



Council Minutes

November 12, 2012
10:00 a.m.

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT

Chair, Commissioner Larry Bustle, Manatee County
Vice Chair, Mayor Bob Minning, City of Treasure Island
Secretary/Treasurer, Mr. Andy Núñez, Pinellas County gubernatorial appointee
Past Chair, Commissioner Bill Dodson, City of Plant City
Mayor David Archie, City of Tarpon Springs
Commissioner Nina Bandoni, City of Safety Harbor
Commissioner Woody Brown, City of Largo
Vice Mayor Sam Henderson, City of Gulfport
Commissioner Lorraine Huhn, City of St. Pete Beach
Mr. Robert Kersteen, Pinellas County gubernatorial appointee
Ms. Angeleah Kinsler, Hillsborough County gubernatorial appointee
Councilman Bob Langford, City of New Port Richey
Commissioner Jack Mariano, Pasco County
Councilor Bob Matthews, City of Seminole
Council Member Janice Miller, City of Oldsmar
Councilman Patrick Roff, City of Bradenton
Mr. Tim Schock, Hillsborough County gubernatorial appointee
Ms. Barbara Sheen Todd, Pinellas County gubernatorial appointee
Ms. Kim Vance, Hillsborough County gubernatorial appointee
Councilwoman Jodi Wilkeson, City of Zephyrhills

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT

Vice Mayor Ron Barnette, City of Dunedin
Commissioner Scott Black, City of Dade City
Commissioner Neil Brickfield, Pinellas County
Mayor Shirley Groover Bryant, City of Palmetto
Commissioner Victor Crist, Hillsborough County
Council Member Alison Fernandez, City of Temple Terrace
Council Member Doreen Hock DiPolito, City of Clearwater
Mr. Harry Kinnan, Manatee County gubernatorial appointee
Councilwoman Mary Mulhern, City of Tampa
Commissioner Gail Neidinger, City of S. Pasadena
Council Member Wengay Newton, City of St. Petersburg
Councilman Ed Taylor, City of Pinellas Park
Mr. Charles Waller, Pasco County gubernatorial appointee
Ms. Pamela Vazques, Ex-Officio, FDEP
Mr. Waddah Farah, Alt., Ex-Officio, Florida Department of Transportation
Ms. Michelle Miller, Ex-Officio, Enterprise Florida
Mr. Todd Pressman, Ex-Officio, Southwest Florida Water Management District

OTHERS PRESENT

David Lukeic, Mgr. Env. Captial Projects, TECO
Adrian Alcoz, Sr. Env. Specialist, TECO
Lindsay Cross, Env. Scientist, TBEP
Hugh Pasco, President, PPS
Christine Barreiro, Planner, Heidt Design
Raul Quintana, City Architect, City of St. Petersburg
Andrea Zelman, Attorney, Fowler White Boggs
Janelle Irvin, Reporter, WMNF Radio
Al Davis, Citizen
Cindy Davis Citizen

STAFF PRESENT

Mr. Manny Pumariega, Executive Director
Mr. Donald Conn, Legal Counsel
Ms. Suzanne Cooper, Principal Planner
Ms. Lori Denman, Recording Secretary
Mr. John Jacobsen, Accounting Manager
Ms. Betti Johnson, Principal Planner
Ms. Wren Krahl, Director of Administration/Public Information
Ms. Jessica Lunsford, Intergovernmental Service Coordinator
Mr. John Meyer, Principal Planner
Mr. Patrick O'Neil, Senior Planner
Mr. Brady Smith, Senior Planner
Mr. Avera Wynne, Planning Director

Call to Order – Chair Bustle

The November 12, 2012 regular meeting of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TBRPC) was called to order at 10:01 a.m.

The Invocation was given by Mr. Tim Schock, followed by the pledge of allegiance.

Roll Call -- Recording Secretary

A quorum was present.

Voting Conflict Report -- Recording Secretary - None

Announcements: - Chair Bustle

- Councilor Bob Matthews was thanked for providing refreshments.
 - The Future of the Region Awards Call for Entries is now available on the web site. Council members were asked to share with their city or county staff, or any group or entity that may have a project or program to enter. The deadline for entries is Friday, January 11th. This year's luncheon will be held Friday, March 15th, at the Carillon Hilton.
1. **Approval of Minutes** – Secretary/Treasurer, Mr. Andy Núñez
Councilwoman Wilkeson made a correction on page 10 of the minutes. "...*Florida Hospital has 1400 employees...*". Motion to approve the October 8, 2012 regular meeting minutes as amended. (Wilkeson/Kersteeen) Motion carried unanimously.

2. **Budget Committee** – Secretary/Treasurer, Mr. Andy Núñez
The Financial Report for the period ending 9/30/12 was approved. (Todd/Kerstean)
-

3. **Consent Agenda** – Chair Bustle

A. **Budget and Contractual**

1. Pending City of St. Pete Beach Commission approval, the City wishes to engage Council staff to develop a Catalyst Plan for Economic Revitalization. Staff will conduct focus groups, economic analyses, public participation exercises, and the like to develop strategies for economic revitalization. The period of work is expected to be from December 2012 until June 2013.

Action Recommended: Motion to authorize the Executive Director to sign the contract.
Staff contact: Avera Wynne, ext. 30

2. DMS Florida Software

The Department of Management Services (DMS) has asked TBRPC to purchase third party verification data using our current Broadband Mapping contract with the Department, which satisfies the verification portion of the deliverables. We were able to negotiate and reduced the cost from a normal price tag of \$60,000 or more to a fixed purchase price of \$22,500. The vendor, Geo-Tel, has been approved by the state and is part of the www.myfloridaworkplace.com network.

Action Recommended: Authorize the Executive Director to purchase mentioned data for the state of Florida.

Staff contact: Marshall Flynn, ext. 11

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

1. IC&R Review by Jurisdiction - October 2012
2. IC&R Database - October 2012

Action Recommended: None. Information Only.

Staff contact: John Meyer, ext. 29

3. IC&R #080-12 – TECO’s Site Certification Application/Polk 2-5 Combined Cycle Conversion Project, #92-32 Polk/Hillsborough Counties
4. IC&R #081-12 – TECO’s Site Certification Application/Big Bend Station Gypsum Conveyor & Storage Area Improvements, #PA 79-12, Hillsborough County
5. IC&R #082-12 – New St. Petersburg Pier, SWFWMD ERP #670555, City of St. Petersburg

Action Recommended: Approve staff reports.

Staff contact: Suzanne Cooper, ext. 32

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

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

DRI 264 - Starkey Ranch (Rescission), Pasco County

Action Recommended: Approve staff report

Staff Contact: John Meyer, ext. 29.

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

F. **Annual Report Summaries (ARS) / Biennial Report Summaries (BRS)**

1. DRI # 68 - Cargill Riverview Facility, RY 2011-12 ARS, Hillsborough County
2. DRI #115 - Woodland Corporate Center, RY 2011-12 ARS, Hillsborough County

3. DRI #116 - Tampa Telecom Park, RY 2011-12 ARS, City of Temple Terrace
4. DRI #119 - Northwood, **RYs 2010-12 BRS**, Pasco County
5. DRI #129 - Seven Oaks, **RY 2010-12 BRS**, Pasco County
6. DRI #148 - The Pavilion, RY 2011-12 ARS, Hillsborough County
7. DRI #151 - Crosstown Center, RY 2011-12 ARS, Hillsborough County
8. DRI #158 - Tampa Bay Park of Commerce, RY 2011-12 ARS, City of Oldsmar/ Pinellas County
9. DRI #194 - DG Farms, RY 2011-12 ARS, Hillsborough County
10. DRI #203 - Beacon Woods East, RY 2011-12 ARS, Pasco County
11. DRI #255 - Bexley Ranch, **RYs 2010-12 BRS**, Pasco County

Action Recommended: Approve staff reports
 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 State Land Planning Agency and the appropriate local government in accordance with Rule 29H-1.003(3), F.A.C.

For adopted amendments that do not require Council comments, no report is attached.

1. DEO # 12-3ESR, Hillsborough County (proposed)
2. DEO # 12-3CIE, City of Plant City (proposed)
3. DEO # 12-1ESR, Town of North Redington Beach (proposed)
4. DEO # 12-4ESR, City of Plant City (proposed)

Action Recommended: None. Information Only.
 Staff contact: Jessica Lunsford, ext. 38

I. Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendments (LGCP)

The following report(s) are presented for Council action: - None

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda. (Kersteen/Schock)

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. **A. Hugh Pascoe**

The West Central Florida MPO/TPO Staff Directors, in cooperation with the Regional Priorities Working Group, have developed a draft unified list of ranked high priority transportation initiatives covering all of West Central Florida. Mr. Pascoe, Pascoe Planning Services, presented the draft list and map and described the list development process.

Mr. Pascoe, contracted through TBARTA, was representing the Chair's Coordinating Committee (CCC) who have developed a series of priorities for consideration by the Regional Planning Council. They are trying to get a dialogue going with certain groups that look at what priorities are. There is still a lot of conversation about what constitutes something regional, and what constitutes a priority. This is something that has been going on for a long time and finally we got to the point where you have one group with a set of priorities.

The High Priority Major Transportation Initiatives has been approved for comment. It isn't the final program. We want to engage the RPCS and other entities who have a stake in

regional priorities and keep the conversation going. Several people here today are very aware of the CCC and have served on that committee.

The CCC has been very involved with prioritization for some time. We have been developing a program for priorities for The Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP), a state funded initiative. We have been dealing with the Multi-Use Trail Priorities. What we are really talking about are High Priority Major Transportation Initiatives.

With the TRIP funding we have been able to fund projects that have real regional significance. Previous successes are Bruce B. Downs Boulevard, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) on major corridors in Pinellas, and others. We work with DOT and other entities on a consistent basis to come up with priorities for that program. If you take a look at the size of the West Central Florida area, which the CCC covers under its legislatively mandated program, from Citrus County all the way to Sarasota/Manatee and from Pinellas County to Polk County, you are talking about some issues that have been important over several decades. Multi-Use Trails has been a very successful program. We have at least ten different priorities between FDOT District 1 and District 7.

Major initiatives, we did not call them projects because we are trying to concentrate on corridors. There are many different things that we could do in individual corridors, some of which would work better than others. We are trying to focus on the different corridors and say, this is really where we need to concentrate. Some will pop out as things that have to be done, corridors that can't be ignored. Others will reflect local concerns. When we put them all together we have to consider that this has to be the big picture and address all of West Central Florida. Materials related to regional projects that were reviewed are: TBARTA Master Plan, Tampa Bay Partnership Priorities, MetroPlan Orlando, the CCC's adopted 2035 Regional Long Range Transportation Plan, and the One Bay Vision. Criteria were used to assess the relative benefit of major regional projects: Mobility, Safety, and Economic Development. Hurricane Evacuation is a major safety component. Economic Development - accessibility to workplace and to activity centers. This is something in the One Bay effort as well.

MetroPlan Orlando prioritized the multi-modal systems using a technical process. They have been successful in focusing on things that they really need this over the next 10-20 years. They considered the collective good of the region rather than any one jurisdiction and maintain a constant program of regional engagement. There is extensive outreach with the business community and many civic organizations. They make considerable effort in dealing with legislative delegation and their staff. They have their own dedicated lobbyist in Tallahassee. They have lobbyists that work together, pushing for a lot of different things.

High Priority Major Transportation Initiatives:

- Priority - Initiatives are placed in ranked order.
- Facility - Major regional corridors that serve the many travel markets which comprise West Central Florida. Multi-modal projects are grouped within these corridors based upon their role in meeting regional travel needs.
- Improvement Needed - The improvement needed within each corridor is clearly defined.
- Rationale - Each initiative has its own set of benefits for the region. This section describes how specific transportation improvements contribute to the area's continued mobility, safety and economic development. Why is this important to be on the list? People say their project should be on the list. How does their project really benefit the region?

There are ten items on the list, but there should only be three or maybe five. How do we define the projects when you look at how large the area covers? We brought all of the areas together out of the ten projects. Every entity has something on the list, something that they can take back to their local boards. We still have to do the 20-25 year look into the future for our Long Range Plans and say this is legitimately what we feel is going to be the problem in each of the corridors. Can it be handled with highway? Can it be handled with transit? Can it be handled with special use lanes? There are a lot of different things that need to be looked at and to squeeze additional capacity where we don't have additional right-of-way we might have to convert lanes over to high occupancy vehicle lanes. We want to put everything out there - lane tolling where you won't get additional lanes unless you are generating some kind of revenue. These corridors are too big and we really need a transit component. In a lot of cases it will be express bus service. In some places it might be some sort of rail.

We all know we need additional lanes on I-75, Hernando to Sarasota. There are a lot of capacity issues within the area. The improvement needed is to widen to at least 6 general lanes, add managed lanes with express bus stations and service.

I-4 / I-275, Orlando/Tampa/Pinellas - add managed lanes with express bus stations and service.

Howard Franklin Bridge, I-275 between Pinellas and Hillsborough - bridge replacement with transit envelope and intermodal centers. Adding new right-of-way to speed transit vehicles will make transit an attractive choice, reducing growth in congestion and crashes. Intermodal transfer centers at each end of the bridge will create seamless connections to local routes, Park & Ride and other options.

US 19, Pinellas to Pasco - controlled access and overpasses with express bus stations and service.

State Road 54/56 - Those of you who have dealt with the Pasco County area, and something that was really looked at with the One Bay effort, and all the things that are going on with that corridor - it is strategically positioned to form a "Northern Loop" that is currently missing a link in the regional roadway network. The corridor intersects with Bruce B. Downs Blvd., I-75, US 41, US 19 and the Suncoast Parkway with potential to extend eastward to US 301. Current plans call for completing the 6-laning of the corridor (Suncoast Parkway to US 41), and adding future capacity in the form of managed lanes. This corridor is a critical component of the Regional Loop System envisioned for the Tampa Bay area.

US 41, Palmetto in Manatee to North Port in Sarasota - The US 41 corridor is part of an urban core/spine traversing from the Port of Manatee in Northern Manatee County through the cities of Palmetto, Bradenton, Sarasota, Venice and North Port to the Charlotte County line. They are doing a lot of things such as multimodal transit and pedestrian improvements.

Suncoast Parkway Corridor, Hillsborough to Citrus - Expanding capacity on the Veterans Expressway to 8 lanes north of Gunn Highway; extending the Suncoast Parkway northward into Citrus County as a 4 lane facility, thereby providing relief for the US 19 and US 41 corridors. New toll lanes with express bus stations and service.

The Pinellas County Alternatives Analysis is the preferred alternative for light rail connecting

the downtowns through the Gateway business district and Clearwater.

CSX Corridor/Hybrid Rail. We will try to utilize the existing corridor and build on Orlando's SunRail. Commuter or hybrid rail service could be added on this corridor at a fraction of the cost of laying new light rail track and potentially extend in the future to the Tampa International Airport. An agreement between CSX and local, regional and state governments must be crafted.

I-4 Rail, Tampa to Orlando. You cannot ignore the tremendous traffic volume on this corridor and some kind of rail technology needs to go in place in that corridor. Rather than calling it High Speed Rail we felt that the extension of SunRail would potentially be a good way of looking at it. SunRail has been very successful, eventually it will be extended to the community of Poinciana on the west end of Orlando.

Next Steps:

- September 14: CCC approved draft for circulation/comment/endorsement.
- Presentations and discussions with:
 - TBARTA Board
 - MPO Boards
 - Regional Planning Councils
 - Tampa Bay Partnership
 - And other interested parties
- Revisions to draft
- CCC final adoption in March 2013
- Distribute and advocate

The presentation will be provided to the Central Florida Regional Planning Council and will schedule others in December and January. The RPCs and the knowledge that they have in their respected regions are important partner entities of the CCC.

Questions & Comments:

Council Member Miller:

It appears you haven't considered north Pinellas with the train going through Oldsmar, Safety Harbor up to Clearwater. You have all those people from Pasco to get to Tampa or east toward Orlando. North Pinellas doesn't even have interstate access. You need to consider everybody.

Councilwoman Wilkeson:

If we were to build rail in the medians, then you would come east to the Veterans Expressway and potentially that would be where a high speed rail would run. That's my understanding from TBARTA, we are trying to use existing right-of-way in major thoroughfares.

Mr. Pascoe:

The Pinellas MPO and the PSTA have worked with federal transit in doing the alternative analysis. The corridor you mentioned has been considered but we are working very tightly with what has been approved by federal transit as the improved alternative.

Ms. Vance:

You mentioned SunRail. I'm curious as to how that was funded.

Mr. Pascoe:

They got quite a bit of federal funding and some state funding. They had to put a lot of effort in working with DOT to get the money. I can get you the details of funding. That occurred at about the same time we were looking at high speed rail. Again, they had a very tight

focus on commuter rail.

Mr. Nunez: You did mention in your presentation and I see it on the provided map that just about everything on the SIS (Strategic Intermodal System) has been touched in some way except for the Sunshine Skyway Bridge and that connection between western Manatee County and southern Pinellas County. Any particular reason why that's not included in your plan?

Mr. Pascoe: Based upon need over long term, yes there is a need in that corridor. We have identified it as a very important travel market. When working with Sarasota/Manatee MPO they really thought the US 41 corridor was the one they needed to concentrate on.

Mr. Nunez: There has been something that has come up in the Regional Collaboration Committee of the TBRPC regarding the larger ships that cannot get under the bridge. In order to continue the development of the Port of Manatee or the Port of Tampa and in terms of tourism/economic development I would have thought that would come into play.

Mr. Pascoe: It was discussed and it was discussed at length. There were a lot of other projects that were talked about but we had to tighten the list as much as possible. The MPO Chairs and staff directors were the ones who had the vote in this. I will take these comments back.

Ms. Todd: It looks to me like a lot of thought has been put into this and a lot of cooperation. I wanted to "amen" the earlier remarks regarding rail. It would be wonderful if we could actually see, rather than being on a map, because as long as I've been involved in county politics we have talked about train of some kind. We've had millions of dollars spent on studies - from north Pinellas to south Pinellas to Manatee/Sarasota. Is there somehow you can get the message across that west of Tampa is interested in seeing connections made to Tampa and Orlando? Tampa and Orlando are very important, but Tampa to St. Pete to Manatee/Sarasota is equally important and let us know how that discussion is being pursued? We really look at this as the entire Tampa Bay region.

Mr. Pascoe: I'm aware of the effort that you are talking about and there has been a lot of dialogue.

Commissioner Mariano: One of the things we talked about on the list is the regional extension project. If you look at what can be built quicker, to the north of the 54/56 corridor all the way from US 19 all the way to US 41 which will alleviate a lot of the traffic on 54/56. On 54/56, we just had the presentation and I never heard anything about rail being implemented to that. Is that something that will be looked at so that when you build it the first time you would have it in place?

Mr. Pascoe: I have heard a lot about that. If you look at the TBARTA Master Plan, how that would be applied may be BRT. It's something that is being discussed right now. The feeling when we are setting a priority to say you have to have rail, we talked a lot with Richard Garrity about that. You have to have some kind of a rail component because you have all the different activity centers, all the town centers along that corridor. It is a very good transit oriented development concept that we feel could be pulled together by rail. We have been talking with Pasco County about that, but the feeling again is when you are

going along with the roadway, how do you make BRT or Express Bus work within that corridor?

Commissioner Mariano:

The Express Bus is a great concept in that it will get you across the county without a slow down. I think 581 is going to be a connector going down the road. As far as Pinellas and the rail, US 41 - is that one of the rail lines you are looking at? And are the lines still on the ground in Pinellas?

Mr. Pascoe:

There are lines on the ground, the traditional lines. Looking over in Orlando, they are really getting the better idea about issues and conflict with traffic. There's enough of an opportunity to work with what we call a hybrid rail.

Council Member Miller:

You have to also consider tourists that go to Orlando and then want to visit Busch Gardens and the beaches. Everyone wants to go to the beach. CSX tracks are already through Oldsmar and Safety Harbor, around to Clearwater. In fact, CSX goes through Oldsmar two or three times a day. It's freight, but I would think passenger could be added to that.

Councilman Roff:

It's been my observation that CSX is very reluctant to share its brakeline. Do they have a right-of-way for a second track?

Mr. Pascoe:

That's a sticky issue. We want to keep the dialogue going with CSX but it's going to be an uphill battle. CSX is willing to come to the table, but they are very tough to negotiate with. I heard they have right-of-way for a second track, but I'm not sure about that. I would have to check and get back to you on that.

Chair Bustle:

I would like to ask staff to take the comments that have been raised today and provide those comments to you. You mentioned in your briefing that although there are ten projects on the list, it is your desire to come down to 3-5 projects. I recently attended a TBARTA meeting where the comment was made that if we had any hope at all of competing favorably with the bigger regions like Miami/Dade, then we need to come down to maybe 2-3 projects out of this ten. The only way that they will succeed and get funding is if all of the jurisdictions in Tampa Bay agree with the 2-3 projects. That's a challenge. How do you take all of these that are dear to each and every one of our hearts and say, for the good of the region we are going to come down to these 3? I don't envy you that job.

Mr. Pascoe:

We are going to be taking this to the TBARTA Board Meeting on December 14th. You have to have a very tight focus on what you can push as a legislative program. We wanted to put the things that we thought were absolutely necessary for the good of the entire west central Florida area.

Chair Bustle:

Can the RPC make a recommendation as to how to release the list? If something pops out during your review of the comments, maybe that would be appropriate and see if we can help with suggestions.

B. Integrating Nitrogen Management with Planning - Ms. Suzanne Cooper, TBRPC Principal Planner

Federal and State regulators now require that all nitrogen sources to Tampa Bay not exceed the existing loading rate. For municipalities, counties and the private sector, any new

development or redevelopment activity must either retain substantially more storm water runoff (the principal source) on-site or greatly improve the treatment standards, and that no increase in municipal wastewater discharge can occur without a corresponding reduction in nitrogen loading elsewhere. Ms. Cooper presented the project underway to inform local governments of this requirement and of ways to revise policies and land development codes to accomplish this while allowing for continued development and redevelopment.

This is a project that the Council is handling for the Tampa Bay Estuary Program (TBEP). Lindsay Cross from TBEP was present. Integrating Nitrogen Management with Planning doesn't sound interesting but it is very important to our region. In the 1970s the bay was a slimy mess, too much nutrients, raw sewage, fish kills, and rotting vegetation had people fleeing the shoreline. What were the causes? Lack of coordinated effort and management for the bay was evident and as a result of a legislative study in 1985 the Council created the Agency on Bay Management which is still around today. Nutrients were identified as a serious problem in the bay. The TBEP was adopted in 1991 and they chose seagrasses as their target for measuring nutrients in Tampa Bay. Nitrogen is the main culprit in seagrass decline. In 1996 the Tampa Bay Nitrogen Management Consortium was formed which is a public/private partnership of local governments to advance this bay recovery effort. This is a model program that has been sought by other communities dealing with similar problems. The goal is to reduce nitrogen loading to Tampa Bay and to date there have been over 430 projects at a cost of over \$760 million that have been accomplished. Every little bit has helped Tampa Bay. Nitrogen loading has decreased and water quality has improved. Over time as these projects have been implemented you can see that Tampa Bay has improved. Water quality has improved dramatically over the years and we are seeing a direct, positive affect on the bay with increased seagrasses which translates into a healthier, cleaner bay, better fishing, more tourism, a better quality of life for all.

There are federal mandates and requirements that have been put in place to cap the loading of nitrogen to Tampa Bay for all existing sources. For example, many of you have treatment plants. They discharge street water. Let's say Tampa has a loading rate of 10 tons per day in their permit, but they are actually only discharging 7 tons. The federal government now says that is your new cap - 7 tons. You can't be left with a 3 ton gap that you can grow to. That is happening all the way across the board for point sources and non-point sources in new permits. There is no room for growth because what growth does is add impervious surface, it adds fertilizers, it adds compacted soils and nutrients that go into the bay. Unless we can find a way to deal with this we can't grow and develop for any new jobs, businesses and industry because they all have point source permits. They won't be getting them unless there are offsets somewhere else.

Given the track record of the Tampa Bay community and the bay recovery, and Tampa Bay being the model for the nation, and the estuary has actually recovered from past abuses, our region sought and was granted the ability to do something innovative. The Nitrogen Management Consortium members received approval from the state and the EPA to set the loads for each source. In other words, set our own reasonable assurance that we could do what needed to be done to continue on the right track for the bay. The state approved this. Almost all local governments in the point sources, the private sector signed on to this to impose this upon themselves to make this happen. They did that because going up against the feds and the state individually would have not been in their best interest. Together they worked, as they had been doing, to arrive at these conclusions.

What are the implications for local governments and point sources? The existing regulations require no additional nitrogen loading. In the near term, based on what's ongoing in terms of improvements underway, current nitrogen strategies will continue through 2013, offsetting new loads by 17 tons per year. The challenge ahead is to deal with increasing growth and we all understand that growth, development and redevelopment are very important for our future but we have to find a way to accommodate this in the face of this new requirement. It will require a change in the way development is designed and the landscape is managed to take care of these loads.

What has been the status quo? For 30 years it's been primarily stormwater treatment ponds connected to very efficient drainage systems. Lawns with high maintenance grass and a lot of fertilizer that is keeping everything very green. There are many techniques, some which are very simple, that will result in much less nitrogen loading and much less stormwater being generated and much less nitrogen flowing off the land and into the bay. Those things can be incorporated into the way development is done. There are actually already developments in the region who have taken these approaches to be more sustainable, more green. They are available to all of us.

How do we get going? Some ways that have been identified, and we did this through a couple of workshops with local governments and the private sector, planners and staff, are to revise land development codes in our comprehensive plans to identify nutrients as a problem in the region and to adopt within our land development codes some of the best management practices and low impact development techniques that have been developed and identified that will allow individual sites to not produce as much stormwater that would then have to be treated. That's where the cost savings will come in. That's where it will be more equitably distributed to new development having to employ greater shore treatment techniques (it takes more land, or more energy, or its more costly in the design). These things can be done without increasing costs to development which will be very attractive for allowing continued development and redevelopment.

Other ways this can be done is with fertilizer ordinances and landscape maintenance ordinances. Pinellas County has done a great job with that, not only the fertilizer ordinance but landscape maintenance training for commercial and land-care companies and workers, and also educating the public about the value of their own uses of their lots. Not spending a lot of time on lawns is a way of getting people to take better care of their landscape without a lot of chemicals. And enforcement is an important part of that. I will have some numbers from Pinellas County on what they're spending, what their results are to be able to show local governments and also the private sector just how it can be done.

Our role is to officially educate elected officials and staff about these requirements through the Nitrogen Management Consortium. Most local governments and stormwater managers have been involved and understand from the non-point source perspective what that can mean to them in terms of keeping their streams and things they are responsible for on the path to reducing nitrogen loading, but it has not yet reached necessarily all the elected boards and all the other parts of city and county government like planners and land development review specialists and policy plan folks. We will have information for local governments and their staffs to help them through this process of reviewing land development codes and comprehensive plans and related ordinances in trying to incorporate these techniques.

I will be setting up meetings with elected boards, perhaps in a workshop setting, where I can go over this in greater detail and provide examples of the kinds of techniques that could be substituted. For example, our parking lot has islands where trees are planted instead of wells. If we had wells stormwater could collect there instead of immediately having to go to the drains. It reduces the amount of stormwater that's generated and you don't have to treat it. It is so much more expensive to treat stormwater once it is in your ponds or in the bay than it is to prevent it. I will be looking forward to talking to some of you and getting on your agenda to present this and help you through the process.

Questions & Comments:

Council Member Miller:

Do our old plants have any bearing on any of this? Do they help or hinder?

Ms. Cooper:

You get your water from wells so its brackish water. What are you doing with your waste? You are putting it back into the deep.

Council Member Miller:

Would you come to a Council meeting? I would like you to talk about the parking lot islands and wells.

Ms. Cooper:

Yes.

Councilor Matthews:

Do you have any items on-line that we can look at for guidelines?

Ms. Cooper:

After our first workshop we put together materials. USEPA has a tremendous amount of guidelines and a checklist that you can use to repair your existing policy(s) to see if you are prohibiting the use of same load impact developing or allowing it as a development option. One thing we learned at our workshops was a lot of finger pointing. Mr. Starkey came and talked about this plan for Longleaf and he wanted to do some sustainable development practices, which reduces stormwater production. At the time, 2003, there was a lot of resistance from the water management district. It wasn't in the checklist of things you can do with your land and it was too expensive for him to try and model and improve the technique he wanted to use. It didn't happen. Now the Water Management District has a model that incorporates all these various techniques and it can be quickly understood what the production in nutrient loading is for each of these techniques as they are applied to a proposed development plan. They embraced this idea which also cuts down on the cost to a developer trying to reinvent the wheel so to speak. I will send everyone the web site that has those materials.

Commissioner Mariano:

You mentioned wells in landscaping, Pasco County has done that. I wanted to touch bases on the oil consortium that FAC started. They are looking for projects all around, up and down the coast. The project that first came to mind when I saw the presentation is the Howard F. Curran Plant, which dumps 52 million gallons a day. They have a pipeline project that runs from their plant all the way up through Pasco County and it was supposed to augment the wetlands. That pipeline was abandoned because of the expense. I think this would be an ideal grant opportunity, it would be funded from the oil money. I presented this to Mayor Buckhorn when I saw him at a meeting and he likes the project. I think this would be something this Council could work with the staff on. I have brought this to the attention of my county as well. I think this is something that you should take, and work that idea up, and bring it forward to the Council and to the local areas as well.

Council Member Langford:

The City of New Port Richey just last week passed three ordinances that addresses all of these concerns. We have zero discharge into the Gulf. All of our water is treated and made into reclaimed water. It's working out quite well. We also addressed the nitrogen and other fertilizer products that people are using on their lawns and we have addressed our water runoff into our river. We have been very proactive on this.

Ms. Cooper:

Did the city adopt its own fertilizer ordinance?

Council Member Langford:
Vice Mayor Henderson:

Yes.

Ms. Cooper:

Regarding the Nitrogen Management Consortium, because there is a general concern out there, do you get the feeling that the utilities, partners in agriculture and industry - are they working to actually reduce nitrogen or are they working in hopes of finding credits from other folks who are not nitrogen contributors? What is your take on how that works? There are some suspicions out there that the intention might not be to assist in actually cleaning up the waters but to find a way to allow to contribute more nitrogen by sharing credits. I think there are three things. First, for example, Tampa Electric converted its Gannon Plant to natural gas. Major improvement in air quality and nitrogen and sulfur-oxide reductions. Great benefit to the bay. Second, federal regulations on air quality have gotten a lot tighter and I think we will see them getting tighter which is another good reason to make that conversion in the most economically efficient way. Third, they have been tremendous partners in funding improvements to the bay just as a part of the community. We are going to need more electricity, no doubt about it. Solar is a great thing, its not very efficient, it takes a lot of land. Do we want to do that or do we want to find the best fuels, the cleanest fuels and use the cleanest technology to make that happen? That industry is doing things for the right reasons. Industries such as Mosaic that have been on the bay for a long time, they were one of the first to come to the table when the Agency on Bay Management was formed because they had major pollution in Tampa Bay, both phosphoreus and nitrogen. They cleaned up their act tremendously for all the right reasons. They were going to stay were they are and they needed to do things differently and so they did. They have been terrific partners in funding a lot of projects that have made a big improvement to the bay. I think they are doing it for the right reasons.

Vice Mayor Henderson:

I was going to see if we could get our member cities, anyone who has passed ordinances, to share those. In looking at your pie graft you still have 62%. That percentage of the pie has increased for non-point sources and I assume a large chunk of that is residential. I'm on the side of those ordinances restricting fertilizer and would like to know the times of the year that you can use nitrogen/phosphate fertilizer, and, in addition, what other cities have done.

Ms. Cooper:

That stormwater runoff is made up of not only the chemicals that are put on lawns but also atmospheric deposition which comes from cars and buses and trains, etc. Trying to just reduce the amount of stormwater that flows off as well are tremendous benefits to bay.

Al Davis, Concerned Citizen:

I sat through several of the One Bay planning sessions and also Nutrient Consortium meetings and I have some concerns. The

distinct impression that I got when I left the Nutrient Consortium meetings was that the focus was at least as much out of the clean water act issues but more on how we can get by. I heard a lot of negative comments about the EPA and lots of suggestions that what we really needed to do in Florida was make sure people felt that things like best management practice and reasonable assurance had substance. And listening to water related meetings over the years I don't feel that is the case. We talked about reducing nitrogen and yet golf courses, which are a huge source of nitrogen loading in our local waters, are exempt from the clean water mandates based on the fact that there is an assumption of best management practices. The recent nutrient consortium issues have been very focused on how to avoid the problems that are coming up with credits. I spoke with officials from SWFWMD about the impact of the Mandalay Bay development forecast and population from people to animal waste and the transportation effort. I asked them how that figured in their planning with stormwater issues. How they were incorporating that in their current projects and the answer I got was that they weren't. They did not have any plan to address projected growth. As a person who is very concerned with water issues, the nutrient consortium group did not build my confidence with their plans and information. I felt it was promoting commercial agriculture, industry and mining interests over that of water quality. And I got the feeling that they were ignoring the growth projections in every category that would come out of implementation. It seems to me that there is a disconnect between the agencies that are involved. I know specifically from talking with DEP and talking directly with EPA that there is a lot of feeling that the nutrient consortium issues are a way to block compliance with clean water.

Commissioner Mariano:

When you look at the pipeline project I mentioned earlier, what happens when you run a reclaimed water line all the way up into our high growth area, Wesley Chapel? We are fixed with mandates, and if we take all that reclaimed water up there and start pumping those well fields, we increase our nitrogen product and shut our economic development growth down. If they cap that number we could work with that number, but we still don't know what those numbers mean to us.

Taken Out Of Order:

9. Other Council Reports

Nominating Committee - Councilor Matthews, Chair

The Nominating Committee met this morning prior to the Council meeting to discuss the 2013 Slate of Officers.

We were challenged once again this year because we had three fine candidates that offered to serve in the role of Secretary/Treasurer. It was a difficult decision because all three candidates would represent us in an outstanding fashion. We thank each of you for offering your time and talents to the Board.

We are pleased to nominate and present to the full Council...for Secretary/Treasurer, Commissioner Victor Crist, Hillsborough County; Mr. Andy Nunez for Vice-Chair and Mayor Bob Minning as

Chair. Each of these candidates have served the Council long and well.

Motion to approve the recommended Slate of Officers for 2013. (Kersteen/J. Miller). Motion carried unanimously.

C. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) - Mr. Patrick O'Neil, TBRPC Senior Planner

The Draft 2012 CEDS was presented. The draft document has been approved for public comment and board approval by the CEDS Steering Committee. Once approved the document will be submitted to the Economic Development Administration (EDA). The Draft CEDS was distributed.

TBRPC is a funded Economic Development District (EDD). The EDA provides half of the funding and TBRPC funds the other half. Tampa Bay has been a funded EDD since 2003. The advantages for Local Governments are that no CEDS are required and everyone is now on the same page. The CEDS is regional and having one CEDS helps EDA out because there is a single point of contact for the region.

The primary functions of the EDD are the preparation and maintenance of a CEDS every five years. Within the CEDS we identify goals and strategies and provide technical assistance to local governments and economic development organizations on their economic development activities, programs, and grant applications.

EDD funded projects from 2007-2012 include the Tampa Port Authority and the REK Pier Restoration, the Hillsborough Community College Automotive and Firefighter Teaching Complex, the Targeted Industry and Workforce Skills Competency Study, and the Disaster Resiliency Study which recently won an award from REMI because of the software we used to make assumptions.

The CEDS update was presented to the Council on April 9, 2012 and at that time we went over some of the economic analysis and components of the CEDS. Following that we had three meetings with the Steering Committee in July, September, and October. The Steering Committee went over the CEDS update process, SWOT, economic analysis, reviewed the foundations, analysis and goals sections of CEDS and at the October meeting we finalized the goals and the draft. November 5th began the start of the 30 day public comment period. In order to submit the CEDS to EDA we are seeking approval from the Council for adoption.

The new CEDS document is more streamlined. The goal is to have an Executive Summary which will finalize the main talking points.

The Steering Committee was represented from all four counties, mostly private individuals but also some public. Their goal is to provide feedback and guidance, Develop SWOT analysis, develop and revise goals, identify important projects and goals, and recommend Final CEDS to Council for approval.

For the 2012 CEDS we worked with all of the RPCs from across the state, who are all EDDs so the CEDS will be uniform across the state. The Executive Summary is going to be built to the goals and objectives and how to achieve the goals and objectives. Implementation projects will be recommended to EDA if they have funding available.

This year we worked with the Florida Department of Economic Development (DEO) and the Florida Chamber. Since everyone was revising theirs at the same time we worked with them. In March/February we helped them do all of the regional meetings across the state. We had over 1,000 participants in total. We used that data in the CEDS.

Within the CEDS framework we aligned as best as possible with the Six Pillars. Because of the Six Pillars we have twelve goals and it aligned very nicely. The economic analysis for the forecasts and trends used population and employment data, and location quotients show where we will be in the future and how we compare to the nation. In the shift share analysis we tried to figure out important changes to our region versus the national.

Location Quotients were concentrated on employment to the national employment. The economic analysis trend charts and graphs is very similar to what BEBR might show with data. SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis was used as a strategic tool to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats in our region. To get back to success Florida needs to get back to growing and retaining jobs. The findings are on page 64 of the Tampa Bay CEDS. The main theme is: 1). Develop the workforce; 2). Collaborate and build partnerships; 3). Build and maintain jobs supporting infrastructure; 4). Build the Tampa Bay Region's brand as a competitive economic engine; and 5). Protect the natural resource.

Currently there are 44 projects on the CEDS implementation list. The process for project submission is: Google Docs, draft list of regional projects with 44 projects that promote regionalism. When EDA look for funding they look to see if the projects are within the CEDS. If they are not, they look to see if they align with the CEDS.

Questions & Comments:

- Ms. Todd: When will this be available for us to access?
- Mr. O'Neil: It is available on-line now.
- Ms. Vance: What is "angel capitalist" that was referenced in Strengths and Weaknesses?
- Mr. O'Neil: It's a major capitalist who provides funding to get his project started or help to get started.
- Mr. Wynne: The term came from our Steering Committee. Areas like the Silicon Valley call them angel capitalist that support projects when you don't have a lot of venture capital.
- Council Member Miller: On 60 Minutes they talked about our workforce being so uneducated and how can we fill all of the jobs if people aren't being educated? The theme was that there are manufacturing jobs that are not being filled because people who can't do basic skills. There are people who cannot comprehend what they are reading and there are people who cannot follow directions. He employs 300 people and wants to employ 300 more but can't.

Motion to approve the CEDS Document (Matthews/Kersteen). Motion carried unanimously.

Presentations provided at Council meetings can be found at:
www.tbrpc.org/council_members/council_presentations.shtml

8. Program Reports

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

The Full Agency met on October 11th. On the agenda were several interesting items:

Dr. Steven Murawski, an Endowed Chair in Biological Oceanography at the USF College of Marine Science, presented on the federal RESTORE Act. Two and a half percent of the penalties expected in the Deepwater Horizon case - or some 80 million dollars, could come to the Florida Institute of Oceanography, headquartered at USF, to focus on monitoring, Gulf science, wildlife ecosystem research, improving sustainable and safe development of energy resources, and fisheries management.

Staff and consultants for the City of St. Petersburg presented the environmental resource permit currently in process for the St. Petersburg pier. ABM review is part of the Council's process in analyzing projects in and around Tampa Bay for regional impacts. The Agency members made several recommendations, which were incorporated into the review that was on our agenda this morning.

The next Agency meeting will be on December 13th. One or more of the Agency's committees will meet that day. All are welcome. There was some pointed discussion which was the order of the day in the St. Petersburg pier project. There were a lot of different ideas. I sent an email to the Mayor's office after the meeting and complimented the staff for staying on point during the Q & A portion of their presentation.

B. Clearinghouse Review Committee (CRC) - No Report

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

D. Emergency Management - No Report

E. Legislative Committee - Manny Pumariega

We will be meeting in Tallahassee on November 26th. As you may recall, Commissioner Black reported to you in September that they met with the Governor's office staff. We provided them information at that time and they requested additional information which we have provided to them. On November 26th I will find out more information and bring it back to the December Council meeting. Our goal is to try to get into the Governor's budget. I think they will try to schedule a follow up meeting with the Governor's staff.

Chair Bustle: What do you think about an appeal to all member jurisdictions of the RPC to pass a resolution supporting the RPC funding?

Mr. Pumariega: We have received a few and will check to see the status and contact cities as necessary.

Taken out of Order:

7. Council Member Comments

Vice Mayor Henderson: I have one thing that I would like to ask us to consider in the

future. This is no comment on our folks who are gubernatorial appointees. I understand our approach the last two years, having not gotten the funding from the Governor has been to try to open the door and have more involvement in hopes of getting that money restored back to us. At this point I don't have much faith that it will happen. I wonder if this Council wants to consider at some point if that funding doesn't come in from any governorship, not just our current Governor but any Governor that is sitting in office, if we want to consider those gubernatorial appointees becoming appointees of this Council. If he's not going to support us and doesn't respect the work that we do, then perhaps those seats that are right now gubernatorial appointee seats should be appointed by this Council. I would approve discussion at some point.

Commissioner Mariano: That might be dangerous. The legislature created RPCs and they can take it away as well.

Vice Mayor Henderson: That's true but the last few times the legislature recommended that we get funding and then it was vetoed by the Governor.

Council Member Miller: May I ask a question to the appointees? Do you lobby for us? Wouldn't that be a logical thing to tell the Governor how important this is?

Ms. Todd: We do.

Mr. Pumariega: As Commissioner Mariano mentioned, when Governor Graham and the legislature passed the growth management act of 1985 he made sure there was representation from the state and he created the 2/3, 1/3 membership of the Council. It is disappointing to the staff and also the Council that we aren't getting the recurring funding. I mentioned a couple of meetings ago that we've never had such a great relationship with the FDOT, they included us in the 2060 Plan and the One Bay Vision plan, and referenced the SRPP. Mr. O'Neil mentioned the work we have done with DEO and how involved we were with the Strategic Plan. The Governor is supposed to be issuing the Five Year Strategic Plan in December and we are mentioned in that plan 14 times. From another aspect we are getting funding from other sources, other state agencies, the Broadband Plan that we are doing right now. We have to walk a fine line and proceed with strategies carefully.

Council Member Miller: What if we could get all the RPCs to go to Tallahassee together? We should be able to have a meeting with the Governor. Make an appointment with him.

Mr. Pumariega: As Commissioner Black mentioned in his Legislative Report, he made a comment about the discussion that the Florida Regional Councils Association had about the next strategy, going to the editorial boards with our case. Once we meet on November 26th we will know which direction we will go.

Council Member Miller: We need to convince the papers first so they will stand behind us.

Ms. Todd: We discussed this at the Florida Regional Councils Association

meeting. In fact, we had a very extensive discussion talking about some of the very ideas you suggested Council Member Miller. Commissioner Black Chairs the statewide association. He and a couple of the other leaders from the different RPCs met with the Governor's staff. There may come a point when we do what you said. I do think the next step, after we get the feedback from the meetings they had with the Governor's office will be to do some deliberate and planned initiatives with the media. You are right on target and that's the way all of us have been thinking.

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

G. Economic Development - No Report

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

10. Executive/Budget Committee Report – Chair Bustle -None

11. Chair's Report - None

Announcement:

Ms. Lindsay Cross, TBEP.

The TBEP is working with the Sarasota Bay Estuary Program and Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Programs to collate environmental projects to submit to the Gulf Coast Restoration Council. There is a pot of money that's going to be available for environmental restoration projects throughout the Gulf coast as part of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. If any of your local governments have already submitted projects to us, we will be asking you to numerically rank those projects and if you have other projects you want to submit to do that by December 14th. Our Boards collectively will be ranking those and developing a report for submittal to the Gulf Coast Restoration Council. Misty Cladas at TBEP is the contact person misty@tbep.org. Hopefully you can submit some projects that you mentioned, anything that helps support environmental restoration or water quality or community resilience.

Councilor Matthews:

There is a new formula for calculating funds from BP's oil spill for businesses. Contact your local Chamber and they will know how to go about evaluating that and determine if you qualify.

12. Executive Director's Report

Mr. Pumariega:

There are 3 sources of money that this act is providing. One is the RESTORE Act and the TBEP is concentrating on this funding component and there are two others. Suzanne Cooper is trying to figure out how to access the third component to evaluate funding opportunities. If you have additional projects you can also submit to this other funding component beside the one that the Estuary Program is working on. Suzanne and I will meet and contact you for potential other projects relating to communities.

We have talked with a couple of potential not for profit tenants for the building. They are evaluating and discussing with their board members. Some have visited the available space. We also talked to another Not For Profit a second time. Between those two they will take up to 7,000 sq. ft. and we will have to work on leasing the other 6,000 sq. ft. We will most likely bring back to you as an agenda item recommending that we go with the same architectural firm to develop final drawings on the leasehold improvements for the build-out. That would be the easiest path.

Ms. Todd:

What is the term of the lease?

Mr. Pumariega:

One lease is for 5 years, with two 3 year options; and the other 7 years, with two 4 year options. The building loan will be paid off in 11 years.

Next Meeting: **December 10, 2012** at 10:00 a.m.

Adjournment: 11:43 a.m.



Larry Bustle, Chair



Lori Denman, Recording Secretary