



Interoffice Memorandum

Minutes

Innovation Way Road E

Special Roadway Agreement Committee

August 6, 2008

Members Present: Joe Kunkel – Public Works Department (Vice Chairman)
Renzo Nastasi – Transportation Planning Division
John Smogor – Planning Division

County Staff Present: Brian Sanders – Transportation Planning Division
Jennifer Cummings – Stormwater Management Division
Susan McCune – Transportation Planning Division
Heather Brownlie – Transportation Planning Division
Rita Gonzalez – Transportation Planning Division

For Applicant: John Florio – McIntosh & Associates
Gloria Lockridge – Broad and Cassel
Chris Sinclair - RPG

Mr. Nastasi called the meeting to order at 4:12 p.m.

Innovation Way Road E Agreement

Development: Innovation Way/Beachline Interchange Agreement

Road Affected: Innovation Way/Beachline Interchange Agreement

Mr. Nastasi opened the meeting stating that there is a Regional Planning Council (RPC) meeting coming up and the County needs to iron out any issues before that time.

Mr. Florio stated that the change in ownership has necessitated a change in the plan that was last reviewed and almost approved. ICP needs to be consistent with the current policies on program and traffic.

Mr. Florio stated that the meeting at RPC is to go through everything and see where we are at and what else is needed in regards to the Development Order. This meeting is to discuss a revised plan in process.

Mr. Florio stated that they are not submitting a new application. They are going to amend the last submission. SLR wants to get the revised ICP, Map H, Traffic Analysis, Land Use Plan and Comp Plan into the County's hands before moving forward with Innovation Way to the Board of County Commissioners. Their goal is to show the County how they all blend in together. They will be looking at Phase I traffic analysis.

Mr. Nastasi requested they submit the new traffic analysis and stated that there are 3 major issues relating to the Development Order.

1. Traffic
2. Environmental
3. Development

Mr. Nastasi requested the new environmental information as well.

Mr. Florio will submit the revised ICP, Map H, Traffic Analysis, Land Use Plan and Comp Plan by August 13, 2008, next week.

Mr. Nastasi asked for the following items.

1. pursuing MMTD – wrapping up the study and designating Innovation Way as an MMTD area
2. Revising the Development Order RPC document to address the AA Study and a contribution to the cost of the study.

Mr. Florio agrees that the AA Study is something the County wants to do. Mr. Florio wants to do a Regional Transportation Analysis and then scale down to the Innovation Way areas. They want to combine the contents of the AA Study with the regional study.

Mr. Florio is looking to blend the two studies since they overlap.

Mr. Nastasi turned to Page 14, Paragraph 8 of the agreement at which the committee had stopped their review at the August 6, 2008 RAC Meeting.

The Roadway Agreement Committee requested staff feedback for Sections 8 and 9.

Mr. Nastasi wants policies in Section 8 to reflect County policies but should not be detailed in the agreement and instead outlined in the DRI/DO.

Ms. Lockridge stated that the policies in the DRI/DO make the project more compatible trying to advance Road E to solve a gap, and this agreement is to be finalized prior to the DO being finalized.

Ms. McCune stated that in absence of the DO, they are outlining DO terms in this agreement to be able to move forward.

Mr. Nastasi stated that we should be able to get to the Board of County Commissioners within a matter of months, presumably before the DO.

Mr. Florio stated that the DO is scheduled for the Board of County Commissioners for December.

Mr. Nastasi stated that the parameters in this agreement will reflect changes to the Comp Plan and the DO, which needs to be clear to the Board of County Commissioners as to what is coming along in December.

Ms. Lockridge understands the need for consistency.

Mr. Nastasi stated that we need to make sure the Comp Plan staff agrees with this agreement.

Mr. Smogor stated that Sections 8(a) and (b) are fine, but there is no need for (c), (d) and (e).

Mr. Nastasi asked that the last sentence with the date in Section 8(c) be taken out and that the County assures them the project will get done.

Ms. Lockridge asked for a copy of the Avalon Agreement.

Mr. Kunkel explained the basis of the Avalon Agreement.

Mr. Nastasi was concerned with putting a date in the agreement, because if the agreement changes, then we would have to change two agreements.

Ms. Lockridge and Mr. Florio will take it back to their client for consideration.

Ms. Lockridge asked for a copy of the draft amendment to see what time frames are included.

Mr. Nastasi suggested referencing that amendment but not tie the two together.

In Section 8(d) Ms. McCune stated that there is no reason to include the fees, it does not include information from the final multi-modal study since it is not yet completed, and some of the items included are not in the study all.

Mr. Sinclair stated that a fixed guideway will be included in the future, but do not want to be limited in connectivity or areas of service and need to make sure that the alignments are protected.

Mr. Nastasi stated that we cannot connect dots that don't connect. The road agreement relates to Road E not all surrounding Counties.

Mr. Nastasi suggested they leave in the first 5 lines only and remove the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. Nastasi stated that the client is asking the Board of County Commissioners to adopt Exhibit K before the study is complete.

Ms. McCune stated that the study will provide the Board of County Commissioners with this information.

Mr. Smogor asked they remove Exhibit K and add "regional" language if they wanted, but not to include a map.

Mr. Smogor stated Section 8(e) cannot guarantee transit stops.

Mr. Smogor explained that in Section 8(f) the Airport to Road E connection will be part of MMTD Area.

Section 8(g) Mr. Smogor asked to keep first sentence in "g" and remove the rest of Section 8. Leave first part of (i) and make a new (h).

Mr. Nastasi asked Ms. Lockridge to define regional study and rework the language in Section 8(h) regarding seeking federal and state funding.

Section 8(i) Ms. McCune asked if they wanted to include the MMTD Study.

Mr. Florio stated that they are trying to expedite Road E before the Comp Plan Amendment process is complete.

Ms. McCune suggested stating just that ICP/SLR will be included in the MMTD Study area that will be adopted.

Ms. Lockridge asked that everyone attending provide their comments.

In Section 9(a) ICP does not want to be prevented from moving forward if the interchange gets further delayed.

Mr. Nastasi stated that the County cannot make that commitment since it is a requirement of the DRI traffic analysis.

Mr. Nastasi said that Road E can only support traffic generation that it can hold and cannot allow development beyond that.

Mr. Nastasi stated that if construction of Road E meets all other concurrency issues and the interchange construction is scheduled within 3 years, it will not stop development.

Mr. Florio stated that the interchange agreement has not been met by any of the parties and questioned as to whether ICP/SLR is party to that agreement.

Mr. Nastasi asked that 9(a) needs to come out since it may not have support.

Mr. Sinclair stated that they would “cooperate” but the language is too strong otherwise.

Mr. Nastasi asked why even mention entitlements and project development when it does not relate to the construction of Road E.

Mr. Nastasi stated that there is too much intertwining in this agreement.

Mr. Florio said that this is not a typical road agreement in that the D.O. is not in place.

Mr. Sanders advised that Road E is a two-lane road and it’s the basic concept of what the agreement is all about.

Mr. Florio stated they did not want to spend a lot of money without the assurances of having the D.O. in place and everything has to work to make Innovation Way successful.

Environmental Issues

Ms. Cummings stated that there is nothing in the agreement relating to environmental concerns.

Ms. Cummings sent an RAI to Mr. Florio with her comments.

The paragraph from the Road E Agreement could be inserted in this agreement on permitting to include what is needed.

On Page 14 the August 1, 2008 completion date has to come out.

Mr. Florio will revise to read 152 feet of Right-of-Way with two 15-foot easements for the south corridors.

Mr. Nastasi asked the applicant to provide Right-of-Way widths in the agreement.

It was asked that the Innovation Place cross-section be added to this agreement.

Mr. Sanders stated that the Wewahootee Interchange was contemplated with Wewahootee continuing east.

Mr. Nastasi and Mr. Sanders will provide details for Ms. Lockridge to work with.

The Roadway Agreement Committee target date is September 3, 2008 for returning, if not sooner.

Mr. Nastasi stressed the importance of coordinating issues prior to the RPC meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:39 p.m.