

Core Study Team Meeting Summary February 19, 2009

Mr. Griffin reviewed the agenda and provided a correction regarding the Temple Terrace City Council meeting date (March 17, 2009). He commented that staff will be briefing the BOCC on March 24, 2009.

Mr. Griffin introduced the revised site selection matrix. Mr. Incorvia reviewed the updates to the site selection matrix. The current matrix has the 12 sites with criteria listed across the columns.

Ms. Bacca asked for a clarification on the acronym for the Temple Terrace Central Business District. She then asked what the CBD is. Mr. Incorvia stated that would be the Tampa Central Business District.

Ms. Corbett asked about the location of Star G, why was it south of 92? Was it inspired by DOT? Mr. Incorvia responded that the site already has sewer facilities, direct access along McIntosh Road to I-4, and more land availability. The other site referenced by Ms. Corbett's group does not meet the criteria for site selection. Ms. Corbett responded that the applicant may be willing to install infrastructure, and would like to be a demonstration project, of sorts.

Mr. Moran asked how the property is delineated. Mr. Incorvia responded it was taken from a certain point and provided a radius. In Gallagher Road, there is sewage under construction and capacity to incorporate additional development, including light industrial and office uses. Users immediately adjacent to the line may connect into it, according to County regulations. The site Ms. Corbett references will not be immediately adjacent to the sewage line under construction on Gallagher Road. Mr. Moran commented that if everyone along the road connected, then all capacity would be lost.

Mr. Horwedel asked about the estimated roadway improvement costs. Mr. Incorvia responded that was covered at the last meeting, and will be reviewed at a future meeting with confirmation and a review from the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Griffin then introduced the summary section of the alternatives phase. Mr. Incorvia discussed how the project team has briefed the various city councils within Hillsborough County. He then discussed the decision process related to site selections and designation of appropriate sites for potential future development. The preferred size for an office and industrial park was determined to be 30 to 100 acres. Mr. Incorvia reviewed the transportation scenarios as determined by FDOT, TBARTA, and the MPO. Mr. Incorvia reviewed the Water Resources presentation regarding potential costs for water/sewer and infrastructure. Those numbers are currently in the process of being refined based on additional data from the transportation analysis. Mr. Incorvia reviewed the joint planning areas, and how there is potential to share costs for development of infrastructure. The staffs of each organization are working on planning agreements to pursue the Joint Planning areas. Mr. Incorvia reviewed the land use options as identified in the presentation, such as rezoning, an overlay, or other government initiated process to protect the corridor for potential future development.

Mr. Incorvia reviewed the deliverables as identified by Ms. Lucia Garsys. Ms. Lamboy commented that she and Mr. Healey have been developing the outline for the report and are starting the drafting process in anticipation of the March 24 BOCC meeting.

Ms. Bacca asked if this process was aligned with the Economic Stimulus Task Force, and Mr. Incorvia responded that he was uncertain how I-4 would figure into the Task Force and how the recommendations from the I-4 corridor study would be implemented by the Task Force. There has been no discussion with the Task Force regarding I-4. Mr. Johnson stated that the Task Force has two components, a short term strategy and a long term strategy.

Mr. Johnson referred to the deliverables, talked about the action plan to proceed. That is included as a deliverable, is it not? The action steps are necessary. Mr. Incorvia responded affirmatively.

Mr. Incorvia shortly reviewed the last meeting regarding transportation, and funding and phasing. He reiterated that it reflected on the 12 sites that have been selected. Mr. Incorvia reviewed the options as outlined by Peter Aluotto at the last meeting. Mr. Incorvia discussed those sites with priority due to location, access to urban services and transportation networks, and area assets (USF, etc). He then discussed the following funding options: Option 1 incentive package through predetermination of land use and zoning, extension of water/sewer, etc;

Option 2 do nothing, keep the existing system; Option 3 a publicly owned industrial park (which is currently a strong Tampa option); and Option 4 was a hybrid public/private partnership.

Mr. Register asked whether all the interstate interchanges had been looked at. He asked whether the Forbes Road interchange been considered; he perceived that the BOCC stated that should be considered. Mr. Incorvia responded that due to the fact that the sites already selected, the overall acreage was way over that what is expected and he did not anticipate pursuing the Forbes Road option. Would you want to attempt 5 sites in Plant City? Does it benefit the County to look at those interchanges?

Ms. Corbett stated that was the concern she has, in terms of comments from the business community that sites are needed in between, and that is not accounted for in the current plan. It is important as a Core Group to understand that there are community plans that can cause conflicts, the locations where private property owners have proposed should be shared with the group. Mr. Incorvia stated that the group clearly stated that the sites on the east and west were acceptable. Those in the middle have not had agreement, but have been kept in play as part of the phasing mix.

Ms. Lamboy commented that it would be worthwhile to include the Forbes Road interchange into the matrix. She stated that she would not want to have this portion unstudied when the BOCC asked for additional study. Mr. Griffin commented that we have forgotten that we have not fully vetted the middle.

Mr. Hurlburt commented that he felt that McIntosh Road would be problematic; Forbes Road may be more attractive. Mr. Griffin reminded the group about DOT's comment not to focus around the interchanges, and to think about an alternative road network. Those interchanges are rural interchanges, not designed to handle the potential traffic impacts.

Ms. Bacca stated that she had a concern related to County Road 579 – the development of that area more expensive due to the fact of roadway constraints. Star E is a 579 interchange project. Mr. Johnson stated that it is important to incorporate the TBARTA plan that includes mass transit. The group must recognize that the corridor will be viewed for some type of mass transit and things will change eventually.

Mr. Griffin stated that core study group recommendations should move forward to the MPO as they develop their Long Range Transportation Plan so I-4 goals can be accounted for with alternative transportation networks. Mr. Moran commented that he's heard the BOCC say that the I-4 Corridor is an asset that is not used properly. Mr. Incorvia responded that was the view of one commissioner, and others move more carefully. Mr. Moran asked if the County doesn't develop between Temple Terrace and Plant City, is it a lost opportunity?

Mr. Griffin stated he was not saying to not add more options, the goal of the study was to get a general idea of costs and where we can put sites, and what types of utilities and transportation would be required. Mr. Incorvia questioned whether by looking at the additional interchange sites we could find some more realistic areas than those in the middle. Mr. Griffin reiterated that the Core Study Team never really had the final discussion as to what is happening in the middle. Land needs to be reserved so that it is not all absorbed by one-acre single-family residential development, which is land consumptive and not an efficient use of resources.

Ms. Bacca asked about the interchange at Forbes Road and the ELAPP project, and Mr. Horwedel responded that was east of Thonotosassa Road. Known as the Court Prairie area, it was determined as not suitable for development, and an annexation request into Plant City was rejected.

Mr. Nash asked how much influence FDOT has. Mr. McCall's response was that traditionally permits are not issued without FDOT's approval. Mr. Register commented that there will be a significant amount of resources that will be required. Mr. Horwedel commented that the number of trips with single-family one-acre residential development must be counter-balanced by industrial and office development. How does the "kitty litter" (housing on one-acre lots) development impact the interstate versus office and industrial development? Mr. Griffin stated we need to set ourselves up so that Hillsborough County can take advantage of opportunities that may not be identified now.

Mr. Johnson stated that the position of the group should be that the one acre development is inefficient and not desired. Mr. Incorvia stated that the R-1 category is the single worst land use category in the County. Ms. Corbett commented that we have to compare apples to apples, such as if we do nothing, versus if do the land use change you have a real opportunity for private funding of the infrastructure. Mr. Horwedel stated that the key case is the NE master

plan, whereas now there are at least 10,000 trips on I-4 that do not pay a dime in concurrency development.

Susan of FDOT stated that the Department doesn't have any intention of stopping development, but is looking at I-4 because there are no funds for road improvements. Need to look at alternate networks to provide predictability, make sure that costs are accounted for, and will have the funds and plan in place for the development to occur. Mr. Incorvia stated that is why the rest of the corridor is modeled after the NE master plan. Mr. Horwedel stated that it is almost like a pseudo DRI where costs are known. Mr. Incorvia stated to implement the corridor plan, it needs to have targeted locations.

Mr. Griffin requested that the group move on to the next step. He requested that Mr. McCall's team look at the interchanges in the transportation analysis.

Mr. Hurlburt commented that there was a site between McIntosh and Forbes Road; DOT may not want to add an interchange but it should be considered.

Mr. Griffin introduced Step 8. He stated that the group will have an education and workforce development session, and then review recommendations regarding land use and zoning classifications.

Ms. Bacca stated that her concern is that she wants to see evidence where it has already worked. She wants proof. She wants to see where the procedure has worked.

Mr. Incorvia stated that we need to get the concept clear, so that as we move forward it will be clear in the implementation phase. Mr. Kulow stated that there are no jobs, and we need to clearly identify how we are going to get those jobs.

Mr. Register commented that he hears Ms. Bacca's concern that there need to be good quality protections. Mr. Griffin commented that there are examples of some development of I-75; just there was a lot of competition by other uses. Mr. Register stated that staff needs to find some other region in the country that illustrates what works. Ms. Curl referenced Richmond, Virginia, and asked someone to look into it. Mr. Horwedel commented that he was the County Administrator in Dimwitty County, 40 miles south and he had a different view.

Mr. Griffin commented that on March 19 there should be some real discussion on the middle area and a review of the sites including the interchanges. The

assessment from FDOT and MPO should be included. Ms. Curl asked whether it was possible to have someone from SWMD comment about the drainage? Especially in terms of the drought? The question is the stability of the ground, and how suitable it is for development?

Mr. Moran stated that the sinkhole issue is a very localized issue. The sinkhole hazard areas may be mapped, and will bring it to a future meeting.

Mr. Register there will come a time that the Team will need to deemphasize sites. When start getting to specific issues like sinkholes, which may be something the market determines the design criteria. The Team will use the sites to determine which make sense and which don't, and will help do determine the future areas that will be targeted. To continue to focusing on the sites is counterproductive; we just need to use it to develop the concept.

Ms. Curl wanted to see the impacts on the Hillsborough River as it could potentially affect the water supply. What happens when things are changed? That is an important matter to consider.