

## **Core Study Team Meeting Summary May 14, 2009**

Mr. Griffin began the session with an overview of the agenda. Mr. Griffin reviewed comments that the project team received at the BOCC briefing, the DCA conference call, and the community meetings. Mr. Griffin stated that DCA was open to the idea of the overlay district and rezoning of certain sites, but would withhold final judgment until they saw the study and recommendations in writing.

Mr. Incorvia reviewed the community meetings. He stated that in general, there was acceptance with reference to the permit-ready sites on the east and west of the corridor. There was controversy, however, on how to deal with the overlay area of the corridor. The Business and Government Advisors expressed concern regarding the nature of the proposed performance criteria. He commented that the Economic Stimulus Task Force, in the draft recommendations to the Board, supports the I-4 Corridor effort. Mr. Incorvia added that on Tuesday, May 12, the project team made a presentation regarding I-4 to the BOCC. He stated that at this point the BOCC seems relatively comfortable with the concepts the project team is advancing with regard to proposed corridor regulations. Mr. Incorvia reviewed the timeline as currently proposed. Mr. Griffin added that the BOCC expressed concern about the size of the overlay district and discussed the possibility of reducing its size.

Ms. Lamboy introduced the project consultant for the performance criteria, Mr. Michael Lauer of Planning Works.

Mr. Lauer began his presentation by stating that his role is to how best lay out how the corridor will function. He stated that the team needs to understand the plan implications. Planning Works will confirm the direction of the Core Study Team, and outline the implications of proposed plan amendments. Mr. Lauer reviewed his experience with plan development, and stated that he has worked in both the public and private sectors. Mr. Lauer identified the objectives of producing permit-ready sites, preserving future sites outside the Urban Service Boundary (USB), and promoting future development without inducing sprawl.

Ms. Lamboy clarified to the Core Study Team that Mr. Lauer's work is part of the implementation phase and that the team has now moved beyond the study phase of the I-4 Corridor project.

Mr. Marchetti commented that, in his opinion, the BOCC wants activity along the corridor, and not necessarily preservation. Mr. Lauer replied that opportunities should be protected outside the USA, and when the infrastructure is in place, the I-4 regulations do not become an engine for sprawl.

Mr. Lauer observed that there are three subareas identified, the port, the university, and Plant City. He stated that policies should identify the locations, the timing of development, development patterns, the types of uses, intensity, form, and sustainability criteria.

Mr. Incorvia stated that there is a joint planning area in the works for Temple Terrace and Plant City.

Mr. Lauer stated that is a good clarification. He asked whether the overlay area should have less intensity; should the focus be on intensity in that area to make it more compatible with adjacent development.

Mr. Register asked whether Mr. Lauer was including economic costs associated with the plan policies. Mr. Lauer responded affirmatively. Mr. Register said there will be differences among the locations, and that should be acknowledged, and felt that it should be emphasized more. Implications for the LDRs include zoning, rezoning, and safeguards for those areas outside the USA.

Mr. Lauer reviewed the status of the overall I-4 Corridor Planning process (see PowerPoint). He stated that as the project goes forward, the team needs to think about what is accomplished through "carrots" and "sticks." If only sticks are offered, that typically does not encourage investment by the private sector. Potential development patterns can include transit oriented development, an employment center, a corporate campus, and a corporate village. The corporate village employs some new urbanist principals to a traditional corporate campus. The village's focus is a broader range of uses than corporate campuses.

Mr. Incorvia responded that mixed-use that includes residential is somewhat problematic and referenced the I-75 planning effort; he stated that very little corporate/light industrial development occurred. He stated that the I-75 corridor is dominated by residential and retail uses.

Mr. Lauer stated that the Core Study Team is considering land uses that are long term. He admitted that is not exciting for developers. Mr. Incorvia stated that Mr. Lauer made a good point that the entire corridor is on the order of 60,000 acres, and the overlay is approx 30,000 acres. The forecast is 1,000 acres in demand, and the team has already identified permit-ready sites that total 3,500 acres.

Mr. Marchetti asked for clarity on the figures that Mr. Incorvia gave. Mr. Marchetti stated that the overlay area would be limited. Mr. Incorvia responded that Core Study Team may reduce the size of the area in response to comments from the public and the BOCC. Ms. Corbett commented that there have been several comments about reducing the size of the overlay area. Mr. Aluotto acknowledged Ms. Corbett's comment. Mr. Marchetti wondered how criteria are developed without knowing where a potential site will be.

Mr. Lauer responded that the challenge of shrinking the area is that many of the larger properties would go outside of the boundary. That will reduce the opportunity for assembly of larger parcels.

Mr. Horwedel stated that the size of the overlay creates angst because it should be narrowed down; he added that if he were a resident he would be concerned about impact on the overall character of the area. Mr. Lauer responded that the odds of having that much office and light industrial development are low.

Mr. Bruce Erhardt commented that he had visited the identified permit-ready sites. He stated that he felt that not all of the sites are quality sites. He offered that the group should take into consideration whether industry would want to locate on the permit-ready sites. Mr. Register clarified that the overlay area is different issue from the permit-ready sites. He added that Mr. Erhardt's point was well taken.

Mr. Lauer asked whether the corporate village concept is something we want to keep on the table. Mr. Register commented that it may have some value for the communities that may be impacted. However, it is not a high priority. Mr. Hunter stated that comment is Mr. Register's opinion. He feels that the corporate village brings together some density to support transit. Mr. Horwedel said that to look in context of the transit corridors and that it should be mapped. Mr. Incorvia stated that the mistake of I-75 should be avoided. Mr. Register asked about what density that would be in the corporate villages. Mr. Lauer responded that residential could be either internal or peripheral. Mr. Lauer referenced Peter

Kageyama's talk and stated that the plan should create places that will attract potential employees and businesses. If the BOCC and other governing bodies have a clear path to encourage the market, there is an inherent risk that the governing body may approve development regardless of it potentially causing damage and being contrary to the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Code.

Mr. Lauer discussed how a floating zone could be created, and he stated that it would be a good tool to use because we don't know where the demand may be in the future. He clarified that the detailed future land use map amendments will be within the Urban Service Area, and there will be general development policies in the overlay area, which is a text amendment. Mr. Marchetti replied that wasn't the vote that took place at the BOCC, and the Core Study Team should create a map amendment change along the entire corridor. Mr. Lauer responded that DCA was open to an overlay, and there may be challenges with a map change along the entire corridor. Ms. Lamboy added that DCA identified that the overlay also does not require financial feasibility for infrastructure improvements, which is key.

Mr. Lauer commented that he felt that the land use and specific parcels being changed on the map is further along the road. Mr. Griffin stated that is not the direction we are moving in. Mr. Pessaro asked about the overlay district, hypothetically does a potential project have to be located within the USA. Mr. Register asked how the overlay relates to the Urban Service Boundary. Mr. Incorvia responded the overlay does not relate to the Urban Service Boundary, and policies may be drafted to allow certain land uses to proceed. Mr. Griffin stated that potentially a development can get services in the Rural Area without moving the boundary. Mr. Register asked that if development criteria were met, would the USA move? Mr. Griffin responded no, that the policies would permit the creation of a village with services that come out to the property (similar to the RP-2 policies that currently exist in the Comprehensive Plan). The USA boundary does not move. Mr. Lauer stated that, in essence, urban islands are being created.

Mr. Moreda asked from a zoning perspective whether the only district available in the area would be an I-4 zoning district. Mr. Hunter responded that several I-4 districts would be created, that reflect the distinct conditions of different portions of the corridor. Mr. Register stated that because the overlay district its own entity, it would have distinct criteria. Mr. Horwedel asked if everyone had looked at the Sarasota example, and commented that it was a good resource.

Mr. Moran asked about limitations on extension of water and sewer lines, and important it is to plan appropriately. He questioned how an island in the rural area could be served, and stated that it is not possible to completely open the overlay area to water and sewer and the present. Mr. Lauer responded that plan policies must encourage extension of water/sewer lines that is done in a considered way so there will not be a lot of parallel lines.

Mr. Moreda stated that only having one I-4 zone could be problematic. He also stated that assembly of property will be a big issue along the corridor. Mr. Lauer stated that unless you have a big enough development, the infrastructure costs will not make sense. Mr. Aluotto stated that the team should lose sight that there are community-based plans along the corridor. There will be other existing uses other than just office and light industrial uses, and it will have to be acknowledged in the new zoning categories. Mr. Horwedel stated that what was Mr. Hunter was getting at.

Mr. Lauer introduced the sustainability issues. He asked whether the sustainability policies were to be targeted just to the I-4 Corridor, or would they have broader countywide applicability. He stated that if the County is promoting green policy, it should be broader. Mr. Incorvia stated that this green discussion was ahead of the task of the land use category and zoning. Ms. Lamboy clarified that the Economic Stimulus Task Force had identified green policy and smart growth in their priorities, for I-4 and countywide.

Mr. Lauer stated that the team considers development in the corridor and elsewhere, there is a broad range of choices regarding the application of performance criteria (standards versus guidelines). Dr. Jennifer Languell has presented to the Planning Commission and illustrated how embracing green has a large return and offers many incentives. Mr. Marchetti stated that there is typically an added up-front cost. Mr. Hunter replied that is not necessarily the case. Mr. Horwedel stated that if you want to incentivize behavior, you have to mitigate the costs. Mr. Lauer stated that as the team looks at green standards, it needs to consider whether it should be mandatory, point systems, lists, discretionary reviews, incentives, or optional. Mr. Lauer stated that the 'optional' scenario is a throw-away because it never typically happens.

Mr. Lauer provided some examples of green standards. He stated that CalTran has criteria, which will be available for detailed viewing on a web site.

Mr. Lauer referenced the various terms relating to sustainability criteria (see PowerPoint). He stated that there are green building initiatives with reference to relative efficiency. The long term target is net zero energy consumption, but currently the technology is not available to meet this criterion. Mr. Lauer stated that location is critical in terms of infrastructure and utility service. He added that environmental features that should be considered. Auto dependence should be reduced, and there should be proximity between jobs and housing. As the jobs increase, it is best to maintain a mix and balance of jobs and housing.

On-site sustainability criteria can include walkability, compactness, and connectivity, a mix of uses, the parking footprint, transportation demand management, complete streets, and public/green spaces. The team may want to consider a minimum floor area ratio, particularly in the area near the university. Mr. Register stated that this will be important – the design standards will provide a delimiter for the ideas that have been bouncing around. The quality of a development will likely determine the value of the skill sets of the employees. Mr. Register stated that this is a good way to approach on achieving the type of development the County is seeking. Mr. Horwedel asked for clarification on the design standards, for instance, how would that apply to a Scripps-type development. Mr. Register commented that was probably given thought, and the employees probably demanded a certain quality of environment with amenities. He stated that this will be key, and although it is not the singular resolution, it will help.

Ms. Curl stated that if the corridor develop according to a cluster concept, it will become very important to be able to connect within the cluster. It will make it easier to recruit other businesses. Mr. Register stated it's not just walkability, but also the whole amenity package. Ms. Curl stated that it could be a mini-mall approach within a campus – where there is a lot of interaction between the businesses. She observed that this could help to recruit business and employees. Mr. Horwedel confirmed that was likely as he learned through his participation in the Economic Stimulus Task Force.

Mr. Lauer stated that the team must remember the context. Mr. Lauer stated that there are programs in place that address many of these issues, i.e. Livable Roadways. Mr. Lauer commented on the infrastructure, including the energy and water efficiency, stormwater collection, etc. He stated that approaches include minimum scoring, regulatory pricing (impact fees based on energy consumption), and incentives based on cost savings. He added that other approaches include utility rebates, capacity credits, property tax incentives, sales

tax incentives and grants. Currently the County's code provides for a 30% reduction in trips, so this is not something alien to the existing standards. Mr. Lauer commented that all incentives have to take into consideration future needs and whether they will be accommodated with the tax cuts, grants or rebates.

Mr. Lauer continued by outlining draft performance criteria. They include development patterns, range and mix of uses, intensity, compatibility, conditions for the establishment of support uses (targeted number of jobs, square footage ratios, or jobs to housing ratio), and accessory activities including storage and operations (will likely be part of the port function).

Mr. Lauer reviewed the purpose of the overlay protection district. A new land use category could float throughout the district, but criteria will have to be met before growth can happen in the overlay district. The County and municipalities need to focus on the permit-ready sites and create synergy, and only look outside the USA once a certain level of occupancy has occurred inside the USA. However, if you have the right player, then a public-private partnership may be considered. Mr. Horwedel stated that the cost of the partnership is a larger discussion. Mr. Lauer responded that oversizing makes perfect sense, but there is no sense running the initial service until there is something moving on sites that are already served by utilities. Mr. Lauer stated that if there is the right company that meets the criteria, the County must be flexible. Mr. Register clarified that there will be give and take. Mr. Lauer commented that sprawl avoidance options should be considered.

Mr. Marchetti stated that the process started with the idea of having some sort of overlay and make permit-ready some sites. He stated that the proposed criteria is a huge step back, and is directly contrary to what the BOCC is stating. He commented that the hearing is that the funding is not there for water, sewer, and transportation; however, to essentially say that the County is not doing anything along the corridor is contrary to Board desire. Why are we going through this exercise if 60-70% of the existing sites have to be developed first? Mr. Horwedel stated that is why he wanted clarification that if there is a user that is right, there will be opportunity. He stated that this is where the rubber hits the road. Mr. Hunter stated that he wanted to correct the record in that the BOCC intention is not to strip out I-4. Mr. Hunter stated that he has never seen a push for I-4 until recently...there have been efforts to bump out the USA in the area, but the BOCC responded with stating they wanted a plan. He stated that if the developer pays for infrastructure, where the money will come from if oversizing does not get any anticipated growth (utilities are enterprise funds, and rely on

revenues to maintain and operate the systems). Mr. Hunter concluded his comment by stating that if funding is diverted to help Water Resources or another agency because of lack of customers that means consequences for other funding efforts in the County. Mr. Marchetti commented on the report in 2004, if take what is indicated defeat the purpose of the entire process.

Mr. Marchetti thought the criteria were for the overlay and then there would be additional criteria in the zoning district. He asked what Mr. Erhardt was going to do to attract industry with the proposed regulations.

Mr. Moran clarified that all the circles indicated on the map are more than the full anticipated absorption of 1,000 acres (circles total 3,500 acres).

Mr. Lauer threw out the criteria for discussion purposes; he stated that he doesn't want to spread it too thin. Mr. Moran responded that criterion cannot be measured. Mr. Register stated that the criteria should not have one area dictate what happens in another area. What are the conditions, the capacity, or availability? He stated that they should be linked to the real drivers of development, not some artificial goal to drive development in a certain direction. Mr. Lauer asked how many jobs, what is the development, what size of business, maybe those should be criteria. He commented that the cost of infrastructure will figure largely.

Mr. Erhardt commented that there are users that do not want to be in business parks. The end user may want a site that is 5, 10, 15 acres in size, and may not want to be in an office park and have to conform to signage and architectural regulations of a park. Mr. Register stated that the team doesn't know what the aggregate will look like. Mr. Lauer stated that if the team is looking outside the USA a development must be larger to pay the freight of the infrastructure. Mr. Register stated that the timing of development is a long process. He wondered how the Performa for a project would work if the development site was a long way away from existing resources. Mr. Register stated that the team has to gauge the criteria; it is not singularly a monetary issue, but logistics also. The team needs to establish the right criteria to make the corridor work.

Mr. Register stated he thought there would be an incremental increase in growth. Part of the model should be on how to make land available to the market as the market changes. He commented that the corridor development will grow inward from Plant City and from the Urban Service Boundary. Mr. Horwedel stated that he was interested in the marketability analysis of the sites. In the

middle, he asked what type of users will look at a 10-acre site or a 200-acre site. Mr. Horwedel stated that he was concerned with the term of incremental growth. Mr. Moreda stated that gets back to how you incentivize the development.

Mr. Register stated that he understood that the team is looking to some form of land use preservation with some certainty through the criteria. It is likely that investors will find 20-40 acre sites along the city and USB. He stated that the County needs to be prepared for the big user and the smaller user. Mr. Register stated that he is trying to predict the obstacles.

Mr. Lauer stated that he felt that Mr. Register had a great point, and the edge issues should be dealt with differently than the middle in the overlay district. Mr. Hunter stated that he has seen 17 years of development going along the urban service boundary. His bigger concern is levels of service for all County services. He stated that when the team talks about nibbling at the edges, he has concern of whether it will be a premier corridor. It has to be sustainable, green, and it will have to be paid for. He concluded that if a business like Scripps wants to come, there will be a way to do it with due process.

Mr. Lauer stated that one of the tools available to avoid inducing sprawl is setting aside capacity, including transportation, water and sewer. A public investment will be required, and there should be an advance payment for these investments. Mr. Horwedel agreed that this tool is a good one.

Mr. Register asked whether the overlay will change the postures and attitudes of FDOT and the Water Department. He commented that otherwise the corridor effort might be doomed before it starts. Mr. Hunter stated that the sewer and water people have done a good job of designing the system to serve the USA, with the allowance for additional capacity when things change. Mr. Horwedel stated he doesn't want the capacity taken by industries that are not target industries.

Ms. Curl asked whether the Core Study Team could go ahead and get started with some of the implementation; she felt a need to start. Mr. Horwedel responded that the corridor is not marketable right now, and suggested that targeted areas are identified.

Mr. Hunter stated his intention to get the plan amendment application package done by August or at the latest, September 1.

Mr. Hurlbert talked about the utilities in the overlay district. He stated that there is capacity adjacent to Plant City. He added that in Plant City, there is a lot of distribution capability. He stated that the fight comes between Plant City and MacIntosh Road because FDOT will not do anything to aid development. Mr. Hurlbert stated this area should be reconsidered in terms of FDOT policy. He stated that he would like to see the GIS overlays where the capacity is today and see whether a site could be considered today to the immediate west of Plant City. He commented that without sewage and transportation, this project can go nowhere. Mr. Horwedel stated that one of the outcomes of the effort is to figure out how the infrastructure will work. He stated that if the capacity is desired, the city/county will make it work. Mr. Horwedel stated that the team has to come up with a unified category to permit development potential.

Ms. Curl discussed Baker Creek and problems with the flooding and fecal coliform. She stated that the creek's flow is interrupted and that is a problem, and discussed her participation in a University of Florida study project.

Mr. Lauer stated that he had learned a lot, and there has been a lot of good information. He stated he will post background information on the Planning Works web site through his organization. He commented that the team needs to move quickly on plan language.

Ms. Lamboy stated that she would email the team with Mr. Lauer's web site information, and she would post a link from the Planning Commission web site.

Mr. Griffin stated that the team still needed to discuss the size of the overlay district.

Ms. Bacca stated that she felt the need to discuss the performance criteria further. Ms. Curl stated that everything should be filtered down some subject areas. Ms. Bacca stated that if the whole study will gear down to the performance criteria, then they must be studied.

Mr. Griffin offered two options, either a break or a session in two weeks (May 28) to discuss the overlay district. Mr. Moreda felt that the issues of the performance criteria and the overlay area were related. Mr. Horwedel stated that the team could have a discussion on the size of the overlay, but also suggested that the team gives the consultant time to deal with the issues.

Mr. Register asked if there was a way to link Mr. Lauer electronically to the next meeting. Mr. Incorvia felt that he was not sure that was necessary.

Mr. Griffin stated that the Core Study Team will have a one-hour meeting to discuss the boundary of the overlay district on May 28.