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Call to Order – Chair Dodson
The April 13, 2009 regular meeting of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council was called to order by Chair Dodson at 10:08 a.m.

Vice Chair, Commissioner Mariano asked for a moment of silence for Roger Tucker. The Council’s long time attorney passed away this past Wednesday afternoon, after a long battle with cancer. Roger served as the Council’s attorney for 36 years and retired in February 2007. His tenure with the Council included many milestones. He was involved with the Development of Regional Impact process since its inception; he was also involved in setting the rules and the very first appeal.

Through the years Roger was a key advisor during a number of re-structuring efforts of the Council and he proved invaluable during the building of the new Council facility in 2004. He was one of the principals in forming the Agency On Bay Management in 1984, and again in 1987 with his involvement in the newly formed SWIM legislation. The Water Management District has been administering this legislation for many years.

Roger was also a key player in establishing the policies and procedures for the National Estuary Program which has been a prototype for the rest of the nation. Along with these efforts he was responsible for initiating the quarterly Bay Soundings Journal which has grown to a quarterly distribution rate of 30,000.

A memorial service will be held at the St. Pete Yacht Club on Saturday, April 18, at 11 a.m. Mrs. Alice Tucker has requested RSVPs if you plan on attending.

The Invocation was given by Commissioner Jack Mariano, followed by the pledge of allegiance.

Roll Call – Recording Secretary
A quorum was present.

**Voting Conflict Report** – Recording Secretary
No voting conflicts were filed.

**Chair Dodson: Announcements & Recognitions:**
Chair Dodson recognized new Council member Commissioner Ron Barnette, City of Dunedin.

Recognition was given to former Commissioner Deborah Kynes. She served on the Council since 2000 in every capacity. She was the Chair last year and during her leadership was responsible for the highly successful Cents of Place/Transportation Forum. Through the years she has been active in several Council committees and served on the Florida Regional Council Association’s Policy Board. Her term as Commissioner ended on April 2nd. Ms. Kynes was presented with an engraved mother of pearl pen.

Ms. Kynes thanked the Council for the pen and stated it had been a pleasure to serve on the Council and to get to know so many from across the region. Dr. Ron Barnette will be taking her place and Ms. Kynes said he will bring a great creative vision to the table and will do a good job. Ms. Kynes said she hopes that the Council continues working on regionalism. The economy might be down now but we will come back, and the regional view is the one that will take us forward.

1. **Approval of Minutes** – Vice Chair Mariano
The minutes from the March 9, 2009 regular Meeting were approved (Kersteen/Brown).

2. **Budget Committee** – Vice Chair Mariano
The Financial Report for the period ending 2/29/09 was approved (Petersen/Mulhern).

3. **Consent Agenda** – Chair Dodson

   **A. Budget and Contractual**
   1. The Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council has received the new maintenance and technical support contract for statewide version of REMI Policy Insight® from Regional Economic Models, Inc. The contract will begin on March 25, 2009 and run through March 24, 2010 at a cost of $34,513. TBRPC owns this version of the model separately from the Council’s version to allow all RPCs in the state to have REMI. $18,513 is for the annual data and licensing while $16,000 is for six RPCs to receive secondary user licenses and unlimited technical support from REMI staff. All costs are paid by the six RPC secondary users, not TBRPC. TBRPC has been a REMI user since 1999 and continues to provide technical support and assistance to the Council’s members, economic development organizations, Tampa Bay Partnership and others. The REMI model can be used to forecast the economic and demographic effects of policy initiatives. Policy Insight® answers the "What if...?" questions concerning regional and local economies. Any type of policy that influences economic activity can be evaluated including economic development, transportation, energy, environmental, and taxation.

      Action Recommended: Authorize the Executive Director to sign the Annual User Agreement for Software Licensing and Services.

   2. Hillsborough County Division of Emergency Management has requested that TBRPC staff provide technical assistance to develop a **Hillsborough County Host Community Relocation Plan** as a component of the Florida Catastrophic Plan (2008). This plan would investigate the capabilities, resources, demands, thresholds and needs in response to a significant post-disaster relocation from
another region in the State of Florida following a catastrophic event.

Action Recommended: Authorize the Chair to sign an Interlocal Agreement in the amount of $49,000 with Hillsborough County.

3. TBRPC has submitted a grant application to the State Division of Emergency Management to develop a **Catastrophic Plan for the Tampa Bay Region**. This effort will identify the scenario-driven components of response and recovery from a catastrophic event affecting the Tampa Bay region as defined by the nine-county Urban Area (UASI). The plan will also address the host community concept on a regional level based on the Hurricane Ono scenario of the **Florida Catastrophic Plan** (2009), a devastating hurricane striking the Miami-Dade area. The award does not require a match.

Action Recommended: Authorize the Chair to sign a contract with the Florida Division of Emergency Management in the amount of $200,000.

4. Economic Analysis and Disaster Resiliency Study of Catastrophic Event to the Tampa Bay Region

Staff submitted an application to the Economic Development Administration for a two phase study of the disaster resiliency and economic impacts of a hurricane to the Tampa Bay Region, including Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco and Pinellas counties. The application is under final review and will be funded through a Federal Funding Opportunity, Second Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Relief Opportunity, in response to the disasters of 2008. The study will cost $250,000, and will be funded 75% through EDA. TBRPC will be funding the other 25%, or $62,500.

The study will take an estimated 12 months to complete. Phase I will provide each county government with an itemized report and map of each county split into sections with employment by industry, housing by decade built, critical infrastructures, and staging areas. This report will allow local emergency managers to quickly identify which industries are located within which disaster prone areas. Phase II would be an economic analysis of a hurricane to the entire region, showcasing the losses attributed to capital stock and employment coupled with the gains associated with reconstruction and cleanup. The analysis will look at impacts by county and industry sectors to encourage planning and resiliency.

Action Recommended: Authorize the Chair to sign the federal award with the Economic Development Administration in the amount of $250,000.

B. **Intergovernmental Coordination & Review (IC&R) Program**

1. IC&R Reviews by Jurisdiction
2. March 2009 IC&R Database

Action Recommended: None. For Information Only.

C. **DRI Development Order Reports (DOR) - None**

D. **DRI Development Order Amendment Reports (DOAR)**

DRI # 253 - The Grove at Wesley Chapel, Pasco County

E. **Notice of Proposed Change (NOPC) Reports**
F. Annual Report Summaries (ARS)/Biennial Report Summaries (BRS):
1. DRI # 65 - Tampa Palms/Areas 3 & 4, RYs 2006-08 ARS, City of Tampa
2. DRI # 66 - Tara, RY 2007-08 ARS, Manatee County
3. DRI # 73 - Summerfield Crossings, RY 2007-08 ARS, Hillsborough County
4. DRI # 84 - Westchase, RY 2007-08 ARS, Hillsborough County
5. DRI # 102 - Creekwood, RY 2007-08 ARS, Manatee County
6. DRI # 119 - Northwood, RY 2006-08 BRS, Pasco County
7. DRI # 121 - Carillon, RY 2007-08 ARS, City of St. Petersburg
8. DRI # 132/PP - Gateway Centre/Pinellas Park ARS, RY 2007-08, City of Pinellas Park
9. DRI # 132/SP - Gateway Centre/ St. Petersburg, RY 2007-08 ARS, City of St. Petersburg
10. DRI # 174 - Bay Vista, RYs 2006-09 ARS, City of Largo
11. DRI # 194 - DG Farms, RY 2007-08 ARS, Hillsborough County
12. DRI # 211 - Meadow Pointe, RY 2007-08 ARS, Pasco County
13. DRI # 229 - Gulf Coast Factory Shops, RY 2007-08 ARS, Manatee County
14. DRI # 236 - Riviera Dunes, RY 2007-08 ARS, City of Palmetto

G. DRI Status Report
Action Recommended: None. For Information Only.

H. Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendments (LGCP)
Due to statutory and contractual requirements, the following reports have been transmitted to the Florida Department of Community Affairs (FDCA) and the appropriate local government in accordance with Rule 29H-1.003(3), F.A.C.
1. DCA # 08-2AR, City of Tampa (adopted) (report attached)
2. DCA # 09-1ER, City of Holmes Beach (adopted) (report attached)
3. DCA # 09-1AR, City of St. Petersburg (report attached)
Action Recommended: For Information Only

The following report(s) are presented for Council action:
4. DCA # 09-2ER, City of Zephyrhills (report attached)
5. DCA # 09-1, Town of North Redington Beach (adopted) (report attached)
6. DCA # 09-CIE, Pinellas County (report attached)

The Consent Agenda was approved (Kersteen/Saenger).

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. One Bay/Regional Visioning Initiative Update
Mr. Avera Wynne, TBRPC Planning Director, provided an update on the One Bay Regional Visioning Initiative.

The concept of visioning is that we don’t want to base the future on past trends. I have looked at
One Bay like a stock portfolio, you don’t want to invest in what worked the last five years. You want to invest in what you think will work in the next five years. In this case, for our region, we want to look at what is going to work for the next 40 years (2050). One Bay is about getting people to think about what Tampa Bay will be like in 2050, not what it was like in 1950.

The future will not be like the past. Nationally we have a lot of demographic trends that are going to influence the Tampa Bay region. The U.S. population is forecast to grow to over 439 million by 2050. 70%-80% of that population growth is going to be in what folks are calling “mega-regions.” Other trends that are impacting the Tampa Bay region and the U.S., as well as the world, is that energy costs are rising. As we move forward we have to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Household sizes will decrease. Americans are getting older at a more rapid rate. In 2011 the rate of folks turning 65 annually is going to explode and that trend will continue and households that do not have children in them will be the majority. In other words, about 80% of households that get created will be childless. That will have a large impact on the type of housing needed in the future.

We also know that water resources are finite. Our number one economic driving force has been the weather for the past 50-100 years. When shown the results of One Bay, people have asked if we really want to have compact development. It’s interesting that in the Houston area, KB Homes has developed an 800 sq. ft. house and their target market is people who have been foreclosed upon. This house costs about $80,000 to purchase. If you think about moving forward with home ownership, they are going to have to have 20% to put into the home, or at least some cash. That means houses will cost less. We are back to the post world war era - it is a re-start. Anytime there has been an age of exuberance and then the economy turns, people get back to saying “what do I need” rather than “what could I buy?” That is going to shape the way KB Homes and others look at the market.

Going green. We need to look at things going forward to save energy. Mr. Connors from St. Petersburg was here last month and he talked about changing the types of LED lights in traffic signals and the lights we use to illuminate streets which can save enough power to generate uses in hundreds of homes. In New York, the Mets use water-less urinals. The New York Yankees are using types of lighting in the stadium that saves enough energy to power 75 homes a year.

The future will not be like the past. If you had predicted the Tampa Bay Rays season last year on their performance the previous 9 seasons you would not have predicted they would have been in the world series. That’s why we have to look to the future and try to figure out what the trends are. That’s what One Bay is all about. A negative seed is that we are not bicycle and walkable friendly.

We began by looking at 1972 and the development that took place. We had almost ½ million acres of land developed, population was at 1.7 million over the seven county region (Hernando, Sarasota, Polk, Manatee, Hillsborough, Pinellas and Pasco). Employment was around ½ million. Moving forward to 2005, 876,696 developed acres, employment was at 2.2 million, and population was at 3.8 million. We are now past 4 million. In 2050 if we continue to extrapolate those trends from 2005 our population may be at 7 million, employment at 3.8 million, and land development at 1.6 million acres. Although employment has been difficult lately most think it will return. We wouldn’t want to stop planning for the water resources for 2050 because we have had a slow down in growth and we don’t want to stop planning for other things as well.

The One Bay process started back in May 2007 with Reality Check. Over 300 civic and business leaders played Legos and worked them into concepts and took those concepts to Community Workshops in the fall of 2007. Alternatives were defined and we began testing those and we are
working on refining those alternatives and moving toward the vision this summer.

The guiding principles from the exercises are:
- Create a sense of place
- Maximize multi-modal transportation
- Preserve natural systems
- Balance jobs & housing
- Strengthen economic development
- Sustain the role of agriculture

These principles were used to develop the four scenarios for the vision of One Bay. Scenario A is business as usual. Scenario B is the people’s choice. This is more compact than A and has more multi-family development patterns and introduces transit, light rail, and things to reduce the reliance on the personal automobile. In each of the scenarios there is still single family houses but the trend seems to say that in the future there will be less a demand for the single family product and more of a demand for multi-family and/or compact townhomes. Scenario C is the most compact of all the scenarios. It uses corridors, it maximizes development around transit corridors and around transit stations. Once again, keep in mind, the single family house still has a role to play in the region and would still be available. Scenario D is environmental. We started with B and then we re-allocated some of the development to strongly avoid environmental resources. In all four of these scenarios keep in mind that the rules and regulations that dictate environment development protects all of our resources, however, this scenario tries to focus development far away from the environmental resources.

In looking at the indicators of Agricultural Land Impacted, Electricity Usage, Total Land Consumed, Vehicle Miles Traveled, Wetlands Impacted, and Water Demand, scenario C has the most favorable indicator. We had about 3500 people complete the Voice It campaign survey. 54% of the folks that voted chose scenario C and 17% liked a blend of the scenarios such as scenario B and C. Only 4% chose the “Business as Usual” scenario A. 2500 took advantage of the open dialogue box and told us why they liked the scenarios, why they voted for a particular scenario and we cataloged and categorized those.

We asked what are the three most important factors for the future of the Tampa Bay region. This was primarily last summer that these were done, but they said we need mass transit, cost of living was a concern and employment. Also water resources and potable water supply as well as natural resources.

All of that work led up to the preliminary recommendations that the One Bay Executive Committee and others have been sharing with City Councils, County Commissions, and MPOs and TBARTA. The five recommendations are:
- Promote transit and transit-oriented development
- Encourage compact and mixed-use development
- Encourage preservation of open space and agricultural land
- Support increased housing options
- Support environmentally sustainable growth

The next steps will be to continue to meet with community leaders to share results and solicit feedback; Complete the One Bay Report; Present findings to stakeholder groups such as the County Commissions, MPOs, Economic Development Organizations, TBARTA, etc., and Development of an Action Plan (Phase II). Before we finalize those
types of action plan strategies there will be a telephone survey to test the results from the Voice It campaign. In the fall we will have a Congress of One Bay Leaders get together and prioritize the actions to determine who the champions are, the investors, and the stakeholders. We will put some names to the strategies and accountability for the One Bay Vision.

The five parties who are members of One Bay are the Southwest Florida Water Management District, the Tampa Bay Estuary Program, the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, the Tampa Bay Vision Group of the Tampa Bay Partnership, and ULI of Tampa Bay.

Questions & Comments:
Chair Dodson: You were speaking of a fall meeting. Would that be in October?
Mr. Wynne: Correct. We will be looking at the issues of form based planning, transit oriented development and provide some of the educational pieces before we ask people to say what their high priority is.

Commissioner Bustle: Reality Check and One Bay were all created on the basis of some assumptions about demographics and jobs. With the changes that are happening in those, how comfortable are you that the findings will stay the same?
Mr. Wynne: Very comfortable because we’re not prescribing or being specific in our descriptions. One Bay is more descriptive - in other words, you’re trying to choose appropriate places for development. We are trying to have people say if they want developments with regional centers and we want to link them with transit corridors, not prescribing the precise density of those. For instance, Plant City might look like a good place for development for the year 2050, whether it is for 150,000 or 300,000. We aren’t trying to be that precise. I think the projections hold up very well. We’ve had conversations with the folks doing the TBARTA work and the folks doing the SWFMD Long Term Water Forecasting. If we don’t hit those numbers in 2050 we will hit them in 2060.

Vice Chair Mariano: Is everyone following closely what is going on in the legislature as far as the federal funding they are trying to get for consumer rail transit in the Orlando area? Are we going to try and tie into that? Is that part of the program of the Super Regional Leadership Conference coming up?
Mr. Wynne: I really can’t speak to that.

Vice Chair Mariano: From talking to Bob Clifford, is this something we all want to keep an eye on? If we get federal funds that take care of the Orlando area and it filters down through us it will be something that will benefit all of us if we can do a full connection all the way through. I know they are working in the legislature to try to keep that push.

Council Member Petersen: I think this is wonderful for people to dream, but when are you going to attach the cost to it? Every time I see one of these plans go forward people are fine until they realize what it is going to cost. I agree with following Orlando, we need some of that money coming this way.

Mr. Wynne: Some of the items we can attach costs to, but other things such as design principles, planning, doing transit-oriented development are irrelevant to costs. They may or may not be less expensive. People will think of the most cost effective way to build things if it’s the right thing to do. Rail
and those types of things - we are looking at some of the costs to TBARTA and are working with them with their Master Plan. While there is a lot of cost in running transit, it gets a little touchy when it comes to spending the money. Some of the benefits are less tangible than others such as making the region more attractive.

Councilman Roff:
I wanted to comment on the housing in Houston. In Manatee County there is a new housing market aimed at cottage style homes that will be starting at 900-1,000-1,200 sq. ft. at $100,000. They sold about 10 homes on the opening day and the market has continued to hold. A development team out of Oldsmar actually created it. It has proven to be quite successful. We have a huge surplus of housing in Manatee too.

Councilman Nurse:
St. Pete went through re-zoning to reflect this and when we finished we had re-zoned everything to make for a more dense population. It takes a long time. It took us four years.

Power Point presentation(s) can be found at www.tbrpc.org/councilagendas/councilpresentations.htm

7. Council Members’ Comments
Councilor Bob Matthews mentioned the tragic auto accident that occurred in Seminole and requested everyone talk to young people about wearing seat belts and driving the speed limit.

Councilwoman Mulhern brought up a possible economic development issue. Jet Blue is looking at moving their corporate headquarters and may be adjusting where their hub is located. She would like Tampa and St. Petersburg to consider that since more and more people are flying directly to South America, Central America, Mexico and it seems we are now competing with Orlando for a lot of international travel. Disney and Universal always seem to attract international travel, there are a lot of people who come to the beach in Pinellas, to go on a cruise out of Tampa’s port and then they go over to Disney. Councilwoman Mulhern said she would love to see the economic people in the region look at this as an actual real possibility.

Chair Dodson recognized Councilor Bob Matthews for providing the Easter treats.

8. Program Reports
A. Agency on Bay Management (ABM) – Chair, Mr. Robert Kerstein
Summaries of the March 12th Full Agency meeting and the April 9th Recreational Boat Launch Task Force meetings were distributed. The next meeting of the Agency will be held on May 14th and will include a presentation and discussion on the Tampa Bay Regional Reclaimed Water & Downstream Augmentation Project, and on local government stormwater regulation and monitoring. The meeting will start at 9:00 a.m. in the Council conference room and all were invited to attend.

B. Clearinghouse Review Committee (CRC) - No Report

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

D. Emergency Management
Ms. Betti Johnson, TBRPC Principal Planner, provided an update on emergency planning studies including the Statewide Regional Evacuation Study, the 2009 Hurricane Guides, Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plans, Local Mitigation Strategies and the Catastrophic Plan.
We are updating the Regional Evacuation Study along with the other 10 regions in the State of Florida. This will be different from the hurricane evacuation studies that have been done in the past, since 1980. The main difference is that the study is “all hazards.” We aren’t just looking at tropical storms and hurricanes. We are also looking at freshwater flooding, wildfires, and the potential of a significant hazardous materials event. All eleven regions are being updated at the same time. Where Tampa Bay has been very active in terms of seeking funding to update our Regional Evacuation Study, there have been some areas that haven’t been updated in over 10 years, and that includes central Florida, as well as south Florida and the metro Dade area which hasn’t been updated since 1994. Nor has the panhandle. The legislature wanted to look at this from a statewide perspective and have all the studies consistently updated in a coordinated fashion.

The first step was the collection of LIDAR (topographic data) which is very detailed and engineer quality for all 35 counties. The bulk of the $29 million went towards this LIDAR and once we receive this all the local governments and our non-governmental partners can use the information since it will be in the public domain. LIDAR information is collected by flying over and bouncing a beam of light which provides the detailed data that generates the configuration of what the land looks like. It is extremely detailed. Then they process it to get it down to the ground and then it has to be verified by county engineering data.

Once we get the LIDAR the National Hurricane Center will provide new SLOSH data. This is extremely important. The data we currently have is old. They are bringing together new scientific data for this particular model. The last time around we had 750 hypothetical storms modeled. There will be twice as many this time around. We have additional grids that go inland further and provide more detail on the back bay areas and that will generate a maximum envelopes of water that give up a storm surge from different tracks and types of storms.

We need the new storm scenarios. When we modeled the 750 hypothetical storms they were average hurricanes with an average wind speed and pressures, with maximum wind readings of 12 nautical miles. We all know hurricanes are never well behaved and they can be very catastrophic. What we found over the last few years is that if you vary that radius of maximum winds so that its larger, it has a significant impact on the amount of storm surge you will receive and when you will receive it. This was very evident in Katrina, Ike and Dennis, which flooded the panhandle and it never got within 100 miles of the panhandle. Ike had a radius of maximum winds of 40 nautical miles. When it entered the Gulf of Mexico we saw 5 feet of storm surge here in the Tampa Bay region and it didn’t come within 100s of miles. For the coast of Texas, they got flooding 24-36 hours before landfall right when we would just be making decisions about evacuations. The flooding took place twenty-four hours before they were expecting the storm and it cut the people off on Galveston Island and Boliver Peninsula. It can have serious consequences. There is a very big difference on rainfall and the winds received depending on the forward speed of that storm. Frances was slow and dumped a ton of water. Jeanne moved much faster and the winds were stronger. These are some of the variables that we need to look at.

The vulnerability assessment. We take the LIDAR data that gives you your elevation and lay on top of that the maximum amount of storm surge we can predict from different storm
scenarios and you get the vulnerability assessment. That creates detailed surge zones which we then have to convert to something that our public can recognize so we know where to evacuate, and that creates our evacuation zones. It is also going to be critically important that we look at all of those anomalies and all potential affects on our critical facilities. We will run that through and look at what the potential storm surge is for our healthcare facilities and our critical infrastructure. At the same time we will look at fresh water vulnerability, the potential for fire, and sites that have hazardous materials. We surveyed over 30,000 people in the state, with approximately 10,000-12,000 in the Tampa Bay area, and asked them if they would evacuate, when they would evacuate, what type of refuge they would go to, and how many cars would be used. The behavioral assumptions are critically important. It impacts all of our planning - shelter planning, transportation modeling, public education, and evacuation notices. According to the behavioral analysis our folks still don’t have a clue. They don’t know what zone they live in, they don’t know what an appropriate response is. We had just as many people leaving from inland areas as we do from our category 1 zone in a category 4 hurricane. We need to focus and clarify our message.

We also looked at shelter inventories, shelter demand, and major issues such as special needs shelters, and pet friendly shelters. We are in a shelter deficit in the Tampa Bay region, particularly in Pinellas County, and folks didn’t want to look at the issue of pets. The truth of the matter is that 58% of our residents have pets and we do not want them to leave their pets behind so we need to make allowances for sheltering our pets. Special needs is another critical issue, particularly for the Tampa Bay area.

We will have an all new evacuation transportation analysis and this will have a dashboard application. We will look at what the impacts are in terms of additional development in our hurricane vulnerable zones. Hopefully it will also take into account some of the intelligent transportation and identify scenarios and planning options to help cut our clearance times. I’m hoping our clearance times will not be as high as they have been in the past because of the sophisticated model, but I was told that may not be the case.

The Statewide Regional Evacuation Study Approximate Timeline:

- New LIDAR for Tampa Bay coastal areas (4/09) They say Tampa Bay will be one of the first approved so we are hopeful it will be this month. Once that is approved it goes to the Hurricane Center for the new SLOSH model.
- New SLOSH Model (5/09) Unfortunately we are heading into the hurricane season. We are hoping we can get our SLOSH models completed before we get into the heart of the season.
- New Atlas (6/09)
- New Zones (7/09)
- New Transportation Analysis (9/09)

This is an opportunity to get the rest of the state to look at this issue in a consistent and coordinated fashion. It’s also an opportunity for us to take it to the next level.

The 2009 Hurricane Guides will be available within the next couple of weeks. We are printing 391,000 copies in English and Spanish and they will be available at libraries, public buildings, post offices, fire stations, etc.
We are still working on the Business Disaster Survival Kit. The kit has a checklist and a guidebook for employers and employees. This is also available in English and Spanish. If you go to the website (www.fldisasterkit.org) you can download all of the information or walk through it in terms of planning for your businesses. There is an interactive Continuity of Operations (COOP) Planning Guide and the Pirate Bay Game which is now a national award winning game.

Staff is working with the counties updating their Post-Disaster Redevelopment and Local Mitigation Strategies. The Local Mitigation Strategies (LMS) have to be updated and adopted by all the local governments by November. We are finishing up Pinellas and Hillsborough and those will go to the state and the federal government for approval. Once we get the general approval we will take it back to our local communities for adoption. Two of our four counties were selected as pilot communities (Hillsborough and Manatee) to do the Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plan. Pasco and Pinellas use other federal funds to develop their Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plan. We are currently working with Pinellas on their plan.

We have submitted a grant application to do a catastrophic plan for the Tampa Bay region that will include two scenarios: hurricane and man-made events. Another component is the Host Community Plan. Tampa Bay is considered a Host Community if the disaster is, for example, in Miami. This is extremely important. The Mayor of Austin said he was deeply moved when they moved the Katrina survivors to Houston and Austin. He welcomed 25,000 people and had the involvement from the community to help these folks with housing, employment, etc. That is what Tampa Bay would do in a catastrophic event in Florida.

Ms. Johnson recently attended the National Hurricane Conference in Austin, TX. While there they got the opportunity to go out to Galveston and Bolivar Peninsula where Hurricane Ike hit last year.

Ms. Johnson described the damages she saw in Galveston and on Bolivar Peninsula. Two of the cities on Bolivar Peninsula are totally gone. The few that survived, didn’t really survive in whole. The problem was, it was a category 2 hurricane, with 95 MPH winds. The people on Bolivar thought a category 2 was nothing to worry about because they were 8 feet above sea level and they stayed. What happened then is that they got caught because it was a category 2 in terms of wind, but it had a 24 foot storm surge. The amount of debris from this storm is overwhelming, millions of cubic yards and its still out there a year later. There were 20 dead in that particular area. They found 12 in Galveston and Bolivar that did not evacuate the first round and they have the 911 calls of people but they couldn’t get to them. There were 3600 people rescued. 684 before the storm. They were out there with helicopters as long as they could be. 34 people are still missing. They think there may be more than that missing because of the illegal aliens that live there. This was the fourth most costly storm in history. This was such a green island before the storm. On the back part there were oaks with moss, oleander, palms, etc. and it was a beautiful place. Now it looks very gray. In terms of planning you have to do a better job identifying the risk and what can happen and we have to do a better job conveying that risk to our public.
Questions & Comments:
Councilman Nurse: Are they going to rebuild?
Ms. Johnson: Probably, although 60% is uninsured. Neal said when he was out talking to folks they would say the wind took the house. He didn’t have flood insurance. That is the main conflict - wind or flood?
Councilor Matthews: You were talking about people not knowing what zones they live in. Is there any consideration given to putting an insert into the utility bill so people get something?
Ms. Johnson: There are many different ways to find out your zone. You can look it up on line, they can call, they can look at their property appraisal if they have one. We have to become more creative in getting the word out to the people who don’t know how to look for the information.
Chair Dodson: It seems like you have an impossible task. As much as you do it continues to show how much more there is to do. I don’t know how you can ever reach the groups that need this information.
Ms. Johnson: You are right. The question is, should they rebuild?
Vice Mayor Worthington: In Gulfport we have a very comprehensive program every year to reach out to condominium groups, local homeowner groups and to ordinary citizens. For our condo owners we have a specific seminar just for them, and it is very location specific. We have a general hurricane conference for our citizens. We advertise when the county is holding one and try to let our citizens know. The local cities have to get very active.
Ms. Johnson: That’s right. Disaster response is local. They told us not to count on the state or the feds for up to 90 days. It has to be local. And it has to be specific. We had people in a condo for Hurricane Elena. They had the police and firefighters going down the street with bullhorns and they were knocking on doors on all these condos. They asked a woman, when they had to go back and get her, why she didn’t evacuate. She told them because no one knocked on her specific door. It has to be down to that individual person.

E. Legislative Committee — Chair, Mr. Julian Garcia, Jr.
The FRCA Legislative Report for the week ending April 10th was distributed.

Both the Senate Budget and House Budget contain $2.5 million from the General Revenue Fund for the eleven Regional Planning Councils.

Mangrove Protection Senate Bill 148 provides that the DEP shall assess a penalty against any person who violates the provisions of the mangrove trimming act. It allows DEP to provide for exemptions and general permits for trimming activities that have minimal adverse impacts on the water resources of the state.

Senate Bill 362 provides revisions to growth management laws, as follows:

- Creates transportation concurrency exception areas (TCEAs) in municipalities that qualify a dense urban land area and adopt in a Local Comprehensive Plan and in a county, including the cities within the county which have a population of at least 900,000.
- Provides for a mobility fee study.
- Allows a permit extension for certain permits.

Senate Bill 2016 authorizes the DEP to obtain from the US Army Corps of Engineers an expended state program (general permit) or a series of regional permits as a mechanism to eliminate overlapping federal regulations and state rules that require duplicative permitting by the state and federal government.

House Bill 5015 eliminates the Century Commission and redirects the documentary stamp tax designated to the commission to fund the DCA cost of providing technical assistance to keep governments and school boards on the requirements and implementation of growth management.

Growth Management Senate Bill 360 that we reported last month, passed the full senate on April 2nd. It seems very likely though that the House will add some provisions to it and send it back to the senate. The companion House Bills are 1019, 7049 and 7127.

We will continue to email you the weekly FRCA reports.

Chair Dodson: The current status as we know it, between the House and Senate, is to continue funding at $2.5 million for the eleven regional planning councils. Provided there are no changes in the last couple of weeks of this session. We hope to hold the line in funding. It would be hard if there is a change now after taking a 40% decline in revenue after the previous year’s legislative session.

F. Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC) – No Report

G. Economic Development – No Report

H. Regional Domestic Security Task Force (RDSTF) – No Report

9. Other Council Reports - None

10. Executive/Budget Committee Report – Chair Dodson
There was no meeting in April, however there will be a meeting in May to discuss the budget.

11. Executive Director’s Report - None

12. Chair’s Report
I would like to thank staff, and in particular Wren Krahl and Sue Young for work that was done on behalf of the Future of the Region Awards luncheon. The Herman Goldner Award went to Dr. Judy Genshaft and it was well deserved.

Next meeting, May 11, 2009 at 10:00 a.m.

Adjournment: 11.16 a.m.