



Council Minutes

August 14, 2006
10:00 a.m.

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT

Chair, Mr. Robert Kersteen, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pinellas County
Vice Chair, Ms. Jill Collins, Gubernatorial Appointee, Hillsborough County
Past Chair, Commissioner Jane von Hahmann, Manatee County
Mr. Richard Albrecht, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pasco County
Councilwoman Mary Alvarez, City of Tampa
Commissioner Gigi Arntzen, City of Largo
Mayor Larry Bustle, City of Palmetto
Councilor John Counts, City of Seminole
Vice Mayor Larry Crowley, City of South Pasadena
Commissioner Bill Dodson, City of Plant City
Mr. Julian Garcia, Jr., Gubernatorial Appointee, Hillsborough County
Dr. Lois Gerber, Gubernatorial Appointee, Manatee County
Mr. Housh Ghovae, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pinellas County
Mr. Kenneth Hoyt, Hillsborough County Gubernatorial Appointee
Ms. Angeleah Kinsler, Hillsborough County Gubernatorial Appointee
Deputy Mayor Matthew McCaffery, City of New Port Richey
Vice Mayor Janice Miller, City of Oldsmar
Councilperson Carlen Petersen, City of Clearwater
Commissioner Robin Saenger, City of Tarpon Springs
Commissioner Steve Simon, Pasco County
Ms. Barbara Sheen Todd, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pinellas County
Mr. Philip Waller, Gubernatorial Appointee, Hillsborough County
Commissioner Kenneth Welch, Pinellas County
Ms. Brenda Williams, Department of Environmental Protection

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT

Secretary/Treasurer, Commissioner Scott Black, City of Dade City
Mayor Ward Friszolowski, City of St. Pete Beach
Reverend James T. Golden, City of Bradenton
Mr. Michael Guju, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pinellas County
Commissioner Ken Halloway, City of Temple Terrace
Commissioner Deborah Kynes, City of Dunedin
Commissioner James McCormick, City of Safety Harbor
Mayor Mary Maloof, City of Treasure Island
Commissioner Mark Sharpe, Hillsborough County
Vice Mayor Ed Taylor, City of Pinellas Park
Councilman Earnest Williams, City of St. Petersburg
Ms. Kathleen Wolf, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pasco County
Ms. Michelle Miller, Enterprise Florida
Mr. Bob Clifford, Florida Department of Transportation
Mr. Todd Pressman, SWFWMD

OTHERS PRESENT

John Healey, Planner, Hillsborough County
Trisha Neasman, Planner, SWFWMD
Shawn College, Exec. Planner, Hillsborough Planning Commission
Parker Keen, Land Manager, MOSAIC
Bob Jeffrey, Asst. Director, City of St. Pete
Rick MacAuly, Senior Planner, City of St. Pete
Jeff Stewart, Env. Super., MOSAIC
Steven Luce, Planner, Luce Planning Group
Joanne McClellan, Planner, SWFWMD
Frank Blandford, Commercial Real Estate, Tourtelot Brothers

STAFF PRESENT

Mr. Manny Pumariaga, Executive Director
Mr. Roger Tucker, Legal Counsel
Mr. Avera Wynne, Planning Director
Ms. Suzanne Cooper, Principal Planner
Ms. Lori Denman, Administrative Assistant
Mr. Marshall Flynn, Principal Planner
Mr. John Jacobsen, Accounting Manager
Ms. Betti Johnson, Principal Planner
Ms. Wren Krahl, Manager of Admin./Public Information
Mr. Bill Lofgren, Principal Planner
Mr. John Meyer, Principal Planner
Mr. Patrick O'Neil, Senior Planner
Ms. Jessica White, Senior Planner
Ms. Kim Williams, Communications/Graphics Coordinator

Call to Order - Chairman Kersteen

The regular meeting of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council was called to order by Chairman Kersteen on August 14, 2006 at 10:01 a.m.

The Invocation was given by Commissioner Steve Simon, followed by the pledge of allegiance.

Roll Call - Recording Secretary

A quorum was present. There were no voting conflicts filed.

Announcements:

Chairman Kersteen invited Council members to stay following the meeting to hear Mr. Robert Grow's presentation on Envision Utah. Mr. Grow is the Founding Chair Emeritus of Envision Utah, a private/public quality growth partnership founded in 1997. He will share his experience with the regional visioning efforts and the successful implementation components to date.

Included in the Council folders was a publication from the 1000 Friends of Florida entitled *Community Stewardship I: A Citizen's Guide to Participating in Florida's Growth Management Process*.

1. **Approval of Minutes** - Vice Chair Collins

The minutes from the July 10, 2006 meeting were approved. (Hoyt/Simon)

2. **Budget Committee** -Vice Chair Collins
The Financial Report for the period ending 06/30/06 was approved. (Hoyt/von Hahmann)
3. **Consent Agenda** - Chairman Kersteen
Mr. Julian Garcia, Hillsborough County Gubernatorial Appointee, filed a voting conflict report on Consent Agenda Item #3.E.1. Notice of Proposed Change Report, DRI 110 Rocky Point Harbor, City of Tampa, and refrained from voting.
The Consent Agenda was approved. (von Hahmann/Albrecht)
4. **Item(s) Removed from Consent Agenda and Addendum Item(s)** – None
5. **Review Item(s) or Any Other Item(s) for Discussion** – None
6. **Mr. Bob Jeffrey, Assistant Development Services Director, City of St. Petersburg**
Mr. Jeffrey provided a presentation on the City of St. Petersburg’s proposed new Land Development Regulations (LDRs). The revisions represent a major overhaul to the city’s code and the culmination of a multi-year visioning process. The LDRs incorporate numerous “state of the art” planning concepts. A key provision of the code is to encourage the development of affordable housing.

The LDR is a project that was started in 2001, culminated in an extensive public input process which created land development regulations for the next 30 years. Vision 2020 was the founding document. 525 citizens were brought together and spent 8 weeks having an educational exercise about the things important to our community such as social issues, housing issues, and things we are faced with. They came up with 15 themes to guide future development within the city. This was adopted in October 2002. To implement the majority of the recommendations we started on a 4-year public process of relaying our land development regulations and embodying not only the things that were important in Vision 2020 that had to do with the social issues, but also the four basic codes that would get the community to where it needed to be over the next 20 years. Recognizing that we only have about 3% of undeveloped land left, a code that would make things fit in seamlessly. We did this through a committee process. There were 20 committees and each of them wrote the various zoning districts with the business community, the Chamber of Commerce, Tampa Bay Area Builders Association and everyone that we could get involved that utilizes the code to make sure that we had something that fits specifically for St. Petersburg.

From a planning perspective the city will have to amend the comprehensive plan and are proposing to the county three new future land use categories. The residential category will cover about 22% of our land, planned redevelopment mixed-use category 4.5% of land, and a new commercial center category for redevelopment that covers 1.5% of land.

St. Petersburg was developed extensively in the 1920s and 1950s and has a lot of traditional neighborhoods. We have a significant grid pattern, an extensive alley system, and traditional houses, some have garage apartments. We wanted to re-introduce the garage apartment which was outlawed in 1977 when the old code was adopted. The garage apartment provides the single family look, it allows for a little more density and it protects the rental pool. By having these on single lots you cannot subdivide or create duplexes and triplexes. The residential proposed category will promote traditional design patterns in those traditional neighborhoods. We are also proposing a new mixed-use category. What we found over the years is that what we typically get in our mixed-use categories or corridors are

the sprawl because there isn't enough intensity, not enough floor area ratio, to create true mixed-use. You need the intensity and the density to get the true mixed, otherwise you are fooling yourself thinking you are going to get it with a floor area ratio (FAR) of .35. The categories that exist in the county-wide rules today are geared toward the beaches. We are proposing a new category that works to get the type of development similar in Winter Park that will allow appropriate intensities and densities to encourage realistic mixed-use up to 24 units per acre (UPA) or 1.25 FAR, with design guidelines to create a strong sense of place and street scape.

The new commercial category will allow retail centers focused on mixed-use with appropriate design features to tame the automobile and create a sense of place. It allow appropriate intensities and densities up to 55 UPA or 1.25 FAR and allows residential uses.

How do we envision this happening? A lot of times when people are doing mixed-use they want to talk about 50 UPA and what we found is that in St. Pete you get a variety of things. Bayfront Tower is actually about 50 UPA but it has a FAR of 22. Compare that with a building in Orlando with also 50 UPA but a FAR of 1.5. As you can see, they are vastly different in scale and character. Also if we look in some of our neighborhood designs we end up getting a FAR of .5 with 4 units in one building and a FAR of .5 with only 2 units. You cannot just use one factor or another to get what you want. Throughout the code we put in a mixed-use formula that actually calculates both at the same time - a maximum number of units per acre and a maximum floor area. Whenever you are talking about mixed-use you are guided by both, so at the end of the day when you add in the design regulations, you add in the set-backs, the height restrictions, the floor area ratios, and the parking requirements and you truly do get mixed use. Floor area ratio better regulates the mass of the building when combined with height limits, setbacks and design guidelines.

The code is divided into 3 tiers: neighborhoods, corridors and centers, but we also recognize the traditional pattern - those built prior to 1945. In our traditional neighborhoods we are being very specific. We are pulling buildings up to the street and encouraging front porches by allowing set-backs to 15 feet, the front porch at 18 feet and the building itself at 25 feet. You can't build the house on the 18 foot set-back, it has to be at 25 feet but by doing so it encourages the front porch to get built. We have also regulated height. The eave needs to start at no more that 24 feet in the air. There are provisions for towers, dormers, etc. Neighbors get upset with construction that doesn't fit together. We have the ability now to "match" - you can pick the neighborhood with the design style you want so we don't have one house sitting next to another in total contrast.

Garage Apartments are a characteristic defining building type within traditional neighborhoods. Having primary and secondary structures maintains the single family look to the neighborhood and keeps lots under a single ownership. They assist with life cycle, affordable housing, and allow additional living space, home office, or space for extended family. We actually have neighborhoods that have about 20% garage apartments, in the older traditional neighborhoods. We have neighborhoods that have as little as 2% garage apartments. Under very strict guidelines we are going to re-introduce those and bring those back so that again, we create that affordable housing component within our neighborhood in a way that can never be separated off in the creation of a duplex. We have strict standards that will go into that. First of all, you have to have a minimum lot size of 5800 sq. ft. You have to provide at least two spaces for the main house to park and an additional separate space for the garage apartment itself because parking is quite critical in our traditional neighborhoods. And the parking has to be in the back, you can't have the big pave-over of the front yard that we typically see to create parking. The building has to create privacy, you can't have the windows facing off into the neighbors side yard.

We are also proposing mixed use districts where you can have a variety of shops and things that would

service the neighborhood. Unfortunately the only zoning category we had was ROR, which if we wanted to put in a Walgreens or a Walmart that would allow it at the expense of the neighborhood. What we have done is created a neighborhood-driven mixed use district that scales those retail spaces down to no more than 1250 sq. ft. It does allow for mixed use to go in and it allows you to have your business on the first floor of your building and live up above. It also allows for garage apartments and it is very regulated by FAR, slightly less than what all the houses have today. By reducing the FAR for new construction you get the bonus of keeping your old house. So now we have preserved the neighborhood, we have kept the scale, the set-backs, all those things appropriate to that and allowed that neighborhood to stay intact.

Along the corridors, this is going to be highly designed. Mr. Jeffrey showed examples of past and future corridor siting and design. The buildings will be closer to the street, have architectural articulation, and will allow for mixed use. It will allow for retail on the first floor and offices on the second floor.

In the industrial areas it was recognized that we have 50 ft. x 100 ft. industrial lots and we've now made the regulation work to allow someone to develop on one, two or three of those lots. The big difference here is that the family home sitting next to the caged industrial storage area – we now have strong buffer requirements that will separate that out and make it so that you are not literally having an industrial area sitting right on a residential lot.

In our centers and along our corridors we are looking at heavy buffering and making things geared towards pedestrians, not automobiles. Our big lot centers such as the Home Depot that was built at the Gateway Centre now has shops along the back so you don't have that big box with the blank wall. You actually have storefronts facing the street. The parking is broken up and put into pods with sidewalks and pedestrian connections are put in between to allow people to function better.

Recognizing our employment center, the Gateway/Carillon area, we like what is going on there and want to encourage and protect that economic driver, but we are looking at the parking so we don't end up with the over parking requirements where we have very large parking areas that are under utilized.

The historic preservation ordinance will bring forward a lot of the preservation activities that have been done over the past 15 years. It will also provide the adaptive reuse ordinance that will take a historical building and allow all its approvals under one body so instead of going for re-zoning, three months later going to the board of adjustment for a variances, site plan approval a couple of months after that, it puts it into one hearing, pulls it tightly together and knocks about 8-9 months off the approval process. As we all know, most buildings do not get renovated because of the amount of time it takes to go to the various boards and commissions.

The city will also have an artist overlay district that is very much like a historical preservation ordinance where a neighborhood can come forward and market itself as an artistic neighborhood. It allows for a few additional things that aren't prominent in most neighborhood districts such as a little more live/work space, a few more saws to be run in the back yard during the week. Those things are very limited now. It justifies the piano teacher that wants to teach lessons after school, it allows gallery openings - no more than 4 times per year for the person that owns the house only. It legitimizes all those things that often create tension in neighborhoods and forces the artist out at some point. We do recognize, because we have very strong design codes here, that there are times when there is a larger tract...a couple of acres that may need special design criteria. This allows that to shift out of the distinct criteria of architecture that we have and allows someone to promote their own design, but it has certain buffering requirements around the outside that makes it blend in. And, what they do in the center of their own lot is up to them.

The city has many grand-fathered uses because of our tourist industry such as little cottages that really don't function very well today. It allows them to be redeveloped to a lesser intensive use. A 14 rooming house could be converted maybe to 3 or 4 units at this point so it allows a great deal of flexibility within that existing box.

We looked at each of the districts to see how we could create incentives that will allow workforce housing. The garage apartment is the biggest thing we see. We anticipate that we can get up to 22,000 garage apartments if everyone would build one. We know the reality is that in the 7 years that it was legal we only had about 3,000 built. We think we would be lucky if we get 5,000. Nonetheless it does allow that to happen. The garage apartment can't be broken off and will always remain in a rental status.

Density bonuses - in most of our corridors where you have densities of 24 units an acre or 15 units you are allowed 3 or 4 additional units which actually equates to just one additional unit per typical 100 x 50 ft. lot. It's not a major type of thing here but allows that extra unit to provide that. It is a monitored program and it will have to stay in the housing system with a land trust for a minimum of 20-30 years. The other thing that we are looking at is in downtown. We have very little FARs as a base. With a bonus system to get you up to the type of development of 6 or 7 FAR you can buy into the housing trust fund. You can actually pay for housing to be built somewhere else in the city because we know land prices in the downtown probably are not going to allow for a lot of affordable housing within the downtown. The other thing, adaptive re-use ordinance - all those things - the redevelopment ordinance that allows for those existing rooming houses to be turned in to apartments is a great way of creating affordable housing.

You are probably most interested in, where is all this population going? We really have a built out population today. We are proposing about another 30,000-40,000 people when we run all the projections. We currently have zoning for 7 so we are taking that back to 5 to recognize the character and to prevent those lots from being split up. We are pushing it into the center, into that traditional pattern, into where the corridors and things like that are not in the coastal high hazard area and allowing transportation to occur. For buses, trolleys to expand that will help for pulling that population where it needs to be. We think we are probably going to be about 1700 less units in the coastal high hazard area when we are done with this.

Traffic related issues, we will maintain the grid system, encouraging management, decentralizing retail, trolley expansion, BRT east/west transit study, and other initiatives. All of these things come into play to help with the additional density.

Mr. Jeffrey reviewed build out under existing regulation vs. build-out under proposed regulation numbers and stated that at the end of the day a lot of the commercial land is staying the same, but it is adding the FARs and the densities to actually make it work.

In closing, all this comes back to what citizens said in 2002 - St. Petersburg is a vibrant cosmopolitan community in which to live, work, play and learn. All the citizens, neighborhoods and businesses collaborated in this development and that was the key, this was driven by the citizens themselves.

Questions & Comments:

Councilor Counts:

How will you encourage, say Tyrone Mall, to comply with your vision?
They are continuing to build internally now, and still have a sea of asphalt, which is something that we are battling in Seminole as well.

Mr. Jeffrey: How do you get the developers to buy into this? The first thing is the floor area ratios, and the bonuses and incentives get them to do the right thing. When someone comes in with a plan and we know you are only going to build 20-30 400,000 sq. ft. today, let's reserve this nice big parking lot off to the side for your next phase of development. Let's start looking at this not as each individual project, but what you can go for in the future. We spent a lot of time working at Tyrone Mall and they are excited about a lot of the things they will be able to do. Will it come about tomorrow, the next day? No. Five years maybe.

Ms. Collins: How are you addressing mobile home parks?

Mr. Jeffrey: They are actually getting a mobile home designation. If anyone wanted to propose anything different they will have to go through that same process.

Ms. Collins: Land use change?

Mr. Jeffrey: Yes. It won't be any easier to convert. However, we are hoping with some of our other programs that we will be able to build in advance of that some other affordable housing that is more realistic.

Comm. von Hahmann: Are you looking at the availability for the mobile home people to actually replace those older units with more solid structures?

Mr. Jeffrey: We are working with a couple of developers who are looking at that. We recognize that the density intensity in these parks is really only 5 units now. We upped that to 15 in hopes that maybe with the density there we might be able to get someone to restore a mobile home park or to renovate it in some feasible way.

Mr. Ghovae: What are the changes to your permitting processes?

Mr. Jeffrey: We now have it so that you are only going to one board or commission. Each of our boards can take on multiple issues because we are going through the same training process for each of them. We've also raised, just slightly, our thresholds for the size of the building and the number of units for site plan approval so those larger projects can go through a little more quickly. Other than that, the permitting process for looking at the structures and things like that will be about the same.

Commissioner Welch: You have done a great job. Are you contemplating using the county's mobile home transition program?

Mr. Jeffrey: I'm not really that familiar with that end of the process so I'm not sure what they are doing with that.

Commissioner Welch: Secondly, we added four categories to the county-wide plan. You mention three. How does that reconcile?

Mr. Jeffrey: We really didn't need the industrial category. We found at the end of the day that our densities/intensities, when you pulled them down to a 5,500 ft. lot, we were already there.

Chairman Kersteen stated he chaired the industrial traditional committee and each committee was diverse in the membership so that we had an environmentalist on our committee. She wanted to put gardens on the roofs of industrial buildings. It was innovative thinking but did not win the support of the majority of the members.

7. **Council Members' Comments** - Chairman Kersteen - None

8. **Program Reports**

A. Agency on Bay Management (ABM) - Chair, Mayor Mary Maloof
There was excellent attendance at the meeting last Thursday. On the agenda were:

TAMPA BAY WATER'S HYDROBIOLOGICAL MONITORING PROGRAM

This program was begun as a result of concerns raised during the permitting process for the surface water withdrawal projects on the Hillsborough and Alafia rivers and the Tampa Bypass Canal. Monitoring has been going on for six years — three before the withdrawals began and three years since. It includes water quality, floral and faunal monitoring. Bottom line: no detectable impacts from the surface water withdrawal projects.

RE-POWERING OF PROGRESS ENERGY'S BARTOW PLANT

Progress Energy staff described the plans to repower and expand the company's Bartow Plant (at Weedon Island) to utilize natural gas that will be provided by the Gulfstream Natural Gas pipeline. Power production will almost triple at the facility, while air pollution will be dramatically reduced. There will be no change in water use or thermal discharge.

CEDAR HAMMOCK (WARES CREEK) FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

US Army Corps of Engineers staff presented this project, planned to alleviate flooding in the 6.23 square mile drainage basin within the City of Bradenton. Mitigation for mangrove impacts will occur at Emerson Point Park, and spoil disposal may occur in borrow areas within the Manatee River. Concerns were raised about removal of a mangrove island.

In other news - maintenance of the Egmont Channel is underway, and the sand is being placed on Egmont Key to stabilize the historic gun batteries and provide beach for recreationists and sea turtles. Excess sand will be placed on Mullet Key (Ft. DeSoto County Park) to abate beach erosion.

The next Agency meeting will be Thursday, September 14th. You are all welcome to attend.

B. Clearinghouse Review Committee (CRC) - Chair, Ms. Jill Collins

Mr. Wynne indicated that the last CRC meeting was held July 10, following the Council meeting. Presentations were provided on the Transportation Methodology that is utilized in the DRI process, as well as the ECFRPC Affordable Housing Methodology. There was spirited discussion on both topics, but the methodology that will be garnering attention is the affordable housing methodology for DRIs. The state is preparing to undergo a process which the RPC will be a stake holder in. The outcome of the CRC discussion was four recommended points to promote to the state to include in their revisions.

These four points are:

1. Concentrate on estimating demand for housing based on DRIs projected employment.
2. In addition to estimating demand for worker housing jobs created in the non-residential portion of a DRI, estimate employment impact and resulting demand for worker housing created by proposed residential units. (A caveat to that, something that needs to be stressed, is the essential worker housing demand is generated by the residential units for police, teachers, firemen, planners, etc.)
3. Drop supply side calculations (too difficult to calculate). Acknowledge that there is an affordable housing deficit and try to come up with solutions.
4. Include monitoring provisions for multiple phase and long single phases (referred to as manual phasing the ECFRPC DRI Housing Methodology). The idea there would be if you have a 10 year phase to a DRI you wouldn't necessarily wait to the end of it to find out if you are meeting the provisions. You might have an interim monitoring aspect to see if they

are meeting the affordable housing obligations. Particularly if they project they are not creating a demand.

The Legislative Committee addressed these four recommendations and recommends the Chairman transmit a letter to the Department of Community Affairs.

Motion for the Chairman to send a letter to the Department of Community Affairs recommending four points for consideration in the state's revisions for affordable housing methodology.
(Albrecht/Hoyt)

C. Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) - No Report

D. Emergency Management - No Report

E. Legislative Committee - Chair, Commissioner Deborah Kynes

Vice Chair Collins stated the Legislative Committee met before the Council meeting at 9 a.m. and one of the topics discussed was presented by Mr. Wynne under the Clearinghouse Review Committee report. Also discussed was the preliminary 2007 Legislative Agenda which will be brought before Council in October for review and discussion. We also talked about the property/casualty insurance reform that the governor issued an executive order and appointed a committee to address those issues. In addition we talked about transportation legislative issues which HB7077 recaps and Senator Sebesta's Tampa Bay Commuter Rail Authority and the Transit Authority in Hillsborough County.

Motion for the Chairman to sign a letter in support of the PSTA Resolution of 06-04.
(Alvarez/Crowley)

F. Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC)

At the last RPAC meeting there was a lot of discussion on the new coastal high hazard area definitions and regulations that were promulgated from HB1359. The group of local planners in the regional planning agencies recognized there are a lot of regional aspects to this, particularly when you are looking at out-of-county evacuations when one county evacuates through another. Another thing we would like to see is uniformity in how one local government applies the new criteria of CHHA (coastal high hazard area). At the next RPAC meeting (October 6th) we are going to discuss some of the common criteria. Now local governments are going to have some latitude. Once you take the scientific data from the CHHA you are going to be able to deviate that line plus or minus depending on your local criteria so we are going to work on trying to establish as much consensus as to what that local criteria should be.

G. Telework Tampa Bay - No Report

H. Economic Development - No Report

I. Regional Domestic Security Task Force (RDSTF) - No Report

J. Sea Level Rise Study

The Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council was contracted by South West Florida Regional Planning Council, through a grant from the US EPA to participate in this nationwide sea level rise planning and awareness project. Similar projects are underway or have been completed in New Jersey, North Carolina, and Maryland.

The EPA purpose of the nationwide project is to ensure long-term survival of coastal wetlands, diminish losses to life and property from erosion and/or inundation, and to stimulate government planning for adaptation to the effects of sea level rise.

The overall objectives of TBRPC study is to encourage local government planners and citizens to think about sea level rise, to predict response to a five foot rise in sea level, and to produce a report and maps consistent with the statewide approach already established in completed sea level rise studies. These studies have been completed in most all of the other coastal RPCs.

The basic study method was the creation of maps that portray the expected responses of counties and municipalities to sea level rise. This was based on information such as the current land use designations, future land use policies, federal, state & local programs & policies, and local planner input. The maps created we of an anticipated response to sea level rise. For this approach we used four general mapping categories to define levels of protection, protection being defined as physically holding back or diverting the sea water rise to avoid inundation of the land. The four categories are: Protection almost certain; Protection reasonably likely; Protection unlikely; and, No protection.

The mapping procedures included identifying the study area and this study included all areas of each county that are below 10 feet in elevation or within 1000 feet of the shoreline. Then anticipated response categories, or levels of protection, were identified for all land within the study area. Adjustments were made based on local input.

Conclusions and Uses of the Report:

- Approximately 64% of the study area is identified as “protection almost certain.”
- 23.5% of the study area is currently identified as either tidal or non-tidal wetlands.
- Tidal wetlands that are expected to be inundated with sea level rise will in many cases be unable to migrate inland due to coastal development.
- Utilize in siting criteria for future public facilities and infrastructure.

The entire report and maps are available at: www.tbrpc.org/gis/sealevelrise.htm

Questions & Comments:

Commissioner Welch: When you say “protection almost certain” are you saying protection from erosion?

- Mr. Miller: Yes, and or inundation, completely going under water. It's a very general term in this project.
- Commissioner Welch: Can you pull up one of the maps? Is it the dark brown areas on the map that are defined as protection almost certain?
- Mr. Miller: Yes, the brown would be "protection almost certain." The dark green or the purplish/pink color are both wetlands, tidal being the dark green and non-tidal being the purple. The red in Pinellas is in the Fort DeSoto area and is "reasonably likely protection" and the blue color is "protection unlikely." Just east of MacDill you will see a "no protection" area.
- Commissioner Welch: What is the time span?
- Mr. Miller: Generally 100 to 200 years. They used a table that was developed through a 1995 report by US EPA. We were doing a response based on 5 foot rise but we needed to consider tidal influence on top of the 5 foot rise. The general table located in the report shows the probabilities of different levels of rise.
- Commissioner Welch: So there is a good level of protection in the dark brown areas for the next 100 years.
- Mr. Miller: It's anticipated because of the expenditures that have already occurred since they are so developed there would be protection. It doesn't mean that it's feasible, but there is money available for that.
- Mr. Hoyt: If I own a piece of property, would this determine whether or not I have to evacuate? Would it mean that I would have to pay a higher insurance rate?
- Mr. Miller: This is a general planning map and is currently not being used for anything of that sort. Hopefully it will be utilized for things like looking where we would put new infrastructure.
- Vice Mayor Phillips: I have never seen any studies where we run out of oil which is sure to happen in the next 40 to 50 years. There will be no more oil to burn. Does that change this picture at all?
- Mr. Miller: I'm not sure of that. This study followed the US EPA estimates on sea level rise.
- Ms. Collins: Will this study have to be used down the road to prohibit or encourage local governments to take a look at where to develop?
- Mr. Miller: That is one of the purposes of doing the study, to encourage them to use something like this. By getting their input we are hoping they will use this as a tool.
- Motion to transmit the Sea Level Rise Study to the SWFRPC (Phillips/von Hahmann).

9. **Other Council Reports** - None
10. **Executive/Budget Committee Report** - Chairman Kersteen – No Report
11. **Chairman's Report** - Chairman Kersteen - No Report

12. **Executive Director's Report** - Manny Pumariega - No Report

Adjournment 10:58 a.m.

Following the adjournment of the Council meeting Mr. Robert Grow, Founding Chair Emeritus of Envision Utah provided a presentation on his experience with the Envision Utah regional visioning efforts and the successful implementation of the components to date.

Next Meeting - September 11, 2006 at 10:00 a.m.

Events Calendar located in Council folders.

Lori Denman, Recording Secretary

Robert A. "Bob" Kersteen, Chairman