in the second document and final report.

IV. Kissimmee Vine Street Corridor Overlay-Presentation by Bob Wright-Kissimmee Development Services

Mr. Wright from Kissimmee Development Services gave a project briefing on the Kissimmee Vine Street Corridor Overlay. He spoke about the history and context of this project, the community vision for this corridor overlay, as well as next steps.

Mr. Wright spoke about the market analysis that took place in 2007 which had identified Kissimmee as an urban hub within Osceola County. At the time of the market analysis in 2007 the plan was to increase density and uses within the city as well as expand housing diversity as part of a 20 year vision. Mr. Wright said that once the recession hit, they had to adjust their plan from 20 years to 30 years. He gave the Vineland Vision Implementation Timeline and an overview of the design framework for this analysis. Mr. Wright also mentioned the intent for future development and increased density in this corridor. He also gave an overview of the overlay framework and a best practices guide for site design. Mr. Wright mentioned that the City of Kissimmee already has a fairly good street grid system in the downtown area that they want to maintain and build on. Mr. Wright concluded by talking about next steps which are funding options for development, a multimodal transportation plan and the interagency partnership that will be necessary to form with other agencies to ensure success of this long-term vision.

Chairwoman Martin then called for questions from the Council. Mr. McDermott asked what the size was of the Vine Street Corridor Overlay. Mr. Wright answered that is seven miles long.

Mayor Land asked if this was the old Main Street in Kissimmee. Mr. Wright replied, no, it is one street over from Main Street. Director Laurien asked for clarification of the number of street lanes, whether the final plan called for three lanes plus 2 lanes of street parking or another alternative. Mr. Wright said that the number of street lanes has not been adopted by the Commission yet, and that there are a couple alternatives being developed. Haven't been adopted by commission yet, couple alternatives have been developed.

Mayor Randels asked about the effect of increasing densities on Kissimmee's Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Wright replied that it would require changes like setting higher densities, which would mean discussion with DCA, but that the City of Kissimmee should have a good argument to back the necessary changes since higher densities are a necessary component of good transit.

V. East Central Florida 2060 Plan (Strategic Regional Policy Plan-SRPP)

Director Laurien said that he wanted to open this portion of the agenda this morning to discussion from the council on their comments on the SRPP they were given at the January 20th 2010 Council Meeting.

Commissioner Sheehan started by saying it was one of the best written policy documents she had ever read and that it did a good job of boiling down concepts so everyone could understand the intent of each policy even if they did not have a background in that content area. Commissioner Sheehan went on to say she did have a couple of concerns from the Orlando perspective, her main concern is using College Park as an example of a well planned neighborhood since it has effectively walled itself off from Colonial and that now there is pressure from other neighborhoods who want to wall themselves off from adjoining neighborhoods like College Park. Sheehan said this is creating huge problems in her district and that it may be better to use Thornton Park rather than college park as an example of a complete neighborhood in Orlando.

Commissioner Sheehan also mentioned several corrections that needed to be made: that a caption on a picture should be changed from College Park to Central Boulevard and that on page 29 the picture is not Tallahassee, but Downtown Orlando and should be labeled as such. Commissioner Sheehan closed by saying she really liked the section on affordable housing and that the SRPP did a great job communicating the ideas in that chapter.

Director Laurien agreed that the affordable housing section is an important component of the SRPP. He gave Houston, Texas as an example of a city that allows accessory apartments by right of the property owner which has made that type of housing an affordable option for people in Houston, and it is an idea that should be embraced here in Central Florida. Commissioner Sheehan agreed and mentioned that Commissioner Brummer had tried to make that point yesterday at a City of Orlando meeting, but that people in attendance did not seem to get it. She stressed that lack of understanding makes the SRPP an even more important tool in citizen education. She wants to have the Council Staff come do a presentation on the SRPP at a future City of Orlando meeting.

Commissioner Carey asked for clarification on the timeline of how the SRPP becomes an adopted document that is officially approved by the Governor and Legislature. Director Laurien explained the steps to the Council. The SRPP will have to go through required public hearings prescribed by law and the official distribution will be made at a public hearing next month,

which will be public hearing number two. Director Laurien said that the Council Staff will also work with the region's MPO's to get out into the communities in the region to gain more local input. Director Laurien said it is a six month process to get local input including distribution to all 68 cities and 7 counties. After that, the document must be approved by the Governor which should happen sometime in late fall. Director Laurien stressed that formal approval by the Regional Planning Council precedes the SRPP going to the Governor.

Commissioner Carey said that Seminole County's planning department has twenty-two pages of comments and concerns that they have sent to Council Staff, and that she would like to just mention a few of those concerns. Her first concern had to do with the 90 gallons per day recommendation made in the Water Chapter of the SRPP. She said that the 90 gallons conflicts with the consumptive use permit of the county and the water districts goal of 120 gallons per day. Commissioner Carey talked about her concerns with the recommendation made to use reclaimed water to irrigate crops in the region because of possible viruses in that water. She mentioned that Seminole County would not want to adopt something with goals that are in direct conflict with the County's Comprehensive Plan.

Director Laurien said he wanted to respond to those concerns from a different perspective. He said that the whole point of the Water Chapter in the SRPP is to look at what happens if we continue to grow the way current trends indicate growth will continue in this region. Based on this projected growth why shouldn't the region set a goal to conserve our way out of our region's current water shortages? Director Laurien then gave the example of New York City deciding 30 years ago to set a goal to conserve their way out of water shortages, and then accomplishing that goal. He stressed that setting a goal is an appropriate option to consider in this document because it sets a target for the region.

Commissioner Carey responded by saying that Seminole County already has an aggressive plan for water conservation, and that they don't want to take action at the regional level that would conflict with county plans. Commissioner Renick said it is important to remember that Kirby Green, the Executive Director of the St. Johns River Water Management District did not disagree with this goal of 90 gallons. Director Laurien followed up on this point by saying that Mr. Green had also said that the Regional Planning Council can recommend a policy of 90 gallons per day to conserve water in the region, and that the St. Johns River Water Management District would have less ability to do so.

Director Laurien also said that the SRPP will at times, conflict with county comprehensive plans, and that is what it is supposed to because it provides a better plan for future growth based on looking at current and future trends for growth. He went on to say that this is meant to be a high level policy plan that will help set a better outcome for counties in this region. Commissioner Carey replied that if every county adopts what had been agreed upon with *How Shall We Grow?* that each county will be where they need to be in terms of planning for future growth.

Ms. Christman from the St. Johns River Management District asked whether regional agencies be given the option to comment on the SRPP in writing. Director Laurien replied, absolutely. Ms. Christman went on to say that the 90 gallons goal is good, but she emphasized that the goal must be measurable, because the last thing the council will want to do is set a target where it cannot be determined if you have achieved your goal or not. She said that right now, SJRWMD technically cannot determine what residential consumption actually is, and that the Council may

want to divide consumption out to measurements of indoor use and outdoor use, with slightly different goals for each category. Christman also clarified for the Council that consumptive use permitting is totally different than planning for a lower number of gallons used per day.

Ms. Garfien said it is important to clear up what Commissioner Carey had said about concerns of viruses in reused water. She emphasized that reused water does not have viruses; and that citrus growers have been using reclaimed water for years, and that it is important to clarify that misunderstanding.

Chairwoman Martin wrapped up the conversation by saying that it is important to remember that these are goals and guidelines that while they are not set in stone, are meant to help counties plan for long term growth in a more comprehensive way. Chairwoman Martin said to please send any and all comments on the SRPP back to the Council Staff.

VI. Chairwoman's Report

Chairwoman Martin said her only report was to introduce Commissioner Mary Bolin of Brevard County and that it was good to have her back on the Council.

VII. Executive Director's Report

Director Laurien gave his report to the Council. He mentioned that the Investment Committee had met with SunTrust once again because of the Council's concern with the very low amount of interest that is being earned on the current investments. The Investment Committee is trying to find a better way to invest the money, where it meets state and bylaw criteria while getting the best possible return on the investment. He said this may mean moving the money to another financial institution other than SunTrust.

Director Laurien spoke about the Pension Committee which was formed because of two competing sets of information about the pension. Attorney Livingston said that he had looked over the information as requested by Director Laurien and concluded that he could not make a determination on which set of information was correct. He suggested Director Laurien use the services of our local pension documents lawyer who can get in touch with Mr. Barrett in Maryland who is the person currently handling the money. Attorney Livingston mentioned that Mr. Barrett is very receptive to any comments from the Council on amendments to the current pension plan. Mr. O'Keefe asked whether the pension provider could be moved to Florida from Maryland. Attorney Livingston said it could be moved, which would not be a bad idea to do that. Mr. O'Keefe suggested that the Pension Committee should check on the possibility of switching to a pension provider in Florida. Attorney Livingston said he would have a report back next month and that the Pension Committee would look at whatever alternative was suggested by the local lawyer the next time they meet.

Director Laurien mentioned the letter he had received from Orange County about the budget for next year. He said he expects to get preliminary budget information from the county in July, and that Orange County will be cutting their budget by 7% and that he is currently in the process of putting together an ECFRPC budget that complies with that cut.

Director Laurien went on to discuss the Governor's Budget which is currently only allocating \$500,000.00 for the eleven regional planning councils in the state. For perspective, Director

Laurien mentioned that four years ago the funding allocated to the planning councils was 4 million dollars. He emphasized that this will be another challenging year for the Regional Planning Council. Director Laurien said that the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council will receive about 17% of the state allocation and even though the amount of funding is significantly reduced amount, it does not change the mandated requirements of the planning council in terms of DRI reviews and work on comprehensive plans.

Director Laurien mentioned continued coordination with myregion.org on policy recommendations in the region.

Director Laurien spoke briefly about the Seminole County Public School System Economic Impact Analysis, saying that the schools had not released our report yet, but our REMI analysis was completed. This is an example of the sort of economic impact models the regional council staff can run. There is only a modest cost to members for running full studies to aid counties with potential large development impacts.

Director Laurien concluded by saying that air quality in the office is back to normal, and that the outer offices have had a mold problem that has been mitigated. He mentioned that the landlord had been uncooperative at first but that remediation has been going on night and day for the last week and now the cleanup is being done. Director Laurien mentioned that the council has had to spend about \$6000.00 out of pocket to get the landlord to respond, but they should be reimbursed fully by landlord.

Contracts Update

Ms. McCue gave a brief update on the Evacuation Contract. She said it should be completed by end of June and that Volusia County's LIDAR and SLOSH Models have already been run and that Volusia County Emergency Managers have adjusted their evacuation zones based on this new information. Ms. McCue said they are currently working with Brevard County and DEM to make sure that Brevard's information is 100% accurate. Once that information is verified, emergency managers in Brevard County will also be given the data from SLOSH models for their county that will aid in future evacuation plans. Ms. McCue explained what SLOSH and LIDAR are to the Council and how they help in showing what areas will have water over land in case of hurricanes, and also how deep water will be in the areas. Director Laurien said the purpose is to try and anticipate what impact water and storms will have on counties in the region so that emergency managers can adjust their plans and evacuate residents accordingly.

Councilwoman Northey asked about the relevancy of LIDAR, and the timeline for completion of LIDAR for Volusia County. Ms. McCue replied that everything for Volusia County was complete, and that it should take about 12 weeks to run the transportation model. She mentioned that Volusia County's DEM has that data, but that the data is still considered draft until it is formally accepted on June 30th. Ms. McCue told Councilwoman Northey that she could look at this data and use it currently but it will be considered in draft form until the 30th of June.

Ms. McCue said that for Brevard County there are still small pockets of data that are not included, which means she is currently working with the county to fill in those holes with up to date data. Commissioner Bolin asked for a timeline of when Brevard County could expect completed data, and Ms. McCue replied that the March 15th deadline will be met.

Director Laurien spoke about the SR 50 FDOT Corridor Analysis, (Lake Co.) saying that the staff is working on this analysis with FDOT which includes a build out analysis based on current build out and capacity as well as future alternatives including what this corridor would it look like if transit is added.

Proposed Contracts

Director Laurien discussed a proposed contract for YMCA & Community Schools Siting. Randy Lyons may request the RPC staff to consult on a federal grant to do school siting in Orange County using the Lake Nona Community School as the model of how to build schools that share facilities with the YMCA. He said that this would be a GIS exercise that would include search criteria for other sites in Central Florida that would be a feasible site for this type of combination school and YMCA. Director Laurien also said that there could be siting done by others in Chicago for similar schools.

Director Laurien said he also had a inquiry about ECFRPC joining the consultants for a corridor analysis of International Speedway BLVD. Councilwoman Northey said she spoke at the last Volusia County Council Meeting and that a study on 1792 in Volusia County is also something that the county is interested in having the staff work on in addition to the speedway project.

VIII. Planning Manager's Report

Mr. Kinney stated that there are about eleven comprehensive plan reviews at various stages currently being worked on by the staff as well as five intergovernmental reviews currently being conducted. Mr. Kinney concluded by saying that if Council Members have specific questions, they can e-mail him anytime.

IX: Announcements

Commissioner Grieb wanted to thank the City of Kissimmee for the great work they did on the presentation today. Mayor Randels wanted to recognize Director Laurien and Ms. Rothbeind for their excellent presentation to the Canaveral Port Authority last month. He mentioned that the city of Cape Canaveral is aggressively planning for a brighter future thanks in part to the work done by the regional council staff. Ms. Garfien also complimented the staff on getting into the community to help get places like Tavares on board with new planning ideas.

X. Adjournment

There being no further business before the Council, Chairwoman Martin adjourned meeting at 11:45 a.m.

ATTACHMENT 2

February 2010 Financial Report

Financial Forecast

Statement of Condition as of February 28, 2010

Cash-in-bank on February 1, 2010		\$2,441,181.05
Deposits and Interest - February 2010	\$144,824.65	
Checks Issued - February 2010	-\$168,212.51	
Cash-in-bank on February 28, 2010		<u>\$2,417,793.19</u>

Financial Forecast for March 2010

Operating Cash March 1, 2010		\$2,417,793.19
Accounts Payable on March 1, 2010		<u>-23,591.13</u>
Net Operating Cash for March 1, 2010		\$2,394,202.06

Anticipated Revenue/Expense for February 2010:		
Accounts Receivables (Revenues)	\$155,623.38	
Accounts Payables (Expenditures)	<u>-124,539.68</u>	
Net Anticipated Revenue/Expense		31,083.70
Anticipated Operating Cash for March 1, 2010		<u>\$2,425,285.76</u>

	Budget	1/31/2010 Year to Date	Actual February	Current Year to Date	Under (Over)	41.7%
Personnel						
Salaries & Wages (Permanent)	851,920	272,166	72,148	344,314	507,606	40.4%
Fringe Benefits	300,000	88,428	23,393	111,821	188,179	37.3%
Outside /Temporary Services	26,000	3,784	688	4,472	21,528	17.2%
Contract Labor-SRPP and contracts	83,645	308	-	308	83,337	0.4%
Interns	30,000	8,672	1,938	10,610	19,390	35.4%
Unemployment	3,500	3,025	-	3,025	475	86.4%
Total Personnel	1,295,065	376,383	98,167	474,550	820,515	36.6%
Overhead						
Annual Audit	17,000	578	-	578	16,422	3.4%
Advertising/Regional Promotion	4,000		-		4,000	0.0%
Computer Ops (General)	29,664	2,438	12,885	15,323	14,341	51.7%
Depreciation/Use Charge	12,000	4,000	1,000	5,000	7,000	41.7%
Equipment (General)	22,000	2,945	1,800	4,745	17,255	21.6%
Equipment Maintenance/Rental	1,500		75	75	1,425	5.0%
Equipment Lease/Sales Taxes	400	2	-	2	398	0.5%
Graphics/Outside Printing	30,000	5,599	1,754	7,353	22,647	24.5%
Insurance	14,000	2,539	1,273	3,812	10,188	27.2%
Inter-Regnl Bd Rel (travel/training)	3,500	395	-	395	3,105	11.3%
Legal Counsel	44,000	13,333	3,334	16,667	27,333	37.9%
Library/Publications/Subscriptions	3,000	625	43	668	2,332	22.3%
Office Supplies	12,000	3,002	305	3,307	8,693	27.6%
Pension Fund Mgmt. Fee	900		-		900	0.0%
Postage	12,000	1,418	248	1,666	10,334	13.9%
Professional Dues	26,000	8,688	2,938	11,626	14,374	44.7%
Rent	119,000	39,667	9,916	49,583	69,417	41.7%
Office Maintenance	2,000	1,303	-	1,303	697	65.2%
Staff Training	9,000	1,806	225	2,031	6,969	22.6%
Telephone & Communications	8,000	2,010	537	2,547	5,453	31.8%
Staff Travel	24,000	5,519	1,179	6,698	17,302	27.9%
Recruiting	4,000		-		4,000	0.0%
Hmep Training	40,000	2,682	-	2,682	37,318	6.7%
GIS Coordination	3,000		-		3,000	0.0%
GIS Data Collection	1,500		-		1,500	0.0%
Consultants (DRI)	64,000	12,376	2,638	15,014	48,986	23.5%
Consultants(SRPP)	15,000		-		15,000	0.0%
Consultants(UASI Training & Exerccs	164,000		24,000	24,000	140,000	14.6%
Consultants CFGIS/LRTP tool	10,000		-		10,000	0.0%
Consultants (Cape Canaveral)		300	-	300		
CFGIS Web Site Maintenance			10,000	10,000	(10,000)	
Storage-Off Site Records	1,600	407	143	550	1,050	34.4%
Meeting Expenses	10,000	1,438	303	1,741	8,259	17.4%
REMI Annual Maintenance	20,000	6,867	1,716	8,583	11,417	42.9%
S. Bitar VISA Sponsorship	4,000	720	-	720	3,280	18.0%
Total Overhead	731,064	120,657	76,312	196,969	534,095	26.9%
Total Expenditures	2,026,129	497,040	174,478	671,518	1,354,611	33.1%

REVENUES	Project:	General	DRI Reviews	FY10 DCA	FY10 LEPC Staff Support	FY10 Haz Mat Emrg Preparedness	FDOT Cont's & Imp of CFGIS	Regional Evacuation Study	USDC EDAC/EDS FY08-FY09	SEMIHOLE COUNTY Public Schools	17-92.2 Seminole County	Casselberry Intersection 17-92 & 436	SR 50 Corridor Study	Cape Canaveral Visioning	Palm Bay Sign Code	State TEP 2010-2012 Update	State TEP 2011-2013 Update	
Member Assessments		579,209.00																
Member HEMI Contributions																		
Federal						187.88			8,880.88									
State				117,254.04	14,423.42													
Local																		
DRI Fees			68,309.16															
Other		8,645.13																
Total Revenues Received		587,854.13	68,309.16	117,254.04	14,423.42	187.88	10,986.59	0.00	8,880.88	0.00	98,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6,000.00	0.00	0.00	
Account Receivables:																		
Member Assessments																		
Federal						1,763.75			8,245.22									
State				168,268.96	917.63				3,486.94									
Local/Other							10,547.04											
Total Accounts Receivables										5,000.00	1,100.00	482.16	2,895.32					
TOTAL REVENUES		587,854.13	68,309.16	285,523.00	15,341.05	1,951.63	21,533.63	23,330.77	20,613.04	5,000.00	99,100.00	482.16	2,895.32	0.00	6,000.00	3,020.14	51.97	
EXPENDITURES																		
Salaries		87,875.47	30,923.78	116,926.75	6,281.36	634.13	2,345.32	13,296.29	11,419.37	3,660.39	22,397.22	280.13	1,711.09	7,429.44	2,180.72	1,751.38	30.19	
Fringe Benefits (Pool)		27,798.96	10,345.42	34,858.92	2,115.01	213.52	786.02	4,455.30	3,845.04	1,232.50	6,521.62	94.33	467.16	2,386.89	685.69	589.71	10.17	
Indirect Cost (Pool)		33,270.25	11,869.83	43,656.51	2,414.96	243.80	900.64	5,105.71	4,390.34	1,407.29	8,317.62	107.70	626.51	2,823.36	824.44	673.34	11.61	
Unemployment Comp		3,025.00																
Audit Fees																		
Advertising/Regional Promotion																		
Computer Operations		7,564.82					6,500.00											
Dues		2,133.07																
Equipment		3,744.69					1,000.00											
Graphics		3,459.00	46.20	6,262.41	50.83	435.79				1.46	681.61		34.85	385.58	2.17	5.71		
Inter-Region Bd Relations		395.22																
Legal		16,666.65																
Office Supplies		273.79		574.18														
Postage		475.25	70.46	106.52	687.05	1.56	1.65	6.14			10.37							
Publications		449.75		125.75	65.56													
Recruiting																		
Rent																		
Equipment Rent & Maintenance					75.00													
Staff Training		1,805.75			225.00													
HMEP Training					2,259.67	422.83												
Taxes, Sales/Property		2.00																
Telephone																		
Travel		2,277.64	39.21	1,392.31	986.41				298.30		188.92		55.71	189.41	64.92			
Temporary Labor/Outside Services		1,667.60		1,296.40	255.20													
Interest Expense																		
DATA Fees																		
Consultants			15,014.26	308.00														
GIS Coordination																		
CFGIS Workshop Expense																		
Meeting Expenses		1,740.76																
REMI Annual Maintenance		8,583.34																
Web Site Maintenance																		
Web Site Upgrade							10,000.00											
S. Bihar VISA Sponsorship		720.00																
Office Maint/Printing		1,302.68																
New Office Fit Up																		
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		205,231.69	68,309.16	205,522.75	15,341.05	1,951.63	21,533.63	23,330.77	20,613.04	6,301.64	38,117.36	482.16	2,895.32	13,514.68	3,757.94	3,020.14	51.97	

East Central Florida Regional Planning Council
 Financial Report
 February
 2010

	RDSTF	UASI RFP	UASE 2010 Exerciser	TIC Plan	Rollins College	Camp Blanding Exerciser	Total
REVENUES							
Revenues Paid:							
Member Assessments							579,209.00
Member REMI Contributions							0.00
Federal							9,068.76
State							142,664.05
Local							104,000.00
DRI Fees							68,309.16
Other							8,645.13
Total Revenues Received	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	911,896.10
Account Receivables:							
Member Assessments							0.00
Federal	3,430.33	4,609.18	24,535.23	6,587.32		2,152.60	8,245.22
State							72,968.23
Local/Other					228.59		182,628.95
Total Accounts Receivables	3,430.33	4,609.18	24,535.23	6,587.32	228.59	2,152.60	6,810.75
TOTAL REVENUES	3,430.33	4,609.18	24,535.23	6,587.32	228.59	2,152.60	1,182,549.25
EXPENDITURES							
Salaries	1,947.68	2,630.06	301.97	3,751.92	120.78	1,155.02	319,050.46
Fringe Benefits (Pool)	655.81	885.57	101.68	1,263.32	40.67	388.91	99,742.22
Indirect Cost (Pool)	748.81	1,011.16	116.10	1,442.48	46.44	444.06	120,452.96
Unemployment Comp							3,025.00
Audit Fees							0.00
Advertising/Regional Promotion							0.00
Computer Operations							14,064.82
Dues							2,133.07
Equipment							4,744.69
Graphics	1.05	5.25	0.20	72.57	14.02	0.20	11,634.32
Inter-Regnl Bd Relations							395.22
Legal							16,666.65
Office Supplies							847.97
Postage	61.67	60.75				5.44	1,486.86
Publications		16.39					657.45
Recruiting							0.00
Rent							0.00
Equipment Rent & Maintenance							73.00
Staff Training							2,030.75
HMEP Training							2,682.50
Taxes, Sales/Property							2.00
Telephone							0.00
Travel	15.31		15.28	57.03		158.97	6,698.00
Temporary Labor/Outside Services					6.68		3,159.20
Interest Expense							0.00
DATA Fees							0.00
Consultants			24,000.00				39,622.26
GIS Coordination							0.00
C/FGIS Workshop Expense							0.00
Meeting Expenses							1,740.76
REMI Annual Maintenance							8,583.34
Web Site Maintenance							10,000.00
Web Site Upgrade							0.00
S. Bihar VISA Sponsorship							720.00
Office Maint/Printing							1,302.68
New Office Fit Up							0.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	3,430.33	4,609.18	24,535.23	6,587.32	228.59	2,152.60	671,518.18

ATTACHMENT 3

Proposed Wekiva Trail letter

To: Noranne Downs, FDOT District 5 Secretary
Mr. Mike Snyder, Orlando -Orange County Expressway Authority

RE: Wekiva Trail Connection from Mt. Dora to Seminole County Trail System

February 23, 2010

Dear Secretary Downs and Mr. Snyder,

Lake and Seminole Counties along with various agencies such as the ECFRPC, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) Office of Greenways and Trails, FDEP Division of Recreation and Parks, and the MPOs are working to establish a clear unified vision for the future of the Wekiva Trail. We wish to express the importance of working with FDOT and OOCEA to address areas where the Wekiva Parkway and proposed service road could work in conjunction with a multi-use trail. The various alignments and areas that would take advantage of this situation will be determined through the trail feasibility study being conducted by FDOT.

The consensus among the agencies is that trail connectivity is the priority, along with offering alternative transportation options in the corridor. Dependent upon the aforementioned feasibility study, utilizing the proposed wildlife crossing and the service road crossing of the Wekiva River remain the top priority of the agencies involved.

There has been discussion and legitimate desire for a separate river crossing for the trail along the abandoned rail line located off Longwood Markham Road. This option offers recreational opportunities, but does not enhance the connected multi-modal opportunities the SR 46 crossing embraces. Many constraints are associated with this crossing and it should be considered a second priority to ensuring trail access is included in the Parkway Project. This crossing should be considered a recreational extension separate from the FDOT and OOCEA Wekiva Parkway efforts.

Thank you for your efforts and time to ensure the Wekiva Trail and Wekiva Parkway Parkway Corridor are planned collaboratively to make this endeavor a model for other areas around the country. We look forward to working with you towards this success.

Signed by:



Lake Sumter MPO



MetroPlan Orlando



Lake County BCC



Seminole County BCC



ECFRPC



Office of Greenways and Trails



Florida Park Service