



Envision Alachua Task Force

Summary of Task Force Meeting #6 February 15, 2012

prepared by

MIG, Inc.

March 2012

in support of the Envision Alachua
process convened by Plum Creek



Background

On February 15, 2012, Plum Creek convened the sixth and final Task Force meeting of the first phase of the Envision Alachua process. Envision Alachua is a community planning process to discuss future economic, environmental and community opportunities in Alachua County on lands owned by Plum Creek. Plum Creek is the largest private landowner in Alachua County, with 65,000 acres. Nearly 24,000 of these acres are permanently conserved. The company's holdings are located throughout northern and eastern Alachua County. Plum Creek is considering future uses for its lands that could be aligned with community needs. The Envision Alachua process will explore potential opportunities for lands in East County that are suitable for uses other than timber.

The objectives for the sixth Task Force meeting were to:

- Receive an update on recent Envision Alachua planning process activities and next steps in planning process
- Review and finalize Draft Vision, Goals and Planning Principles document

This document summarizes the general discussion comments made by the facilitator, presenters and Task Force members during the February 15th meeting; it is not intended as a transcription of the meeting. Meeting materials, information about the process and a videotape of the meeting can be found at www.envisionalachua.com.

I. Welcome and Introductions

Todd Powell, Senior Real Estate Director, Plum Creek Florida, opened the meeting and welcomed all participants. He commented on the quality and creativity of the student work that was presented during Educational Forum #4 which was held on January 26, 2012. He then introduced Daniel Iacofano, lead facilitator for the Envision Alachua process. Daniel provided a brief overview of the agenda. He also briefly introduced the next phase of the process, expressing hope that Task Force members would continue to stay involved.

II. Brief Review of Planning Process

Daniel reviewed the project timeline, noting that we were on schedule and the final Vision, Goals and Planning Principles document would be available in about one month, near the end of March. He briefly commented on the success of the Educational Forum, and then introduced the results of the Community Workshop which was held on January 11. The results were condensed into a 9-minute video that showed the reports from each of the small group discussions. The 9-minute segment is included in the videotape of the meeting which can be viewed at www.envisionalachua.com.

Daniel then referred the group to the Draft Vision, Goals and Planning Principles document. He noted that discussions had focused on a vision that

taps into the innovation economy and creates jobs. Job creation is the top priority, and the job factories of the future will be looking for opportunities like those we have here in Alachua County. Daniel briefly reviewed the goals and reflected that there is enough land to accommodate all the goals. Daniel then asked each Task Force member to share their comments on the draft document.

III. Review of Draft Vision, Goals and Planning Principles Document

Brent Christiansen opened the comments by noting that as someone focused on economic development, it's hard to argue with a plan that starts with economic development!

Karen Cole-Smith stated that she had no specific comments at this time.

Dug Jones commented that the document should emphasize that education is attainable across all levels, and opportunities will reach the full spectrum of abilities. The plan can provide a continuum of opportunity.

Pete Johnson seconded the need to emphasize education and provide high quality opportunities. He encouraged the development of a second P.K. Yonge School on the east side of the county. The P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School is a public school district affiliated with the University of Florida and located on its campus, serving approximately 1,150 students. This K-12 school is a department of the College of Education, and P.K. Yonge faculty are also faculty of the University of Florida.

Nona Jones commented that she feels positively about what has been accomplished and agrees with the emphasis on education.

Rob Brinkman also endorsed the idea of establishing a P.K. Yonge School on the east side. He noted that several community leaders have come out of this school.

Rob also provided comments on specific goal statements. He expressed that the wording of Planning Principle B7 and its focus on projects that demonstrate compatibility of conservation and economic development really resonated with him. He also suggested specific edits on Planning Principle B9 so that the statement focused on "ecologically significant portions" of proposed project areas. He suggested reordering the comments so that water recharge was at the top of the list, and also suggested the document further define the "Six Pillars" concept and possibly include it in an appendix.

Stephen Seibert noted that large landowners provide ecosystem services such as groundwater recharge or flood control. There has been some discussion about landowners being compensated. The document should strike a claim for this to be considered in this process. He commented on Planning Principle G3 which references being consistent with current policies. He cautioned that ideas shouldn't be constrained by current policies since this

may limit innovation and development of new practices. We don't want new ideas constrained by old policies.

Stephen also commented on Goal M, requesting clarification of what is meant by "governance." This is an important topic and needs more information.

Robert Hutchinson agreed that this is a good document. He also offered comments on specific planning principles. He referenced Planning Principle E5 [sic; he intended to reference E4], asking if we can control our destiny regarding fuel. We have enough forest products under our control to do so. We should consider growing high quality trees like those near Tallahassee to support the wood products industry.

He commented on Planning Principle G9, stating that he didn't believe "state-of-the-art" described current fire control practices, noting that lands are not burned frequently as would have been properly done in the past. He suggested that we use the term "fire-wise development practices." The County has adopted these practices; we should add this term to the planning principle.

Hutch also commented on Planning Principle M1, noting that this area of the county doesn't have an urban reserve boundary. It is not part of any municipality and it's not clear who the future government will be – it could become a new city. It's a problem for Plum Creek since they don't own all the land. This topic should be addressed early if the area is going to become a new city.

Tom Coward commented that he is very pleased with the process and hopes it will continue to develop. He inquired how much involvement communities like Melrose, Gainesville and Hawthorne had in the process, and suggested seeking greater involvement by these neighboring communities.

Jack Payne apologized to Plum Creek for his inconsistent attendance due to schedule conflicts. He stated that he has learned so much when he has attended meetings, and he applauds Plum Creek on a high quality effort and a first class process. The Community Workshops attracted good participation and were successful in getting people involved and sharing their issues and concerns. He likes the inclusion of performance measures in the document.

Jack predicts there will be challenges to putting this all together. To reach the goal of truly living sustainably today, we will have to sacrifice a lot. The future will involve quality high density development, rather than living on five acres. Helping people understand this will be very important. He was very impressed by Bob Segar's presentation on the West Village Development at the University of California Davis. Jack commented that he really appreciates the involvement of the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS). The project goes beyond agriculture; it includes natural resources and also helping disadvantaged community members.

Scott Koons shared that he works for an organization that is promoting economic development while at the same time protecting natural resources. These are mutually interdependent and he is pleased that they are the first two goals, serving as the cornerstones of the document. He is working with agencies that are updating their economic development plans to reflect the Six Pillars strategy. He complimented the project team on the job they did listening to the Task Force members and reflecting their remarks.

Charles Lee shared that he echoed Steve Seibert's comments on governance and the importance of that issue. As he looks at the landscape, it is clear that the execution of the development plan for these lands involves properties that aren't owned by Plum Creek. It is logical that the interests of both Plum Creek and these other landowners are considered. There needs to be a vehicle to accommodate the participation of other land owners and treat these lands the same as Plum Creek's. He's not sure if the Sector Plan process is the appropriate vehicle for this.

Charles commented that there needs to be some type of unified boundary of the lands identified in the emerging concepts map. In the next phase, Plum Creek should work with the County to construct a governance platform to address this up front. Overall, it is rare that a new community is informed by the type of information this process has provided. We could quibble over a few words, but everything we need is covered in this document.

Rose Fagler shared a quick comment, suggesting that any members who had questions regarding Plum Creek's forest management practices discuss them with Jon Rashleigh. She noted that Jon was not in attendance this evening, but would be available to answer any questions that members might have.

Brad Pollitt was very complimentary of the document and described it as "excellent." His only comment related to the suggestion that we look at the longer 50-100 year time frame and move through the process unrestricted by what we know today. He thought the student presentations were very creative and interesting and highlight a variety of ways people might interact with the lands.

Lindsay Krieg suggested that Planning Principle A6, regarding stopping the brain drain, should be moved up in the list so it has higher priority. This should also be tied into Planning Principle I5. We also need to address the needs of young professionals.

Bill Strassberger commented that we need to include the full spectrum of education including technical, vocational, and higher education.

Bobbi Walton seconded the comments by Bill and Dug, emphasizing that education is very important for the Hawthorne area. If the school system doesn't change and improve, this project will be a hard sell. She thought it

would be fantastic to have a P.K. Yonge school in Hawthorne along with Santa Fe College and University of Florida facilities. She believes education is just as important as job creation. Technical and trade schools need to be included.

Bobbi also noted the importance of water and recreation issues. It appears that our lakes are at lower levels than they should be. This process may help bring attention to our lakes and lead to improving their health and water quality. The lakes are a significant draw in the county. Daniel replied that the students brought up this issue and looked at the challenges and opportunities provided by phosphorus and other water quality issues.

Justin William shared that he had few comments to add. He found the document well-written and appreciates the inclusion of recreation-related Planning Principles K1, K2, and K3 in the document. He is very appreciative of the process and what he has learned through it.

Tom Coward asked, who will be the driving force in how this comes together - is it Plum Creek, the County, others? Todd Powell responded that the effort was led by Plum Creek, who wanted to get input from the community and local leaders. However, the heavy lifting starts now when we have to take this document and turn it into master plan. We have been working at the 30,000-foot level and Plum Creek will need to develop more detail. Plum Creek will also need to return to get additional input.

Karen Cole-Smith reminded the group about not forgetting the residents in East Gainesville who will be impacted. She described the inquiries she received from people who have participated in the workshops, noting that we have an obligation to go back and share the results. We need some type of venue to accomplish this. These community members may have more to add, and it gives residents who were part of the process a sense of ownership. It also assists in closing the loop and helping people understand what is going to happen next.

Todd Powell shared that Plum Creek intends to rent a space where the student work can be viewed and which will also provide a venue for sharing information about the process.

Tom Coward inquired if we could thank the process participants for coming together and let them know that we are moving forward? Daniel replied that yes, we can contact them and share updates on what is happening.

Rob Brinkman suggested that Plum Creek contact the County and get on their agenda to provide information about the process. These meetings are also on public access television and can reach a broad audience.

Karen Cole-Smith suggested that we work through action networks and the churches to create and maintain channels of communication.

IV. Envision Alachua Planning Process Phase II: Where Do We Go From Here

Daniel then reviewed the process briefly from the beginning, highlighting the following points:

- Alachua County requested that Plum Creek prepare a master plan for all its lands – this was the catalyst for Envision Alachua.
- Plum Creek owns 65,000 acres in Alachua County.
- Current land use and zoning allows 1 residential unit per five acres.
- Results of the visioning process emphasized the community's desire to focus on economic development along with environmental conservation and other community uses.

Daniel showed a graphic that illustrated how the Task Force has moved from a starting point where Plum Creek's zoning allowed silviculture and rural residential (or one house to five acres) to a vision that supports clustered development with significant areas for conservation. One of the key components is agriculture, which includes both food and timber, as well as manufacturing and food related production. Agriculture had been in decline, but it is coming back. There's a new paradigm and way of thinking about how we live.

Daniel then introduced Pierce Jones, Professor and Director, Program for Resource Efficient Communities, IFAS, University of Florida.

Pierce opened his presentation with a brief history of master plan community development, starting with Bill Levitt, who developed large swaths of potato and onion fields into Levittown, New York. He noted that our current process is to develop elaborate concept plans. Large projects actually have a pattern book that includes a huge level of detail, showing what each lot is like. This level of detail is needed to get approved and to attract financing. Once a project is approved and financing is obtained, you clear the land, put in infrastructure for Phase 1, build homes and then put in landscaping. Phase 1 dictates how well Phase 2 sells. Homeowner association rules are established to help maintain look and feel and overall quality. Sometimes these rules can be restrictive. For example, some communities don't allow gardens, since they are messy and may impact the look and feel of the development.

Pierce stated that at IFAS, they are less concerned about what the land looks like and more about how it performs. He briefly reviewed a case study of a community by the name of Restoration. It is a mixed-use transit oriented development project that was fully entitled in 2009. In its early planning stages, it was a community with conventional features including a golf course. The project ran into resistance due to environmental features. The developer came back with a different design that included the same number of units and one million square feet more commercial development. The golf course was removed and areas were redesigned with an emphasis on more

efficient transportation, resource conservation and other features. They also put 7% of the property in a conservation easement.

This provided an opportunity to compare two separate designs for the same property. The first plan, done in 2006, required 186 lane miles of roads. In the 2009 version, lane miles dropped to 103, reducing road costs by \$145 million. These costs usually aren't questioned since they are not explicit and are hidden in taxes and other costs. The 2009 plan reduced gas consumed and what residents would have to spend on fuel to move through the property.

Pierce's case study looked at other elements. For example, in the 2006 plan, 988 acres were landscaped. In the 2009 plan, 428 acres were landscaped. This greatly reduces the usage of pesticides, fertilizer and irrigation. Pierce asked the group to consider what would happen if these resources were applied to growing food. This can be accomplished in the same amount of land as the golf course (140 acres). By reducing the costs of food and transportation, the cost of living in these communities can be reduced. Pierce didn't mean to suggest a one to one reduction, but instead show the relationship between these costs.

Pierce continued to explain that at the University of Florida, they are teaching people how to farm. The local food movement is accelerating and the University now offers a practicum in the College of Design, Construction and Planning to help students determine how to integrate local food into community design. A local farm near Waldo, Frog Song Organics, is run by IFAS graduates.

In terms of big business, Alto Straughn's leadership in production of blueberries in the state is currently generating \$80 million/year. Agriculture is still a big part of the area economy. Peach production is rising with a 25% increase in acreage planted. Alachua County is the largest pecan producer in the state. The Chinese have discovered pecans, and as a result, the pecan market is growing significantly. Olives are also growing in popularity, and some citrus growers are considering shifting to olives.

Pierce concluded his remarks by stating that he agrees this is a long-term process and that we are looking at 50-100 year planning horizon. Once a project is designed and built, the resource demands are established. We need to think about flexibility so that we are not locked into any one model.

Daniel asked if there were any comments or questions on the presentation. Charles Lee shared that he and his colleagues at Audubon have found Pierce's work to be among the most important and enlightening work being done in supporting conservation activities as a part of economic strategies. He noted that we have a tremendous resource here at the University. He also commented on providing payment for ecosystem services and explained that there is an emerging concept called "water farming." He described how the

growers of Indian River Citrus had been forced out of business by pricing and disease. Today, they are looking at being paid to use their land to store excess water that is running off into the Indian River.

Daniel then introduced Tim Jackson, Principal Engineer, AECOM, to describe the required land use planning activities that would be part of the next phase.

Tim Jackson provided a brief review of planning documents and tools that would influence the future steps in the process.

Tim referenced the Alachua County Comprehensive Plan, which is a blueprint, adopted by the County Commission, to guide economic growth, development of land, resource protection, and provision of public services and facilities in Alachua County. The Plan implements the community's vision through a series of elements that provide a framework for development to maintain and achieve the quality of life desired by residents and business owners.

He briefly reviewed the process through which the Comprehensive Plan is amended. Amendments are approved by the County Board of Commissioners. Amendments happen regularly and follow a standard process.

Tim also briefly reviewed the following large scale land use planning tools, noting the opportunities that come from having all this land under one ownership:

- Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)
- Rural Land Stewardship Overlay
- Sector Plan - covers multiple owners
- Development of Regional Impact (DRI) - includes development order that allows County to negotiate directly with landowner

Tim showed a map of Florida with a significant number of large-scale projects that have been proposed and approved. Having the land under one ownership increases the chance of success. For example, large scale conservation easements are more easily negotiated when there is only one landowner involved.

Daniel opened the floor for questions and comments. Charles Lee discussed the plan developed for the Farmington community. It was a very complex comprehensive plan amendment and included very detailed parameters. The conservation plan for the remainder of the tract had a level of detail that would match most DRIs in place. He suggested considering this model.

Tim responded there are a number of examples where just the comprehensive plan amendment process was used, in addition to tools such as transfer of development rights. There are a few counties that have

adopted a framework or a set of rules so that landowners could amend the comprehensive plan by following the same process.

V. Summary and Next Steps in the Envision Alachua Planning Process

Daniel reminded Task Force members that Plum Creek would like them to stay connected to the process and recommended that they use the website to stay up to date.

Todd Powell provided additional information about the next steps in the process, and thanked everyone for their time over the past year. Todd expressed appreciation for the quality of the document created through the Task Force's work, and noted that it far exceeded his expectations of what might be produced.

He described the current place in the process as Phase 1, where we are working at the 30,000-foot level. Now we have to start to put together a more detailed plan. We have to determine the strategy we use to address the entitlement of this land and conservation areas. There will be a Phase 2 that starts to tackle the more specific detail required. Plum Creek will continue to lead the process, but it is a partnership. Plum Creek appreciates the role it has been able to play working with the Task Force and the community. Todd acknowledged the assistance of the many people at the event facilities, Plum Creek staff and the consulting team support who helped make the meetings a success.

This concluded the sixth and final Task Force meeting of Phase 1 of the Envision Alachua Planning process.

A meeting wallgraphic, attendance roster of Task Force members and a comment submitted by a member of the public are attached at the end of this document.

ENVISION ALACHUA

A ECON IMPACT

▷ ECONOMIC SERVICES:
CONSIDER COMPENSATION
→ A WOOD PRODUCTS INDUSTRY...

E ENERGY

E5: FOREST
BIO MASS/PRODUCTS
FUEL

K RECREATION

K1-K3 GREAT!

J EDUCATION

▷ MAKE A QUALITY EDUCATION ACCESSIBLE AND ATTAINABLE F/ ENTIRE SPECTRUM!

CONTINUUM OF HIGHER ED. → VOC → GRAD.

ALL LEVELS
PRE-K — 12
CREATE A PK-YOUNG STATE SCHOOL ON EAST SIDE.

TRADE SCHOOL + PRESENCE OF SEC OF JF

A6: MOVE HIGHER
LINK TO I-5
INCL. YOUNG PROS!

B ENV. CONS.

P7: GOOD
P9: ^ ECOLOGICALLY-SIGNIFICANT

G LAND USE

▷ CONSISTENCY... NEW POLICIES SHOULD BE ALLOWED...

P/09 PIPE NET/DATE OF THE ART PRACTICES.
FIRE-WISE LANDSCAPE PRACTICES.

F WATER

P1: PROTECT WATER-RE CHARGE
≥ 50% WASTEWATER LAKE TREAT

M GOV.

▷ EXPAND EXPLANATION
M1: COULD BE ITS OWN AREA/CITY OR?
ID EARLY ON...
STUDY/ANALYZE

▷ CONSIDER NEEDS OF NON-PLUM CREEK LAND OWNERS...
→ CONSIDER A UNIFIED BOUNDARY.

N PLNG. PROCESS

▷ 50+ YEAR HORIZON
▷ N10: DEVELOP THE 6 PILLARS (Appendix)

▷ HAVE SOME COMMUNITIES OF HAWTHORNE, ETC... MELROSE...

ALL OF EAST GAINESVILLE...

MOVE IDEAS FORWARD...

KEEP THE CONVERSATION GOING...
KEEP COUNTY IN THE LOOP...

LOOK FORWARD

Envision Alachua Task Force Meeting #6 – February 15, 2012

Appendix A: Roster of Task Force Members

* denotes in attendance at February 15, 2012 meeting

Jane Adams

Vice President, University Relations
The University of Florida

Dr. Dale Brill

President
Florida Chamber Foundation

* **Rob Brinkman**

Vice Chair of Citizens Advisory Committee to
MTPO, Member of Rural Concerns Advisory
Committee, Former Chair of Suwannee St. Johns
Sierra Club

Robert Castellucci

Vice President, Marketing
RoomSync

* **Brent Christensen**

CEO
Gainesville Area Chamber of Commerce & Council
of Economic Outreach

* **Dr. Karen Cole-Smith**

Executive Director
East Gainesville Initiative & Community Outreach
Santa Fe College

* **Tom Coward**

Retired Alachua County Commissioner & Retired
Lincoln High School Teacher

Ed Dix

Realtor, Developer
Edix Investments, Inc.

Mike Dykes

Officer, Cracker Boys Hunt Club
Senior Project Manager, CH2MHILL

Vivian Filer

Chair
Cotton Club Museum & Cultural Center

Eric Godet

President & CEO
Godet Industries

Dr. Richard Hilsenbeck

Director Conservation Projects
Florida Chapter Office
The Nature Conservancy

* **Robert Hutchinson**

Director
Alachua Conservation Trust

* **Pete Johnson**

Former Board Member
Gainesville Regional Airport Authority

* **Dug Jones**

Assistant Vice President of Economic
Development
Santa Fe College
Center for Innovation & Economic Development

* **Nona Jones**

Community Relations Director
GRU

* **Lindsay Krieg**

Community Director
March of Dimes
North Central Florida Division

* **Charles Lee**

Director of Advocacy
Audubon Florida

Eddie Lee Martin

Former Vice Chair, NCFL Regional Planning
Council &
Commissioner City of Hawthorne

* **Jack Payne**

Senior Vice President
Institute of Food & Agricultural Sciences (IFAS)
University of Florida

* **Brad Pollitt**

Vice President of Facilities
Shands Healthcare

Ed Regan

Assistant General Manager, Strategic Planning
GRU

* **Steven Seibert**

Senior Vice President & Director of Strategic
Planning
The Collins Center

* **Bill Strassberger**

District Engineer
Clay Electric

Adrian Taylor

Pastor
Springhill Missionary Baptist Church

Kevin Thorpe

Senior Pastor
Faith Missionary Baptist

Terry Tougaw

Director, Community Planning
Alachua County Public Schools

* **Bobbi Walton**

President Community Service for Windsor,
Former Research Librarian for CH2MHILL
and Environmental Science & Engineering

* **Justin Williams**

Officer, Public Relations
Cracker Boys Hunt Club

Ex Officio Members

Rick Drummond

Assistant County Manager
Alachua County

* **Scott Koons**

Executive Director
NCF Regional Planning Council

**Participating Task Force Members
Representing Plum Creek**

* **Todd Powell**

Director, Real Estate
Plum Creek

* **Rose Fagler**

Manager Community Relations
Plum Creek

**Plum Creek Resource Liaison to the
Task Force**

Jon Rashleigh

Senior Resources Manager
Plum Creek

MIG, Inc.

* **Daniel Iacofano**

Principal & Lead Facilitator
MIG, Inc.

* **Joan Chaplick**

Principal
MIG, Inc.

Appendix B: Public Comment Card

comment card

Thank for your Time and Consideration!!

Please write your question for the speakers below. Please print clearly. Thank you!

QUESTION: Hello my name is Kenneth Johnson, I am a Community Leader of the next generation. President/Founder of No Limit Outreach Foundation. Community Based Organization.

I wanted to add a Life Skills Center. * I think today's youth need life skills to become successful in education. + add

A 2nd Chance Center to give citizen a 2nd chance in life to help build a successful tomorrow!!

Name: Kenneth Johnson



ENVISION ALACHUA MODELS OF INNOVATION SERIES