

An aerial photograph of a residential and commercial area. A yellow highlight is drawn over a road on the left side of the image, extending horizontally across the middle. The text 'APPENDIX K' is centered in the upper half of the image.

**APPENDIX K**

**PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPT**

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
Public Hearing

Re: I-95 Interchange at Ellis Road

Widening of Ellis Road from  
John Rodes Boulevard to Wickham Road

Project Development and Environment Study

PRESENTATION BY:  
Daniel Kristoff, Jr.

---

DATE TAKEN: October 25, 2012  
TIME: 5:00 P.M. - 6:50 P.M.  
PLACE: 2955 Minton Road  
West Melbourne, Florida

Proceedings taken before:

Patricia A. Migliaccio, RMR, CRR, CLR, FPR, CCR(NJ)  
Court Reporter  
and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

	PAGE
Presentation	3
PUBLIC SPEAKERS	
Shirley VanDiver	23
Scott Morgan	27
Stephanie Eley	28
Kathy Meehan	28
Public Meeting Closed	29
Certificate of Reporter	30

1 MR. KRISTOFF: Okay. Good evening. And  
2 welcome to the alternatives public hearing for  
3 the I-95 interchange and Ellis Road Project  
4 Development Environmental Study.

5 My name is Dan Kristoff, and I am the  
6 consultant project manager. And I hope you all  
7 have had an opportunity to talk with DOT staff or  
8 our staff prior to coming into this presentation.

9 Before we get into the project specifics  
10 there are a number of recitals we need to put in  
11 the record, so please bear with me.

12 This public hearing is being held in  
13 accordance with the following state and federal  
14 regulations: Federal Highway Act of 1968 as  
15 amended by 23 US Code Section 128, 40 CFR 1500  
16 through 1508, 23 CFR 771, and Section 339.155 of  
17 the Florida statutes as it relates to State  
18 Financial Identification Project Number  
19 426905-122-01 and Federal-Aid Project Number SFT1  
20 251 R.

21 This public hearing was advertised  
22 consistent with federal and state regulations,  
23 and is being conducted consistent with the  
24 American Disabilities Act of 1990. This hearing  
25 is being held to afford all citizens the right to

1 understand the project and comment upon their  
2 concerns.

3 This hearing is being held to afford all the  
4 citizens a right for you to understand the  
5 project and comment upon it to the Department of  
6 Transportation. It is being held to comply with  
7 the Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and  
8 Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 as  
9 amended.

10 Public participation is solicited without  
11 regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex,  
12 religion, disability mor family status. Persons  
13 wishing to express their concerns relative to  
14 DOT's compliance with Title VI and/or Title VIII  
15 may do so by contacting the FDOT District Five  
16 Title VI and Title VIII coordinator Lorie  
17 Matthews at 719 South Woodland Boulevard, MS506,  
18 Deland, Florida, 32720 or the Florida Department  
19 of Transportation Equal Opportunity Office, 605  
20 Suwannee Street, Room 260, Mail Station 65,  
21 Tallahassee, Florida, (332)399-0450.

22 All inquiries or complaints will be handled  
23 according to Department of Transportation  
24 procedures in an expeditious manner.

25 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to

1 inform you of the study findings, discuss the  
2 study recommendations, and receive input  
3 regarding the location, conceptual design, and  
4 potential social, economic, and environmental  
5 effects of the proposed improvement upon the  
6 community.

7 In case you have not gotten a speaker card  
8 at the sign-in table, speaker cards are available  
9 and I would ask if you would raise your hand and  
10 you wish to speak this evening our personnel will  
11 provide you with a speaker card.

12 This graphic identifies the major phases  
13 that are required to complete this project. The  
14 planning phase for the project has been completed  
15 in that it is identified in the current FDOT  
16 five-year work program and the Space Coast TOP  
17 Long Range Transportation Plan. The PD&E study  
18 which is currently under way will be followed by  
19 preliminary and final design activities that will  
20 include the development of right-of-way plans and  
21 permit applications for construction. Once  
22 right-of-way acquisition is completed the project  
23 will be ready for construction.

24 The PD&E study is a multi-phase element in  
25 itself. It begins by collecting data, followed

1 by forecasting future traffic to determine the  
2 true need for the project. It is then followed  
3 by the development of alternatives, an evaluation  
4 of potential impacts of the build alternatives,  
5 and the selection of a preferred alternative that  
6 will move forward into the final design phase.

7 Funding is available for the preliminary and  
8 final design phases of the interchange, and this  
9 project will be initiated after the Federal  
10 Highway Administration accepts the environmental  
11 document.

12 Throughout the entire PD&E study a public  
13 outreach program secures information from  
14 government agencies, stakeholders in the project,  
15 businesses, individuals, and special interest  
16 groups that may be affected.

17 Today's meeting provides an opportunity for  
18 any person or group to view the progress to date,  
19 ask questions, and provide comments to the  
20 Florida Department of Transportation.

21 Let's take a brief look at the project. The  
22 purpose of the project is to provide a new  
23 interchange with I-95. It will be midway between  
24 the State Route 518 and the State Route 192  
25 interchanges. It will provide a connection to

1 Ellis Road and upgrade the Ellis Road corridor  
2 from John Rodes Boulevard to Wickham Road. A  
3 connection will also be provided to the St. Johns  
4 Heritage Parkway to the west.

5 Today Ellis Road is a two-lane roadway with  
6 signalized intersections at John Rodes Boulevard  
7 and Wickham Road. It does not connect to I-95.  
8 Along the route there are numerous side streets  
9 and business driveway connections. Deep ditches  
10 and canals line the road for virtually its entire  
11 distance, and almost one dozen utilities provide  
12 services to adjacent properties.

13 This area of the east coast region of  
14 Florida is a significant economic engine with  
15 more than 35,000 jobs within the service area of  
16 the Melbourne International Airport. In order to  
17 maintain and grow the region's economy it is  
18 essential that freedom of movement for both  
19 people and goods is maintained.

20 Currently, the interchanges at State Route  
21 518 and State Route 192 serve as connections  
22 between I-95 and the Melbourne International  
23 Airport. They are designated as Strategic  
24 Intermodal System connections. When completed,  
25 the new I-95 interchange and Ellis Road corridor



1 system will become the new Strategic Intermodal  
2 System connection. It will provide direct access  
3 to the airport and other Florida regions, as well  
4 as relieve the traffic at the State Route 518 and  
5 State Route 192 interchanges.

6 The new connection will carry an estimated  
7 27,000 vehicles per day, thereby providing  
8 improved mobility to the region. The Ellis Road  
9 connection will require four lanes to handle the  
10 traffic demand. Community and environmental  
11 issues that are specific to the project are  
12 listed, as well as some of the major engineering  
13 considerations. Let's examine a couple of those.

14 In the northeast quadrant of the interchange  
15 the Lamplighter neighborhood is relatively close  
16 to I-95 and the proposed connection to John Rodes  
17 Boulevard. In the northwest quadrant of the  
18 interchange a Department of Environmental  
19 Resources Conservation Easement provides  
20 protection to the natural environment. Storm  
21 water retention ponds shown in dark blue are  
22 required by the St. John's Water Management  
23 District. They are close to a number of wetland  
24 systems and will likely have some affect upon  
25 them.

1           Utilities that serve the region are located  
2 along the west side of I-95 within the purple  
3 shaded area. They include a major Florida  
4 natural gas line and significant distribution  
5 lines for Florida Power.

6           Lastly, L-15 and M-1 canals cross the area  
7 and are critical in the flood control system of  
8 the Crane Creek drainage basin.

9           The earlier slide mentions the constraints  
10 or sensitive community issues at the I-95  
11 interchange. Several modifications to the  
12 interchange concept have been developed to reduce  
13 the effects on the more substantive items.

14           Alternative number one has been developed to  
15 avoid the Lamplighter Village by constructing a  
16 retaining wall along the westbound lanes of the  
17 roadway approach to the bridge over I-95. Also  
18 the M-1 canal system is routed to the east of the  
19 interchange to maintain adequate flow.

20           Alternative number two is similar to  
21 alternative one but is shifted farther to the  
22 south. This eliminates the need for the  
23 retaining wall and avoids the conservation area  
24 that is west of I-95. The M-1 canal is again  
25 routed to the east of the interchange. Conflicts

1 with utilities west of I-95 are unavoidable with  
2 either interchange, but the impacts to them are  
3 being reduced by shifting the ramps closer to the  
4 bridge by using mechanical wall systems.

5 In order to meet the future demand a  
6 four-lane roadway is required. The roadway  
7 elements will include two travel lanes in each  
8 direction separated by a grass median. Bicycle  
9 and pedestrian accommodations will also be  
10 provided. This typical section meets the  
11 Strategic Intermodal System criteria of 50-miles  
12 per hour.

13 Similarly, the bridge over I-95 will clue  
14 the four travel lanes, appropriate turning lanes,  
15 and the accommodations for both pedestrians and  
16 bicycles.

17 Let's examine several issues along Ellis  
18 Road. Numerous businesses that are near the  
19 existing two-lane road occupy both sides of the  
20 corridor. A pocket of single family dwellings  
21 fronts the roadway near the Wickham end of the  
22 project. And both the businesses and residential  
23 areas along the corridor will be affected by the  
24 proposed roadway improvements.

25 Two typical sections have been carried

1 forward for further analysis. This top section  
2 meets the SIS criteria and requires a minimum of  
3 136 feet of right-of-way. A curb and gutter  
4 system is used in order to reduce the  
5 right-of-way required for the roadway  
6 improvements.

7 The bottom typical is similar to the SIS  
8 section. However, it has a narrower median, and  
9 the sidewalks are closer to the roadway lanes.  
10 It requires a minimum of 102 feet of  
11 right-of-way, and it is the narrowest typical  
12 section that would meet urban design standards.

13 Three separate horizontal alignments have  
14 been developed for each one of the typical  
15 sections. They are a widening to the north, a  
16 widening to the south, and a best fit alignment.  
17 At the Wickham Road intersection, which is  
18 circled in red, all of the alignments tie into  
19 the recently completed improvement in conjunction  
20 with the NASA Boulevard relocation.

21 After careful consideration of the potential  
22 impacts of the alignment alternatives a best fit  
23 alignment for each of the two typical sections  
24 has been carried forward for your further  
25 consideration and is presented this evening.

1           The 50-mile per hour SIS typical section and  
2           the 45 miles per hour are independent of each  
3           other. As you can see they can be reviewed at  
4           the display boards in the adjacent room.

5           This aerial photograph depicts the  
6           difference in overall right-of-way requirements  
7           between the two typical sections. The area  
8           shaded in orange shows the additional  
9           right-of-way required by the 50-mile per hour  
10          alternative versus the 45-mile per hour. Let's  
11          take look at several of the engineering  
12          challenges.

13          The existing right-of-way for the road  
14          varies between 75 and 100 feet. This is  
15          insufficient to accommodate the proposed  
16          improvements requiring the purchase of additional  
17          property.

18          There are 11 utilities along the corridor.  
19          Most of them require relocations, and service  
20          must be maintained to adjacent users during the  
21          construction period. This will require extensive  
22          coordination and detailed scheduling during  
23          construction.

24          The Crane Creek drainage basin has a series  
25          of canals that define the flow of storm water and

1 control flooding in the region. The most  
2 significant element that affects the project is  
3 the system of canals that collect and control  
4 drainage and flooding through this area. It is  
5 an extensive system, and the Ellis Road project  
6 is centrally located within this system.

7 More specifically, the L-15 canal lies  
8 immediately adjacent to the existing roadway,  
9 serving as an equalizing canal between the M-1  
10 and L11 canals. While the existing canal, as can  
11 be seen in the photograph, takes on many  
12 different shapes along the Ellis Road corridors,  
13 the photos clearly reveal one major constant: It  
14 is that water is always present within the canal  
15 system.

16 Therefore, from I-95, which is the vertical  
17 line shown on the left, to Technology Drive,  
18 almost three quarters of the length of the  
19 project, the typical section must provide a  
20 positive canal connection system. This typical  
21 section is shown on the slide clearly indicating  
22 the additional area required to accommodate the  
23 flood control facility.

24 The Department of Transportation has a  
25 standard practice for the treatment of canals.

1 This involves setting the canal away from the  
2 adjacent travel lanes for both the safety of the  
3 motorist and the ability to maintain the canal  
4 without disrupting traffic on the roadway.

5 This image on the bottom road shows you an  
6 approximate dimension that is required for a  
7 45-mile per hour speed limit with a guardrail  
8 section. Almost 75 feet for the canal treatment  
9 from the edge of pavement.

10 There are alternative measures that can be  
11 investigated for the canal. For example, a  
12 closed box culvert could be placed in concrete  
13 with a standard ditch construction. Another  
14 method is a closed box culvert with a sheet pile  
15 wall. And lastly, an open dish with a vertical  
16 sheet piling provides another solution.

17 These investigative treatments will be given  
18 further detailed consideration as the project  
19 moves into the next phase. Information gathered  
20 during this phase of the project is insufficient  
21 for engineering recommendations for those  
22 alternative solutions, but they are committed to  
23 be examined in the next phase.

24 Within the approximate two-mile distance  
25 between John Rodes Boulevard and Wickham Road

1           there are approximately 60 side street and access  
2           points. Except for the project end points, there  
3           are no signals along the project, and only one  
4           location that has a separate turning lane. This  
5           results in poor operations and the potential for  
6           numerous accidents.

7           In light of the future traffic that would  
8           utilize the roadway access management features  
9           will be part of the proposed improvements. They  
10          will not only improve the flow of traffic but  
11          also reduce conflict points and provide improved  
12          safety.

13          Access management features that will be  
14          incorporated into the project include a median  
15          that separates the opposing directions of travel.  
16          The median also provides safety for left turn  
17          movements by allowing the turning vehicle to be  
18          out of the through traffic lane. Other features  
19          of an access management plan are to reduce the  
20          frequency of median openings, reduce the  
21          frequency of signals, and have fewer side street  
22          connections. All of these items are directed to  
23          not only improving operational characteristics of  
24          the roadway but to significantly improve motorist  
25          and pedestrian safety.



1           The images on this slide convey the means by  
2           which conflict points and, therefore, the risk of  
3           accidents are reduced by the use of directional  
4           medians. The typical all movement intersection  
5           on a four-lane roadway has 18 major conflict  
6           locations where accidents can potentially occur.

7           We have the 18 major conflict points on the  
8           left side. In contrast, a directional median  
9           opening has only four major conflict points.  
10          Along a roadway that will be required to handle  
11          almost 28,000 vehicles per day, the appropriate  
12          use of each typical and each type of opening will  
13          substantially improve the safety and operations  
14          of the facility.

15          Evaluation matrices of the six alternatives  
16          have been developed and they have been used in  
17          the analysis of the alternatives. They include  
18          information regarding environmental, community,  
19          and economic factors. In addition, comments from  
20          public agencies and the general public provide  
21          further items to consider.

22          After considering the input that has been  
23          received, we have carefully evaluated the  
24          alternatives that have been developed for the  
25          project. Let's examine the preferred

1 alternatives.

2 For the I-95 interchange to John Rodes  
3 Boulevard segment, the currently preferred  
4 alternative is a high-speed SIS urban typical  
5 section utilizing the alternative two alignment.  
6 It avoids conservation land to the west, has the  
7 least effect on the Lamplighter Village  
8 residential area, and is the least costly of the  
9 two alternatives.

10 For the segment of the project between John  
11 Rodes Boulevard and Wickham Road the currently  
12 preferred alternative is the 45-mile per hour  
13 standard urban typical section utilizing a  
14 best-fit alternative. It requires the least  
15 amount of right-of-way, has the least disruption  
16 to the residential and business community, and  
17 reduces the impact to adjacent wetlands, and is  
18 the least costly.

19 Access Management was identified as a major  
20 component of the proposed improvements. Access  
21 Management Class Five is recommended for the I-95  
22 interchange and Ellis Road widening project.  
23 This classification is being performed in  
24 compliance with the standards developed by the  
25 Florida Department of Transportation under

1 Section 335.18 of the Florida statutes in order  
2 to protect public safety, provide for mobility,  
3 and preserving the functioning and integrity of  
4 the roadway.

5 The recommended Class Five criteria is as  
6 follows: The median type is restrictive with  
7 median opening spacing as follows: Signals at  
8 1320-foot intervals, full median openings at  
9 1320-foot intervals, directional median openings  
10 at 660-foot intervals, side connections at  
11 440-foot intervals.

12 However, any businesses or residences that  
13 will remain along the roadway will continue to  
14 have the access that they have today. It will be  
15 further developed in concert with you when the  
16 final design process moves forward.

17 The preferred alternatives have been  
18 evaluated in accordance with Executive Order  
19 11988 Floodplain Management, and Executive Order  
20 11990, Protection of Wetlands of the Constitution  
21 of the United States of America.

22 There is no significant floodplain  
23 encroachment. Wetlands cannot be totally  
24 avoided, and the FDOT will work with the  
25 regulatory agencies to provide the appropriate

1 mitigation for the impacts.

2 A survey for threatened and endangered  
3 species has been conducted for the project. The  
4 report concludes that the proposed improvements  
5 will not affect any known or threatened or  
6 endangered species.

7 Air quality and noise analyses were  
8 performed to identify potential impacts to  
9 adjacent properties and sites. The preferred  
10 alternative will not have any significant adverse  
11 impact on air quality. Therefore, this project  
12 meets the maximum air quality standards  
13 established by the US Environmental Protection  
14 Agency.

15 The results of the noise study indicate that  
16 three residences are predicted to approach or  
17 slightly exceed the state's noise attainment  
18 criteria. However, since the preferred  
19 alternative will require the acquisition and  
20 removal of these residences, consideration for  
21 noise abatement measures is not applicable.

22 A Cultural Assessment Report has been  
23 completed for the project area. We have  
24 determined that the preferred alternative has no  
25 impact upon any archeological or historic sites.

1           The Federal Department of Transportation Act  
2 of 1966 provides specific protection for wildlife  
3 and waterfowl refuges, historic and archeological  
4 sites, public parks, and recreation areas. The  
5 preferred alternative has no involvement with any  
6 Section 4(f) properties.

7           For the segment west of John Rodes Boulevard  
8 let's recalculate. The preferred alternative is  
9 the SIS typical section utilizing alternative  
10 alignment two. East of John Rodes Boulevard the  
11 preferred alternative is the standard urban  
12 typical section with its best alignment.

13           In summary, the preferred alternative  
14 recommendations are consistent with the regional  
15 transportation needs. They provide the necessary  
16 capacity and safety for an SIS connector. They  
17 provide enhancements with continuous sidewalks,  
18 bicycle provisions, and improved storm water  
19 collection and treatment systems. They have  
20 least impact to the community and to the  
21 environment, and it is the least costly.

22           What's next? Following today's hearing we  
23 will evaluate and utilize the information that we  
24 have received to perform our final assessment of  
25 these alternatives including the no-build

1 alternative. We will complete the technical  
2 environmental documents and submit an  
3 environmental document with a preferred  
4 alternative recommendation to the Federal Highway  
5 Administration. When the Federal Highway  
6 Administration accepts our recommendations they  
7 will approve the environmental document and issue  
8 design concept and location approval.

9 The next step in our process tonight is to  
10 open the public meeting to public comment. But  
11 before we commence with the public testimony  
12 let's explain how we'll conduct the proceedings.

13 This is not a question and answer session.  
14 It is a time for each individual who desires to  
15 place his or her comments on the record. We do  
16 request that you limit your testimony to no more  
17 than three minutes in order for all of those who  
18 wish to testify to have an opportunity to do so.  
19 We will remind you when you are near your time  
20 limit.

21 We ask you to please be respectful of those  
22 who speak. We ask that you do not applaud or  
23 hiss when comments are made. The order in which  
24 I have received the speaker cards are the order  
25 in which I will call the names for those who wish

1 to speak.

2 All comments are being recorded by our court  
3 reporter and are placed in a transcript of this  
4 hearing. The transcript will become a part of  
5 the document that is provided to the Federal  
6 Highway Administration for review and approval.

7 Again, if you don't have a speaker card,  
8 feel free to raise your hand and a speaker card  
9 will be provided to you.

10 We realize that many individuals prefer to  
11 provide their comments in writing rather than at  
12 a public setting. Direct contact information  
13 with the Department and the consulting team  
14 project managers is included in the handout that  
15 was provided today and can be found on our  
16 project web site. Written comments can be made  
17 to the individuals identified on the handout or  
18 directly to the web site.

19 Comment forms were made available at the  
20 sign-in table and will be mailed to the  
21 pre-addressed location or dropped in our comment  
22 box in the adjacent area. Written comments  
23 postmarked through November 5, 2012 are  
24 considered to be a part of this hearing. You may  
25 send your comments to the addresses previously

1 indicated or on the pre-stamped or pre-addressed  
2 comment form that was provided to you.

3 I have two speaker cards. I will call the  
4 names of those that have completed them and they  
5 will be in the order received. And hopefully I  
6 will be able to do my best to pronounce the names  
7 accordingly. After I call your name please  
8 approach the microphone in the center aisle,  
9 state your name, your full address prior to  
10 making your statement. If you represent an  
11 organization, municipality or other public body,  
12 please provide that information as well.

13 Again, we ask that you speak directly into  
14 the microphone so that our court reporter will be  
15 able to be certain to complete the record and get  
16 your comments.

17 The first speaker card that I have is from  
18 Shirley S. VanDiver.

19 MS. VANDIVER: I've got one question. I  
20 know I am supposed to ask a question but they  
21 said you would identify --

22 MR. KRISTOFF: Please give us your name and  
23 address.

24 MS. VANDIVER: Shirley VanDiver. We own  
25 two properties on Ellis Road. Our home address



1 is 2455 New York Street. It's in West Melbourne.

2 I've got one question. They said that you  
3 would identify any city officials that were a  
4 representative here at the meeting. Could you do  
5 so?

6 MR. KRISTOFF: I know there are some city  
7 officials, and we will ask them to stand after  
8 we've heard your comments.

9 MS. VANDIVER: Well, it referred to my  
10 comments as well. We've owned one property on  
11 Ellis Road since 1985. We bought -- which we  
12 have retired from the business that we own, but  
13 we still own the property and building. We have  
14 rentals that provide our retirement income. We  
15 built a second property on Ellis Road at 495 Stan  
16 Drive, and that was also towards our retirement  
17 income. We have been self-employed previously  
18 for 30 years; thus, we had no other retirement  
19 income. This is our retirement income.

20 We have been involved in this expansion of  
21 the roads for the last probably 15 or 20 years  
22 because we're a property owner, the first being  
23 at Melbourne Airport probably 15 years ago. At  
24 that time your drawings continued right straight  
25 down the middle of Ellis Road. And I have an

1 objection to what you have done with the drawing  
2 at the present time.

3 The one you are leaning towards is the best  
4 fit which comes right smack in the middle of our  
5 building, both buildings, even the new one. When  
6 we put the new building up approximately  
7 five-and-a-half years ago, I asked for enough  
8 setback so it wouldn't be affected at all,  
9 parking, building, whatsoever, and they approved  
10 the plans in the City of Melbourne at that time.

11 I am not happy with the way you've done it.  
12 You keep insisting that it can't go down the  
13 middle. You're ripping up everything in there.  
14 Nothing is going to remain the same. The road  
15 isn't going to be located exactly. I see no  
16 reason whatsoever why you can't maintain the road  
17 down the middle and take a little bit off the  
18 north and a little bit off the south. That's my  
19 objection.

20 It wouldn't affect -- it would affect  
21 everybody a little bit but nobody a lot. The  
22 explanations that you personally provided to us  
23 earlier in the evening make no sense to me  
24 whatsoever.

25 As far as these limited access, it's an

1 industrial area. We have lived in the area for  
2 approximately close to 40 years. And that  
3 four-laning of I-95 the engineers did and gave us  
4 limited access, to me it creates more of a  
5 problem than it did previously. This is an  
6 industrial area. Limiting access and having  
7 tractor trailers have to make U-turns in that  
8 road is ridiculous.

9 Okay. Just one other thing real quick. I'd  
10 like to know if anybody's here from the City of  
11 Melbourne. I saw Stephanie Eley from the City of  
12 West Melbourne earlier. So, I assume she is  
13 still here.

14 When I talked to City of Melbourne they said  
15 that the cities were supposed to be impartial.  
16 Nobody is supposed to tell what their favorite is  
17 or non-favorite is. We attended a meeting in the  
18 City of West Melbourne and they are recommending  
19 hold the south. Uhm. I wonder if it could be  
20 that's their tax base. They're taking all their  
21 property and wanting to keep it. City of  
22 Melbourne, really doesn't matter to them. That's  
23 my opinion.

24 MR. KRISTOFF: Thank you very much for your  
25 comment. Mr. Scott Morgan.

1 MR. MORGAN: Good evening. Scott Morgan,  
2 City Manager, City of West Melbourne, 2240 Minton  
3 Road, West Melbourne, representing the City.

4 Back in June the West Melbourne City Council  
5 did go on record supporting the project. We  
6 think that it's a very important project, and so,  
7 certainly the interchange and the recommended  
8 alternative carrying that forward, the SIS  
9 alternative, alternative two is a very good  
10 alternative. It has less impact on Lamplighter  
11 Village, and we support that alternative for the  
12 interchange.

13 With respect to the Ellis Road segment, we  
14 do support the hold the south, wide north  
15 alternative. We believe that will have less  
16 utility location. It has less total property  
17 acquisitions than the SIS alternative, and we  
18 believe it forces a solution for taking advantage  
19 of the right-of-way the county has for the  
20 drainage. And spending project dollars on  
21 drainage and fewer dollars on right-of-way  
22 acquisition is something that our city supports.

23 So, I just want to go on record as we do  
24 support the hold south, wide north alternative.  
25 Again, the 45-mile an hour standard urban is

1 certainly better because it also requires less  
2 acquisition of business properties. So, because  
3 you're carrying that forward, and it appears that  
4 the SWA's role will allow the 45-mile an hour  
5 standard urban as opposed to the SIS, that's a  
6 better project than the 50-mile an hour which  
7 requires more right-of-way. West Melbourne  
8 commented although we would support either.  
9 Certainly if FHW would approve the 45-mile an  
10 hour standard urban, that is better, less  
11 impactful for the environment, business  
12 community, and City of West Melbourne and FHA  
13 will approve the standard urban for that section.  
14 Thank you very much.

15 MR. KRISTOFF: I understand the Mayor of  
16 Melbourne is with us.

17 MS. ELEY: I just want to let everybody know  
18 I'm councilwoman for the City of Melbourne and  
19 I'm here to listen. We -- I'm on the  
20 Transportation Board too. So, we did see this  
21 project, but it hasn't been brought it forward to  
22 Melbourne for their comments.

23 MS. MEEHAN: Kathy Meehan. I'm here to  
24 listen.

25 MR. KRISTOFF: I do not have any other

1 speaker cards. However, if someone wishes to  
2 make a comment, you may do so if you step to the  
3 microphone, but we would ask you to complete a  
4 speaker card after you have completed your  
5 comment.

6 Seeing none, we hope that you have really  
7 had an opportunity to view the displays that are  
8 in the other room. We will be here through 7:00  
9 p.m. this evening and our personnel, the  
10 department's personnel will be available for  
11 further dialogue.

12 And again, I want to thank you all for  
13 participating and taking your time and providing  
14 us with your attention. Any comments that we  
15 receive will be incorporated into the record, and  
16 this does conclude the official public testimony  
17 portion of the hearing. And I will close the  
18 official public testimony at 6:40 p.m. Thank you  
19 very much.

20 (Public meeting closed.)

21 MR. O'BRIEN: I just want to say that I  
22 oppose the preferred alternative route, and I  
23 will inform them in writing my preference.

24 (This concludes these proceedings.)  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Patricia A. Migliaccio, RMR, Court Reporter do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did report the foregoing proceedings, and that pages 2 through 29 are a true and correct record of my stenographic notes.

Dated this 16th day of November, 2012 at Melbourne, Brevard County, Florida.



*Patricia A. Migliaccio*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PATRICIA A. MIGLIACCIO  
CRR, RMR, CLR, FPR, CCR (NJ)

PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPT CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that on Oct. 25, 2012, beginning at 5:00 p.m., I presided over a Public Hearing for the following project:

I-95 / Ellis Road Interchange and Ellis Road from I-95 to Wickham Road (CR 509)

Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study

Brevard County, Florida

Financial Project ID: 426905-1-22-01

I further certify that the Public Hearing was conducted relative to the economic and social effects of the location and design concept for the subject project and its impact on the environment, that a transcript was made and the document attached herein is a full, true, and complete transcript of what was said at the Hearing, and that the Florida Department of Transportation has considered the social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed improvement and is of the opinion that it is properly located and should be constructed.

Mary M<sup>s</sup> Sehee

Mary McGehee, Hearing Moderator

August 20, 2015

Date