



Envision Alachua

Technical Advisory Group

Summary of Technical Advisory Group Meeting #3 March 19, 2013

prepared by

MIG, Inc.

March 2013

in support of the Envision Alachua
process convened by Plum Creek



Background

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. Phase I of the process yielded a community vision, goals and guiding principles to guide Plum Creek's decision making as it explores potential opportunities for lands in East County that are suitable for uses other than timber.

During Phase II of the process, Plum Creek will work with a Technical Advisory Group, Task Force and members of the community to determine how to achieve the community's vision and goals that support economic development opportunities, environmental conservation and activities that meet community needs as expressed during the Envision Alachua process.

This document provides the general discussion, presentation points and comments made by the facilitator, presenters, and Technical Advisory Group members during the March 19, 2013 meeting. It is intended only as a summary and should not be considered a transcription of the meeting. Meeting materials and information about the process can be found at www.envisionalachua.com, and will be posted following the upcoming Task Force meeting on April 4, 2013.

I. Welcome and Introductions

Daniel Iacofano opened the meeting and asked participants to conduct self-introductions. He reviewed the agenda and the meeting objectives, which were as follows:

- Provide update on process and schedule
- Introduce Economic Progress Initiative
- Present Draft Framework Map and Related Land Uses
- Discuss Potential Land Use Program

Each TAG member was given meeting materials which included the agenda and summaries of TAG Meeting #2, Task Force Meeting #2, and the Community Workshop held on February 7th. He then reviewed the schedule for upcoming meetings and reflected on the key themes

which were identified at the January 24th Task Force meeting and the February 7th Community Workshop.

Key themes identified at Task Force Meeting #2 included:

- Follow the “four corners” strategy
- Start in Area B - it's ready
- Work from the edges in
- Be consistent with adjoining land uses
- Link to transportation resources - rail, major roadways, Hawthorne Trail

He also briefly reviewed the key themes from the Community Workshop, which was well attended by more than 100 participants. They were asked to work in small groups and discuss: What are the potential opportunities for East Gainesville to Hawthorne? Key themes from the group reports included:

- Area B is ready - zoning, water supply, rail line and existing workforce are in place
- Highway 20 and 301 corridors are major arteries for commercial development
- Availability of open space can support outdoor recreation economy
- Hospital or health care expansion is desired and could include some retail
- Make sure local community members are not out-priced as land values increase
- Utilize Highway 20 and 301 corridors as major arteries for commercial development
- Provide adequate infrastructure for industry and development
- Address water supply and quality
- Link education and workforce development opportunities to the University of Florida and Santa Fe College
- Maintain opportunities for hunting, fishing, hiking and camping; promote outdoor recreation opportunities
- Preserve character of local communities
- Preserve the “Emerald Necklace”
- Create conservation areas in a manner that promotes linkages for habitat

Daniel asked for comments from any of the TAG members who attended the Community Workshop.

Justin Williams commented that as an observer of the process, he noted the vision is still in place and the same goals and guiding principles we discussed in Phase I are being brought up by new participants. The group agreed this was a positive sign that the process had covered the full range of issues and concerns.

II. Economic Progress Initiative

Dale Brill provided an overview of the Economic Progress Initiative (EPI). Dale described how the focus of this effort differs from typical economic development activities in that this process seeks to improve the quality of life and protect the economy and environment.

The “Leap to Prosperity” includes three main points:

1. Economic progress trumps economic development
2. Civic engagement builds social capital; social capital refers to a positive working relationship where the parties are trusted; we will fail if we can't continue the momentum of Envision Alachua and build on the relationships we have already created
3. We can get there from here; there are cases demonstrating that these concepts have been achieved

Tale of Two Counties

Dale compared Alachua County with Boulder County, Colorado to demonstrate what might be possible.

Alachua and Boulder have some commonalities, including a major academic anchor. Alachua County has more students and a larger endowment, including the University of Florida and Santa Fe College.

Dale briefly reviewed a map which showed the number of companies per 100,000 people. The map is designed to show entrepreneurial companies. The companies identified were scaling companies, meaning they are intended to grow. He clarified that not all small businesses are entrepreneurial. While the jobs small businesses create are valuable, we can't count on small businesses that are not scaling businesses to add the numbers of jobs we need to grow our economy. Entrepreneurial companies seek to grow, thereby adding jobs and creating wealth.

Dale briefly reviewed rankings produced by the Milken Institute, which ranks the best performing cities. Last year, Boulder went from #59 to #16. Gainesville dropped from #100 to #167.

We should pay attention to these rankings since they tell us where we stand in terms of job growth, wage growth, high-tech GDP growth and other related factors.

There is correlation between what we find in Boulder and what we want to build in Alachua County. During the comparison, they looked at adults age 25 years and above to remove the impact of the student population from the numbers. They found a poverty rate difference of 4%, and the parity difference in persons in poverty is 5,600. If we can make a family receiving public assistance self-sufficient, we can reduce the responsibility of taxpayers to provide support.

Entrepreneurial Payoff

Dale also looked at the entrepreneurial payoff. If we estimate 10% growth per year (which isn't a stretch), in ten years from now, Gainesville can grow its economy to \$42.54 million.

To get this type of growth, we will need to change our approach. The current economic development model focuses on recruitment, retention and entrepreneurship. We invest most in recruitment, and we pay for what we cannot provide. Retention gets less resources and entrepreneurship tends to focus on small business, not necessarily scalable companies.

In the Economic Progress approach, we turn the approach upside down. We start with geo-marketing and we assess who we are and what assets we have. Retention is better resourced, and allows us to identify how we can use local skills and talents so that firms don't leave our County. By retaining our talent, we are able to have a larger focus on entrepreneurship.

Steve Seibert asked if the Chamber ever conducted exit interviews to see why companies would leave the County. Dale responded that the Chamber did a focus group and learned that firms were leaving because of workforce and business climate. (These are also national issues.) They learned that there is a disconnect between what we are producing and what businesses need. More specific information on the focus group results can be found at: www.flchamber.com/foundation.

Plum Creek is working to change the game by emphasizing the following:

- Regional Blueprint

- Measurement Feedback
- Strategic Prioritization - led by Chamber and Innovation Gainesville
- Platform Development
- Civic Engagement

We are building on 10 years of momentum. The process template has six steps:

- North Central Region Baseline Analysis
- UF Asset Analysis
- Regional Blueprint
- Marketing Plan
- Develop Marketing Platform
- Metrics and Tracking System

Dale reminded the group that we are not seeking to be Boulder, Colorado, but rather to determine what we want to be. Economic progress is not at odds with our efforts to have a quality environment.

Chris Bird asked about the metrics of success for this approach. Dale answered that we can look at:

- Economic Development - look at mean wage or income per capita
- Economic Progress - look at poverty index, culture and quality of life metrics such as commute times. (Boulder's average commute is 26 minutes and Gainesville's average commute is 23 minutes.)

One issue in Boulder is that the blue collar workforce has been priced out of the community. Envision Alachua is talking about a more inclusive definition of success, whereby a rising tide raises all boats.

Robert Christianson wanted to know who was paying for the initiative and how it was governed. Dale responded that the Chamber of Commerce is the champion for the initiative. Todd Powell added that the Economic Progress Initiative is a public/private partnership with the University of Florida and Santa Fe College as important partners. Our goal is to have a plan that is brought to reality. Plum Creek is making a leadership effort on the regional level. Some issues, such as workforce issues, are larger than the County.

Robert asked if the group has a charter. Todd replied that the initiative was relatively new and its charter is in development. There will likely be a formal roll-out sometime in June, hosted by the Chamber.

Justin asked about retention and community character and geo-marketing. Dale noted that recruitment requires a larger investment in terms of the incentive you provide. Geo-marketing costs less to play. Austin is Austin and companies are moving there because that's where they want to be.

Justin added that when you talk about civic engagement, how does that align with the County's plan? Do they want these businesses to come to the County? How do we make sure the civic engagement is recognized as social capital? Dale responded that we need people to understand that we are not bringing smokestacks to the County. We are seeking advanced manufacturing, industries that don't fundamentally change the County, while they bring jobs and opportunities.

Steve Seibert asked about how quality of life is all part of this. Dale responded that it is similar to the six pillars concept advanced by the Florida Chamber.

III. Discuss Draft Framework Map and Related Land Uses

Daniel invited Tim Jackson and Fred Merrill to join the presentation and walk the group through the process of developing and refining the framework map. Tim started the group off with a review of the framework map from December 2012.

Tim reminded participants that the Sector Plan has two elements - the Long Term Master Plan (LTMP) and the Detailed Specific Area Plan (DSAP.) The Sector Plan applies to all of Plum Creek's lands in unincorporated Alachua County, which include about 60,000 acres.

Starting with the Long Term Master Plan, the centerpiece is a framework map which also shows where Plum Creek's lands are in the context of the County. Framework map shows the four land uses that must be addressed - conservation, urban, rural and agricultural. We then need to provide additional information about the character or form of development that would take place and the densities and intensities of development.

We started mapping with a look at regional landscape linkages, and then honed in on local linkages. Tim referred to the Environmental Summary map showed all the major environmental features. At a minimum, it should include wetlands of at least 40 acres. Zeroing in on the East County scale, we looked at issues and opportunities including wetlands, green connections, outparcels and edges, adjacent communities, areas for economic development, and the need for certainty versus flexibility, since this is a 50 year plan.

This strategy for identifying conservation lands led us to a potential map that showed all the connected wetlands, as well as those larger than 40 acres. He then referenced a map that shows what the area might look like with the four land uses defined. Since the last TAG meeting, we looked at landscape linkages, while keeping in place all the 40 acre+ wetlands and the places where agricultural uses make sense. The map also showed a creek corridor that is at least 0.5 to 1 mile wide.

Following this, Daniel stopped to take comments and questions from the group.

Chris Bird asked if wetlands of less than 40 acres were included. These are important resources and we also have to respect local resources. He noted that the 40 acre size wetland parcel is not a resource category that is in the Comprehensive Plan. The County has a wetlands avoidance policy and he is not sure how that fits in here. Daniel asked if there was a minimum size wetland recognized by the County. Chris said no, and reiterated his concerns regarding wetlands less than 40 acres due to the value they contribute to the lake system. He referenced the Orange Creek Basin Master Plan.

Daniel explained that an area classified as urban is not totally paved - it just includes certain land uses. Wetlands can still be protected. Chris suggested that it was a communications issue, since he knows Plum Creek values the smaller wetlands - they just don't show on the map. Chris further commented on "optimizing" and how many things need to be optimized in this process.

Ana Richmond commented that in the Sector Plan process you can develop the map in two ways. There is an overlay that is implemented through the DSAPs. The County plan is under this overlay. The framework map needs to show what will be kept in conservation over the long-term. Everything else is done through the DSAP process.

Todd added that we are intent on doing DSAPs concurrently, to help people better understand what we are doing by taking it down to the next level of detail. Plum Creek is considering two concurrent DSAPs. The DSAP needs to be consistent with the LTMP.

Robert Christianson shared that his main reaction is about the conservation corridors. This map does a good job of connecting the north-south corridors. The southeast portion is less well-connected, but it is a lower priority. He called out two linkages that he believes should be considered. They include the area on the southwest portion of the property near Newnan's Lake and the Flatwoods. He suggested there is a corridor there, and the land has been heavily utilized. He called out a second corridor that runs north-south in the upper middle portion of the property. He asked if there was an acreage number we were targeting and what the drivers were.

Tim explained there was not a specific acreage figure being targeted since it was important we retain flexibility.

Ana Richmond inquired if we want to have a policy that the corridors would be further examined when the DSAPs are developed. It was suggested that we do it now at this point in the process.

Laura DiGruttolo expressed her agreement with Ana's suggestions and the other comments. There's an opportunity to further delineate the corridor.

Bob Romig asked how the decision is made to identify the corridor in the LTMP versus the DSAP? Tim replied that internally, we are looking at different design options. We can't have a job center and keep everybody's wishes for the corridor in place.

Ana Richmond commented that the Sector Plan is supposed to provide flexibility. However, the conservation easements are not flexible. Plum Creek needs to consider whether they want to stay at the 40 acre parcel size for wetlands or determine how they will deal with the smaller wetland parcels.

Robert Christianson noted that we have laid out the key corridors and we may not have enough detail.

Todd shared that he found the comments expressed to be very helpful and reminded the group that the focus is not on the 17,000 acres in

East County, but the total 60,000 acres that Plum Creek owns in the County.

Justin Williams encourage the group to refocus the discussion on the corridor so that we don't miss the big picture. There must be a trade-off between the wetlands and the size of the land Plum Creek is willing to put into conservation.

Daniel suggested to the group that we can shed light on where we want to go by applying a set of principles and standards This can help us understand the trade-offs.

Scott Koons weighed in from a regional perspective and noted that we have two classes of resources - natural and regional. These include Payne's Prairie, Lake Lochloosa, Newnan's Lake and the O2O connection. As we go further north along 301, there is a lot of land. Is there an opportunity to have agriculture here along adjacent to conservation areas and focus on the four corners strategy?

Tim explained there will be plenty of agriculture in the plan, including the urban areas. Agriculture includes silviculture. Daniel noted that Plum Creek is serious about the incorporation of agriculture and agri-technology. The field of agriculture is changing radically, and UF is at the forefront.

Bob Romig commented that we need to consider the connectivity needs of the future and that we are not yet at the level of detail for these conversations. Daniel asked about the transportation corridor linking to the Jacksonville Airport. Bob Romig commented that from a transportation standpoint, the emphasis over the long-term is on the connection between Tampa Bay and Jacksonville. How do we make connections happen? Is 301 improved or are other actions taken? It was noted that Alachua County is at the epicenter of truck travel from Jacksonville to Tampa.

Scott Koons said the Regional Planning Council is looking at this but hasn't yet come to conclusions.

Missy Daniels is waiting to see what the urban land use will include. She expressed concern that there are no real connections to Phifer Flatwoods.

At this point, Fred Merrill continued the presentation and referred back to Dale's presentation. This plan has to provide a place for the EPI to

occur. He reviewed the land use concept diagram from the Task Force Vision, and noted that we have included the primary, secondary and supporting uses developed in the Vision.

What we are suggesting is we have about 23,000 acres in conservation easements and 36,000 acres in rural agriculture, which allows development of one unit per 5 acres. The County encourages clustering, but there would still be substantial residential use. The future LTMP shows an increase of the potential conservation easement by 25,000 acres in exchange for the urban uses.

Tim explained that the agriculture shown here would remove the ability to develop one unit per five acres. We are removing this from 20,000 acres.

Allowable uses for conservation include: preservation, silviculture, agriculture, stormwater, mitigation, recreation and roadway connections. Agriculture includes one unit per 40 acres.

Bob Romig suggested that roadway connections should be included in all the uses. Chris Bird noted that stormwater should be identified in rural and urban uses as well.

Scott Koons asked if transferring the density to other areas helped us determine the number of units that have been proposed. Tim explained that no, the numbers were determined based on the creation of an economic driver.

Robert Christianson said that active recreation should be put in the urban category, and intentionally called active.

Missy Daniels noted that our list ends up mixing things that the County doesn't mix, even at the land use level.

Daniel commented that environmental services is a viable function and land use. While stormwater retention can be engineered in an urban area or managed differently in a conservation area, we should use the term "environmental services" since it is more all-encompassing.

Robert Christianson asked how the outcome might resemble the emerging land use concept diagrams from the Vision, with their sense of scale and conceptual targets. Daniel explained that the emerging land use concepts were where Phase I left off and the starting point for Phase II.

Laura DiGruttolo asked if we will revisit this list of allowable uses and what would be included. What are the details on what would be allowed? Is this the right phase for these questions? Tim replied that we need to consider that not every piece of conservation is the same.

Daniel asked if there was a reference document that would help clarify some of these uses? We may want to suggest a starting point. There doesn't seem to be much difference between the land uses allowed. Conservation and agriculture seem to be very similar, with the exception of the one unit per 40 acres allowed in agriculture. There were some questions about agriculture and how it is accommodated within conservation.

Robert Christianson suggested we provide some clarity around the conservation easements. From Plum Creek's perspective, there are some things required under previous easements that you might not want included.

Fred reviewed a potential urban land use program with the group. The timeframe is over 50 years. We are looking at this initiative as a jobs creation initiative. We are looking at 6 million square feet for Research and Development/Office/Institutional, creating 18,000-24,000 jobs, and 8 million square feet in advanced manufacturing, creating 6,000-12,000 jobs. This is a high jobs-to-household ratio of three to one; the current ratio in the County is one to one.

We are also including residential, retail, schools, civic uses, and roads and infrastructure. In addition to conservation uses, about 30-35% of the urban use (excluding wetlands) will be open space.

Daniel described how the uses on this slide compare with the land uses in many of the brain hub cities we have referenced previously in the process. The brain hub cities have a strong university presence. Daniel and Fred reviewed a slide that compared the proposed program with conditions in Madison, Boulder, and Huntsville. Daniel reviewed a slide that put Envision Alachua in perspective with other sector plans, which showed that it includes significantly less development compared to other plans.

Daniel then briefly reviewed a few case studies that showed agricultural facilities such as the Monsanto Learning and Research Center, the DuPont Pioneer Hi-Bred Agricultural Research Facilities and the USDA Fruit and Tree Nut Research Laboratory. He discussed how

agriculture could be woven within an urban setting. The inclusion of research development and office facilities was received well earlier in the process. These facilities feature “desk-top” manufacturing, where they are manufacturing right from their desktop. We are seeking to make more of the things we design in this country, with the goals of a smaller land footprint and a more congenial interactive space. Daniel also described a laser factory in Ditzingen, Germany where people live and work. There is one main access point, and agriculture is integrated into the community.

There are 2,000 jobs at the Volkswagen Manufacturing plant in Germany, and the factory generates an additional 9,000 jobs. We have an opportunity with the Innovation Hub and Innovation Square to stimulate additional jobs. While there's not enough space within those areas for manufacturing, these activities can be located nearby.

Robert Christianson asked how 30-35% of the land would be in open space but not wetlands. The response was that Plum Creek has the information about the wetland acreage, but not at our fingertips. We will follow up and provide more detail on this topic. Robert went on to say that the agricultural use seems more prominent than it was in what he had previously heard. This does pose some questions about water usage. Tim replied that the Task Force has been emphasizing water as a key issue throughout the process.

Robert was curious how the water requirements for this process would be determined. Tim replied that Plum Creek is initiating a study that will help us to understand the water needs of the site. Todd further responded that we are seeking an answer that is different than what the current zoning allows, which is basically that anyone can drop a well to serve their residence. Plum Creek is seeking to explore how to design for the future versus letting the development happen piecemeal, to be corrected later.

Todd continued by saying that water is both the number one issue and the number one opportunity. For today's meeting, we are focusing on the cumulative water needs and water budget for the total 65,000 acres. There is potentially a relationship between silviculture and intensive agricultural practices and their related water budgets.

We need a large area to begin approaching a large, long-term solution. Ana Richmond reminded people that the Sector Plan goes to the water agencies for their review and consistency with water plans. Robert Christianson sees today's meeting as being proactive in order to avoid

issues later in the review process. Todd mentioned that 65% of all water uses in the state, currently, are for irrigation. We have the opportunity to design a site were this type of usage wouldn't be allowed. We need to determine what stage this happens at – during the design process or the regulatory process?

Chris Bird noted that the current land use is silviculture, which relies on water that falls and does not need irrigation. There is no way to get around the fact that the land uses require that water be pumped out of the aquifer in an area that has very little recharge. This will lead to a major change. There is some technology that can help. It's important to keep tabs on the net nutrient load. What can Plum Creek do to capture nutrients and prevent this from becoming a problem, and how will we deal with aquifer recharge?

Scott Koons suggested that as the person who represents the regional perspective, he hopes we can think outside the box. For example, water may come from outside the region, considering that current water recharge occurs further north.

Robert Christianson commented that one of the benchmarks we need to consider is what the area could become, and not just the current silviculture, but the rural zoning as well. Chris Bird commented that, when the Comp Plan was put into effect, water was not the issue it is currently. Robert recommended we have further discussions with our water experts to help address this issue effectively.

IV. Discuss Potential Land Use Program

For the discussion regarding the potential DSAP areas, Tim asked the group to assume we are working from an approved framework map and consider where our jobs and employment centers would be. He asked the group to focus on Areas A and B which were identified by the Task Force.

Area B is within the urban reserve of Hawthorne. This planning area should be easy to advance given that our plans are consistent with the current plan for this area. Tim reminded the group that the DSAP application includes both the urban land uses and a percentage of the conservation.

DSAPs are processed as planned developments within the county. At a simplified scale, it includes residential and manufacturing, mixed use included. Focusing on Area B, we are looking at about 900 acres total.

One proposal identifies about 560 acres in manufacturing, 338 acres in residential, and 64 acres in mixed use. DSAP B would include about 4 million square feet non-residential. The development and conservation would be well-integrated and connected to Hawthorne. Tim reminded the group that we will not be filling up all the urban land uses on Plum Creek lands. The current population of Hawthorne is about 1,600 people. If the DSAP is fully implemented, we would be adding the equivalent of about 1.5 Hawthornes. This would occur in an area where Highways 301 and 20 and the railroad come together.

The proposal for DSAP A is that we have mixed use, residential and agriculture. This includes 4,500 dwelling units and 6 million square feet of non-residential to form an agricultural technology center village. When we think about this as an employment center, we have to consider how we balance wetland impacts with jobs creation. The mixed use zone would include: research and development, institutional/educational, commercial, logistics/warehousing, advanced manufacturing and light industrial, agri-technology, retail, residential and civic.

Daniel asked the group to share their comments on the proposed DSAPs.

Laura commented that she was getting stuck on the details of what the agricultural and residential areas will encompass. She also wanted to know what type of agricultural uses would abut the conservation corridor. We need to examine the linkage between large wetlands areas. This process will require some additional guidance to create the development standards that result in the type of development that would be desirable.

Scott Koons commented that that DSAP A has a major roadway going through the green corridor. We may want to provide an additional access point to the area.

Bob Romig noted that having multiple access points creates more issues. However, a single access point may impact the ability to have a walkable community. The character of the roadway will determine if we are connecting a major employment center or connecting communities that are walkable and bikeable.

Justin Williams commented that he was comfortable with DSAP B, but that DSAP A still needed discussion. He inquired if these plans would impact his ability to travel through this area. Plum Creek doesn't own

the pie piece where Highway 234 meets 20, but maybe Plum Creek can provide additional access. He also asked if we are talking agriculture besides silviculture on these lands. Will IFAS be involved?

Todd Powell explained that we wanted to have a residential deficit. By having such a high jobs to residence ratio and by not providing all the housing on Plum Creek lands, the housing demand gets pushed out into other communities, including Hawthorne and East County.

Tim Jackson commented on the numbers. When you have 6 million square feet of non-residential space and you use the standard of 4 employees per thousand, this yields about 20,000 jobs or 4,500 households. This area becomes a net importer of jobs. You can't control where people live, but you can create conditions that will attract a number of workers to live near their jobs.

Ana Richmond reminded the group to keep in mind that this project has a 50 year timeline. For example, in the Bay County Sector Plan, there was a push to build an airport, and then the recession hit. The landowner has done everything it can to push the airport, but little progress has been made.

Robert Christianson commented that he was looking at the mixed use and wetlands configurations. The residential mixed use/agricultural split is okay, but he expressed concern about the outparcel and suggested the proposed residential development be moved.

Todd Powell explained that the outparcel is wet, which is why Plum Creek has not purchased the property. This proposal helps reduce traffic on Route 234, since Plum Creek does not own this frontage.

Fred explained there is a mixed use core concept plan along Route 20 that shows how people can live, work and recreate all in this area. It also might include a corporate or institutional campus where companies can come together to create transformational space. The agricultural uses are interspersed and located close to buildings and research areas. The agricultural uses could also be part of efforts to conduct research on stormwater management, having the area function as a living landscape.

Todd Powell commented that IFAS has been very active in this process. Gainesville has the most substantial pool of agricultural talent in the state. The knowledge base is unlike anywhere else in the southeast US.

Daniel asked the group for any additional comments and what they would like to see at the next meeting.

Scott Koons said he would like to see principles and standards for the proposed land uses. Plum Creek will re-send the guiding principles for the Envision Alachua process to the group.

Robert Christianson expressed that he was pleased with this effort and believes the planning and conservation emphasis is well done.

Scott Koons noted that some people have a great vision for the future. He wanted to know what the context is for the County.

Missy noted that County staff had a smaller meeting a few weeks ago with Plum Creek about the project. The key question Plum Creek needs to be able to answer in order to get approval of its application is: Why here? What will this do for the County?

Todd Powell replied that Dr. Denslow is working on the answer to “Why here?” and also “Why now?” But part of the response is what this process means for East Gainesville and how it will address some of the historic inequities. When I-75 was constructed, it pulled the center of town west. Some of the best agricultural land in the county was built upon, and not in a way that is a model of development.

He noted that we wouldn't be sitting here if Plum Creek didn't have the 301 corridor and the CSX multi-purpose line running through their property. We have significant infrastructure opportunities for the area.

The strategic ecosystem overlay is at the heart of the debate. While we are creating economic development, we are also creating 25,000 acres of conservation. There is no other method for creating conservation at this scale.

Robert Christianson referenced the comparisons with other communities and requested that we show, based on developable acreage, how some of these metrics are expressed.

Missy Daniels expressed that this is a huge opportunity. Todd Powell commented that there is no model in the state for us to follow. We are writing a textbook on how this can be done. How we address water quality and supply will be key. We have the ability to create significant areas of conservation along with an economic development engine that

helps position the area and region to go to the next level. The challenge will be to limit the amount of compromise required at each step.

Daniel asked Ana Richmond to provide her perspective on the process. She described this plan as very robust in defining the conservation area. This is a major difference in this process, as well as the significant community involvement that has occurred since the beginning. We realize this is a long process. The development footprint focuses more on the jobs. The agricultural uses help focus on science, technology, and mathematics and maintain our silviculture heritage.

Steve Seibert asked whether these types of conversations are legitimate in answering the question of “why here?” Ana replied that yes, this conversation is useful, but we need more detail. The County has an urban boundary and other requirements.

It was noted that Dale Brill’s presentation was the deepest dive into economic development that has been done to date. This information should grab people’s attention. It was asked if the discussion of economic progress is part of the equation. Missy Daniels replied that yes, it is. Ana followed up with a reminder that this is a long-range plan and not just another map amendment.

Todd Powell commented we can’t achieve the goals at the scale we have been discussing are talking on a piecemeal basis. These lands are not going to stay in single ownership if we can’t figure out how to do this. Plum Creek’s holding base has gotten smaller, and given the existing infrastructure, there is pressure to sell off certain lands that have become higher in value.

Scott Koons shared that the population of Florida was 8 million when the first Growth Management Act was put in place. He hopes we did a much better job planning for the next 8 million residents in the state.

Ana requested that Plum Creek share examples of projects they have done in other parts of the country.

V. Summary and Next Steps

Daniel thanked everyone for their participation and closed the meeting. The next TAG meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 16, 2013.

MEASURING SUCCESS

- ▷ ECOL DYMNT vs. ECOL PROGRESS
- ↓ INCLUSIVE APPROACH
- ▷ E.P.I. CHANGES-LED (A CHANGE IS BEING DEVELOPED)
- ▷ PRESERVING CHARACTER OF COUNTY.
- ▷ A COUNTY CONVERSATION: FOCUS ON ECOL
- ↳ WE NEED TO PROMOTE THIS CONVERSATION!

DISTINGUISH CORRIDOR VS XG

DEFINE "EXEMENT"

DRAP A DRAP B

□ MORE AG, LESS RES? □ FEELS LIKE RIGHT MIX

AS in relation to Wetlands/Corridors

- ▷ GET PRINCIPAL DRAIN OTTS TO PROTECT LOCAL RESOURCES
- ▷ ACCESS PIS
- ▷ RESERVE RES
- ▷ RID/MS, R.C. CONDU INSURE
- ▷ PERHAPS URBAN COULD BRING ITS OWN NET OF LUG
- ▷ NUTRIENT NET
- ▷ ACQUIFER RE CHARGE
- ▷ AG IMPLIES HIGH XFER USE... DO WE HAVE SUFFICIENT SUPPLY?
- ▷ EX MIXED USE
- ▷ ACTIVE REC IN URBAN
- ▷ EQUALS TRN SERVICES
- ▷ EQUALS URBAN
- ▷ EQUALS
- ▷ EX MIXED USE
- ▷ O2O
- ▷ ETC...

Envision Alachua Technical Advisory Group Meeting #3 – March 19, 2013