

A special meeting of the WEST COAST INLAND NAVIGATION DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS was held Thursday, April 19, 1962 at the Manatee County Office Building.

Present were:

Ellsworth G. Simmons, Chairman, Hillsborough County  
H.H. Anger, Vice Chairman, Charlotte County  
A.L. Anderson, Secretary, Pinellas County  
L. Elmer Bustle, Treasurer, Manatee County  
Warren S. Henderson, Sarasota County

George Kumpe, Executive Director  
Joe K. Merrin, Engineer  
Dewey A. Dye, Jr., General Counsel

Absent:

Mack H. Jones, Lee County  
J. Hardin Peterson Sr., Special Counsel

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 11:05 A.M. and stated that the attorneys for the Board had been negotiating with officials of the City of Venice in an effort to secure the remaining parcels of right-of-way and that all action which could be taken had been taken with the exception of court action on the acquisition of this right-of-way. He said that he was still hopeful that an arrangement could be made whereby this would not be necessary but in the event it is not reached he believed the Board should authorize court action.

Mr. Dye stated that the law requires that as a condition precedent to a condemnation suit a formal right-of-way resolution must be adopted and right-of-way maps must be approved for the land to be acquired. Mr. Dye then read the proposed resolution and presented the right-of-way maps

showing the extent and location of the necessary rights of way and the City of Venice owned spoil area southeast of the canal alignment. The resolution was discussed and the maps examined.

Mayor Brohard of Venice commented that all were aware of the problems that Venice has in connection with the C-1 route, and that the State Road Department had recently proposed to build either the Venice Avenue bridge or two 2-lane bascule bridges on present U.S. 41. The City Council had not accepted State Road Department proposals and had reaffirmed the resolution passed in 1955 that U.S. 41 should remain in its present location, that necessary bridges should be built at no cost to the City of Venice and that utility costs be borne by other than the City. Chairman Simmons pointed out that WCIND does not have jurisdiction over primary highway matters of the State, and that the Navigation District had passed a resolution pledging to relocate utilities along the waterway.

Commissioner Henderson asked Mayor Brohard if the items in the 1955 resolution were met would the C-1 route be acceptable to the City of Venice and the Mayor said that he did not think it would be the most desirable route, but a previous City Council made this decision and the present Council would abide by it.

City Council President Raymond of Venice concurred in Mayor Brohard's remarks and reiterated that the City must have three bridges, with utility modifications paid for by someone other than the City. Dr. Hogan, another City

Councilman said that the position of the City had been stated. Chairman Simmons expressed appreciation for their attendance at the meeting and said that the Board needs and solicits their cooperation.

Mr. Raymond asked why it was necessary to have a permanent spoil area on the extension of a runway and why the area must be obtained in fee simple. Mr. Dye answered that some permanent spoil area was necessary to receive spoil during maintenance operations and that the height of fill would not be permitted to exceed safety requirements for the runway. The area was desired in fee as the complete perpetual use of the property would be required for future maintenance operations as well as present construction requirements and as it would be separated from the remainder of the City airport property by the Waterway it would apparently be of little future use to the City. In answer to a question Mr. Dye stated that the next closest permanent spoil area would be at Venice Inlet.

It was reported that tentative spoil areas for Section 3 were selected on April 12 but that the report had not been received from the Corps of Engineers on the selection. Mr. Dye said that many private owners want and need spoil to fill in low spots but they want to know what kind of material will be excavated, therefore, the Corps must take additional core samples, etc.

Commissioner Bustle made a motion that the resolution  
 as read by Mr. Dye be adopted/and that the right-of-way maps  
 be approved. The motion carried with Commissioners Simmons,  
 Anger, Anderson and Bustle voting for the motion and Mr.  
 Henderson abstaining. The Chairman asked the attorney for  
 the District and District personnel "to attempt in every  
 way to see what points of agreement can be reached, to work  
 with the City of Venice to pursue the Waterway and its con-  
 struction being mindful at the same time of our responsibility  
 to the people."

Attorney Dye said that he would like for a meeting to be  
 arranged with the City officials of Venice to discuss the  
 original contract with the City and the possibilities of re-  
 solving the problem. Councilman Raymond said that he would  
 arrange such a meeting, which it was hoped would be held  
 early in the week of April 23rd.

Vouchers #3037 through #3043 covering current bills were  
 approved for payment.

The Director obtained by telephone during the meeting  
 information that the low bidder for Section 4, Tampa Bay to  
 Venice Inlet, was R.C. Huffman Construction Co. of St. Peters-  
 burg; that there were four bids received. The Huffman bid was  
 for \$2,206,500 and the government estimate was \$1,406,824.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 A.M.

W. L. Anderson  
 Secretary

H. H. Anger  
 Vice Chairman