Council Minutes
March 14, 2011
10:00 a.m.

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT
Chair, Vice Mayor Bill Dodson, City of Plant City
Vice Chair, Commissioner Larry Bustle, Manatee County
Secretary/Treasurer, Mayor Bob Minning, City of Treasure Island
Past Chair, Commissioner Jack Mariano, Pasco County
Commissioner Nina Bandoni, City of Safety Harbor
Commissioner Ron Barnette, City of Dunedin
Commissioner Neil Brickfield, Pinellas County
Commissioner Woody Brown, City of Largo
Commissioner Victor Crist, Hillsborough County
Commissioner Al Halpern, City of St. Pete Beach
Councilman Sam Henderson, City of Gulfport
Council Member Bill Jonson, City of Clearwater
Mr. Robert Kersteen, Pinellas County Gubernatorial Appointee
Mr. Harry Kinnan, Manatee County Gubernatorial Appointee
Ms. Angeleah Kinsler, Hillsborough County Gubernatorial Appointee
Councilman Bob Langford, City of New Port Richey
Councilor Bob Matthews, City of Seminole
Council Member Janice Miller, City of Oldsmar
Councilwoman Mary Mulhern, City of Tampa
Council Member Wengay Newton, City of St. Petersburg
Mr. Andy Núñez, Pinellas County Gubernatorial Appointee
Mayor Kathleen Peters, City of South Pasadena
Vice Mayor Patrick Roff, City of Bradenton
Vice Mayor Robin Saenger, City of Tarpon Springs
Ms. Barbara Sheen Todd, Pinellas County Gubernatorial Appointee
Mr. Earl Young, Pasco County Gubernatorial Appointee
Ms. Diana Bandlow, Alt., Ex-Officio, Department of Environmental Protection
Mr. Ming Gao, Alt., Ex-Officio, Florida Department of Transportation
Ms. Michelle Miller, Ex-Officio, Enterprise Florida
Mr. Todd Pressman, Ex-Officio, Southwest Florida Water Management District

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT
Mayor Scott Black, City of Dade City
Mayor Shirley Groover Bryant, City of Palmetto
Council Member David Pogorilich, City of Temple Terrace
Vice Mayor Ed Taylor, City of Pinellas Park
Ms. Kim Vance, Hillsborough County Gubernatorial Appointee
Mr. Charles Waller, Pasco County Gubernatorial Appointee
OTHERS PRESENT
Trisha Neasman, Planner, SWFWMD
John Healey, Planner, Hillsborough County
Will Augustine, Planner, Hillsborough County Planning Commission
Tom Patton, Brown & Brown
Scott Davis, Senior Manager, CB&H
John Gilberto, Partner, CB&H

STAFF PRESENT
Mr. Manny Pumariega, Executive Director
Mr. Donald Conn, Legal Counsel
Ms. Suzanne Cooper, Principal Planner
Ms. Lori Denman, Recording Secretary
Mr. Marshall Flynn, Principal Planner
Mr. John Jacobsen, Accounting Manager
Ms. Betti Johnson, Principal Planner
Ms. Wren Kralh, Director of Administration/Public Information
Ms. Jessica Lunsford, Senior Planner
Mr. John Meyer, Principal Planner
Mr. Greg Miller, Senior Planner
Mr. Patrick O’Neil, Senior Planner
Ms. Amanda Shaw, Senior Planner
Mr. Brady Smith, Senior Planner
Mr. Avera Wynne, Planning Director

Call to Order – Chair Dodson
The March 14, 2011 regular meeting of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TBRPC) was called to order at 10:09 a.m.

The Invocation was given by Councilman Wengay Newton, followed by the pledge of allegiance.

Roll Call -- Recording Secretary
A quorum was present.

Voting Conflict Report -- Recording Secretary - None

Announcements: - Chair Dodson
• The Future of the Region Awards Luncheon is taking place Friday, March 18th at the Wyndham Hotel Westshore, Tampa. The luncheon is complimentary for Council Members and members were asked to RSVP in order to have an accurate count for the luncheon.

• Chair Dodson read the following letter from the Governor’s Office into the record:

  Dear Mr. Dodson:
  Thank you for contacting Governor Rick Scott and sharing your concerns about high speed rail. The Governor asked that I respond on his behalf.

  Governor Scott rejected the Obama Administration’s plan to partially-fund the costly Tampa to Orlando high-speed rail project. The decision to reject the project comes down
to three main economic realities:

- The capital cost overruns from the project could obligate Florida taxpayers to pay an additional $3 billion;
- Ridership and revenue projections are historically overly-optimistic and would likely result in $300 - $575 million in taxpayer subsidies over 10 years; and,
- If the project became too costly for taxpayers and is shut down, the state would have to return the $2.4 billion in federal funds.

Governor Scott believes that rather than investing in a high-risk rail project, Florida should focus on improving our ports and existing rail and highway infrastructure to attract increased import and export business. In doing so, Florida can become a global hub for trade and create thousands of jobs.

Rest assured, the Governor is committed to providing Floridians with the best transportation options possible, provided the investment yields a meaningful return for the investors - our taxpayers.

Thank you again for taking the time to contact the Governor’s office.

Sincerely,
Kira R. Frye
Office of Citizen Services

- Congratulations were extended to Councilwoman Mary Mulhern, City of Tampa and Councilor Bob Matthews, City of Seminole for their re-elections.

- Birthday wishes were extended to Angeleah Kinsler.

- Councilman Sam Henderson, City of Gulfport, was welcomed to the Council.

- Vice Mayor Robin Saenger is term limited next month and this was her last meeting. She has been a Council member since 2006 and served on the Council’s Agency on Bay Management as well as the Legislative Committee. Her contributions to her community and the Council have been numerous and TBRPC benefitted from her ears of service. Vice Mayor Saenger was presented with an engraved bookmark.

Vice Mayor Saenger thanked the Council. She said she has made some great friendships while serving and has learned a lot. A favorite was her service on the Agency on Bay Management. Tarpon Springs is a working waterfront and sitting on ABM has contributed a lot of knowledge. Vice Mayor Saenger thanked Mr. Kersteen for his work on ABM and Ms. Cooper, as well as the staff of the TBRPC. The City of Tarpon Springs has sent out three resolutions to the Governor, in one day. One was for high speed rail, one was for pill mills, and the other was for the RPCs. We all have different ideas and ideologies and we all have ideas on the best way to run the government, and we all have the best answers. But sometimes to reach across the aisle is as simple as a handshake and we can meet each other there, whether we are different political parties, or whatever seems to separate us. Sometimes it is so overwhelming that it seems like it’s almost impossible to reach. I think that’s the feeling I’m getting here, that somewhere we have to find a way to let ourselves be heard. I’m reminded of a poem by the mystical poet Rumi, who
said that somewhere there is a place beyond ideas or right doing and wrong doing and there is a field and I will meet you there. I think that’s what we are going through. Hopefully you will stay strong and your voices will be heard.

1. **Approval of Minutes** – Secretary/Treasurer Minning
   The minutes from the February 14, 2011 regular meeting were approved. (Kersteen/Newton)

2. **Budget Committee** – Secretary/Treasurer Minning
   A. The Financial Report for the period ending 01/31/11 was approved. (Saenger/Newton)
   B. Mr. Scott Davis, Cherry Bekaert & Holland, presented the FY 2010 Annual Audit. Cherry Bekaert & Holland was engaged to render an opinion on the financial statements dated FY ending September 30, 2010 and dated our report February 14, 2011, as required by generally accepted auditing standards of the United States of America. We rendered an unqualified opinion, or as more commonly known a clean opinion. That means the financial statements are presented fairly in accordance with all material respects and in conformity with the U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The Government Auditing Standards (GAS) report passed internal controls and compliance with grants, regulations, state statutes and those types of items. Even though we don’t audit specifically for compliance and internal controls if we identify anything we are required to report that to you. We did not require anything that rose to a level of material weakness and internal controls, and we did not notice any compliance issues that need to be disclosed. There were no material weaknesses or significant deficiencies.

   We issued an unqualified report under OMB Circular A-133. This report was not issued last year as you were not required to have a single audit performed. This year we had two major programs: Department of Commerce-Economic Adjustment Assistance Grant and the other was the Department of Homeland Security-Emergency Management Performance Grant. When your federal reaches $500,000 or greater you are required to have an audit under OMB Circular A-133. We did not have any compliance findings which is also a very good testament to management’s control.

   We also issued our report under Chapter 10550 Rules of the Auditor General, State of Florida. We had no deficiencies to report.

   We are independent in relation to the Council. There were no new accounting policies or changes to policies in the current year. Next year there will be a change to one of your accounting policies to the limitations of GASB54.

**Questions:**

Councilman Newton: Is that GASB54 not 34?
Mr. Davis: Yes. GASB34 is related to journal entries that we made.
Councilman Newton: Is GASB54 compliant - is GASB34 a part of that?
Mr. Davis: That’s something different. 34 was previously implemented. 54 is new and relates to the fund balance accounting and to the definition of special revenue funds.

The FY 2010 Annual Audit was approved. (Nunez/Janice Miller)
3. Consent Agenda – Chair Dodson
   A. Budget and Contractual

   1. The County Emergency Management agencies of Citrus, Hernando, Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco, Pinellas and Sarasota have requested that TBRPC staff provide assistance in the production and coordination of printing and distribution of the annual hurricane guide. Bids were received from three (3) print companies based on the specifications provided. Newspaper Printing Company, Tampa, FL, a local firm was again selected based on past performance and references, demonstrated capabilities and lowest cost. Print placement and management services will be provided by Printing Solutions of Florida.

   Action Recommended: Authorization for the Executive Director sign a Purchase Order for up to $40,000 with the Printing Solutions of Florida for services of the 2011 Hurricane Guide.

   Staff contact: Betti Johnson, ext. 39

   2. Pinellas County Planning Department would like technical support in the enhancement of the Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plan (PDRP) to include the Health and Human Services component. Staff will work with the Planning Department, the Disaster Recovery Leadership Network (DRLN) and the County Health Department to incorporate these vital elements in the PDRP.

   Action Recommended: Authorization for the Chair to enter into an Interlocal Agreement with Pinellas County for $30,000 to address Health and Human Services in the Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plan.

   Staff contact: Betti Johnson, ext. 39

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

   1. IC&R Reviews by Jurisdiction - February 2011
   2. IC&R Database - February 2011

   Action Recommended: None. Information Only.

   Staff contact: John Meyer, ext. 29

C. DRI Development Order Reports (DOR) - None

   Staff contact: John Meyer, ext. 29

D. DRI Development Order Amendment Reports (DOAR)

   1. DRI # 145 – Southbend, Hillsborough County
   2. DRI # 266 – Waterset, Hillsborough County

   Action Recommended: Approve staff reports

   Staff contact: John Meyer, ext. 29

E. Notice of Proposed Change (Nopc) Reports – None

   Staff contact: John Meyer, ext. 29
F. Annual Report Summaries (ARS)/Biennial Report Summaries (BRS) – None
   Staff contact: John Meyer, ext. 29

G. DRI Status Report
   Action Recommended: None. Information Only.
   Staff contact: John Meyer, ext. 29

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 # 08-1, City of Bradenton (adopted)

   Action Recommended: For Information
   Staff contact: Jessica Lunsford, ext. 38

The consent agenda was approved. (Brickfield/Newton)

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. Horizon 2060: Florida’s Transportation Plan (FTP) for 2060
   Ms. Huiwei Shen, Florida Department of Transportation’s Office of Policy and Planning
   provided a presentation on the recently completed Florida Transportation Plan. To view the
   plan: [www.2060ftp.org](http://www.2060ftp.org)  The DOT still does not have a secretary but the Governor has
   completed his interviews of the three candidates that were recommended to him by the
   Transportation Commission. The Department has a very straight forward legislative package this
   year. We are just cleaning up some language that was outdated in the statutes and cleaning up
   some of the language with regards to CEDS.

   The Florida long range transportation plan is a plan for all of Florida. Although DOT is the lead
   in developing this plan, it is not a plan just developed for DOT. The plan is written by the
   Steering Committee. The Plan establishes policy framework for expenditure of state and federal
   transportation funds which flows through the Department’s five year work program. It has a lot
   of relevance and provides policy guidance for all transportation partners. In addition, FTP also
   identifies the roles and responsibilities of all partners for implementing this plan.

   Based on the State Statute, the FTP has to be updated every five years. It was updated last year
   with an extensive out reach program. To develop the plan we developed a Steering Committee
   that is composed of 30 representatives (modal operators, citizens, military, local representatives)
for cities and counties, and Pat Steed represented the RPCs. To help them write the Plan we also expanded by forming four advisory groups that focused on four different issue areas. Mr. Pumariega participated in several of these advisory groups. The advisory groups wrote the language and presented it to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee made changes and then approved it, and then the Plan was developed. We held 12 regional workshops to gather input on key transportation issues throughout the state. We also had a web-based public comment period and overall we heard from over 10,000 people. We also held a statewide summit and at the beginning of the process we held a webinar that was attended by over 500 people. At the end of the process we had another webinar and told everybody that the plan was going to be on the website for public comment. These webinars were very effective in reaching out to the general public. During the official public comment period we recorded every comment that was received, as well as our response to the comment. Now the Plan is posted on our website: www.2060ftp.org

A lot of people asked why we picked a 50 year plan when the law only requires the Plan to address 20 or more years into the future. The reason is because we wanted to rise above our day to day transportation concerns. We wanted to be visionary and take a look at the entire state and figure out what kind of legacy we wanted to leave behind. What do we want the state to look like in 2060? The interstate system gradually came into fruition within a 50 year time span. If we want to move people and freight more efficiently and more effectively, if we want to do something different, now is the time to think about it.

One concern that we gathered throughout the public comment period was that a lot of people thought this was a 50 year plan and we are not doing implementation right away. They wrote 1,200 emails within three days from the Sierra Club urging us to take immediate actions to implement the plan. We had to clarify that this is a 50 year plan but implementation starts today. We will update the plan in five years so I have a plan implementation for the next 5 years.

What do we want Florida’s transportation system to look like in 2060? We want to have a multi-modal transportation system with better connectivity to urban and rural areas. Connectivity was discussed at length with the Steering Committee. We want to have greater reliance on public transportation including statewide passenger rail and enhanced transit systems. We want to integrate our multi-modal system of trade gateways, logistical centers, and transportation corridors to move people and goods more efficiently and seamlessly. We also want to enhance our global leadership in air and space transportation systems. We also want to take into account the new generations of infrastructure, vehicles, fuels and technologies. Things are changing rapidly.

The 2060 FTP Goals have been structured a little differently. There are three goals for how transportation supports Florida’s future. They are not focused narrowly just on transportation. We need a competitive economy and we want to make transportation decisions to support an enhance liveable communities and we want to continue our leadership with environmental stewardship. The three goals for the performance of the transportation system provide a safe and secure transportation system for all users; maintenance and operation; improve mobility and connectivity for people and freight.
How is this plan a little different from the previous transportation plans? The last plan was 2025 FTP. This plan has the continued emphasis on these traditional transportation goal areas such as: safety, security, emergency response; infrastructure maintenance; environmental stewardship; and transportation choices. However, there are a few new emphasis: economic diversification; creating liveable communities; reducing energy consumption, improving air quality, reducing greenhouse gas emissions; maximizing use of existing infrastructure; and reduce the fragmentation - transportation governance and decision making.

We have representatives from the private industry on the Steering Committee. A lot of them were struck by the large number of entities that are involved in transportation decision making. The push for regional coordination has been a very important topic for the Steering Committee. Right now we have completed the update of the Plan. What we are working on is to implement the Plan within the Department and also with partners to implement our Plan. There are three major issues that we need to focus on:

• We need to have a 21st Century Governance Model. The FTP calls for the creation of a statewide vision that is coordinated with all the local and regional visioning efforts that have taken place. Gather them all together and develop a coherent statewide vision for the entire state.

• Enhance regional coordination and decision making. They were specific and want to transition Florida’s MPO structure to focus on regional and metropolitan scale transportation issues. We gave them the charge of starting from scratch to think about what is the best structure and framework for transportation decision making. The Steering Committee also talked about strengthening regional transportation planning and priority setting in rural areas; promote integrated regional transit solutions; and, strengthen regional coordination among modal partners and operating agencies. When they talk about regional coordination it is not just amongst MPOs, counties and cities and the RPCs. It’s also about the modal partners and transit agencies.

One thing we would like to hear from you is, how do we best approach this? How do we provide incentives and remove barriers to regional coordination?

The Steering Committee was also very insistent on the fact that we need to come up with a statewide needs framework. What are our transportation needs? We have a pretty good handle within the DOT’s work program, but once we go out to the cities and counties and our modal partners - how do we develop a needs framework? The Steering Committee has a very good message for us, we need to be prepared to offer coherent needs from everybody. We will be working with our partners to see if we can come to a consensus as to what is the best methodology to use to start developing the statewide needs framework.

We need to start tracking progress. The Department is going to develop the 2011 Performance Report that will report the Department’s implementation progress based on the 2060 FTP goals and objectives. We are also going to talk with our partners to see what is the best way to develop a statewide scorecard so we can let people know how we are doing in terms of implementing the FTP goals and objectives. It will be a multi-year process. We are currently laying the background for implementing these three major issues but we will need to talk with the new secretary to see how far we will push these priorities. Right now we are going out to our partners to communicate to them the goals and objectives to see if they can incorporate them into their
plans. When we were at the FRCA meeting a few weeks ago there was a strong interest in working with DOT to develop the regional approach to transportation planning and one short term item that the FRCA members thought they could do is to integrate the 2060 FTP into their Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP) as they update their plans. The RPCs would like to see a model for regional planning in all parts of the state and have also offered their help if we need it to develop an investments framework to do the needs analysis for all the MPOs.

Council Member J. Miller: It seems to me that the DOT’s hands are tied because the Governor turned down the railway. You can’t have multi-modal without rail.

Ms. Shen: It is stated in the Plan that we need to have interconnected passenger and freight rail systems in the state of Florida and rail was a big issue for a lot of our partners and the general public. Multi-modal is one thing that’s emphasized in the transportation plan. What we are doing right now is waiting until we have a new secretary and talk to the Governor to see and advance his priorities.

Mr. Gao: High speed rail is only a part of a multi-modal system. We do have a big transportation system in the state. This plan gives us a policy guideline on how to develop our program. A lot of projects support multi-modal development. For example, we have a big project-the Crosstown Connector project. We are looking at it as a highway project however, if you look at the region it supports the seaport in Tampa and that is a big economic engine in the area.

Council Member J. Miller: So when it comes into the port it will be moved by truck and will still be on our highways.

Mr. Gao: We are investing in rail systems, just not high speed rail. We are supporting freight movement. We consistently invest money into our rail system, moving freight back and forth throughout the country. High Speed Rail is only one of the components.

Commissioner Crist: Generally, looking at the last six Governors, the Governor generally starts with larger agencies in making appointments. Is it too early, or can you give us an idea of what he would be willing to support? Not necessarily rail - what areas of transportation is he showing interest in?

Mr. Gao: He has emphasized economic development. He made the announcement about the dredging project at the Port of Miami to deepen the channel in order to receive larger ships after the Panama Canal is expanded. I think he is putting a lot of emphasis on economic development. Transportation is obviously tied to economic development, you have to have a transportation infrastructure in place to support that.

Commissioner Crist: You can fit a lot of different things into the category of economic development. Is it safe to assume that if we had a rail
line going from a port or an airport to a major distribution hub in order to move good and services quickly that this might be something he could be interested in?

Mr. Gao:
I can’t really speak on his behalf, but whatever direction he gives us is what we will do.

Commissioner Bustle:
I really question the viability of a 2060 Plan. Technology turns around in 2-15 years. New technology from today, everything that we are using and doing is going to be affected by new things that we don’t even know about. I think you can only afford to put some futuristic type goals into a 2060 plan, whereas a 2030 or 2025 plan is maybe something that you and people sitting in this room could see as coming into being. I’m a little bit skeptical and I truly believe we need some good guidance on where this state should be. I agree the high speed rail is a part of the guidance we need, but the comments that have been made are instead of putting money in the high speed rail we would like to put it into the ports. I happen to be the Port Authority Chairman for Port Manatee and I haven’t seen any money put into my port. I know we spend about $8 million a year. Look at the potential Ports have as an example of economic development and see how badly they have been neglected.

Ms. Shen:
You aren’t the only one who brought that to our attention. What we are doing right now is to work with our partners to start the immediate implementation to focus on the short-term items and also work with the administration to see what the Governor’s priorities would be and work with that to push them forward. We don’t want this to be a plan that’s just on the shelf. I understand you are skeptical of the 2060 time frame, but during the implementation process we are going to make this plan relevant. When we update the Plan in the next five years we will take a look at the time frame to see if we should continue 2060 or scale it back to 2040 or 2045.

Councilman Newton:
I don’t see how you are going to have transportation without rail. Everything you have done up to this time was about rail. I was in Denver the first week in December to look at their transportation plan. They got 38 Mayor’s to agree along a stretch of rail because of all the infrastructure and all the transportation oriented development that was going to go along that rail. Our Governor is talking about one Port and that’s all the economic development there’s going to be.

Ms. Shen:
Without the high speed rail, that doesn’t mean the Department is going to stop working on multi-modal. We are trying to do the best that we can to move people and freight in a more interconnected way and also invest in logistical centers with a connected passenger and freight rail system.

Councilman Newton:
You can’t push transportation as economic development when you don’t have ways to move people. Florida is a tourist
destination and always has been. I don’t see how it’s going to work.

Ms. Michele Miller: Enterprise Florida is the state’s economic development organization and I think one of the things you said is key to what we are going to need to do and that is to develop the measures of success. When you talk about what does it cost to move a product, what are the opportunities that are lost based on our investment - when you have your measures in place, when you have the data. Right now there is an emotional feeling that this train is what we need for Florida. It works in other places and it ought to work here. What is more compelling are actual numbers. What is the opportunity that is lost? Who is it that when they come here, they can’t get employees, they can’t move their product and they are going somewhere else. That speaks to what the Governor really cares about.

Commissioner Mariano: Last May we had the City of Orlando’s regional council donate $25,000 to help push rail and that shows how important the high speed connection is going to be.

Ms. Shen: I understand the high speed rail issue is going to come up but other than that, we do have these governance and regional coordination issues that we would like to work with the Council on. The high speed rail was not the only issue that we originally wanted to talk to you about.

Council Member J. Miller: Is CSX subsidized by the government?

Mr. Gao: I’m not aware of any subsidy being sent to CSX, but we are partnering with moving freight and we would partner with doing crossing enhancement.

Council Member J. Miller: So that entails the government putting out money for projects with CSX.

Mr. Gao: I don’t see it as a subsidy because when you have rail crossings at a highway and a rail comes through, you have all the traffic backing up. We need to take care of that problem first. Second, I think providing a more efficient movement of freight is a benefit to the economy of the state. We see a lot of benefit in that and that’s why we invest money into those improvements.

Council Member J. Miller: We are dealing with that right now. We recently opened a road and we are going across CSX tracks. Tampa generously said they would give up one of their crossings so we could have that. Can you only have so many crossing with FDOT?

Chair Dodson: We are going to limit questions to the presentation.

Vice Mayor Saenger: I sat on the MPO before TBARTA and high speed rail was up there. There has to be an opportunity to every challenge. One of the opportunities we have is to focus on local to make our communities better. Tarpon Springs is the only city in Pinellas County to have a multi-mode of transportation. To start locally
and do what we can within the counties, within the cities. Our ports cannot accommodate the big container ships and our airports cannot accommodate the cargo planes with freight. We don’t have that capability in Florida to have those giant ships and giant planes. I’m wondering if we are able to get there, what do we need to do to have that capability? But also, for 50 cents I can buy a head of garlic from Peru. I think that seems like an out of balance way to move produce that we could easily grow here. I think as a result we do have power in our local communities and we do have power in our counties and at that level we need to see what opportunities we have to create systems within those local areas that we have some say over.

Ms. Todd:

The Governor’s already made a decision on the high speed rail so I think we need to move on. What Vice Mayor Saenger has said is very appropriate and I would like to make some suggestions as to how the TBRPC could be helpful to you (DOT) and the Governor. I think it would be a good idea if we let him know what Tarpon Springs is doing and maybe encourage the Governor to have an opportunity for some of the local communities and perhaps the people he selects could come up with some ideas that he feels would be financially feasible for us to grow upon. Secondly, you heard one of our Council people mention our ports, Manatee and Tampa. Perhaps the Governor is thinking that we need to be taking products out. One of the things we could offer would be an insight on some of the ports we have and the opportunity for him to explore beyond Miami, in the Tampa Bay region specifically. Third, you heard discussions about 2060 - I don’t think there is a problem with dealing 50 years ahead. I would suggest that one of the ways the RPC could help you and some of our other partners could assist you would be if you would set up some five year time periods where you would have performance measurement of those goals and fine tune them with technology. Lastly, one of the strengths of the RPCs around Florida is that we have developed very advanced economic development data that we would be happy to share with him and assist and define the kinds of economies that we have seen grow in different areas and needs for regional or statewide cooperation could work effectively.

Commissioner Brickfield:

I enjoyed your presentation today. I am glad someone is working on 2060. Somebody in our state better be thinking about what we are going to look like in 50 years. When it comes to the high speed rail, Governor Rick Scott said from day one of his campaign that he didn’t like the high speed rail. I wasn’t surprised he got rid of it. I would like to remind everyone that high speed rail is only one part of our total transportation plan for the state and what we are really talking about is mobility and whenever we increase mobility our economy grows and there’s lots of ways to increase mobility.
Councilwoman Mulhern: Do we know who the three candidates for secretary are?
Ms. Shen: They are:

- Thomas Conrecode, Vice President of Collier Enterprises and former member of the Florida Transportation Commission.
- Ananth Prasad, FDOT’s assistant secretary for engineering & operations.
- Gordon Goodin, former Santa Rosa County Commissioner.

Councilwoman Mulhern: I agree with Commissioner Brickfield about the value of long range planning and what really strikes me right now is the big picture with rising sea levels and coastal development. The earthquake and tsunami in Japan brings home how we need to plan where we are developing. Not just our transportation corridors, but all of the development that we are doing. I think this has to be done in a long range plan. As a RPC, we also look at emergency management and I think that the management that we have to do in times of crisis needs to be thought of in the planning stages.

Ms. Shen: There were sharply diverging views amongst the Steering Committee members on sea level and climate change but what we discovered is that we need to have good planning practices and engineering practices to protect our infrastructure. We do address these issues in the 2060 FTP.

Chair Dodson recognized John Jacobsen, TBRPC Accounting Manager and his staff for their outstanding work.

7. Council Member Comments

Councilman Newton: Thanked everyone for their support for the City of St. Petersburg as the city mourns the loss of three officers.

Mr. Núñez: The FDOT has not taken high speed rail and commuter rail off of the table because of this one particular opportunity being turned back. Sometime in the future perhaps we will see this occurring. Sun Rail has a big problem with the indemnification of rail lines. I serve on the Engineering & Construction Committee on the Florida Statewide Passenger Rail Transportation Commission. Everything has vision and opportunity, we just have to be as informed as possible and supportive as possible.

8. Program Reports

A. Agency on Bay Management (ABM) – Chair, Mr. Robert Kersteens

Vice Mayor Robin Saenger was recognized and Mr. Kersteens thanked her for participating
on the Agency on Bay Management for the past five years. Chair Kersteen said the ABM have appreciated her involvement and enthusiasm and hopes she will continue to be actively engaged in regional issues and in environmental issues, and wished her well.

The full Agency met on March 10th. On the agenda were several items:
Brady Smith, Senior Planner, presented the background and results of the Resilient Tampa Bay workshop held in February with Dutch experts on how to cope with high water (from urban flooding, storm surge and sea level rise) and possible future steps for the Tampa Bay region. Brady will be providing the presentation to this Council later in this meeting.

Dr. Robert Dean, Professor Emeritus of the Department of Civil and Coastal Engineering at the University of Florida, presented his research on understanding the variations in Sea Level Rise acceleration based on U.S. Tide Gauges and other analyses, including 150 years of records from Europe.

The Agency discussed various 2011 legislative proposals that affect Tampa Bay and the natural resources of the region. Mr. Rick Tschantz, Director of Legal & Administrative Services for the Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County, provided an overview of several issues addressed in current legislation. Ms. Sally Thompson, the Agency’s Legislative Review committee chair, led the discussion.

The Agency adopted positions on several of the bills now before the state’s legislators, and voted to send that information to this Council for its use as well as to the members of the Tampa Bay legislative delegation. The positions paper is in your folders this morning. We would appreciate you holding on to this paper and supporting these positions when you discuss legislation with your legislators.

One of more of the Agency’s committees will meet on April 14th, and the next full Agency meeting will be May 12th. All are welcome.

B. Clearinghouse Review Committee (CRC) - No Report
Mr. Avera Wynne, Planning Director, deferred his report on the Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP) to the April 11th meeting.

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

D. Emergency Management - No Report

E. Legislative Committee – Mayor Scott Black, Chair
Mayor Black was absent due to jury duty and Chair Dodson provided a report.
There was a Joint Meeting of the Executive Budget Committee and the Legislative
Committee this morning to discuss pressing matters of the Legislature.

These are in very challenging times, as we all know. Budgets are tight, revenues are down, but the demands on local governments keep increasing as the state shifts more and more programs to county and city government. Nowhere is this more evident than in legislation concerning the regional planning councils that is being considered during the current legislative session.

The House Community and Military Affairs Committee has already met on proposed legislation that eliminates most state and regional involvement in the local comprehensive planning process. The committee is meeting today to formally introduce that legislation. It will which will repeal all state rules concerning the comprehensive planning process and enact a major rewrite of the growth management laws that will result in less state and regional involvement in growth management.

Under this legislation, local governments will be given more authority and responsibility. But it is difficult to see how the coordination and sharing of resources, which the state and regional councils provide, will continue to be available to local governments as they carry out these responsibilities under this proposed legislation.

This move to impose more responsibilities on cities and counties is also evident in senate bill 1910 by Senator de la Portilla which will eliminate all regional planning councils created by state statute. While this bill has not yet been heard in committee, it is obviously of great concern. Our representatives in Tallahassee are watching this carefully. They have explained to the bill’s sponsor that the councils play a very helpful role for local governments by coordinating growth management efforts across jurisdictional lines and providing services to local governments on regional issues. We are working hard to turn this legislation around.

And of course there is the issue of funding for the regional planning councils. Over the past few years we have done more with less. But if state funding is eliminated or further reduced, services to local governments will be negatively impacted. Again, the impact of state cuts will fall on local governments.

Commissioner Crist is a former State Senator and provided the following information:

Now being in local government and having the chance to see from the inside-out how it operates it’s clear to me that there is not a true understanding of how the legislative process really works. Our locals at home look at the state process and assume it functions similar. It does not. A lot of times, at the state level, legislatures will file bills that they never intend to pass. In fact, they may take a side with their bill that is completely the opposite of the side that they are really for. There’s a variety of reasons why they do that. I can’t say whether this is the case here or not, I can just speculate. I don’t necessarily see what Senator de la Portilla is doing. While we disagree with the substance of what the bill says, it does do one thing for us. It guarantees that no one else can run this as an amendment on any
other bill. Once this is a subject of a final piece of legislation, it prohibits anyone from running this as an amendment on any other bill until this bill is withdrawn. That's to our advantage because it cuts out the end game at the last minute of something getting stuck somewhere. Sometimes lobbyists will do this intentionally. They will ask that a bill be filed by a legislature so they take ownership of this issue because they are trying to protect a client. I don't know if this is the case or not. It could be that Senator de la Portilla has issues with his local RPC and is trying to wake them up with a wake-up call. Or it could be that he truly sees the need for change. As soon as there is a new secretary at DOT we will find out what it is that the Governor supports and what it is that he is willing to get behind, and tailor our directions that way. Senator de la Portilla has several brothers, one has just left the legislature with me and he served me for 18 years. They are from the South Florida area and they want to see economic opportunities and I see this maybe as a wake-up call. That we need to be more than a think tank. We may need to be collaborators where we step forward by putting forth partnerships to help the Governor bring economic viability to the state. As a region we can do more leveraging working together. If Hillsborough has some dollars or land and Pinellas has some dollars and land, or Manatee has a Port, when we start collaborating together we can do more with less. Maybe this is the call for us to come together and be more than just a think tank. The fact that he doesn't have a House companion bill clearly says this isn't a priority. Generally when a legislator is serious about an action, they get a partner. This bill is dead on arrival by virtue of Senate rules for not having a House companion.

Chair Dodson thanked Commissioner Crist for his insight and comments. This is an issue we will continue to follow very closely and as the session continues if there are any more further developments we will forward that information to Council members.

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

Resilient Tampa Bay 2011: An Exchange with Dutch Experts

Mr. Brady Smith, Senior Planner, provided a report. As this event was being planned a year ago, we couldn't have known that the world would be dealing with the catastrophic event currently in Japan. It brings home the importance of resiliency planning for regions throughout the world, and certainly one as vulnerable as we are in the Tampa Bay region.

We know the Tampa Bay region is vulnerable to flooding, storm surge, extreme rainfall events, and sea level rise. Looking across the Atlantic Ocean, the Dutch have developed strategies for “living with water,” based upon their experiences with major events and catastrophes, most recently the 1953 storm which killed 1,835 people. Half of the country lies below sea level.
After Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans, the Dutch experts and representatives came over to collaborate with local planners, engineers and experts to share “lessons learned.” They have had three events to date in New Orleans. This Resilient Tampa Bay event feeds off of those types of collaborations.

We had a 3-day event, three weeks ago (February 21-23). The first day was a bus tour of selected vulnerable areas so our Dutch visitors could get a lay of the land for some of our vulnerabilities. The second day was more of a symposium with presentations and panel discussions. The third day there were break-out focus groups to look at different geographic locations, what vulnerabilities those locations have, and what we can do in the future to improve our resiliency planning for those areas. The bus tour covered the downtown Tampa area, downtown St. Petersburg, the Port of Tampa, and the Gulf beaches.

Our keynote address was given by Steve Seibert of the Collins Center for Public Policy, former Pinellas Commissioner and former Chair of FTBRPC. The presentation tied in resiliency with looking at Florida’s vision for the future and an initiative that the Collins Center has, “our Florida, our future.” The lunch speaker was Jim Beever of the Southwest Florida RPC sharing his experiences with the Charlotte Harbor adaptation plan and the City of Punta Gorda’s adaptation plan. We had panel discussions which were organized by the vulnerability topic of urban flooding, storm surge, and sea level rise. The presentations by panelists were a mix by our Dutch visitors and by our local representatives. This was a knowledge exchange so that we were able to glean some ideas from the Dutch and they were able to take home some ideas that we had as well. Tampa Bay is a leader in resiliency planning because of our vulnerabilities. It was interesting as we went through the day to see the differences in our perspectives on resiliency and the perspectives that the Dutch have. Their focus in the Netherlands on resiliency means keeping water out, at all costs. Not letting one drop of water into their populated areas. When we think of resiliency a lot of times that means, how can we get through the event(s) and rebuild in a better way.

On the third day we broke out into groups that were focused on different geographic locations: Tampa, St. Petersburg, the Gulf beaches, and there was a group that looked at regional vulnerabilities. The groups went through specific vulnerabilities and identified potential ways to mitigate. The regional group did not focus on individual vulnerabilities and mitigation strategies, but took a bigger picture look at some of the things we can do as a region to make Tampa Bay more resilient.

This event just happened three weeks ago so we are still compiling the results, but we identified the need for a strategic resiliency plan. We identified that we need leaders and champions to not only relate the different vulnerabilities that we have in this region, but also ways to move forward. There was a lot of interest in having the Regional Planning Council and the Estuary Program be one of those leaders for getting that message out. We need a way to improve our information and capacity building as it relates to resiliency and create a clearinghouse for getting that data to the right folks. The outreach and education component is very important as well. We don’t have a sense of true vulnerabilities within our Tampa Bay region population. One of the reasons for that is it has been 90 years since the Tampa Bay region was directly hit by a hurricane. Others within the 90 years
have brushed by us and created affects, but the last one was a Tarpon Springs storm in 1921. When you go from 90 years and the only historic record you have are narratives and pictures from after the event from a category 3 hurricane striking a region, sometimes there is a bit of denial and a feeling of invincibility. That’s not the case. We are vulnerable to a lot of different types of events, especially storm surge. And again, it points to one of the differences between the Netherlands and Tampa Bay. The culture in the Netherlands is to understand that vulnerability and to realize as a culture and a society that they, in order to survive, need to mitigate against those vulnerabilities. Sometimes that can be missing in the Tampa Bay region and it’s something we need to address.

We will be working with USF going forward, as well as our other partners in improving our resiliency planning in Tampa Bay. Tampa Bay leads on a national level in resiliency planning.

**Questions & Comments:**

**Ms. Todd:** Do you have a summary besides what you showed.

**Mr. Smith:** On our website we will be posting a summary of the event as well as all of the presentations that were given, a summary of the panel discussions and also a summary of what was discussed within the break-out groups. The website is: www.resilettampabay.org

**Councilman Roff:** Looking at the pictures of the aftermath and cleanup of Japan, there seems to still be a large amount of standing water. Knowing that it was a tsunami wave, do you have any idea of why that water is still standing and not back out to sea?

**Mr. Smith:** It has to do with the local conditions and topography of that particular region. We would have places where there would be standing water. It also depends on the height of the storm surge as well. Tsunami and storm surge are created by different mechanisms. I was reading a report that said they can have kind of the same results. This report compared Katrina with the 2004 tsunami in SE Asia. When you have a large wave you can have the same kind of devastation. We wouldn’t be like New Orleans where you have no way for water to get out unless you pump it out, however, there would be small basins of water where the water wouldn’t be able to recede from those basins.

**Chair Dodson:** That was a great comment you made about Tampa Bay leading in resiliency planning and policy making nationally.

**Mr. Smith:** That doesn’t mean that we are where we need to be, even if we are a leader. When you look at other regions around the country and in some cases around the world, we have excellent coordination between our local governments, between law enforcement and our emergency management departments that in some parts of the country don’t exist. We are a step ahead of the game but it doesn’t mean we are where we need to be.

**10. Executive/Budget Committee Report** – Chair Dodson - None
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11. **Chair’s Report**

The Future of the Region Awards Luncheon is March 18th at 11:45 a.m. and we hope to see everyone there.

12. **Executive Director’s Report**

The week one Legislative Session Report from Ron Book’s office are in your folder. There is going to be a proposed growth management bill in the Senate, and a DRI bill. As these issues come to the forefront, we will keep you posted. We heard from Ron Book and his team is that our contacts with local legislators has paid off and we are receiving good feedback. Please keep the good word of the RPCs going.

Adjournment: 11:53 a.m.

William D. Dodson, Chair

Lori Denman, Recording Secretary