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Call to Order – Chair Dodson
The June 8, 2009 regular meeting of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council was called to order by Chair Dodson at 10:03 a.m.

The Invocation was given by Mr. Earl Young, followed by the pledge of allegiance.

Roll Call -- Recording Secretary
A quorum was present.

Voting Conflict Report -- Recording Secretary
No voting conflicts were filed.

1. Approval of Minutes – Secretary/Treasurer Collins
The minutes from the June 8, 2009 regular meeting were approved (Kersteen/Todd).

2. Budget Committee – Secretary/Treasurer Collins
A. The Financial Report for the period ending 05/31/09 was approved (Todd/Beckner).
B. The Financial Report for the period ending 06/30/09 was approved (Todd/Kersteen).

Announcements:
Chair Dodson recognized Todd Pressman who was recently elected as the Chair of the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD).
Congratulations were extended to Mayor Scott Black who has been elected as Second Vice President to the Florida Regional Council's Association (FRCA) Policy Board.

Vice Mayor Matthews was recognized for supplying refreshments.

The TBRPC will be holding a workshop on SB360 and the Community Renewal Act. The workshop is taking place on Tuesday, August 25 at the Quorum Hotel from 10:00 a.m. to noon. DCA Secretary Tom Pelham is confirmed as one of the panelist and Representative Rich Glorioso will assist with the welcoming remarks. Registration is complimentary for Council Members only. Registration is also available on the TBRPC website and AICP credits are pending for those planners in attendance. Board members were requested to call Bobbi Jaroy to register for this event.

Going Green:

The Regional Directory is going green after 22 years. A free copy can be downloaded from the front page of the website (www.tbrpc.org).

We are looking at ways to cut costs and would like to see if you would be willing to receive your monthly agenda packet via email as opposed to the US Mail. Currently we are spending $7.00 on postage per packet each month. This could be a significant savings throughout the year if Council Members agree to receive the packet electronically. We encourage you to print out items of interest and we will provide paper copies for you to share with your neighbor when you arrive at the monthly meeting. A survey was distributed for Council Members to fill out and return.

Our Tenants, Help-A-Child, Inc. are having their 10th Annual Cooking for Kids event on September 17th at The Coliseum. This event benefits the fight against child abuse. A flyer was distributed with information.

Barbara Mabee from the 2010 Census is unable to present due to an unexpected conflict. Staff will be rescheduling her presentation.

Consent Agenda Item #3.H.11. - Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment DCA #09-1ER, Town of St. Leo (adopted) was inadvertently left off the agenda. The report was mailed to Council Members and there is a copy in your folder.

3. **Consent Agenda** – Chair Dodson
   Consent Agenda Item #3.H.3. - Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment - DCA #09-1AR, City of St. Petersburg (adopted) was removed by Commissioner Brickfield for discussion.

   **A. Budget and Contractual**
   "As-Needed" Consultant Services - Staff has conducted a Request for Qualifications (RFO) from consultants to provide various "As-Needed" planning services related to the Council's emergency management, community visioning, and planning activities. The consultants will be contracted to be available to assist the Council and local governments on an "as-needed" basis. The level and detail of work to be performed is unknown at this time. The consultants will be expected to enter into a master contract that governs performance and contractual matters. Consultants must submit a scope of service for each work authorization issued under the contract. Scope of services and fees shall be negotiated prior to award of each work authorization and become part of the contract.
document. Services that do not exceed $25,000.00 may be executed by the Executive Director. Services exceeding $25,000.00 will be submitted for Council's approval. Responsive firms meeting the RFQ include: All Hands Consulting, Inc; Beek Disaster Recovery, Inc.; Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc.; Concurrent Technologies Corporation; Corporate Crisis Management, Inc.; CSA International, Inc.; Dewberry; Disaster Resistant Communities Group; Elliot Consulting Services; EREC; Excalibur Associates, Inc.; Glattling Jackson Kercher Anglin, Inc.; Grimald Crawford, Inc.; ICF International; IEM; Louetta H. Muller Emergency Planning; Management Experts, LLC; Meredith Management Group, Inc.; Mier Consulting Group, Inc.; Nancy H. Smith, Inc.; NTB Group; O'Gara Group; PBS&J; URS; Vistra Communications, LLC; Wakefield Brunswick, Inc.

Action Recommended: Authorize Chairman to execute Master Consultant Contract with the above reference consulting firms for “As-Needed” services

B. Intergovernmental Coordination & Review (IC&R) Program
   1. IC&R Reviews by Jurisdiction - June & July, 2009
   2. IC&R Database - June & July, 2009
   Action Recommended: None. Information Only.

   3. IC&R #052-09, Interbay Moorings Marina Expansion, TPA #08-062, Hillsborough County
   4. IC&R #053-09, Hillsborough County MPO 2009/10 - 2013/14 Transportation Improvement Program
   5. IC&R #054-09, Sarasota/Manatee MPO 2009/10 - 2013/14 Transportation Improvement Program
   6. IC&R #055-09, Pasco County MPO 2009/10 - 2013/14 Transportation Improvement Program
   7. IC&R #056-09, Pinellas County MPO 2009/10 - 2013/14 Transportation Improvement Program

   Action Recommended: Approve staff reports

C. DRI Development Order Reports (DOR) - None

D. DRI Development Order Amendment Reports (DOAR)
   Due to statutory and contractual requirements, the following reports have been transmitted to the Florida Department of Community Affairs (FDCA) and all relevant review agencies in accordance with Rule 29H-1.003(3), F.A.C.
   1. DRI #16 - Tampa Bay Center, City of Tampa
   2. DRI #244 - Cypress Creek, Pasco County
   Action Recommended: For Information
   The following are presented for Council Action:
   3. DRI #157 - Trinity Communities, Pasco & Pinellas Counties

   Action Recommended: Approve staff report

E. Notice of Proposed Change (NOPC) Reports - None

F. Annual Report Summaries (ARS)/Biennial Report Summaries (BRS)
   1. DRI #74 - River Ridge, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, Pasco County
2. DRI # 78 - Tampa Downtown Development, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, City of Tampa
3. DRI # 93 - Lake Brandon, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, Hillsborough County
4. DRI # 95 - Wingate Creek Mine, RY 2008-09 Annual Report, Manatee County
5. DRI # 98 - Sabal Center, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, Hillsborough County
6. DRI # 103 - Cooper Creek, RY 2008-09 Annual Report, Manatee County
7. DRI # 105 - Sunforest, RY 2008-09 Annual Report, Hillsborough County
8. DRI # 130 - Cypress Banks, RY 2008-09 Annual Report, Manatee County
9. DRI # 151 - Crosstown Center, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, Hillsborough County
10. DRI # 157 - Trinity Communities, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, Pasco & Pinellas Counties
11. DRI # 166 - Wesley Chapel Lakes, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, Pasco County
12. DRI # 191 - Fishhawk Ranch, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, Hillsborough County
13. DRI # 197 - Gregg Business Center, RY 2008-09 Annual Report, City of Plant City
14. DRI # 208 - The Crescent, RY 2008-09 Annual Report, Hillsborough County
15. DRI # 216 - University Lakes, RY 2008-09 Annual Report, Manatee County
16. DRI # 217 - Harbour Island, RY 2008-09 Annual Report, City of Tampa
17. DRI # 211 - Pinellas Criminal Courts Complex, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, Pinellas County
18. DRI # 239 - River Club Park of Commerce, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, Manatee County
19. DRI # 241 - Harbor Bay, RY 2008-09 Annual Report, Hillsborough County
20. DRI # 246 - Suncoast Crossings, RY 2008-09 Annual Report, Pasco County
21. DRI # 249 - South Shore Corporate Park, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, Hillsborough County
22. DRI # 253 - The Grove at Wesley Chapel, RYs 2007-09 Biennial Report, Pasco County
23. DRI # 259 - Lake Hutto, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, Hillsborough County
24. DRI # 266 - Wolf Creek Branch S/D, RY 2007-08 Annual Report, Hillsborough County

Action Recommended: Approve staff reports

G. DRI Status Report
Action Recommended: None. 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-1.903(3), F.A.C.
1. DCA #09-1AR, City of Safety Harbor
2. DCA #08-2ARA, City of St. Petersburg (adopted)
3. DCA #09-1AR, City of St. Petersburg (adopted) (pulled for discussion)
4. DCA #09-1PEFF, City of Dade City (adopted)
5. DCA #09-1AR, City of Clearwater (adopted)
6. DCA #09-1, Hillsborough County (adopted)
7. DCA #09-1ER, City of Pinellas Park (adopted)
8. DCA #09-2AR, City of Largo
9. DCA #09-DRI, Pasco County
11. DCA # 09-1ER, Town of St. Leo (adopted)
Action Recommended: For Information

The following report(s) are presented for Council action:
10. DCA # 09-1ER, City of Temple Terrace (adopted)
Action Recommended: Approve staff reports

The Consent Agenda was approved. (Black/Beckner)

4. Item(s) Removed from Consent Agenda and Addendum Item(s)
Consent Agenda Item #3.H.3. - Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment - DCA #09.1AR, City of St. Petersburg (adopted) was pulled by Commissioner Brickfield for discussion.

Commissioner Brickfield stated the report has to do with the annexation of Tierra Verde and the future land use map. This is being litigated and the Commissioner would like to vote no.

Mr. Conn: Ms. Lunsford can provide background on the report, but as Commissioner Brickfield mentioned, this is in litigation and the parties for and against will have an opportunity obviously in that litigation to have their particular issues resolved. As requested by Ms. Todd we will provide a brief overview of the report.

Ms. Lunsford: The City of St. Petersburg annexed a piece of property from Pinellas County which is on Tierra Verde. There are 13 parcels totaling 18.25 acres. The City of St. Petersburg wants to increase density in these acres. There is a 7.08 acre property that they are considering for multi-family and commercial space and another 10.2 acre property for multi-family/residential units and commercial. The situation with the property is that it is in the Tierra Verde area. Council’s issue with this is the huge population that needs to leave the island to get to an evacuation route. The evacuation route would be impacted by the increase in people living on the island. Our issue is not so much the annexation itself, but the fact that it will increase density and there will be an impact to the regional evacuation routes. There is only one way onto the island and one way off. The county has other issues that they have submitted in a report.

Ms. Todd: Would it be appropriate, given the fact that this is under litigation, to continue this?

Mr. Conn: Let me explain procedurally where we are on this report. As is reflected on your agenda, this report is presented to the Council for your information. Because of the one month period where the Council did not meet, in accordance with your new rule, and because of statutory requirements when reports must be submitted to DCA, this report has already been submitted to DCA. It’s presented to you today, along with other reports in this section of the agenda, for your information. When DCA received the report they reviewed it and have already issued a Notice of Intent to take action. So procedurally that’s why litigation was then begun. Rather than continuing it today I think the best course of action would be those who have
objection to it can go on record as objecting to the report, but it has already been transmitted and is really here for your information.

Commissioner Bustle: Did DCA accept our report?
Ms. Lunsford: DCA issued no comments on the report.
Commissioner Bustle: Ms. Lunsford, you have given the impression to me that staff is opposed to this and you have problems with it, and yet the paper says this is consistent and no objections were raised.

Ms. Lunsford: It is consistent because the Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP) will not allow us to find it inconsistent. We certainly are not pleased but at the same time our hands are tied in this situation.

Mr. Pumariega: Keep in mind that we also have to comply with the state statute of coastal high hazard areas. In that particular area there is no increase in population as the report states. There was no inconsistency with the state statute.

Ms. Todd: Is it appropriate for us to take a look at that? I don’t think we should ever be handicapped from expressing the professional opinions of our staff. Yet in this, or any other case, if there is an inconsistency in what is appropriate perhaps we should be taking a look at this to put into our SRPP.

Mr. Pumariega: We have had dialogue in our region. Ms. Johnson, would you like to make a comment about the advisory committee? They came up with some recommendations regarding islands where you have to cross bridges which is not dealt with in our SRPP. Maybe we should try to change the statutes. In this situation there was no increase in the population for residency in the coastal high hazard area. This is a recommendation that came from discussions with state pollers and experts on evacuation in the Tampa Bay area.

Sec/Treas. Collins: Then according to our report, we won’t increase density in any way.

Mr. Pumariega: Some of the islands such as Tierra Ciea are increasing the population but they are not in the coastal high hazard area.

Ms. Johnson: The state statute that changed the definition of the coastal high hazard area was discussed with the Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC). We recognized that there were areas that are highly vulnerable to storm surge from even a category one storm that weren’t being picked up because of limitations on the SLOSH model which doesn’t look at wave height or tides or in terms of the isolation factor. Even if you build a property up it’s an extremely vulnerable area that we wouldn’t have access to after a storm. That is not reflected yet in the SRPP. We had hoped the state legislation would re-evaluate their decision but that hasn’t happened yet.

Vice Chair Mariano: Has this come before Pinellas County?
Commissioner Brickfield: I’m trying not to say anything. The annexation came before the Commission and we were against it, but it moved forward.

Mayor Black: Has the request for development come before you? Was it ever
Commissioner Brickfield: denied by the county?

Mayor Black: Prior to this coming to the City of St. Petersburg?

Commissioner Brickfield: This is an annexation of St. Petersburg. After they do it they transmit it to us. This was an item of great discussion in that community. The owner wanted to do something with the county and thought he could get a better situation with the City of St. Petersburg.

Mayor Black: Was it denied by the county?

Commissioner Brickfield: It never got to the Commission.

Commissioner Bustle: I have a follow up question. It seems to me that we are in a bit of a dilemma here because we have something that conforms to our SRPP and yet staff is saying that there are problems with it. I think we need to make an action item out of this and change the SRPP or something because you can’t ignore what they are saying. I think there should at least be a comment saying although consistent with the SRPP as written, staff has objections and lay those out. And it ought to be public. This body ought to have a chance to act accordingly.

Mayor Black: It’s my understanding this is already water under the bridge. Is that correct?

Mr. Conn: It has already been transmitted to DCA, yes. On the bottom of page 5 of the report, are there comments there that are reflective of your concerns that you expressed here this morning?

Ms. Lunsford: Yes.

Mr. Conn: The point being that staff did include their concerns but still had to conclude that it was consistent overall.

Sec/Treas. Collins: If we were here in July would we have had time to address this in a timely manner?

Mr. Wynne: If you notice on each page it says the report was prepared June 2, 2009 which means it came to us after the agenda mail-out so we did not have time to get it to the June meeting. It is a 30 day review. Keep in mind that we are under alternate state review. This is completely different than other city reviews in Pinellas County because of the alternate state review process and the burden on us is to find if it is inconsistent based on a state or overwhelming regional issue. There is a page full of our concerns in the report for DCA to take a look at. They had enough timely information to act accordingly. One of the other issues to keep in mind is the coastal storm area that Pinellas County has chosen to implement and the City of St. Petersburg has not, nor have ten other municipalities. The coastal storm area is an area that you have to evacuate over a bridge or something of that nature, but it’s not technically in the coastal high hazard area due to elevation or other things.

Mr. Pumariaga: There could be an action based on Commissioner Bustle’s statement about changing the SRPP. Keep in mind that any time we change the SRPP we have to make sure we have the authority
for us to make those changes. It might be better for us to be on a parallel tract and try to change the state law which is something we could take to the Legislative Committee when we meet in September.

Mr. Garcia: Would the outcome have been any different if we had met in July?

Mr. Pumarijega: No.

Mr. Pressman: I want to clarify because I’m not sure if I heard the answer. If this body met in July would we have had a chance to review or not?

Mr. Pumarijega: No.

Ms. Lunsford: When DCA issued it’s letter they had no comments.

Ms. Todd: I think if it comes before us we should have an opportunity to express an opinion.

Mr. Pumarijega: The state designated six or eight counties to take part in the alternative review process. With the new SB360, that will increase the number of counties and the cities within those counties. When we meet on a regular basis you will see that we purposefully separate the two types of Local Plan Amendments; the ones that have already been transmitted to DCA because of the 30 day clock, and the ones that have not. The Council should take action on the ones that are still within the review process time frame.

Chair Dodson called for a motion to approve (Black/Beckner) (15 yeas/11 opposed)

5. Review Item(s) or Any Other Item(s) for Discussion
Resolution #2009-03 Support for the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Funding for the Reparation of the Friendship Trail Bridge.

A request was received to bring forward a resolution in support of the TIGER funding for the Reparation of the Friendship Trail Bridge. A copy of the resolution was provided. Because of the grant application time line it was necessary to bring this to the August Council meeting for approval.

The Resolution was read into the record by Mr. Conn. Motion to approve (Kersteen/Todd).

6. Scott Collister, Director of Transportation Development for FDOT, District 7.
Council Member Andy Núñez suggested Mr. Collister present on the District Seven Workplan as well as provide an update on FDOT’s execution of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (AARA) projects, including the I-4 Crosstown Connector.

Looking back in 2006 there was a reduction in cash for the growth management funding. In 2008 the numbers picked up. In June of 2008 there was a reduction of $931 million out of the work program which translated into deferring $1.3 billion worth of projects out of the work program. A very challenging process, not only for District Seven but for all of the Districts statewide. The encouraging thing is when you look at March 2009 we are hopeful that things have tapered off. If you were to take a sub-set of this and look at the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), which are high priority corridors and those projects which are primarily the interstate system, this shows
that $5 billion out of the $9.5 billion reduction has been the cause of the delay of interstate projects. Within the District Seven area of responsibility it is the cause of the delay of work on I-75 and I-275. The reductions are because of the Doc Stamps and real estate market slowing down which are decreasing our revenue. We are required by law to have a balanced work program that we can finance and execute so unfortunately that means we have to defer projects.

Mr. Collister showed a slide that lists District Seven Corridors. Most of the corridors are on the interstate system. We have funded in the work program through 2015 $1.2 billion worth of work, but estimate that in order to complete the work we need another $2.5 billion which gives us a program of about $3.7 billion. A lot of the corridors already had design or right-of-way acquisition well underway in 2004 and 2005, but the impact of the economy has caused us to shift this work off into the future.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). The Department has put into the execution of this program to preserve and create jobs and promote economic recovery. We started this process in mid October when there was a dialogue going on nationally that the new administration was going to have a federal stimulus law (Public Law 111-5). We looked at all of our projects that we had under design that needed additional construction funding and asked how many of these jobs can we get ready, and how many can be ready in early 2009 after the law is signed? We also worked closely with all of our MPOs and the Citrus County BoCC to identify all of those projects that they felt were a priority in their area that needed to be added to this program.

Some of the implementing guidance that the federal highway issued to us includes expeditious delivery: preference shall be given to projects that can be started expeditiously - 50% of these funds need to be obligated by June 17, 2009. I am pleased to report that District Seven, as of that date, actually has 99.6% obligated for the projects that we have. We only had one project that was ineligible to participate in this program and we are now looking to find a replacement project so we can spend a small amount of the funds on that particular project. Within District Seven we have three counties that, as gauged by the 1965 law, are labeled as economically distressed areas - Citrus, Hernando and Pasco Counties. In our program we try to give priority to projects in those three counties.

Eligible Projects must be on roadways that are eligible for federal aid assistance; must be on the statewide and local Transportation Improvement Program; must comply with requirements of National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; and if right-of-way was acquired the acquisition must have followed the Uniform Relocation and Assistance Act.

Mr. Collister showed a slide with projects in Citrus County, Hernando County, and Pasco County. Within the District we have a total of 30 projects, seven of those will be led by the Department and 23 will be led by local agencies. The vast number of those are in Citrus and Hernando. The total amount of funds in Citrus is $9.5 million. In Hernando there are a large number of projects, 2 will be led by the Department. The total amount of funds in Hernando is $11 million in stimulus projects. Pasco County has two projects, US 41 is now under contract to widen a critical segment of 2.841 miles. This is a $14 million project. Total funds for Pasco County is $15.8 million.

What is unique about Pinellas and Hillsborough Counties is that both MPOs labeled a project on a state highway system, or one that had been deferred on the Work Program, as their number one priority. In Pinellas County it is the reconstruction of almost 2 miles of US 19 for about $45
million of stimulus dollars. The total stimulus dollars for Pinellas is $46 million. Hillsborough County’s project is the I-4 / Selmon Expressway was promoted by the Hillsborough County MPO as their number one project for stimulus funding. The total stimulus funding is about $105 million for Hillsborough County.

District Seven has a highway and bridge program that is about $197 million in stimulus and if you add to that the transit component, it's about $37 million in all five of the District’s counties, and then the direct grants by the federal government to the aviation authority of about $13 million. When you add it all up within District Seven it comes to $238 million in stimulus funds.

AARA Resources can be found at www.recovery.gov; http://flarecovery.com; and the Florida DOT ARRA Wesite: www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/economicstimulus.

The I-4/Lee Roy Selmon Connector is a project that is truly transforming the interstate system within Hillsborough County. This project has been on the books and has been talked about since 1989. Twenty years later we now have a project that is advertized and ready to put under construction. A critical date was the approval of our final environmental impact statement in 1996, followed by a record of decision in January 1997. There was a design change/reevaluation done last fall which brought us up to date with federal highway on changes we made to the connector design. We also have a small project that will start construction next month to improve the mobility and safety operations of the eastern end of the Howard Franklin Bridge. We are moving the decision point where people make the decision to head either to Tampa International or Kennedy Boulevard. That will be moved farther to the east because our modeling has shown that we can take out a lot of the weaving that goes on right now and improve the safety of that operation of the interstate significantly.

The connector project is about 1.5 miles and is an interchange that will connect I-4 and the Lee Roy Selmon/Crosstown Connector facility on the southern end. This is a critical Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) link to the Port of Tampa. It will provide choices for the traveling public that don’t exist today and will also provide flexibility for hurricane evacuation. Currently we are running industrial traffic or truck traffic in and out of the Port. On Tampa the 21st and 22nd Street corridor, across numerous railroad crossings and through numerous traffic signals. By building the connector we will reduce traffic in Ybor City by 43% and reduce truck traffic by 67%. This will be a significant change in moving traffic out of that corridor and out of the registered historical landmark district. Between 2000 and 2006, 130 truck related accidents took place and in 2007 there were 32 truck related accident along those two corridors.

The Port of Tampa has a significant need for this project. The Director and Port staff have a $350 million capital investment program they are doing to increase their container truck traffic. Their container business will explode in 2030 with a huge amount of truck traffic in and out of the Port. Daily, in round numbers, there are about 10,000-12,000 trucks going in and out of the Port of Tampa. The expansion to the Port of Tampa and the completion of the I-4 / Crosstown Connector also falls in line with the expansion of the Panama Canal which is scheduled to be completed in 2014. Construction to the connector will allow us to plug into a future extension of the downtown interchange. We have no plans on the books right now to have another project to reconstruct the downtown interchange in Tampa, however, we have locked ahead to see what it would be like to put express lanes through that facility.
The I-4 Connector consists of three movements. The “S” movement is to and from I-4 if you are westbound on I-4 and the connections you can make to the Port of Tampa or onto the Lee Roy Selmon. The “Z” movement is if you are traveling eastbound on I-4, and you can go to and from the Lee Roy Selmon and head eastbound into Brandon and points east. The “I” movement will take truck traffic traveling either eastbound or westbound on I-4 and put them onto a dedicated lane with their own dedicated ramps and carry them in and out of the Port of Tampa through explicit ramps that are designed to carry that truck traffic.

There have been a lot of challenges building this project. By far the largest project in both the planning and design phase that District Seven has ever undertaken. There will be a complex tolled urban interchange and you have a choice to head to the east toward Brandon. You will take a ramp that will carry you up and over the reversible express lanes of the Lee Roy Selmon. When the reversible express lanes project was designed and constructed there is actually a dip in the vertical profile where the facility goes down at grade. It was designed to accommodate this future project which we now have advertised for construction.

The complex tolled urban interchange is state of the art. All electronic polling, no man, cash, toll booths and very similar to the Sun Pass System you see operating statewide. All of the toll equipment will be accessible through the gangway above so if there is any maintenance that needs to be done the maintenance staff can go right across inside the gangway without interruption and delaying traffic in any way. This will be a toll facility and we are looking at very nominal tolls. Florida’s Turnpike has modeled the traffic volume and looked at the optimal toll rate to be on this facility. For the “S” movement the toll would be $1.00 and for the “Z” movement, 50 cents. For the truck movement the toll would also be $1.00. These are very modest tolls for an opening year of 2014 when the facility is constructed.

The right-of-way is now 100% complete. A significant number of residential owners, residential tenants, and businesses were relocated to different facilities in the area over a number of years to do this project.

This is an incredibly complex project for involvement with the CSX railroad. It was a very long process to accommodate not only their current needs but also to accommodate future needs for the operation of CSX within Hillsborough County.

We have spent over $5.5 million to date mediating hazardous sites. We have one of our own contractors that will work with the construction team when the project starts in order to deal with contaminated ground water when the foundation goes in for the project. A huge number of utilities will have to be relocated. A number of them are underway now.

We have this project advertised today with four different superstructure options for the contractor team to bid on and the challenge they have is determining which is the cheapest alternative because the Department is selecting the project based upon the lowest bid that is submitted.

We have incorporated about $18 million worth of deck panel into this job. There are numerous bridges and various sections of the deck panel that are showing significant amounts of wear. Since our contractor will be working where the bridges are within the project, we made a decision in 2005 and collaborated with Tampa/Hillsborough and they are investing $18 million of toll revenue to get all these deck replacements done by our contractor once the project is under
construction.

We have communicated with a lot of groups such as the general public, business owners, community associations, civic associations, the Port of Tampa and the Palmetto Beach Community. A lot of agencies have been involved in bringing this project forward. For a number of years the Department shared a design review committee to look at all the aesthetic features. In working with the Palmetto community, an area that is qualified to be a historic district, they really wanted to maintain a port type flavor in their neighborhood so when we construct the walls to hold up the ramps we will put a stain cargo container type look on the panels to make them look like stacked cargo containers. We also have the gateway going into 7th Avenue in Ybor City and we maintained the same architectural look. The full gantry will be approximately 110 feet in the air over existing Ybor City. We have selected the areas of 26th and 22nd Street where we have some aesthetic lighting that will add to the look of the connector as the facility crosses Lee Roy Selmon.

The amount of investment the Department has made today in design and right-of-way is $136.2 million. Our construction costs right now at a maximum bid price of $446.2 million. We do not anticipate that the project will cost that much.

The Build-Finance Project is the second one the District is doing. Last week we opened bids on our first build-finance project which is a unique project. What we have done is adapted the law passed in 2005 that allows a public/private partnership. We’ve only done it in a build-finance mode because we had invested so much in the design of US 19 we didn’t figure there was a lot of innovation or savings by paying for the engineering again and have an engineering team come in and bid on that project.

The first build-finance project that we advertised for which we opened bids on last Wednesday, has a maximum budget price of $162.3 million for this project. We received six bids which was significantly more than the Department team anticipated, and the low bidder bid $109.4 million. By using federal stimulus funds the Department is able to get this project underway years ahead of where the funding is in the work program by using the funds provided by the contractor who will then pay them back with the funds in the future work program under this unique process.

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

7. **Council Members’ Comments**

Secretary/Treasurer Collins provided a brief report on the June National Association of Regional Councils (NARC) Conference.

In early June, Mr. Pumariaga, Chair Dodson and Secretary/Treasurer Collins attended NARC’s 43rd Annual Conference and Exhibition in Denver, Colorado. The conference had over 450 attendees with the theme of Regional Innovation. NARC provided a very full agenda which ran from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. everyday. Topics included Green Infrastructure and Land Care, Transportation and Evacuation Planning, Passenger Rail Redevelopment as an Economic Engine, and Regional Climate Change Planning, as well as Integrated Air Quality and Transportation Planning. These are a sampling of the workshop topics that were offered throughout the conference. Mr. Pumariaga was also a presenter in a Best Practices Environmental Session. He was asked by NARC to redeliver the presentation that the Council heard regarding the model nitrogen ordinance. This presentation fell under the topic of Water Quality and Quantity and was
well attended. Presentations and materials are available at www.narc.org and there is also an update in your packet under Agenda Item #7 which are policy updates.

Chair Dodson pointed out that Ms. Collins serves on the NARC Board representing the State of Florida and Georgia and is in her first term.

8. **Program Reports**
   A. **Agency on Bay Management (ABM)** – Chair, Mr. Robert Kersteen
      The next Full Agency meeting will be on September 10th. Summaries of the June 11th and July 9th meetings were distributed.
   
   B. **Clearinghouse Review Committee (CRC)** - No Report
   
   C. **Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)** – No Report
   
   D. **Emergency Management** - No Report
   
   E. **Legislative Committee** – Chair, Mr. Julian Garcia, Jr. - No Report
   
   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**
Mr. Avera Wynne, Planning Director, provided a One Bay status report.

We became involved with One Bay for regional visioning. If we continue to develop at the pattern and rate from 1972 through 2005 and at 2050 there are concerns. It asks the question, is this the future we want for Tampa Bay or do we want something different? Moving forward, regions will compete to be great places to live and work and that will be the driver of economic development. We need to look at our land use patterns and everything else in order to compete. One Bay came together as a consortium of five partners. Reality Check was held in May 2007 where folks played with Legos and a lot of information was gained from that exercise. We developed those into concepts and took them out to the counties and held workshops where another 700+ folks participated in Lego exercises. The workshops had guiding principles to create a sense of place, maximizing multi-modal transportation, preserve natural systems, balance jobs and housing, strengthen economic development, and sustaining the role of agriculture.

Four scenarios were developed. Greg Miller and Brady Smith have done a lot of work developing these scenarios. Scenario A is “business as usual” and to continue to grow as we have been. Scenario B is where we took a lot of the Lego data and molded it into a scenario, paying close attention to what the 1,000 folks created with their Legos. Scenario C has a lot more emphasis on compact development, more multi-modal transportation. Scenario D started with scenario B where people placed their Legos and told us where they thought development might go in the future, or where they thought it should go. This is also the environmental avoidance scenario where people placed additional emphasis on avoiding the environment. That becomes important when you hear the Mason Dixon results because it was portrayed on the
telephone as environmental.

By using the indicators for each of the four different scenarios folks could get an indication of how land is impacted, electrical usage, vehicle miles traveled, wetlands impacted and water demand. The Voice It Campaign last summer had 3,500+ people go on the internet and vote on the scenarios. We also had the magazine with a form to mail in. Overall, 54% chose scenario C which was the compact development scenario with an emphasis on additional transportation modes. Most importantly, only 4% chose scenario A which shows people are rejecting “business as usual.” Cost of Living, Employment, and Mass Transit were the three most important issues facing the future of Tampa Bay. Closely behind is water availability and water quality.

The Mason Dixon Poll took place in early June 2009. One Bay commissioned a Mason Dixon Polling survey of 1,100 adult residents of Hillsborough, Pinellas, Pasco, Polk, Hernando, Manatee and Sarasota counties by telephone from June 1 through June 5, 2009. The margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points. It is important to note that the survey took place when we were at the height of the drought and there was a lot of emphasis in the newspapers about water conservation. This is a scientifically valid survey and it matches the demographics of the seven counties very well. The residents rejected scenario A. They said they don’t like “business as usual.” They did like scenario D the best in this poll because it is protecting water resources, per the verbiage. A little different from last summer was employment, public education, water availability and to a slightly lesser degree, transportation issues were the issues of importance. I think transportation slipped a little because of gas prices being a little less and water was more scarce this year. There is some seasonality to the way people responded. The important thing was that they said that it is important that we plan for the future growth to minimize water demand. We need to maximize the amount of open spaces and we need to try to reduce automobile trips by enhancing rail, bus transit options and the like.

Scenario D came out number one on this poll. When we did the Voice It Campaign we allowed people to state that they liked a blend of different scenarios and they were able to tell us. In the Poll that option was not available. The pollers asked questions in a different way. The question was: Which one of the following do you feel local planners should give the highest emphasis to? The first one was protecting lands that have environmental value; second was to reduce automobile use by creating compact, walkable communities near mass transit stations; third was placing residential areas in close proximity to where people work; forth was to maintain current government regulation of land use, and fifth was not sure, which was not read. They were basically validating the results with A, B, C and D with the question stated a different way. The one that was rejected was scenario A.

The One Bay scenario is being developed based on the Voice It! responses with consideration given to the Mason Dixon Poll. The scenario seeks to incorporate the preferred elements of B & D into C, which represents a blended scenario based on the levels of support indicated in survey responses. Preliminary recommendations help guide the scenario formulation as well. The policies for One Bay are to “promote transit and transit oriented development, encourage compact development, encourage preservation of open space and agricultural land, support housing options and support environmentally sustainable growth.”

Where are we going from here? We are refining the One Bay scenario based on all this information that we have. We are completing a report that details the 2,500 responses we received, as well as all the data from the surveys. We will be working with experts and
stakeholders over the next few months to help refine and we will put that in to a document. There will be a Transportation Forum in October and we will highlight transit oriented development at that time, similar to Cents of Place last year but with an emphasis on what is happening in other communities like Charlotte and how that translates into what One Bay could be. There is a ULI Conference in November and we will get some detailed information on the Mason Dixon Poll as well as Voice It! and bring the development community up to date on where One Bay is. In February, March, or April 2010 we will have a Reality Check II where we reconvene everyone that was originally together and show them what they created.

One Bay partners are: Southwest Florida Water Management District, Tampa Bay Estuary Program, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, Tampa Bay Vision 21, and ULI Tampa Bay. For more information: www.myonebay.com

Questions & Comments:
Commissioner Beckner: When would you expect that specific recommendation be provided to governmental bodies for consideration?

Mr. Wynne: After sitting down one final time with stakeholders and subject matter experts it could be as early as November and as late as February/March/April 2010. There is a lot of underlying information available. One of the things I didn’t cover is that we have done a lot of comparisons with land use and how One Bay and TBARTA match up.

Vice Chairrr Mariano: The numbers on A go from 4% to 12%. I thought that was interesting, but even still the C category was at 54% and then when you add up C and D after the survey it totals up to 55%? What are your thoughts on that?

Mr. Wynne: In the way it was described, when folks did Voice It! last summer they had a two to three paragraph description of that scenario and they tried to help people envision what the lifestyle in those four scenarios would be like. Some people were able to view presentations and then voted. There was a lot of education for the person filling out the survey. The Mason Dixon Poll’s strength is that we had 1,100 people with diverse representations of the county but they may not have been as aware of the One Bay concepts. All they had to go on when they voted was a two-three minute description of that scenario. I think when people were voting they were voting on key words. They didn’t have any kind of spatial representation of what those scenarios looked like.

Mr. Pumariega: Commissioner Beckner, also the time table may be extended because the One Bay Steering Committee is looking to set up a leadership group to try and use them as a springboard with our ideas before we take this formally to the local governments to implement in their local plans. The time table may be extended a little longer.

Chair Dodson: Are you still making presentations around the region?
Mr. Wynne: We don’t have a formal program right now, but we certainly wouldn’t turn down the opportunity to spread the word.

Chair Dodson: I can vouch for the fact that I’ve invited speakers in our community to come and address civic groups on other occasions and they have done an exceptional job. If Council Members have civic clubs or associations in their municipality they could benefit from hearing this presentation.
10. Executive/Budget Committee Report – Chair Dodson - None
   The next meeting will be held on September 14, 2009 at 9:00 a.m.

11. Executive Director’s Report
    The Legislative Committee will meet immediately following the September 14, 2009 Council meeting.

12. Chair’s Report
    The Chair reminded Council Members of the upcoming workshop:

    Senate Bill 360 / “Community Renewal Act”
    Tuesday, August 25th
    Registration: 9:30 a.m.
    Program: 10 a.m. to Noon
    Quorum Hotel
    700 N. Westshore Blvd.
    Tampa, FL 33609

    Next meeting, September 14, 2009 at 10:00 a.m.

Adjournment: 11:35 a.m.

[Signatures]
William Dodson, Chair
Lori Denman, Recording Secretary