

Core Study Team Meeting Summary April 2, 2009

Mr. Incorvia began the meeting by reviewing the discussion held at the March 24, 2009 BOCC meeting. Mr. Incorvia discussed the PowerPoint presentation, and how it summarized the actions of the Core Study Team to date. The team asked direction from the BOCC regarding the preference for the site-ready philosophy versus other philosophies. Mr. Incorvia pointed out to the Board that this would be the last meeting prior to the recommendation session on May 12. There were a lot of questions and BOCC members shared Commissioner Norman's concerns. In the end, the BOCC accepted the report by unanimous vote, with Commissioners Norman and Hagan absent. In May, if the BOCC accepts the report, it will begin implementation immediately. On April 17, the project team will make a presentation to the Economic Development Task Force. On next Tuesday, Commissioner Norman has requested additional discussion at the Land Use Meeting.

Mr. Horwedel complimented Steve and Joe on their presentation.

Mr. Incorvia read to the group the request made by Commissioner Norman to have additional discussion at the April 7 land use meeting.

Mr. Moran questioned the purpose of the "review of the report." Mr. Griffin commented that there will be independent reviewers, including Gene Gray and Paula Harvey.

Ms. Harvey commented that Commissioner Norman's inquiry was received yesterday afternoon. The Commissioner's aide contacted Ms. Harvey regarding the process. When she read the memo she stated that she was confused. She did not understand the need for a review of a project of which she is an active participant. Ms. Harvey added that all reviewing parties have been involved to a certain extent. Ms. Harvey guessed that really that Commissioner Norman wanted to state his opinion in person to staff who would report back to the Core Study Team after the discussion on April 7. Commissioner Norman really wanted to express for himself what he put into the memo prior to the March 24 Progress Report.

Mr. Kulow asked if this was “in the sunshine.” Ms. Harvey replied in the affirmative, and there is nothing out of the ordinary. Simply put, Mr. Norman was at a funeral and unable to attend the original report.

Mr. Gormley stated that there is nothing unusual to have the BOCC ask for something to be placed on the agenda. In his opinion, there is no problem with the process that was followed regarding the agenda request. The purpose is to have the issues discussed in the sunshine at a land use meeting, which is open and available to the public.

Mr. Incorvia stated that there are two regular items for discussion: the joint planning areas and transportation update. The transportation portion has not yet been completed.

Regarding the Joint Planning Areas, the jurisdictions have been working to implement some of the long-term goals of the jurisdictions and this study. Whatever the land use and zoning discussions are, the concerns will have to be brought back to the governing bodies for discussion. Water and sewer services have been vetted with each jurisdiction regarding service areas and potential expansion abilities. The establishment of the Joint Planning areas would become one of the implementation actions, just like the land use and zoning.

Mr. Marchetti asked about the relationship between the jurisdictions of Hillsborough County and Temple Terrace and Plant City. Mr. Incorvia responded that each city council has stated an interested in jointly developing the areas with the County, and a resolution was passed to that effect in Plant City. There is no such resolution with Temple Terrace, but one could be drawn up because there is conceptual agreement between Temple Terrace and the County. Furthermore, there are interlocal agreements that exist.

Mr. Pessaro made an inquiry regarding the agreement. If a proposed project located in the Northeast Master Plan area, if the agreement is not signed, and a development agreement sought, no mitigation fee would be required. Mr. Horwedel responded that regardless, Plant City is telling developers a mitigation fee is required until the formal ordinance is adopted. In addition, there has been no planning board meeting in the past 4 months, and it takes over a year from a Commission approval to the building permit stage. Mr. Incorvia commented that the appropriate land use is not in place, neither is the zoning. This effort is trying to strip out that long lead time.

Mr. Marchetti asked about the mitigation fee, is it in lieu of impact fees...and is it also in lieu of concurrency? Mr. Horwedel commented that will in effect be the concurrency requirement. The fee is based on a 20-year time frame, and is collected by the City, which contracts for the road improvements to be made as required by concurrency. Mr. Pessaro commented that there was an unanticipated impact that some of the developments were having an impact on the frontage road. The program has been in place for 8 months according to Mr. Horwedel.

Mr. Incorvia commented that the implementation phase happens after the Board accepts the report in the summer.

Mr. Incorvia asked whether there were any final issues that needed to be discussed. After many hands went up, He stated Ms. Bacca was first.

Ms. Bacca asked whether there would be more meetings with the Community and Government/Business Advisors prior to the final report. Mr. Incorvia felt all of the issues have been presented to the community. There is not much new to present...Mr. Incorvia stated that he personally did not feel it is necessary to do.

Mr. Marchetti stated that he wanted to make a statement for the record. He felt that not going back to the Business/Government advisors is a big mistake. In addition, he felt that taking the issue to the Economic Stimulus Task Force will not be effective. He stated that he started the I-4 process with the plan amendment along I-4, and it was pretty clear in his mind that the BOCC wants to study the I-4 corridor as a whole. Mr. Marchetti felt it disingenuous to go to the BOCC and not have that map attached to it...the map was not part of the back up during the last presentation. He feels that he is not going to get any more from the Core Study Team, and his concern is the focus of the corridor itself.

Mr. Moran never understood the quantum step from the corridor to the activity centers, was it because it was too much? Did DCA have a problem with it?

Mr. Incorvia responded that initially there was no definition of the corridor. At the first meeting with the BOCC, staff suggested 1 mile north/south as a starting point based on the 2004 report provided to the board by Paula Harvey and Lorraine Duffy-Suarez. The Government and Business Advisory group suggested looking further out in order to have less expensive land opportunities, and FDOT also suggested some buffering for traffic circulation purposes. The

Core Study Team determined that the demand to 2025 would be 1,000 acres in the corridor. However, the team provided some additional acreage to provide choice as guided by the Government and Business Advisory group.

Mr. Griffin commented that the Government and Business Advisory group stated that flexibility was key and there should be a palette of choices. He asked when was the last time the Government & Business Advisory group met? Ms. Lamboy replied January 27. Mr. Marchetti commented that the “stars” were criticized at that meeting, and that the issue of the land use was the most important. He felt that the Core Study Team had gone way off course according to the guidance of the BOCC and Business and Government Advisory groups. Mr. Marchetti stated that he felt that there are some real problems with the sites that have been identified.

Mr. Marchetti stated that the one mile north and south of the interstate makes sense, the overlay makes sense, the interchanges will be service oriented. Off the intersection there will be other uses. His office has taken a lot of effort to look at those sites, and there are problems with them.

Ms. Bare commented about just service oriented uses at interchanges may be incorrect – and she referred to I-75 and Fletcher as an example. Mr. Incorvia commented that the project team agrees, and issue has taken that into consideration as to the location of the sites. There is JP Morgan Chase located at I-75 and MLK. The interchanges should be visually appealing to the target industries, even if the target industries are not located right at the interchanges.

Mr. Moran stated the concept of having whole area open makes it hard to plan for infrastructure, and would become cost prohibitive. Mr. Marchetti replied the County can do it, and reviewed the oversizing the line to the school as requested by Commissioner Norman. Mr. Moran stated that, as he explained to Commissioner Norman, it would require flushing 100,000 gallons of potable water a week into a cowfield and would be a waste of resources. Mr. Marchetti commented that he was unable to put an activity center in Keystone, and questioned how will the team deal with Thonotosassa. Mr. Incorvia responded that would be part of the implementation, the site is part of a later phase in the timeline of development.

Mr. Marchetti commented that the purpose is to generate activity, and see what it can do. There is a site that is 100 acres on 1-4, and nothing can be done with it. Mr. Griffin responded that the phasing was discussed. He commented that the

project team had discussed an overlay district, with performance criteria to enable potential development on suitable sites. Mr. Marchetti requested that the team not preclude potential economic development. Mr. Marchetti stated that there should be other options in addition to the site ready option.

Mr. Register commented that package plants are ineffective, not good long-term. Mr. Jeffers commented there used to be interim package plants all over the county, and there was a cost of integrating them into the public sewer system. Mr. Marchetti asked how this is done with other jurisdictions along I-4.

Mr. Horwedel outlined what has been done in Plant City: a refundable advance agreement with oversized infrastructure, as additional development hooks in there is payment to the city and the original developer is reimbursed.

Mr. Marchetti specifically referenced his site regarding his client willingness to run water and sewer and meeting road network concurrency standards; yet he was still denied. Mr. Griffin commented that the team trying to make a sustainable policy for economic development along the corridor.

Mr. Horwedel replied to the situation about personal opinion, "make it happen." Mr. Griffin commented that the County has to put the policies into place so that appropriate development can happen.

Ms. Corbett stated that if the group was moving in direction of targeting some specific areas, she suggested pulling maps and got concerned about phasing concept. There are challenges...in Circle B, for example, there are large parcels that are CMU-12 already. The economic development task force wanting an activity center or geographic focus...if have one, this is where it should be. There could be potential for office and research, but it already has potential. Area A has property owned by the water management district, then a lot of small parcels. Parcel D has a lot of wetlands. If getting site specific, there could be serious problems based on the available land.

At this time, Ms. Lamboy left the meeting and Lindsay Mineer continued the summary below

The meeting was opened up to discuss other issues.

Bruce Register – We have been discussing different strategies, but they are all to achieve the same goal. Each strategy has it strengths and weaknesses. Looking

at the different locations, some have good value for economic development, but they don't all have the same value. It is not like each acre has the same value as every other acre. We ought to be doing reverse engineering – what does a developer of our targeted industries look for when selecting a site?

Bill McCall – Confused about what the BOCC has asked us to do. There are two approaches. [I could not write fast enough to make notes on the two approaches]

Joe Incorvia – (in response to Bill) Our mission is stated on the top of each agenda.

Steve Griffin – The corridor has assets and economic engines that need to be considered. Don't just look at 1 mile north and south of I-4. There are established communities along US 92.

JJ – BOCC instructed us to work with the cities and the business community and to consider the community plans.

Vivian – When we looked at the matrix of the sites, we were looking at the pros and cons of each site. Should we go back and add a factor to consider economic development issues using knowledge from Bruce Register and Bea Bare? We could call it the “Bruce Factor”.

John Healey – What do the circles really mean? Do you have to be in the circle or do they just denote an area? At what point in time do we change land use? We have done a generalized evaluation in a generalized area. A detailed review will come later.

BR – The circles are just a planning tool.

JJ – After BOCC approval, we will look at each parcel.

BR – Lay out opportunities for investors. They will be able to choose. Development is not done in a consistent manner. The developers have to have a choice. Prefers an overlay approach with criteria. The sites we have chosen could encroach on neighborhoods. Private sector will drive this. We need to partner with them.

JH – At what point do we do site selection?

Vivian – Water issue – having to flush large quantities of water if developing in the rural area.

JH – If we pick sites within a circle, you still have to provide services.

BR – (speaking to Terry Flott) Where do the community folks want to exclude possible development? Instead of deciding where development might go, let's identify where it cannot go.

Terry Flott – In Seffner along 92, it is already built out between 579 and McIntosh. Stay out of this area. Would like to see development west of 579. South of 92 is environmentally sensitive. Avoid spot development.

Kevin Moran – Have the Thonotosassa Community people been notified? What are their concerns?

Herb Hurlbert – He wants to look at the area between McIntosh and Plant City. There are no services – it is a rural area. City limits of Plant City and 92 – services are available now.

BR (speaking to Herb) – Is there an area where development should be prohibited?

Herb – Wetlands. We need another exit off I-4.

Dave Kulow – Let's avoid the disaster of I-75. No job creation happened there. Don't repeat those mistakes.

Kami – Different criteria for different areas in overlay.

Brian (DOT) – We began the study because of Vin's parcel. The study evolved, we realized that there are problems with developing in the middle. Are we supposed to ignore the study results? Whose interests trump?