

Mr. Incorvia reviewed the Business and Government Advisory meeting and the Community meeting. He stated that the Business and Government Advisors in general desire changes in land use. The business advisors especially downplayed site-specific areas as that would potentially increase land values thereby increasing costs. They thought it was a good idea to create an overlay that is corridor-wide. Mr. Griffin added that the business advisors desired to increase opportunities for greenfield development and increase the number of interstate interchanges for more development opportunities.

Mr. Incorvia summarized the comments from the community meeting held on February 2, 2009. At this meeting staff had a better reception, and there was general comfort with the star locations on the east and west locations. There was concern with the sites located in the Rural Area. Community support is focused on the development of quality jobs, as long as it does not open up the area to general development. Mr. Griffin stated that after the meeting he spoke with citizens. Mr. Griffin commented that there is a 'silent minority' that supports the effort. There are people that want to see something happen, it is not all negativity.

Mr. Incorvia stated that a meeting is scheduled with the Temple Terrace City Council on March 3, 2009. He then transitioned to introducing the first presentation, which is about transportation improvements that may be required.

Ned Baier began by stating his goal was to evaluate the capacity in the I-4 corridor around the previously-identified 'star' sites. Planning and Growth Management assessed the employment potential as part of their analysis. The vacant, developable parcel information was provided (sites a minimum of 5 acres). Some assumptions were made about whether or not economic development would be professional office space, research corporate park, or manufacturing uses (attached). The transportation team then looked at the existing roadway network to determine level of service and transportation concurrency requirements. Adequate access and adequate level of service was determined. On a handout, the transportation team provided a summary sheet of estimated costs for each of the 'star' sites. In developing the analysis, did not want to develop a comprehensive transportation plan in the Rural Area. The transportation team did not identify improvements beyond the study area, or access points from the study area to the interstate. This is a minimal network required based on our assumptions. If you look at the costs, you will see that the costs make sense. For those sites located closer to the interstate access, the cost is less. There were also assumptions about the costs of construction itself. Those costs were consistent with those used by FDOT and the Hillsborough County Public Works Department. In the area that is being considered, there is not much that is listed on the Long Range Transportation Plan. If you adopt any of these changes, an amendment to the Long Range Transportation Plan will have to be made through the MPO.

Bill McCall then presented the results of his work. He stated that he started thinking of each area and the existing number of lanes, and what is the capacity of the lanes. What is the existing traffic demand in those areas? Are there enough lanes? Take Area A as an example. Virtually all roads in that area are substandard, and there will have to be significant improvements made. Mr. McCall reviewed the chart (handout). Area A has capacity, but improvements will be required. If FDOT has capacity, then count that capacity as part of the equation and we do not count it as part of the total cost to the County.

Harney Road needs to be brought up to standard outside of the star area, north of Fowler Road.

Site B will be less expensive than other sites, as only Harney Road will have to be improved and Davis Road will have to be extended by 1/3 a mile.

Mr. Incorvia commented that for water and sewer assumptions, staff used a prototype for calculating the overall costs. At the time the estimates were created, didn't have all the information we have now. It may be worthwhile to go back and detail the water and wastewater estimates.

Ned stated that the study team provided assumptions about potential employment numbers for each site. There are different types of industries for different sites throughout the corridor. Intensities were different throughout the corridor.

Bill added that the lowest impact was 14,000 trips, and the highest impact was 42,000 trips. The difference was somewhat significant.

Site D could get some access from Sligh Road or Eureka Springs Road. The Core Study Team must ask which will develop first to determine the points of access. D generates enough traffic that requires a 4-lane improvement to Williams Road. How does one split the costs? Star C is related to D by way of the road network. The cost figures come from FDOT Cost Estimates dated June 2008. Those costs are available online, including the list of assumptions for calculating cost estimates. The FDOT cost estimates do not have a cost however, for taking a substandard road and bringing it up to County standard. Bill thought that maybe widening a road could be equal in cost as an enhancement project, but those numbers were low. He then calculated the cost to build 2 new lanes, which is \$6 million per mile. Right-of-way acquisition costs are not included in the calculation. Right-of-way acquisition generally costs up to 90% of a construction project. Some sites do have sufficient right-of-way, and staff can tell which do have sufficient right-of-way.

Site E only has capacity for 12,000 trips. A Thonotosassa Bypass would have to be constructed to connect Fowler Road with County Road 579. E is the most expensive site of all the sites. It does have the largest amount of land - there is 647 acres of land available, but the anticipated buildout number of employees is 11,800 employees.

Mr. Griffin commented that it would be good to connect Sligh Avenue to County Road 579. That would improve the transportation access. There is a road there, but it is not up to County standard. That could provide somewhat direct access to the interstate.

Ms. Garsys asked what makes sense. Does the County really want the connection to 579, and then the rest would be sorted out at the development review stage? Mr. Baier responded that the major roads already on the MPO plan, the interior roads are considered local access road and are not in the MPO plan.

Mr. Incorvia stated that the most difficult is determining what is the buildout of the sites. How do you incrementally put in all the pieces? Mr. Baier responded that the analysis did not include any development outside the identified zones.

Mr. Hudson identified that most of the improvements are north south. He recalled how DOT had commented that E/W access would have to be improved. What will the cost be of that?

Mr. Baier responded that at this time, the comprehensive parallel routes were not considered because they were looking at the star sites. Mr. Griffin stated that the plan is looking further than 2025, and parallel facilities should be considered for adequate access and to accommodate future buildout. Mr. Pessaro of FDOT echoed the concern raised by Mr. Griffin and Mr. Hudson. East/West connections should be considered.

Mr. Aluotto stated that the direction given to look at sites to see what improvements minimally to make this work. Many of these would be covered by long range plans. But the network will ultimately have to be considered. He added that the interstate highways are the lifeblood of the community. If we are to have business and industry, we will need to rely on some use of the interstate. The parallel facilities will not be able to accommodate all traffic and take traffic off the interstate. Mr. Griffin responded that we should look at some east/west roads because maybe that could take some commuter trips off the interstate, and therefore improve the interstate.

Mr. Register stated we are suggesting a more comprehensive look, including E/W linkages. The new road to the Thonotosassa bypass listed as a 4-lane cost, but you stated as 2-lane. Mr. McCall clarified that the improvement would be 4 lanes.

Mr. McCall stated that he would not go over each site individually. He added that he was doing a comparative analysis, to determine what is most appropriate. The goal was to look at it from a developer's point of view. The numbers may be very low for land cost, but once designated as an economic corridor, landowners will raise the cost of land.

Ms. Garsys stated that if look at D and require those road networks to accommodate only the site. The Core Team could miss the broader value of better community-wide access. There is a cost for accommodating the site, then there is the value for accessing those road networks like Mr. Griffin has discussed.

Mr. Aluotto that we could do that, the numbers would be astronomical we'd be paralyzed. Right now we are in a deficit, trying to address needs in the USA.

Mr. Incorvia added that this would feed the community concern about the opening up the entire area for development.

Mr. Griffin responded that could be addressed through appropriate regulations and how development is phased over time.

Mr. Register stated that the incremental approach is one to be stuck with. It is good to understand the overall affect on the network. We are trying to reevaluate some issues that have been postponed for a while. Mr. Baier stated that if DOT was given an opportunity to review this proposal to determine whether it is enough. Now the MPO is having planning update, could ask other agencies to look at certain types of planned improvements.

Ms. Lamboy commented that the County has always employed the incremental approach, and that is what has created the deficit it is in today with regard to road improvements. She suggested a more comprehensive approach be taken as a good planning measure.

Ms. Corbett said that either will do something new, or will stay as it is. We will analyze the cost. Does this level of analysis occur for community plans? This is similar to that kind of process. Mr. Healey responded that the community plans typically don't call for increased intensities or densities. Ms. Corbett stated there may not be an increase in intensity/density as part of this study.

Mr. Pessaro stated that FDOT would be happy to review the data. Has the County thought about employing the regional transportation model?

Mr. Incorvia stated that the buildout of these sites is quadruple the 1000 acres originally identified as part of this study. We need to think about the timing.

Mr. Register asked out to flesh out more than what would be a limited approach. We may need to contemplate a limited approach as what the future may look like. Mr. Baier stated they have completed a limited network dealing only with the sites. DOT can help us with that concern.

Mr. Pessaro stated the assumption can be a before/after picture.

Ms. Bacca – is the whole point the shoestore? Mr. Incorvia stated that if all 12 are in play, only a very small area of development occurring.

Mr. Griffin stated that the sites near the USA will be in play, the others will come along later.

Mr. Register said that he wants some certainty for potential development opportunities. If it continues to develop around the interstate as it is today, the opportunity for industrial and office will soon be gone. The context needs to be limited and focused.

Mr. Griffin said the certainty can be provided through the land use category. The category can provide some mechanism so that large-lot single family development does not occur, and then 10 years in the future there will be land available.

Mr. Pessaro recommended to do a model run just in the Temple Terrace and Plant City areas, if those are the identified areas for prioritized development. Mr. Griffin stated that those areas in between need to be preserved for future development, when the time is ready and infrastructure improvements can be afforded. He commented that the group has to keep in touch that we are part of the Florida High-Tech Corridor and the aim is to connect the economic engines, including USF, the Port of Tampa, and the Executive Airport. We can't look at I-4 in isolation, we have to look at the bigger picture of how the interstate fits within the community and the region.

Ms. Bacca asked whether we can assume the Ybor I-4 connector would be built. Mr. Baier responded yes, it will be built even though it has been delayed.

Someone commented that maybe the stars should be grouped, and analyzed on that basis.

Mr. Incorvia stated the next step would be to follow up with FDOT on an evaluation of the transportation model and information provided today.

Mr. Aluotto started a presentation regarding Funding and Phasing. He stated the assumptions of potential annual development. We will not be able to do all the improvements at once, how will it be broken down into meaningful bites? How do you make it rain? First, there must be a Comprehensive Plan category change. Second, a zoning change will be required to achieve consistency. That would be a considerable saving of time and effort and is value-added to the developer. A hurdle will be concurrency, because it is unlikely that we will be able to make the sites concurrent. We can identify the projects in the Capital Improvements Element to accept developer contributions to make roads and other infrastructure happen.

One of the regular complaints we get is the lack of certainty. Developers have to negotiate every step of the development review process, and therefore cannot get the anticipated costs up front. Streamlining also goes hand-in-hand – less time spent in approval process is less cost.

What are the options? Stay at the status quo – which really is not an option, and is not working well. Option 2 is an incentive program, including land use, zoning, certainty as to the fees, special assessments, trip mitigation, impact fees, and place projects into the CIE. All of these things will be value added from a development standpoint. Option 3 would be the public entity as developer. This is not ruled out for the constituent municipalities, like Tampa's assembly of land for development purposes. Option 4 is

quasi-public; a public-private partnership. A small millage or authority could be established, and the jurisdiction would have the ability to do anything a real estate developer would be able to do. You can accomplish a lot through the authority as you cut through the red tape.

If we do nothing else but get the right plan designation and the zoning process complete, then we are miles ahead. We have contemplated the phasing notion, when projects reach a threshold of buildout then more sites will be developed. The County has no money to go out and build, acquire, etc. The bond market is weak. This will be further down the road when times are better.

Mr. Incorvia commented that the transportation is the biggest cost to overcome. It could go back to the mitigation fee zone as done in Plant City. The City limits of Plant City make for a logical connection of roads, the idea of the Northeast Area plan can be relayed back to the board.

Ms. Corbett commented the Plant City was a good idea, but no matter how phase it you are talking about a more spread out area. The County should be concerned with how the improvements are made and what is the timing. You may want to have the developer actually do the improvements in certain cases, rather than the developer paying in to a fund. You may also think about have an interim place for projects, because if you put on CIE, it must be financially feasible. If you make them eligible on an interim, then they can be incorporated in a relatively short time.

Ms. Harvey stated that for the development community the rezoning process is relatively easy. However, the last thing developers want to do is a Planned Development zoning. You need a specialized zoning district – that would eliminate the BOCC approval process. The County will not be able to get away with existing plan categories; a new one needs to be created. It can be either with a permanent category or an overlay. The overlay may be better way to address the land in the middle – so don't end up with lots of 1-acre subdivisions; however, there will be no Comprehensive Plan change without DCA discussions. It is important that the team, or staff, start interacting with DCA. We are trying to support what the governor is doing with the state for economic development. Ms. Harvey encourages a discussion with DCA. We need to refine the steps of the process, and DCA will have to be involved. Otherwise, the County could get turned down. We should put this on a future agenda.

Mr. Register replied that we need to know what we are going to ask DCA. Each step does not create a clear answer, need to continue working toward a solution.

Herb Hurlbert commented that in the patterns of light industrial/research, there is a dollar cost for each of these uses. We may get more participation if you figure the total costs. What will you have to have on the site? For distribution, won't need much sewage, but for corporate, you do need it.

Mr. Aluotto responded that the team assumptions hopefully addressed this issue. We may have to refine the assumptions, as estimating is not an exact science, but the team hopes to come up with reasonable assumptions.

Mr. Griffin stated that the Business and Government Advisors requested to not limit the types of uses; the market will dictate the use. We just need to set the stage through the land use category and zoning. Mr. Register stated that we have to harness the market to help us with our decisions. The market should not control or drive the placement or geographic disbursement of what will happen.

Manatee County is the closest example of an overlay. Mr. Moran asked how close to carved into stone we can get it? Mr. Griffin responded it depends on how the parameters that are created, and the performance standards will have to be established. Mr. Incorvia stated that a Phase I is site-specific and then future phases will be determined less geographically.

Ms. Corbett stated that things can change based on the elected officials. She added that the team will have to write the standards so that officials cannot so easily waive standards.

Mr. Register stated that there are economic filters. He stated that when you have a level of amenities, will be restricted by costs of locating there. There are market forces that will delimit some of the types of uses, but must augment through policy and regulations as well.

Mr. Incorvia stated the goal of the next meeting regarding education and workforce. Maybe next time we should focus in on the next phase.

Ms. Bacca stated that early on the team had identified infrastructure-water as an issue, and now it is concurrency for the sites. She stated that there is no concurrency for water/sewer infrastructure. She suggested that the Water Resources Team do some additional analysis. Mr. Incorvia responded that we would do the water/sewer analysis and the FDOT analysis at the next session.

Herb Hurlbert wanted to remind everyone about the Strawberry Festival, February 26.