



Council Minutes

July 9, 2007
9:30 a.m.

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT

Chair, Commissioner Scott Black, City of Dade City
Vice Chair, Vice Mayor Deborah Kynes, City of Dunedin
Secretary/Treasurer, Reverend James T. Golden, City of Bradenton
Past Chair, Mr. Robert Kersteen, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pinellas County
Commissioner Gigi Arntzen, City of Largo
Mayor Larry Bustle, City of Palmetto
Council Member Bob Consalvo, City of New Port Richey
Commissioner Ronnie Duncan, Pinellas County
Council Member Alison Fernandez, City of Temple Terrace
Mayor Ward Friszolowski, City of St. Pete Beach
Mr. Julian Garcia, Jr., Gubernatorial Appointee, Hillsborough County
Commissioner Jack Mariano, Pasco County
Councilor Bob Matthews, City of Seminole
Vice Mayor Janice Miller, City of Oldsmar
Commissioner Bob Minning, City of Treasure Island
Commissioner Robin Saenger, City of Tarpon Springs
Ms. Barbara Sheen Todd, Gubernatorial Appointee, Pinellas County
Mr. Philip Waller, Gubernatorial Appointee, Hillsborough County
Councilman Earnest Williams, City of St. Petersburg
Mr. Kent Fast, Alt., Ex-officio, Florida Department of Transportation
Mr. Todd Pressman, Ex-officio, SWFWMD

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT

Vice Mayor Larry Crowley, City of South Pasadena
Commissioner Bill Dodson, City of Plant City
Commissioner Rose Ferlita, Hillsborough County
Dr. Lois Gerber, Gubernatorial Appointee, Manatee County
Commissioner James McCormick, City of Safety Harbor
Councilwoman Mary Mulhern, City of Tampa
Council Member Carlen Petersen, City of Clearwater
Councilman Ed Taylor, City of Pinellas Park
Commissioner Jane von Hahmann, Manatee County
Commissioner Robert Worthington, Alt., City of Gulfport
Ms. Deborah Getzoff, Ex-officio, Department of Environmental Protection
Ms. Michelle Miller, Ex-officio, Enterprise Florida

OTHERS PRESENT

Shawn College, Exec. Planner, Hillsborough Planning Commission
John Healey, Planner, Hillsborough County
Joanne McClellan, Planning Liaison, SWFWMD
David Goldstein, Pasco County Attorney
Roy Chapman, Transportation Engineer, Florida Design Consultants
Steve Peacock, V.P. Env. Services, F.D.C.
Debra Sloshey, AICP, Director of Planning, FL Design Consultants

Carey Hayo, Principal Planner, Glatting Jackson
Andy Nothstore, Principal Planner, Glatting Jackson
Randy Misert, Principal Planner, Glatting Jackson
Andrea Petersen, Principal Planner, Glatting Jackson
Tim Butts, Project Planner, Wilson Miller
Steve Wasson, FDC
Tom Sunderman, Project Manager, JES Properties
Kathryn Starkey, School Board Member, Pasco County
David Roberts, Dir. Land Dev., StanPac
Quantom Hu, Planner II, Pasco County G.M.
Matt Armstrong, Planner, Pasco County G.M.

STAFF PRESENT

Mr. Manny Pumariega, Executive Director
Mr. Donald Conn, Legal Counsel
Ms. Suzanne Cooper, Principal Planner
Ms. Lori Denman, Administrative Assistant/Recording Secretary
Mr. John Jacobsen, Accounting Manager
Ms. Betti Johnson, Principal Planner
Ms. Wren Krahl, Manager of Administration/Public Information
Mr. Bill Lofgren, Principal Planner
Mr. John Meyer, Principal Planner
Mr. Greg Miller, Senior Planner
Mr. Patrick O'Neil, Senior Planner
Mr. Brady Smith, Senior Planner
Mr. Mike Spina, Senior Planner
Mr. Luis Suarez, Intern
Ms. Jessica White, Senior Planner
Ms. Kim Williams, Communications/Graphics Coordinator
Mr. Avera Wynne, Planning Director

Call to Order - Chairman Black

The regular meeting of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council was called to order by Chairman Black on July 9, 2007 at 9:37 a.m.

The Invocation was given by Yumna Musa of Tarpon Springs, followed by the pledge of allegiance.

Chairman Black thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Due to the seven vacant Gubernatorial Appointments it is important that everyone attend for a quorum. The Governor's Appointment office is currently working on the appointments, but no final decision has been made.

Chairman Black welcomed Council Member Alison Fernandez from the City of Temple Terrace. The 2007 Regional Directory and the 2007 Future of the Region edition of Visions were distributed.

Recognition was extended to Manny Pumariega, Executive Director. Two weeks ago the National Association of Regional Councils (NARC) conference was held in Orlando. Manny Pumariega received national recognition from NARC as the recipient of the Walter Sheiber Leadership Award. This award is given to an Executive Director who has made a significant impact at the local, state, and national levels.

There are over 500 executive directors of RPCs in the nation. Recipients must demonstrate professional and executive management excellence in carrying out regional concepts, approaches and programs. He was nominated a few months ago and we were pleased to find out about 3 weeks ago that he would be the recipient. Congratulations were provided.

Mr. Pumariega stated this type of an award is not always about individual accomplishments, but for the contributions of many others over the past years. He thanked the policy board and staff for making this possible and stated it is an award of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council.

Chairman Black pointed out page 9 of the current Visions, where there is a picture of Mr. Pumariega receiving the award. General Barry McCaffery presented the award and he was also the keynote speaker at the luncheon.

Roll Call - Recording Secretary

A quorum was present. There were no voting conflicts.

1. **Approval of Minutes - Chairman Black**

The minutes from the June 11, 2007 meeting were approved. (Friszolowski/Waller)

2. **Budget Committee -Chairman Black**

A. The Financial Report for the period ending 5/31/07 was approved. (Bustle/Mariano)

B. The Budget Committee met last month and was presented with the 2007/2008 Initial Budget. The budget provides for performance pay incentives in the amount of \$54,582. The Council's dues per capita rate remains at \$.32 and has opted to provide a provisional adjustment to maintain the fiscal year 2007 dues level. The overall budget decreased \$276,000 from the 2006/2007 Mid-Year Budget. This is primarily the result of:

1. Federal revenue decreased \$110,000 due to the completion of the EDA Economic Module Phase II and a reduction in the Economic Development District revenue due to timing between years.
2. State revenue will decrease \$191,000 as a result of the completion of the Fiscal Impact Analysis Model. This \$398,000 reduction will be partially offset by an increase in funding for Reality Check/One Bay Visioning and the DCA master funding contract totaling \$81,000. Also, the addition of the Florida Business Disaster Survival Kit will provide \$126,000 of new funding.
3. Appropriated fund balance in the amount of \$17,000 is budgeted to offset the provisional dues adjustment.

The Executive/Budget Committee unanimously approved the proposed 2007/2008 Initial Budget.

Questions & Comments:

Councilman Williams:

I would like to know what the other expenditures are.

Mr. Pumariega:

“Other expenditures” is a category that we have been using over the years and it includes items such as: Future of the Region luncheon expenditures (we also have revenues coming in for that event), workshop expenses, contract with Tampa Bay Water to provide facilitation of meetings throughout the region. Basically any expenditures that don't fit the other categories.

Councilman Williams:

You do provide some breakouts of some expenditures.

Mr. Pumariega:

On Page 12 of the budget you can see the One Bay Regional Visioning, there are some costs that were incurred to facilitate some of the meetings, workshops and

stakeholder group meetings.

Mr. Jacobsen: That is \$121,000 out of \$3 million.

Councilman Williams: I understand, we are on a tight budget.

Mr. Pumariega: We can provide you a detailed breakdown if you would like. Over the years we have established these categories instead of having an additional 10 or 15 categories that could get lost in the detail. These major cost categories have served us well in accounting for the expenditures by the Council.

Mr. Waller: It wasn't obvious to me in looking at the budget but your revenue is down \$276,000. Where was the reduction in the expenditures - was that an outside contract?

Mr. Pumariega: Yes, it was in outside sourcing. We received a master contract from the State of Florida for the Fiscal Impact Model which was then subcontracted out to the 11 RPCs. We provided the training to the local governments.

Reverend Golden: I do have one concern and that is whether or not in the budget we are preparing to take into consideration the impact of the special session and the legislation that came out of that.

Chairman Black: Have we made a provision for any impacts if certain cities decide not to renew their dues?

Mr. Jacobsen: The dues were adjusted about \$17,500 to hold last year's level. The grants and funding shouldn't change from the contract. We haven't made any other adjustments.

Reverend Golden: How do we get noticed that they will pay their dues, or if they will not?

Mr. Jacobsen: We send an invoice out in late August for the dues that are due in October. We contact the counties so they can build it into their budgets.

Reverend Golden: What percentage of our budget is derived from the dues?

Mr. Jacobsen: About \$940,000 out of \$3.2 million. About 20-50%.

Reverend Golden: So, what level of decrease in the dues would begin to impact TBRPC in terms of our efficiency?

Mr. Jacobsen: If a significant amount of the dues were cut, we do have fund balance available to use (of several hundreds of thousands of dollars) but obviously there is an end to that.

Chairman Black: The counties are statutorily required to be members and cities are optional.

Reverend Golden: I'm hoping that this year we will go the extra mile and solicit the support of the municipalities. We don't want to be the first thing they cut from their budget. I know we send out invoices, but what I'm really asking is, if it is the the sentiment of the membership, that we communicate formally, from the chairman. We ought not to assume that everybody is going to respond to that invoice positively given all the changes in the political landscape.

Chairman Black: We can certainly include a letter with the dues and I'll be glad to sign such a letter. I think with all the changes taking place in the Tampa Bay area in terms of growth that you wouldn't want to loose your place at this table. I know it is important to my city to be a part of this process.

Mr. Jacobsen: Mr. Pumariega does send out a letter along with the dues invoice.

Ms. Todd: I would be very positive in any type of communication about the fact that the leadership of this regional planning council has been considerate of the financial issues that cities and counties are facing. I would not put it in a negative light, I would put it in a more pro-active light because this is absolutely something that the cities and counties must participate in for the future of the region.

The 2007/2008 Proposed Budget was approved. (Friszolowski/Garcia)

3. **Consent Agenda** - Chairman Black
 - Division of Emergency Management award in the amount of \$133,970 for the update of the *Florida Business Disaster Survival Kit* to translate the products into Spanish.
 - IC&R #145, Tampa Electric Company Ten-Year Site Plan, Hillsborough and Pasco Counties, and the City of Oldsmar.
 - IC&R # 161, Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization, FY 2007/2008–FY 2011/2012, Transportation Improvement Program.
 - IC&R # 162, Pasco County Metropolitan Planning Organization, FY 2007/2008–2011/2012, Transportation Improvement Program.
 - IC&R # 163, Sarasota/Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization, FY 2007/2008–FY 2011-2012, Draft Transportation Improvement Program.
 - Development Order Amendment Report DRI # 116 – Tampa Telecom Park, City of Temple Terrace.
 - Annual Report Summary DRI # 130 – Cypress Banks, RY 2006-2007, Manatee County.
 - Biennial Report DRI # 253 – The Groves at Wesley Chapel, RYs 2005-2007, Pasco County.
 - Local Government Comprehensive Plan Proposed Amendment Report DCA # 07-1, Hillsborough County.
 - Local Government Comprehensive Plan Proposed Amendment Report DCA # 07D-4, Pasco County (DRI #261-Ashley Glen).
 - Local Government Comprehensive Plan Proposed Amendment Report DCA # 07-1, Pasco County (Amendment #BCPA-07-1(1)-Future Land Use Map/Pine Ridge Estates was pulled for additional information and will be considered at a future meeting).
 - Local Government Comprehensive Plan Proposed Amendment Report DCA # 07-1, Manatee County.

The Consent Agenda was approved. (Kersteen/Duncan)

4. **Item(s) Removed from Consent Agenda and Addendum Item(s)**
 Consent Agenda Item #3.H.3., Local Government Comprehensive Plan Proposed Amendment Report, Pasco County DCA #07-1 – Amendment #BCPA-07-1(1) – Future Land Use Map - Pine Ridge Estates was pulled for additional information and will be considered at a future date.

5. **Review Item(s) or Any Other Item(s) for Discussion** - None

6. **A. DRI #257 - Ashley Glen Final Report**
 Mr. John Meyer, TBRPC Principal Planner, presented the Final Report. The Council’s Final Report summarizes the proposal, identifies the anticipated impacts, lists the developer commitments made throughout the course of review, and proposes recommendations for the Development Order which would offset the anticipated regional impacts.

The Ashley Glen DRI is a 260± acre, mixed-use development located in south central Pasco County northeast of the Suncoast Parkway/S.R. 54 intersection. The project is immediately adjacent to the Bexley Ranch DRI and in close proximity to the Suncoast Crossings, Long Lake Ranch, Sunlake Centre, Trinity Communities and the proposed Starkey Ranch Developments of Regional Impact. The applicant is seeking specific approval for all three project phases with the assumed buildout date of 2019.

At project buildout in 2019, it is anticipated the project will consist of 900 multi-family residential units, 1.8 million sq. ft. of office, 444,000 sq. ft. of retail and 6,000 sq. ft. of day care uses. The bulk of the residential uses are proposed for the northern portion of the site and the non-residential

uses are centrally located as well at the southern portion of the site. The existing category 1 wetlands line the northwest portion of the property and will remain following development.

The project is subject to consistency with the Council's former Strategic Regional Policy Plan and corresponding map of *Natural Resources of Regional Significance*. The reason being that the project has been undergoing DRI review since submittal of the Application for Development Approval in November 2005 and conduct of the Preapplication Conference four months prior. As depicted on map 3 of the Final Report, **no** natural resources of regional significance are located on the project site.

Some of the more notable recommended Development Order conditions include:

- Mitigation for the extensive list of transportation improvements identified on 38-41;
- Implementation of the voluntary affordable housing mitigation program (Page 49);
- Requirement for additional pre-development breeding season surveys for listed species;
- Implementation of a development-wide Water Quality Monitoring & Management Plan including provisions for ground and surface water quality monitoring.
- Implementation of a Integrated Pest Management Plan;
- Requirement for bi-annual traffic counts and monitoring program.

The proposed Land Use Equivalency Matrix, included on Page 45, would allow the developer to convert amongst project uses. The extent of flexibility in conversions shall be determined by Pasco County.

Council staff recommends approval of the Final Report and forwarding to Pasco County for consideration and incorporation into a Development Order for the project.

Mr. Richard Davis, representing the developers, presented an overview of the project. Mr. Davis introduced consultants from the Florida Design Consultants Firm who are the lead consultants of the project. The developer of this project is JES Properties, Inc., a local corporation founded in 1989, headquartered in Oldsmar. They are currently developing a number of mixed use, office, residential projects throughout the area which include in excess of 2 million square feet of office and 3400 residential units. JES is experienced in developing properties and has enjoyed working with the TBRPC staff on this DRI.

This project is located in the southern portion of Pasco County and is approximately 2 miles north of the Pasco County/Hillsborough County boundary. The major road network location is the northeast quadrant of the interchange of S.R. 54 and the Suncoast Parkway. In this particular quadrant this project lays directly south of Bexley Ranch and a number of other approved projects in the direct vicinity of this project. There will be conditions of approval with this project eventually which will include construction of a road through the project to serve as access not only to this project but also to Bexley Ranch.

There are an abundance of class 1 wetlands on the southern portion of the project boundary and those will be in a preservation designation on the comprehensive plan amendment that follows this particular project. There are also class 2 and 3 wetlands. The class 1 wetlands are approximately 29 acres and the class 2 and 3 wetlands are approximately 37.5 acres. The comprehensive plan amendment is running concurrent with the project and the conditions of approval will directly relate to the development of this project.

The flood plain preservation and restoration area will also be shown as conservation on the comprehensive plan amendment. The project is approximately 280 acres. The open space and the class 1 wetlands are 160 acres which will be left in its present state, essentially preserved.

Roadway network considerations include construction of a major road through the project, which is described as Ashley Glen Blvd. There will be an extension of Mentmore Blvd. which will provide cross access with adjacent properties.

The proposed development plan has been divided into a series of development parcels. Parcel 1 and Parcel 3 are targeted for residential development. In staff's Final Report it is noticed that the residential development is scheduled during the first phase of the project. There will be approximately 900 units total, 733 units are shown in parcels 1 and 3. Parcels 2, 4, and 5 are identified as 1.1 million square feet of office, over 30.3 acres. Parcel 6 is a mixed use parcel which combines a number of uses: another 700,000 square feet of office, 450,000 square feet of retail, and 167 condominium units. The condo units, when added to the other residential, complete the residential component of the project. The open space is identified as parcel 8 and that is approximately 47.5 acres.

We are looking at a 3 phase project that runs through the year 2019 and are seeking specific approval for the entire project. Phase 1: 2007-2012, will focus on the residential units and also construction of a portion of the shopping center and specialty retail and 290,000 sq. ft. of office. As we move into phase 2: 2013-2017, there is focus on the shopping center to complete the retail development; and, phase 3: 2017-2019, completion of the office component of the project. The total project will consist of 900 residential units, 20,000 sq. ft. of specialty retail, 430,000 sq. ft. of shopping center, and 1.8 million sq. ft. of office, which includes 6,000 sq. ft. of daycare.

When we designed this project the key focus was to provide a mixed use project that would function as an employment attractor. Also, as a part of this project and as a part of the zoning that will accompany the project, we will construct shared parking garages that will be used predominately by offices on the site. The project will employ a multi-use building strategy where offices share parking and parking structures, and there will be specialty retail on the first floor of the office buildings. The intent is to provide an environment where you have a synergy between the office users and their needs for specialty retail uses such as restaurants.

The project has a voluntary housing mitigation program designed to fit the project. It involves the payment of an assessment that is pro-rated across the uses in the project and this is in response to the affordable housing directives that apply to all DRIs. We have approximate mitigation fees for a total of \$679,500 and each mitigation fee is pro rated against the particular uses. We also retain, as part of your Final Report, the ability to develop affordable housing on the site as we move further in the planning process with the residential uses.

Significant economic benefits to Pasco County and the region:

Employment:

- Anticipated jobs created at build out: approximately 6,055
- Average annual economic output: \$959.2 million
- Average annual employee earnings: \$408.9 million

Government Revenue Summary (through build out):

- Ad valorem revenue: \$39.6 million

- County sales & gasoline tax: \$7.7 million
- School Board taxes: \$33.4 million
- Impact fees: \$17.4 million

Through the close working relationships with the TBRPC staff and consultants we have arrived at a series of development commitments that are included in the Final Report, which are commitments we stand ready to make. Accompanying that are Recommended Conditions of Approval which we are in total agreement with, and will indicate that agreement today on the record, as well as to the Pasco BoCC when we appear in Public Hearings before that jurisdiction. We respectfully request that you forward the final report to the Pasco County Board of County Commissioners.

Questions & Comments:

Vice Mayor Miller: I see you have 47.5 acres of open space but I don't see anything for recreation. You don't have any parks.

Mr. Davis: We will be working during the local zoning process with Pasco County on meeting the park needs that are generated by virtue of the residential users.

Vice Mayor Miller: We wouldn't want to have a problem like we have at Brooker Creek.

Mr. Davis: We will address that concern.

Councilman Williams: My biggest concern is transportation. We are dealing with roads that are failing and this particular project is going to dump more traffic on S.R. 54. There is another DRI that is very close to that so all that combination of traffic makes me very concerned about the impact.

Mr. Davis: As a part of the DRI process the applicant must prepare a very detailed transportation analysis that details impacts and the roads that are affected by the traffic proposed for this development. Through that process the goal is to identify options for addressing the traffic impacts. The Final Report outlines a series of options that are available for the developer of the project. We are working in close contact with the TBRPC staff as well as with the staffs of FDOT and the Department of Community Affairs and the Pasco County BoCC to identify a proportionate share contribution and other mitigation strategies that will, within the context of those DRI rules, impact transportation and directs our impacts. It is a very important issue to us, as well as to Pasco County and TBRPC. Mr. Meyer identified in the Final Report those options that could provide a basis for addressing our transportation impact. This project won't be approved unless and until Pasco County feels comfortable that we have mitigated our transportation impacts.

Councilman Williams: Do we have a process that we go back at some point and look at the DRIs that we have approved and see if things were done in terms of impacts?

Mr. Meyer: The appropriate forum for that was the Annual Report, now it is the Biennial Report where they are responsible for identifying compliance with each and every condition within the development order as well as identify the status of development to ensure that it is proceeding in accordance with the analysis.

Councilman Williams: My point goes a little deeper than that. Its one thing to comply and its another if you tell me your economic impact is going to be "X" and then after everything gets approval then you say it really didn't do what we thought it would do.

Mr. Meyer: As far as the economy is concerned

Councilman Williams: That is only an example.

Mr. Meyer: As far as the revenue generation, I think that is a best guess as to what it will

generate. They could not be conditioned to bring in those revenues, but its based on the best available data. As far as transportation, as indicated in the Final Report, it requires doing biennial traffic counts to ensure they are not exceeding the number of trips they generated. As far as schools, etc., they are required to identify what the status is of the development - what's been built out there. As far as the other issues, yes, those also will be addressed in the Biennial Report.

Vice Mayor Miller:

Didn't we require the Cone Ranch people to put in a lane for BRT?

Mr. Meyer:

I'm not sure of the answer – Cone Ranch is not a DRI.

Vice Mayor Miller:

I can't remember what it was but I know we had a developer that was making a huge development put in an extra lane each way.

Mr. Meyer:

We're not knowledgeable of any BRT requirements.

Chairman Black:

We will try to find out more for you on that.

Commissioner Mariano:

I do have some concerns I wanted to bring up and I talked to Mr. Goldstein earlier. As far as the affordable housing – you retained the right to do it, but a lot of what looks like it could be possible affordable housing is going to be built in phase 1. You are saying you are going to retain the right but you haven't said if you have any plans other than doing the donations. When would you make the decision?

Mr. Davis:

The predominant strategy for addressing the affordable housing consideration is through the mitigation strategy there. I believe, and it is my client's intent, that as we get closer to actually beginning development we can then focus to see if the construction option is a viable option. At this point the initial commitment is the financial commitment that we made as described in the Development Order, and that strategy is one that we did work with the TBRPC staff on.

Commissioner Mariano:

I think I was reading where you say you are going to look for low income levels.

Mr. Davis:

My client is certainly evaluating – that is very difficult at this point Commissioner. They are certainly looking at that.

Commissioner Mariano:

As far as the parks go, Pasco County has an ordinance where they have to donate certain amounts of land in development so we can accommodate for that down the road as we go further with the process. The Ashley Glen Blvd. is going to create a tremendous amount of traffic flow. How large is that road expected to be?

Mr. Davis:

It has been analyzed in great detail and initial construction contemplates a 4-lane divided facility.

Commissioner Mariano:

Then it will be enough for the stage of 2019?

Mr. Davis:

If you would like I can get a more detailed answer, but our sense is yes. Of course that is one of those factors that you do constantly monitor in a Biennial Monitoring Trip Generation of the project and that will be an issue that will be looked at over time.

Commissioner Mariano:

I would like David Goldstein to come forward (Pasco County Attorney). One of the things that triggered me to get worried about the transportation issues was the first phase was \$1.4 million for proportionate share, and then it goes up to \$14 million and at the very end when we will have the most desirable piece of it, \$27 million. My fear was that we would never get to that point and they may not want to donate at that time. I talked about that this morning with Mr. Goldstein and I would like him to address that issue.

Mr. Chapman:

Mr. Roy Chapman, Florida Design Consultants. The way the county deals with proportionate share issues is we calculate proportionate share for phase 1, phase 2, phase 3 and then they take the phase 3 proportionate share and then we pro rate that down – we are classified for employment center light, and that includes the office development and that portion of retail that is underneath the office

buildings. Where the retail is under the office footprint and the office, that's called employment center light. We calculate the trips for that, compared with the rest of the trips that come out of the project and then we will have a proration that would be how much is employment center light and how much is the rest based on the phase 3 total proportionate share and that's how that will be split.

Mr. Goldstein:

We look at the project as a whole. You look at it cumulatively. We look at the mitigation for phase 3, \$27 million (assuming that's the right number), and we look at the whole project, and then we figure out how much the project as a whole is responsible for. Just because phase 1 is \$1.2 million doesn't mean that the retail/residential entitlements are only going to have \$1.2 million worth of mitigation. They have their share of the whole. We look at everything as a whole and we breakdown by trips, as Mr. Chapman said. We make sure that the retail and residential is mitigated for its impacts up front, regardless of what these amounts are. In other words, when we look at transportation mitigation we look at the project as a whole, not necessarily how they have phased in terms of their mitigation.

Commissioner Mariano:

As far as the way we look at Ashley Glen Blvd., is the first two lanes of that considered an internal road to them where it is their responsibility?

Mr. Goldstein:

Yes, that is correct. On site roads are considered to be their responsibility.

Commissioner Minning:

I would like to make a recommendation, similar to the last DRI, and that would be for water quality monitoring. I think I heard in your presentation that you committed to both surface water and ground water monitoring and in the DRI comments this is supposed to be reviewed by the various agencies. I would like to add that the word approval be placed in that condition. The recommendation from Council says "review" and I would also ask for approval.

Mr. Meyer:

As an alternative I would suggest on page 47 of our report, the very last condition identifies the review agency comments and perhaps we can amend a general condition 8. and remove the word "should" and replace it with "shall." Not only will it recognize the review agency comments of Tampa Bay Water, it would also require the Development Order resolve those issues prior to adoption.

Commissioner Minning:

I agree.

Reverend Golden:

I would like to return to the voluntary housing mitigation issue. The cash payment plan you have is back loaded in terms of the majority of the funding. There is an \$80 per multi-family dwelling unit cost which is tantamount to \$63,000-\$76,000 for the multi-family unit. All of which would be built in phase 1. But the majority of the money from the commercial development comes in phases 2 and 3 – 2017 and 2019. When we tried to create this voluntary housing mitigation program we were really trying to get housing, not just a payment of money. And particularly a nominal amount in lieu of providing those units. I'm wondering what kind of help we can get, what kind of statement we can send either to Pasco County from this Council. I think this would be a lot more equitable if that \$80 was \$800, then we have a decision to make at the end of the construction in the year of 2012 whether we are going to put 10% of these units on the market as affordable or whether we are going to come up with ½ million dollars to keep from doing it. It's an observation on my part and I appreciate the fact that we have some attention being paid. Maybe I'm misinterpreting the data, but it just doesn't seem this is quid pro quo here in terms of our goals. I'm just saying, in particular at the front end of this thing we are going to put 900 units on the ground by the year 2012 and we're going to give Pasco County \$72,000 so we don't have to worry about when

we get to 2012 whether we have to obligate 10% of those for affordable housing. Maybe I'm misunderstanding the whole concept here. Moreover, when the majority of the office and commercial space isn't constructed until phases 2 and 3 respectively.

Mr. Goldstein: We are facing this issue with the Wiregrass DRI right now as we draft their Development Order. I think the issue is that, and I agree, those fees are low. We, as a county, are looking at adopting a county-wide fee for affordable housing and we are going to be commissioning a Nexus study to come up with what that fee should be. We've put in the Wiregrass Development Order that if that fee ends up being a higher fee than what you all impose through the DRI process, they will have to pay that higher fee. I understand your concern and we are concerned as well, these fees are fairly low.

Reverend Golden: Would you have an objection if, in effect, we include it as language in the approval that it would be \$80 or *the statutorily set amount in Pasco County, whichever is higher?*

Mr. Goldstein: We would have no objection because we are going to do that anyway. In fact you will see that the Wiregrass Development Order, when it gets back to the region, will have that language in it. We are going to put that in every DRI, *if we adopt a county wide ordinance for affordable housing pursuant to the Nexus study, they will pay a higher fee.*

Reverend Golden: Then we will leave it alone.

Mr. Goldstein: I understand your concern, I just don't think we would want to arbitrarily pick \$800 because we haven't done our Nexus study yet. When we do the study we will come up with fees for all uses and obviously we will give them some credit if they made a payment under this requirement.

Reverend Golden: I understand. I don't want to blur the lines of responsibility and authority. I just want to say to my colleagues, at this level, that I don't think that \$80 is a sufficient amount.

Mr. Goldstein: And we agree with you. I think the concern is we had some concern with making the voluntary program at this point, in making that amount to high, unless we do county wide for all land uses, not just DRIs.

Mr. Pumariega: Keep in mind that the State of Florida is working on a new methodology which was discussed last year. This is a step in the right direction where we have gotten these developers to try to voluntarily start participating in affordable housing. There is a workgroup up in Tallahassee and Mr. Avera Wynne is a member of that group. A report is due at the end of September. Hopefully we will come up with a new methodology that we can incorporate into the process along with whatever the county wants to establish on their own.

Vice Chair Kynes: Please elaborate on the transportation, other than roadways.

Mr. Davis: The predominate function of the proportionate share strategy is to look at all our impacts on the road network.

Vice Chair Kynes: In actuality, there are certain counties that have said that transit should be a component and I think that's very important. I know Broward County went ahead and said transit will be considered as a component of proportionate share. I just read in the paper that the Pasco Transit Authority is losing some services and I am wondering, under this proportionate share will public transportation actually be considered as a component and work with your transit system?

Mr. Davis: I would like to emphasize that as we work through the final transportation conditions and approval we are certainly going to be doing, through design and

other efforts, our share of being able to accommodate mass transit successfully within this project. That's certainly a part of what we are envisioning and as we work with Pasco County we are going to be responding to their demands through the final review. In the DRI process and in your staff recommendation there is the recognition that there are a number of options to work with the local government on, and certainly designing the project that can accommodate transit is what we intend to do.

Commissioner Saenger:

I'm still at the affordable housing component of your project and when I hear the different facets of that, such as the county is coming up with something and the state is coming up with something, apparently everyone is on the same page that we need to work towards that end goal. As we know, a true mixed use development, at its best, would provide a place for the people who serve in the retail capacity as employees and in all service components, who are minimum wage earners a place to live in the proximity of your project so they won't have to be furthering a transportation issue. In other words, these things have a domino affect. Where will the people who will be in the shopping centers be driving from? Why is it that at this point, if we know the state and the county and everyone is looking at affordable housing as a real issue and is something that at some point is going to be included, why can we not at this point just put in here guarantees that affordable housing will be addressed from the beginning rather than putting it out to 2012 to where who knows what affordable housing costs will be at that time. Address them now rather than try to play catch up and guess where we are going to be.

Mr. Davis:

And the answer is two fold. The first part of the answer is we have tried, through the language that is in your staff's Final Report and our efforts with your staff at this point to outline a strategy for participation. We also recognize, based on the comments made by Mr. Goldstein this morning, that the effort may change as we work through the final development order process, and as the county works through its adoption of ordinance. I think at this point I would respectfully ask that the region stay with the language that's in your final report, with the recognition as earlier made that the county is looking at uniformity in creating an ordinance, regulatory process for this which will become a part of our Development Order. I would respectfully ask that we stay with the direction we've got today. We did try to pattern this direction after a direction utilized by the county currently in their final review of Wiregrass, but we recognize based upon Mr. Goldstein's comments that we will have to accommodate for a different strategy if it is developed on a uniform basis.

Commissioner Saenger:

I think where I'm coming from is rather than work with the idea of what you are subjected to do, and see what everyone else is going to do and then we are going to conform to that - we have real issues here with affordable housing, with transportation. I'm not singling you out, because it is very common what your response is and what we are facing, but I would like to see when a developer comes to us with a DRI to say, we have a commitment to bring this component to us. We don't really care what the minimums are, what the state may require in 5-10 years, what the county is looking for. We have a commitment to address that up front. As a personal observation I would appreciate that, but obviously I understand your response as well.

Commissioner Mariano:

We have an ordinance coming up at Tuesday's commission meeting that will improve building construction standards to mitigate and help with the sinkhole

issue. That will come forward and these folks will have to abide by that as well. Mr. Goldstein said that is coming up and he is comfortable with that when it comes before us, I'm comfortable that we will incorporate all of our ordinances.

Mr. Goldstein: General rule, yes we do. Any existing ordinances or pending ordinances that we have at the time these development orders come through, we incorporate them into the Development Order.

Commissioner Mariano: The building standards that we are going to be looking at on Tuesday will be incorporated into the DRIs that come through us.

Mr. Goldstein: Yes, and I think that standard is going to be applied at even the preliminary plan/building permit stage, which is far down the process. They will be subject to it regardless, whether they are a DRI or not.

Commissioner Mariano: One thing that came up in the conversation when we did the Wiregrass DRI was that transit was incorporated. They had set up a station where it could be dropped off and incorporated in there. Has anything like that been done with this?

Mr. Goldstein: What was a little bit unique about Wiregrass is it is at an intersection where we have to feature either BRT routes or high-speed routes for transit plans in the future. 54/56 corridor and then the 581 north/south corridor. This particular project we do show in our Needs Plan a future BRT route for the 54/56 corridor. It is possible you might be looking at a Park 'n Ride type facility at this location or some other facility that would accommodate that BRT route. We haven't gotten to that level of detail yet on this project. We have talked about it in the Wiregrass project and we've actually incorporated it as a part of their proportionate share for phase 2 and these Park 'n Ride facilities for these future routes. That's something we can discuss in this particular project. As I've mentioned, the last time I was here - it's a careful balancing act when you are allocating proportionate share for roadway versus transit because every dollar you spend on a transit facility is less money you can spend on roads. The transit option is there and we are primarily looking at infrastructure at this point because there is a pretty tremendous cost in terms of maintenance of the routes. We usually on almost all of these DRIs at least make sure they have the infrastructure in place; the Park 'n Ride facilities, the transfer stations, the bus stops, so that when we have routes there for the future that we can accommodate them.

Commissioner Mariano: Would you say that we should go further with that discussion at this point in time?

Mr. Goldstein: We could. As a general rule our PCPT looks at these sites on a case by case basis and then determines what their future needs will be. I don't know that PCPT has taken a detailed look yet at this particular project. And when they look at those needs, they pull out our Needs Plan and that will show a future type feed or BRT route on S.R. 54. What I don't know though is whether PCPT would want this particular site to be a Park 'n Ride or a transfer station. Those are the kinds of details that I don't know.

Commissioner Mariano: But if we aren't going to go with the details as far as to try and maximum our transit, and this is one of those opportunities where there is a Park 'n Ride on the other side of the Suncoast Highway, we are looking at trying to make our connections go north/south as well as east/west that if we look at getting something forward now as opposed to trying to go later on down the road - to me, the sooner the better.

Mr. Goldstein: You will see in the Final Development Order Condition for this project, a condition specific to transit. It's going to require the bus stops on all their major collector roadways. That would include Ashley Glen Blvd., S.R. 54 and even

Tower Road on the north side. What I don't know is whether PCPT also wants something a little more expansive such as a Park 'n Ride, such as a transfer station. That depends on their long-range plans for this area. Before the Development Order is adopted that will be discussed and if we need a Park 'n Ride here, that will be in the conditions.

Ms. Todd: Is it appropriate, when this board acts on this DRI, for us to note the concerns that have been raised at this meeting? I don't think we are just supposed to rubber stamp things. This discussion has been very productive and I think it might make everyone feel better, including Pasco County, if the concerns the Commissioner has raised and Reverent Golden and Ms. Kynes have raised were noted as concerns when this is forwarded to DCA and to the County Commission.

Mr. Meyer: I would think it would be possible to attach the minutes from this meeting, at least for this section, to the Final Report when it is transmitted.

Chairman Black: As you noticed, from the minutes of our past meetings that we do have verbatim on a lot of our discussion during these types of issues.

Mayor Friszolowski: We don't have a letter from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). Have they reviewed this? Does that mean they don't have any comments?

Mr. Kent Fast: I represent FDOT. We did review this, as we do all DRIs. We felt comfortable with the transportation mix. One of the reasons there is, what might be termed, as a relatively large office component is because we are trying to work with the county and the developer to keep the jobs at home to make the trip shorter. I think this is a good honest attempt in doing that.

The *Ashley Glenn Final Report*, as amended, was adopted with transmittal to Pasco County and the Florida Department of Community Affairs. (Mariano/Matthews)

B. DRI #264 – Starkey Ranch Final Report

Mr. John Meyer, Principal Planner, presented the Final Report. The Starkey Ranch DRI is a 2,530± acre, mixed-use development located northeast of the S.R. 54/Starkey Ranch intersection in southwest Pasco County. The project is immediately adjacent to the Trinity Communities and Mitchell Ranch Plaza Developments of Regional Impact, as well as in close proximity of the Suncoast Crossings, Bexley Ranch and the proposed Ashley Glen DRIs. The applicant is seeking specific approval for all three project phases with the assumed buildout date of 2022.

At project buildout in 2022, it is anticipated that this project will consist of 4,285 residential units, 344,520 sq. ft. of office, 277,150 sq. ft. of retail, 170,000 sq. ft. of light industrial, a 120-bed ACLF, a 100-room hotel, a 16-screen movie theatre, 30,000 sq. ft. of day care uses and one or more school facilities. While residential uses are planned to be scattered throughout the project, the bulk of non-residential uses are proposed with the Town Center for Business Park designations along S.R. 54 in the southern portion of the site. "Future Development Parcels" shall be submitted for further DRI review prior to specific approval. The applicant proposes to provide a preservation buffer along the entire northern boundary of the project adjacent to the Starkey Wilderness Preserve. The school facility(ies) will be internal to the project.

The project is subject to consistency with the Council's former Strategic Regional Policy Plan and corresponding map of *Natural Resources of Regional Significance*. The reason being that the project has been undergoing DRI review upon the hosting of a Pre-application Conference in August 2005 and the initial transportation methodology meeting two months prior. Map 3 of the Final Report depicts the Natural Resources of Regional Significance located on the project site, as

subject to ground-truthing.

Some of the more notable recommended Development Order conditions include:

- Mitigation for the extensive list of transportation improvements identified on 50-53;
- Implementation of the voluntary affordable housing mitigation program (Page 61);
- Requirement for a coordinated Conservation and Habitat Management Plan;
- Post-development wetlands depicted on Map H shall be protected and buffered;
- Implementation of a Integrated Pest Management Plan; and
- Requirement for bi-annual traffic counts and monitoring program.

The proposed Land Use Equivalency Matrix, included on Page 56, would allow the developer to convert amongst project uses. The extent of flexibility in conversions shall be determined by Pasco County.

Council staff recommends approval of the Final Report and forwarding to Pasco County for consideration and incorporation into a Development Order for the project.

- Reverend Golden: Mr. Meyer, I have one question. I would like to ask before I leave the meeting about the affordable housing volunteer plan. The last DRI had an \$80 per unit charge that accrued relative to that development and with this one it appears we have a \$2500 per deficit unit charge (deficit units being units that are supposedly set aside for affordable housing). I'm assuming that there is a rationale for the different calculations. I'm also assuming that I'm going to get the same answer from the county attorney in that we are going to have some uniform way of determining the best way to protect Pasco County and affordable housing. I just want to make sure that there is a rationale to that, and secondly, that this is also going to be subject to the same concerns and considerations that we had for the other DRI (Ashley Glen).
- Mr. Goldstein: I can answer the second question – yes, we will put that same provision in that says if we adopt a countywide ordinance that they will be subject to the countywide ordinance. I can't answer the first question because I don't know where the \$2500 came from.
- Reverend Golden: That's the negotiated amount between the Regional Planning Council and the developer. It's an amount negotiated based on deficit units as opposed to the previous DRI which had an amount that was negotiated on the total number of units. The previous one being \$80 for each unit and \$2500 for the deficit units.
- Mr. Meyer: The Council staff has accepted two different mitigation alternatives. One was the one we just reviewed for Pasco for the Ashley Glen project, and this is the second one. I would like to correct you that it's not based on a shortage of units, it's \$2500 per unit for those units that are not built. There is mitigation strategy associated with this one and the mitigation package that they are proposing is \$2500 per residential unit that is not built.
- Reverend Golden: But if they build all of the units they are locked in to 10% of them being affordable.
- Mr. Meyer: Yes. And if they do not build them then they are subject to the \$2500. If they do not build them for low income, they are responsible for \$2500 per unit.
- Reverend Golden: 10% of the units, I think it is 165 units of the 16,500 units. If they don't build 1650 units over the life of the project or affordable housing, they are responsible for \$2500 for each one of those units.

Mr. Meyer: There are 4280 units proposed in the project, so it would be 428, if they do not designate the 428 in the designated criteria, then they are responsible for payment of \$2500 per unit to the county to be assigned to Community Development.

Reverend Golden: And that goes back to my same issue all along. They are building these developments over a span of time, over 18 years and we are locking in right now what we are going to require them to pay. I think the ordinance will probably take care of part of that.

Mr. Meyer: That would be correct, but as Mr. Goldstein said before, they will be held to the more stringent of the mitigation requirements whether it be state or county or as volunteered by the applicant.

Reverend Golden stated he had to leave the meeting, and introduced his wife to Council.

Ms. Carey Hayo: I'm with the firm of Glatting Jackson of Orlando. Our client is Starkey Ranch Investments. Ms. Hayo introduced members of the Starkey Family and others associated with the project.

Starkey Ranch is 2530 acres located in west Pasco County, slightly north of the Hillsborough County line and to the east of the project is the Suncoast Parkway. Starkey Ranch fronts on S.R. 54. Trinity Blvd. and Gunn Hwy are located along the southern boundaries of the project. Immediately to the west is Longleaf and there are other DRIs in the area. Logically Starkey Ranch is an in-fill community in this part of west Pasco County.

The Starkey's were early Florida settlers. They have been ranchers, cattle people and in the agriculture business for a very long time. They have been in partnership with the land as well. The Family and the Ranch have a very long history in this part of Florida and much of their history surrounds stewardship of the lands that they own and commitment to the environment.

The original Starkey Ranch was 15,000 acres. The Anclote River cuts through the middle of what the original ranch was and the South Branch is also an important environmental feature on the ranch. Over time 12,000 acres have been conveyed into public ownership for environmental conservation. That leaves 3,878 for proposed, or is in existing development. As we move forward with plans for development of Starkey Ranch you will see that we are still setting aside a significant amount of open space in the ranch, on the development parcel – 42% of Starkey Ranch will be set aside as open space. The balance will be in development. I think that this alone demonstrates the Family's environmental commitment to this part of Florida. In the end, when its all said and done, 83% of their original ranch will be in conservation and public ownership and only 17% will be developed.

To review the Master Plan of Starkey Ranch, the team and the family began planning for the ranch several years ago. We held a planning charrette in Orlando and got ideas brewing about how Starkey Ranch could be something very special to this part of the region and something that could really be a legacy for the family.

We began by trying to understand what the Starkey Family's mission is and that is to *maintain a family legacy of foresight and partnership with the land, balancing environmental, financial and social stewardship*. All of those missions have been brought to bear in our planning for Starkey Ranch. We also began by putting together some guiding principles that were intended to guide our master planning process, and really to lead us through ultimate development of the community. We want to be *state of the art*. The Family wants to continue to provide leadership in addressing community needs. We wanted to take a holistic approach to environmental preservation and compact urban design, which means setting aside a lot of open space and concentrating your development on what's left of the land. We wanted to conserve and care for areas of higher environmental diversity and really embrace the Starkey Wilderness Preserve which is at the northern edge of the community and not turn our back on it by gating it off and fencing it. We wanted to create neighborhoods that are compact, thoroughly mixed use, diverse, walkable and transit friendly. That is at the very core of the plan for our community. The Starkey Family is also going to create the Starkey Center which is a community that is going to be dedicated to helping the community learn about and appreciate the natural environment as well as the built environment. They want to build long-term value. They are here, this is their legacy project, and we wanted to retain connection to local history and we want to have a lot of civic places and we wanted to have fun while we were doing all of this.

Our master planning of the property actually began with a very sound environmental strategy that was based on a lot of field work, identifying wetlands, identifying wildlife habitat, and some special areas on the site. We put a lot of minds together, including a lot of the agencies, to do that. Our knowledge on the environment began to shape our plan for the community. The idea was to set aside very significant areas of uplands and wetlands that would buffer both the Anclote River, the South Branch, and the Starkey Wilderness but also be brought into the community so that people can enjoy it.

Ms. Hayo provided an overview of the conceptual master plan. We began by setting aside environmental/conservation lands that wind around the edge of the property. Forest and wetlands will be retained. The land that is left is approximately 1,000 acres and on that we are developing the Town Center, a fully mixed used-walkable town center located at the intersection of Gunn Hwy & S.R. 54. We have a Business Center also on S.R. 54 which will be for light industrial and office use. There are several neighborhoods that are a full mix of housing types and at the center of each neighborhood would be a Neighborhood Center that will have a very small amount of "daily needs" shopping such as dry cleaning, florist, insurance agent. We also have a District Park that we are working with the county on, a park agreement for 40 acres or possibly 80 acres. There is a school site and numerous access points out to S.R. 54 to create a road network. There are 2 two land roads that extend through the community which will be a new east/west connection road in this area of the county that will connect S.R. 54 to Starkey Blvd., and also have the potential to connect to a Tower Road extension to the east, if that should happen. A trail connection into the Wilderness Park is proposed.

We are proposing to develop Starkey Ranch over 3 phases, with a total of 4285 full mix residential units. Most of the retail and office will be in the Business Center and the Town Center, and limited amounts will be in the Neighborhood Centers. There will be a 100 room hotel and we are providing for Day Care in a number of neighborhoods, and an ACLF.

Some of the key elements of the master plan are: housing diversity which has everything from work in the town center, residential over the town center buildings where we will have ground floor retail, office, mixed, very small lofts/bungalows/town homes all the way up to country estates. That helps us address the affordable housing issue by having that full range of prices, types, and diversity within the community. We also will have the daily needs such as being able to walk to the Post Office, to Church, to the Deli, etc. We will not only have the District Park, but neighborhood parks and pocket parks. There will be trails and of course, the Starkey Wilderness Preserve. We will also have open space and lake system that will be available to the public. The backbone of all of this are great streets. We plan on having all the streets as 2 lane roads that have adequate capacity to carry traffic through the east/west connection as well as the dense road network that provides alternate modes and alternate choices of routes.

The Town Center is on S.R. 54 and Gunn Hwy. Retail will line the streets with office and housing above, focusing on a major civic point. The housing densities decrease as you move out from the Main Street back out to the edge of the wilderness area. Some of the jobs will be located here, and other employment opportunities will be in the Business Center on S.R. 54.

The backbone of the conservation plan is that it is going to protect regionally significant resources, it is going to provide extensive buffers to the Starkey Wilderness, it is providing 42% of the entire ranch in open space that will be available to the community to use, public access and education. We will have on site mitigation for wetlands, gopher tortoise relocation, and a habitat management plan that will tell us how to manage the land and what uses can occur on the land as it is used by the public.

Transportation, the road network, and our approach to transportation is a fundamental key element of our master plan. Along with the environment it drives what we did with the master plan. We have created a walkable pedestrian oriented community that decreases the dependence on the automobile by providing daily needs on site, the Town Center on site, employment on site, and having the dense road network that was talked about, in addition to the new east/west connection. All of it will create less external traffic and less impacts on S.R. 54 and other regional roads. It actually creates a new road network in this part of the county.

Ms. Hayo explained the street character as defined in their Transect. Paired roadways are fronted by buildings, access comes from rear alleys-no driveways on main roadways, and paired roadways traverse a variety of neighborhood

conditions.

Education is a very dear topic to the Starkeys. We are proposing one elementary school for the community and continue to explore some innovative concepts with the Pasco County School Board. The school will be walkable and neighborhood oriented and it will be co-located with the district park. We are working with the county on that. In addition, we are talking to the school board about an additional school, although we are not required to do that for the DRI. Another educational objection is the Starkey Center who's mission is to engage, educate, and enrich lives as it relates to the land and the built environment.

Starkey Ranch is proposing, and feels it is very important to commit to having affordable housing within Starkey Ranch. It is an issue and one of the ways that we are approaching that is a multi-prong approach by building this diverse community that has a full range of housing. Nearly every type of housing need will be satisfied, including apartments, condos, starter homes, townhomes, and bungalows, estate homes and adult care living facilities. We will be accommodating for affordable housing with this diversity. We will also be working reducing transportation costs, which are a large part of housing costs. We are committing to building 10% of all of the units in Starkey Ranch as affordable to households earning less than 120% AMI and that will be done in each phase, not just at build out or at the end. We are employing several methods of doing that which may include community land trust, down payment assistance, accessory dwelling units, federally sponsored programs, etc. If we don't build them we will pay \$2500 for each unit not built. Our intention is to build them and we feel it is very important. To talk about housing costs, in New York housing costs are 37.1% of a family budget and in Tampa it is 31.1%. When you add on transportation costs you see that in New York City it is 15% of your budget and here they are 25% in the metro area. In the end that it actually costs more when you add housing costs and transportation costs together. It costs more to live in Tampa because you have to drive.

We are reducing transportation costs by providing jobs within the community, providing the opportunity for people to walk, bike, or drive short distances for their everyday needs, and designing in a way that is supportive of efficient transit linkages. We will be designing "transit ready" within our Town Center and in other areas that are appropriate.

What does Starkey Ranch mean to our Region? We believe it is going to bring new employment opportunities, it will be an environment to live and work in that does not currently exist in our region. We believe it will bring a new tax base for Pasco County, and we have the diversity of housing sizes, types and prices. Education is key and we have the enhanced road network with the new east/west connection, and a high internal capture rate which reduces trips on external roads. The new District Park, Community and Neighborhood Parks, all of the open space and conservation lands, and a long term commitment from the Starkey Family to see this through.

Questions & Comments:

Commissioner Mariano:

I would like to say that this is one of the most exciting projects. One of the things I looked at was the amount of industrial that was there. We are actually giving up a little of that but it's going to be with an office component that more than makes up for it. Are the pictures (from the presentation) going to be a part of the record? The District Park, I don't know if you noticed on the side it is located - Starkey Road is now a 2 lane highway, expandable to go to another full lane. That can take a lot of traffic from the north for people to come down without touching S.R. 54. The internal roads, everything is going to let people travel up to that District Park. One of the things Kathryn Starkey, who sits on the school board, and I talk about is to try to work on co-location of the parks with our schools and I think this is going to be the leader in actually doing this. We have another developer doing this as well. It is a great concept putting them both together in efficiency and space. Throughout this development I really like the sufficiency of space, and the green building as well. Between transportation and the co-location I think they have done a great job with this project. Very thoughtful with the amount of conservation land, right next to an extensive park.

Ms. Todd:

I think you have done a wonderful job in your presentation and it certainly is a well thought out development. My concern is that it is close to two major sources of public water supply. I note that Tampa Bay Water and SWFWMD have put some very comprehensive recommendations in this. Are you prepared to comply with all of those requirements? Secondly, will there be some monitoring wells put in there because the plume of influence in the recharge areas and all of that for the supply of water for the entire Tampa Bay area is at risk. That is a major concern to me.

Ms. Hayo:

I forgot to add this at the end of my presentation that we do agree with all of the staff recommendations. There are many commitments and recommendations that we intend to comply with and some of them do relate to water and water supply. I'm the attorney representing the applicant. The Starkey Family does agree to those conditions. There is one minor modification. SWFWMD recommended that we implement low impact design. A portion of the project will have low impact design but we don't know if we will be fortunate enough to get it throughout the project, but we are working on it with SWFWMD. They did not ask for a ground water monitoring program, but I'm sure Pasco County will ask for one and we will work together and develop one.

Mr. Meyer:

What I would suggest for this Final Report is similar to the last one. General condition #8 be amended from "should" to "shall" – the review agencies comments are recognized in our report and that they *shall* be resolved prior to Development Order being adopted.

Chairman Black:

So Item 8 in our conclusion would be strike the word should and inserting the word shall. When we make our motion it will include this amendment.

Vice Mayor Miller:

I want to commend the Starkey Family and the presentation was wonderful. I think it is great that they are so involved and so environmentally conscious. I think its great. My city is doing reverse osmosis, using brackish groundwater. Is that a possibility?

Mr. Herald:

The development order will be structured as, where reclaimed water is available for irrigation purposes, we will use that. I don't think there is a brackish water

source.

Vice Mayor Miller: I'm talking about drinking water.

Mr. Herald: I don't think there is a brackish water source in close proximity. In fact, a good portion of the public water supply comes from the Starkey Well Field.

Mr. Waller: I think the long term commitment to putting the lands in the public trust is very impressive as well as the buffer zone around it. I have a question on the transportation proportionate share. I notice it says the amount calculated by the applicant for phases 1, 2, and 3 for this project is \$17.6 million, for 2000 acres. The previous project was 200 acres and it was \$27 million. I question the difference, as well as some of the other DRIs we have seen that were a couple of hundred million dollars in proportionate share. Is that due to the parallel road network, or what drives these dollar amounts?

Ms. Hayo: That is a part of it. I neglected to mention this in my transportation section that we are continuing to work on the proportionate share costs with the county and with exactly what improvements they will be satisfied with and will serve the county. I imagine that number is going to change.

Commissioner Mariano: Currently we have been working with the Wiregrass proposal for many months and we are still working on that proportionate share number as well. Mr. Goldstein does a great job with that and we will keep working on it. I would like to add something. Frank Starkey and I had talked about golf carts. I know you are experimenting with that at Longleaf and trying to work that in. In one of the pictures you had bike lanes and it just occurred to me – is it possible to expand the lane a little so you could actually make it a golf cart lane/bike lane?

Ms. Hayo: When we talked earlier we said we would look into that and we are just now starting to work on our Master Planned Unit Development and that is something that we will look at and see how we can accommodate golf carts into the community to best fit.

Commissioner Saenger: I applaud your efforts as well as the Starkey Family. I can't imagine this was an easy process to dedicate, first of all, the Wilderness Preserve in the public trust and then to continue with Longleaf and then working on to this project. I applaud your stewardship and also your forethought and looking forward to what we are experiencing as a financial growth in the State of Florida. Congratulations to your Family for bringing this project to us. Also, this is exactly what I was referencing earlier, commitment up front to 10% of affordable housing. It can be done and I so appreciate it. I'm very excited about this project. I attended an early presentation of this at Longleaf, over a year ago, and when I first saw the initial project my thought was that I would like to live there.

Vice Chair Kynes: I just read an article in the paper on the Starkey Family and thought it was so poignant. I would venture to say that if others of the old families had your foresight, then Florida would be in a much better state.

Council Member Williams: By putting a park next to a school and providing playground equipment it can be utilized by both schools and other folks. That might be something you might want to consider as you do this.

Ms. Hayo: We will look into that, thank you.

Mr. Kersteen: This was a project that was developed over the years with a great deal of forethought which is evident in the final project. The Starkey Family should be commended.

Chairman Black:

In all of my growing up years in Pasco County, and I'm 6th generation, there have always been Starkeys' and they've always been public servants. They have also had a love for the land. When all of this is said and done, I don't think the Starkey's will leave doing cartwheels, this is kind of bittersweet for them. But the word stewardship has been brought up many times and they certainly have been good stewards in cooperation with the county and the way that they have gone about developing the Longleaf development. I'm in favor of the program and I wanted to say that as a commendation to the Starkey Family.

The *Starkey Ranch Final Report*, as amended, was adopted with transmittal to Pasco County and the Florida Department of Community Affairs. (Duncan/Miller)

Presentations can be viewed at: www.tbrpc.org/councilagendas/councilpresentations.htm

7. **Council Members' Comments** - Chairman Black

Chairman Black stated that we will be returning to *Celebrating Tampa Bay* as we will have a little more time to hear about your communities. Anyone with upcoming events or any best practices or successful projects, please contact Wren Krahl.

8. **Program Reports**

A. **Agency on Bay Management (ABM)** - Chair, Mr. Robert Kersteen

The next Full Agency meeting will take place on Thursday, July 12, 2007 at 9:00 a.m. Items on the agenda include:

- Presentation from Tampa Bay Water on their planning for future water needs and we will have an interactive input session to get input from agency members;
- Dr. Robert Weisberg, USF College of Marine Science, will provide a graphic interpretation of the impact a category 5 hurricane may have had if landfall had been in or near the Tampa Bay region, and the implications for natural resources.
- Mr. Bob McConnell, Tampa Bay Water, will describe and explain his agency's effort to change the classification of the Tampa Bypass Canal and the Alafia River from Class III to Class I (from fishable/swimmable to potable). They are seeking input and possible recommendation from ABM.

Everyone was invited to attend.

B. **Clearinghouse Review Committee (CRC)** - Chair, Vice Mayor Deborah Kynes
No Report.

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

D. **Emergency Management**
No Report.

E. Legislative Committee - Commissioner Jane von Hahmann, Chair

Vice Chair Kynes provided the legislative committee report due to the absence of Commissioner von Hahmann.

The Tampa Bay Area Regional Transit Authority bill was signed by the Governor on June 28th. The first meeting is required to take place within 60 days. The Governor needs to make four appointments to this board.

The Regional Transit Workgroup is meeting July 13th from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 p.m. at the Tampa International Airport Conference Room. Commissioner Ronnie Duncan has been a key leader and hopes that the efforts of this group will be used as a starting point for the new Regional Transportation Authority.

Commissioner Duncan referred to a newspaper article which said the workgroup of the Regional County Commission, cities, MPOs, transit operators, and FDOT will be looking at the plan that the various MPO staffs have put together. They were charged at the last meeting to put all the MPO transit plans on one piece of paper and look at areas of activity, where we are missing the boat, look at where we have some immediate options. What came about was a somewhat obvious, but very interesting assimilation of 4 MPO plans. That was in the newspaper and has been talked about out in the public. The workgroup will be talking about it on Friday. They are drilling down each one of the components for action steps, strategies, and to talk about the challenges, and how we get from here to there with all of these issues and items. It is an opportune time and we are excited about what is going on.

The next TBRPC Legislative Committee meeting has been set for August 13, 2007 at 9:00 a.m.

F. Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC)

No Report.

G. Telework Tampa Bay

No Report.

H. Economic Development

No Report.

I. Regional Domestic Security Task Force (RDSTF)

No Report.

9. Other Council Reports - None

10. Executive/Budget Committee Report - Chairman Black

No Report.

11. **Chairman's Report - Chairman Black**

At the last meeting I had indicated that I would report on our Washington DC trip back in May. We left the Council meeting on May 14th and went directly to the airport, and we returned on Wednesday. Ms. Todd, Mr. Pumariega, Mr. Kersteen and I were able to meet with our local legislative delegation. We actually met with Congressman Bill Young and also with Senator Bill Nelson. We met with other legislative staff members and ran into Congressman Putnam. We discussed several topics of concern to us in this area such as the Transportation Authority and looking for support of our federal legislators and getting federal money. We did emphasize mass transit as being of importance to our Council. We also met with our delegation regarding Workforce Housing. In our first meeting of the morning with Congressman Young's staff they indicated we may want to meet with a member of Congressman Mica's staff, which we were able to do, and potential funding of our Telework Florida initiative. We also met with the Governor's staff. Whenever you are planning a trip to Washington, be sure to meet with the State of Florida staff. They lobby state issues on the federal level. We let them know what issues we were lobbying for and asked for their assistance as well.

12. **Executive Director's Report - Manny Pumariega**

The Best in St. Pete magazine has a couple of articles relating to our programs, one on hurricane and the second on Telework. You can get copies from a book store, if you are interested.

Adjournment 12:09 p.m.

Lori Denman, Recording Secretary

Commissioner Scott Black, Chairman