



AGENDA

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE WORKSHOP BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Board Chambers
Suite 100
Ernie Lee Magaha Government Building - First Floor
221 Palafox Place

December 8, 2020
9:00 a.m.

Escambia County is committed to making our website accessible. If you use assistive technology, for example a screen reader, and have difficulty accessing information in this agenda online, please contact our ADA Coordinator at ADA@myescambia.com or 850-595-1637.

Notice: This meeting is televised live on ECTV and recorded for rebroadcast on the same channel. Refer to your cable provider's channel lineup to find ECTV.

1. Call to Order

(PLEASE TURN YOUR CELL PHONE TO THE SILENCE OR OFF SETTING.)
2. Was the meeting properly advertised?
3. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.
4. OLF-8 Update
(Terri Berry - 15 min)
 - A. Board Discussion
 - B. Board Direction
5. Hurricane Sally Update
(Janice P. Gilley - 30 min)
 - A. Board Discussion
 - B. Board Direction

6. Accenture Presentation
(Wesley Hall - 30 min)
 - A. Board Discussion
 - B. Board Direction

7. Children's Services Council Briefing
(Janice P. Gilley - 15 min)
 - A. Board Discussion
 - B. Board Direction

8. Adjourn

Committee of the Whole

4.

Meeting Date: 12/08/2020

Issue: OLF-8 Update

From: Janice Gilley, County Administrator

Information

Recommendation:

OLF-8 Update


(Terri Berry - 15 min)

A. Board Discussion

B. Board Direction

Attachments

DPZ OLF-8 Presentation



OLF-8


**Phase 2 Charrette Results
Presentation to COW**

December 8, 2020



C. TAITER

PROJECT TIMELINE



RFP PROJECT GOALS

- **Project Goals:**
 - Determine and balance highest and best economic use for the property that:
 - Enhances the quality of life for those who work and live in Beulah
 - Provides Jobs!
 - Maximizes the creation of minimum 1,000 high-paying jobs on site.
 - Considers all uses compatible with the surrounding context.
 - Provides a master plan that is consistent with the County's RESTORE Multi-year Implementation Plan.
 - Considers the pre-application to Triumph funds for +/- \$30m.
 - Recoups the County's investment of \$19m.

PROJECT GOALS & PRIORITIES

1. Attract over 1,000 high paying jobs to OLF8

+

2. Provide County residents with a solid rate of return on their investment

3. Bring long-term value to OLF8 & Beulah

+

4. Create a thriving, walkable downtown

5. Improve circulation and consider planned transportation improvements

6. Connect people to the open space network and community amenities

7. Build a place respectful of Beulah's heritage

8. Increase community wellness

9. Diversity housing for Beulah residents, (if provided)

10. Provide a resilient block structure that can adapt to changing market needs

OLF-8 OUTREACH & ENGAGEMENT

www.MyOLF8.com

Engage/Outreach: Social Pin Point



5107 **1853**
Total Visits Unique Users

604 **113** **1011**
Unique Stakeholders Comments Survey Responses

Project Website

14,290 **4,055**
Total Visits Unique Users

Facebook



facebook.com/myolf8

This is a snapshot in time as of November 19, 2020

JOB ESTIMATES BY BUILDING TYPOLOGY & INDUSTRY SECTOR

		Mixed Use			
		MF & Office	MU - Surface (Retail)	MF & Office (Ped)	MF & Office
	Gross Square Feet	78,300	27,100	170,300	158,420
	Assumed "Loss Factor"	25%	25%	25%	25%
	Net / Usable Square Feet	58,725	20,325	127,725	118,815
Total Jobs by Building Type (Rounded)	Low	240	40	520	490
	Average	310	80	660	620
	High	440	200	950	890
Job Density/Acre Acres required	Range	41 - 76	7 - 35	91 - 166	6 - 12
	Per 1,000 jobs	9 - 72 acres			

		Single Use				
		Small Office Park	Medical Offices	Office Condos	Office	Hotel
	Gross Square Feet	43,500	80,000	92,400	94,500	300,000
	Assumed "Loss Factor"	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%
	Net / Usable Square Feet	32,625	60,000	69,300	70,875	225,000
Total Jobs by Building Type (Rounded)	Low	140	150	280	290	130
	Average	190	270	360	370	170
	High	290	390	520	530	230
Job Density/Acre Acres required	Range	24 - 51	26 - 68	49 - 91	51 - 92	23 - 40
	Per 1,000 jobs	16 - 34 acres				

		Industrial			
		Commerce Park	Business Industrial Park	Warehouse	Makerspace
	Gross Square Feet	60,000	72,000	85,900	111,300
	Assumed "Loss Factor"	25%	25%	25%	25%
	Net / Usable Square Feet	45,000	54,000	64,425	83,475
Total Jobs by Building Type (Rounded)	Low	120	170	200	260
	Average	150	210	250	320
	High	180	230	270	350
Job Density/Acre Acres required	Range	21 - 31	30 - 40	35 - 47	45 - 61
	Per 1,000 jobs	16 - 48			

See Commerce Block Typologies in appendix for more information

PLAN PERFORMANCE SUMMARY


Project Goals	★ ★ ★
Marketability	★
Tax Value	★
Urban Design	★
Transp. & Circulation	★ ★
Enviro. & Infrastructure	★
Community Preference	★ ★

Project Goals	★ ★ ★ ★
Marketability	★ ★ ★ ★
Tax Value	★ ★ ★ ★
Urban Design	★ ★ ★ ★
Transp. & Circulation	★ ★ ★ ★
Enviro / Infrastructure	★ ★ ★ ★
Community Preference	★ ★ ★

Project Goals	★ ★ ★ ★
Marketability	★ ★
Tax Value	★ ★ ★
Urban Design	★ ★ ★ ★
Transp. & Circulation	★ ★ ★
Enviro / Infrastructure	★ ★
Community Preference	★ ★


Project Goals	★ ★ ★ ★
Marketability	★ ★ ★
Tax Value	★ ★
Urban Design	★ ★ ★ ★
Transp. & Circulation	★ ★ ★
Enviro / Infrastructure	★ ★ ★ ★
Community Preference	★ ★ ★ ★

★ low ★ ★ ★ high



APPENDIX

ALLOCATION OF LAND



PROJECT GOALS

Scope of Work Goals ★ ★ ★ ★
 Stakeholder Goals ★ ★

Scope of Work Goals ★ ★ ★ ★
 Stakeholder Goals ★ ★ ★ ★

Scope of Work Goals ★ ★ ★ ★
 Stakeholder Goals ★ ★ ★ ★

Scope of Work Goals ★ ★ ★ ★
 Stakeholder Goals ★ ★ ★ ★

Summary Rating ★ ★ ★

Summary Rating ★ ★ ★ ★

Summary Rating ★ ★ ★ ★

Summary Rating ★ ★ ★ ★



MARKETABILITY: POTENTIAL AGGREGATE LAND PRICES

Low Range	Mid Range	High Range
\$26.48M	\$35.9M	\$45.33M

Low Range	Mid Range	High Range
\$40.28M	\$51.03M	\$61.77M

Low Range	Mid Range	High Range
\$36.79M	\$46.66M	\$56.54M

Low Range	Mid Range	High Range
\$32.96M	\$40.55M	\$48.14M

- Most Likely
- Likely
- Least Likely

Use	Area
Commercial	36 ac.
Multi-Family	0 ac.
Commerce	233 ac.
Low Density Residential	0 ac.
Farms / Open Space	268 ac.

Use	Area
Commercial	18 ac.
Multi-Family	10 ac.
Commerce	92 ac.
Low Density Residential	235 ac.
Farms / Open Space	182 ac.


Use	Area
Commercial	18 ac.
Multi-Family	14 ac.
Commerce	125 ac.
Low Density Residential	179 ac.
Farms / Open Space	200 ac.

Use	Area
Commercial	9 ac.
Multi-Family	12 ac.
Commerce	72 ac.
Low Density Residential	158 ac.
Farms / Open Space	286 ac.


Summary Rating ★



Summary Rating ★★★★★



Summary Rating ★★



Summary Rating ★★★



MARKETABILITY: PLAN YIELD

Use	Sq.Ft. / Units
Commercial	235,000 sq.ft.
Multi-Family	0 units
Industrial / Commerce	1,000,000 sq.ft.
Office (Corporate)	250,000 sq.ft.
Office (Large)	630,000 units
Office (Small)	369,600 units
Small Single-Family	0 units
Large Single-Family	0 units
Total Residential	0 units
Total Retail	235,000 sq.ft.
Total Office / Industrial	2,249,600 sq.ft.

Use	Sq.Ft. / Units
Retail	225,158 sq.ft.
Multi-Family (over retail)	350 units
Multi-Family (stand-alone)	306 units
Industrial / Commerce	962,445 sq.ft.
Office (stand-alone)	90,961 sq.ft.
Office (loft)	76,328 sq.ft.
4-Pck	276 units
6-Pck	168 units
Town House	399 units
Small Single-Family	276 units
Large Single-Family	243 units
Total Residential	2,018 units
Total Retail	225,158 sq.ft.
Total Office / Industrial	1,129,734 sq.ft.

Use	Sq.Ft. / Units
Retail	176,513 sq.ft.
Multi-Family (over retail)	194 units
Multi-Family (over retail liner)	23 units
Multi-Family (stand-alone)	189 units
Multi-Family (Liner)	148 units
Industrial / Commerce	732,086 sq.ft.
Office (stand-alone)	293,373 sq.ft.
Office (L/W)	104,000 sq.ft.
4-Pck	244 units
Town House	194 units
Small Single-Family	273 units
Large Single-Family	250 units
Total Residential	1,514 units
Total Retail	176,513 sq.ft.
Total Office / Industrial	1,129,459 sq.ft.

Use	Sq.Ft. / Units
Retail	117,223 sq.ft.
Multi-Family (over retail)	234 units
Multi-Family (stand-alone)	376 units
Industrial / Commerce	473,070 sq.ft.
Office (stand-alone)	163,099 sq.ft.
4-Pck	52 units
6-Pck	0 units
Town House	201 units
Small Single-Family	366 units
Large Single-Family	111 units
Total Residential	1,341 units
Total Retail	117,223 sq.ft.
Total Office / Industrial	636,169 sq.ft.

Summary Rating ★



Summary Rating ★★★★★



Summary Rating ★★



Summary Rating ★★★



MARKETABILITY ASSESSMENT - METHODOLOGY

Weitzman obtained and reviewed land sales, which were sold for development with specific housing and/or commercial uses, or with specific zoning in place. We also spoke with local brokers involved in the sale of development sites in Beulah to ask opinions related to achievable prices per acre for the types of sites that are included within the various OLF8 plans. From our brokerage sources, we obtained information that we were not able to ascertain from our third-party data resources, further informing our opinions related to the potential range in sale price per acre that could be achieved at the OLF8 site. Based upon this information, we conceptualized ranges in sale price per acre of development land, or sale price per unit of multi-family housing developed, that could frame the market for each component to each of the four concept plans at OLF8. We applied these ranges to the program produce by DPZ in each of the four plan scenarios, and estimated the potential aggregate land sale prices that could be achieved.

It is important to note that these are not land values, and no one has performed an appraisal of the OLF8 site. In fact, the actual land value would be lower or higher as a result of the time value of money, and the necessary discounting associated with development risk, absorption time, and overall marketability. As an example, one would not likely pay a premium price for a commercial development parcel without the realistic prospect that the land could be developed in the near term, and occupied by a tenant paying rent. Therefore, these potential aggregate land sale prices are representative of the types of prices that could be achieved by use, in today's dollars, without any consideration of the time and burden and development risk it might take a developer to actually build something there. These factors played into our emphasis of how we would expect land sale prices to be skewed, higher or lower, based upon the overall perceived marketability of each scheme and development risk associated with each.

A proper appraisal of the entire OLF8 site and its individual components would be required, utilizing the Income Approach, in order to gain an accurate understanding of the estimated market value of the land in each scenario.

TAX VALUE & PRODUCTIVITY

Tax Value \$325M
 New Roads 8.1 miles
 Daily VMT 309,723
 Housing 0 (2,018)

Tax Value \$638M
 New Roads 14.3 miles
 Daily VMT 345,073
 Housing 2,018 (0)

Tax Value \$528M
 New Roads 13.7 miles
 Daily VMT 301,182
 Housing 1,514 (504)

Tax Value \$427M
 New Roads 8.7 miles
 Daily VMT 229,691
 Housing 1,341 (677)

Summary Rating ★

Summary Rating ★★★★★

Summary Rating ★★★

Summary Rating ★★



LAND VALUATION ASSESSMENT - METHODOLOGY

Total property values for each plan are projected using the details of each plan's layout and buildings developed during the charrettes. Conservative estimates of construction costs were applied. Using GIS computer software the projected value of each building can be mapped to be more easily understood and compared. The 3D models display the Value per Acre, or relative productivity, of each area in each plan. Some of the tallest spikes are generated not by large potential projects, but by maximizing the projected value on a small piece of land, often by building more than one story and using shared open space or parking.

URBAN DESIGN PERFORMANCE

- Sustainable Neighborhoods ★
- Healthy Mix of Uses ★
- Housing Diversity ★
- Walkable ★★
- Sense of Community ★
- Balanced Mix of Open Space ★★

- Sustainable Neighborhoods ★★★★★
- Healthy Mix of Uses ★★★★★
- Housing Diversity ★★★★★
- Walkable ★★★★★
- Sense of Community ★★★★★
- Balanced Mix of Open Space ★★★★★

- Sustainable Neighborhoods ★★★★★
- Healthy Mix of Uses ★★★
- Housing Diversity ★★★★★
- Walkable ★★★
- Sense of Community ★★★★★
- Balanced Mix of Open Space ★★★★★


- Sustainable Neighborhoods ★★★★★
- Healthy Mix of Uses ★★★
- Housing Diversity ★★★★★
- Walkable ★★★★★
- Sense of Community ★★★★★
- Balanced Mix of Open Space ★★★★★

Summary Rating ★

Summary Rating ★★★★★

Summary Rating ★★★★★

Summary Rating ★★★★★



TRANSPORTATION PLAN EVALUATION

External Connectivity	★ ★ ★
Internal Trip Capture	★
Traffic Impact	★
Internal Connectivity	★ ★ ★
Pedestrian & Bike Network	★
Transit Suitability	★ ★ ★
Natural Trails	★ ★ ★

Summary Rating ★ ★

External Connectivity	★ ★ ★ ★
Internal Trip Capture	★ ★ ★ ★
Traffic Impact	★ ★
Internal Connectivity	★ ★ ★ ★
Pedestrian & Bike Network	★ ★ ★ ★
Transit Suitability	★ ★ ★
Natural Trails	★ ★ ★





Summary Rating ★ ★ ★ ★

External Connectivity	★ ★ ★ ★
Internal Trip Capture	★ ★ ★ ★
Traffic Impact	★ ★ ★
Internal Connectivity	★ ★ ★
Pedestrian & Bike Network	★ ★ ★ ★
Transit Suitability	★ ★
Natural Trails	★ ★ ★

Summary Rating ★ ★ ★

External Connectivity	★ ★ ★
Internal Trip Capture	★ ★
Traffic Impact	★ ★ ★ ★
Internal Connectivity	★ ★ ★
Pedestrian & Bike Network	★ ★ ★
Transit Suitability	★ ★ ★
Natural Trails	★ ★ ★

Summary Rating ★ ★ ★



TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT - METHODOLOGY

Evaluation Parameters:

- **External connectivity:** the more entry exits the site has to the adjacent network, the more the external trips distribute among the adjacent roadway, and reduce the pressure in already congested points of the existing network.
- **Internal trip capture:** Internal trip capture rates reflect the percentage of trips that occur within the site as a result of two or more land uses in close proximity. Neighborhoods that mix land uses, such as residential and office and retail, close to one another, allow residents and workers to drive significantly less outside the neighborhood if they choose. The Mixed-Use Trip Generation Model (MXD)* was used to calculate the internal capture rate for each plan, based on the land-use program. The higher the internal trip capture, the less the impact to the adjacent road network.
- **Traffic impact:** the impact on the adjacent road network of each plan is estimated based on the number of external auto trips during the peak hours, calculated using the MXD model, which estimates single-use trip generation for each component land use using ITE and converts to person trips, uses unconstrained internal capture percentages to estimate the number of potential internal trips between each pair of land uses, and includes an adjustment for proximity, and subtract the estimated internal trips from the total trip generation to estimate external trips for the MXD being analyzed and convert to vehicle trips as needed.
- **Internal connectivity:** the internal connectivity is evaluated based on the number of intersections. A well-connected road network has many short links, numerous intersections, and minimal dead-ends (cul-de-sacs) to decrease travel distances, to provide more travel options between two points, and to create a more accessible and resilient system.
- **Pedestrian and bicycle network:** Well-designed, interconnected bicycle and pedestrian facilities allow all users to safely and conveniently get where they want to go and encourage walking and biking as feasible modes. This is directly related to the internal connectivity rating, but also to the building frontages and mix of uses to make walking more attractive and feasible, and the provision of an internal bike network that connect with external trails and bike infrastructure.
- **Transit suitability:** Transit is better suited in high connected networks and where the road network is direct, with smooth turns for buses operations, and where there is sufficient density of population and employment, and well as mix of land-uses.
- **Nature trails:** provision of trails for hiking, biking and horse riding within the side, and connecting to external trails.

TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT - METHODOLOGY

Evaluation Results:

The rating of each of the parameters listed below per plan are based on the road network of each plan, and on the results of the Mixed-Use Trip Generation Model (MXD), which considered the following for all the plans:

- A school for 1200 students, divided into 400 Elementary students, 400 Middle school students and 400 High school students
- A bank, a supermarket, a health club, one restaurant and two fast food restaurants, and the remaining of Commercial square footage was assigned under the category of General Retail.
- Trip length in miles were calculated from average trip lengths in minutes from the NW Florida Regional Model with an average speed, by trip purpose.

Results indicate that the Market Plan is the one with the highest summary rating as it provides a dense and well connected direct road network, with multiple entry/exits both to the north, south and east, as well as to the nature trail network to the south west of the site. In addition, its land-use program, which offers a great variety of uses, results in a high internal trip capture rate. While the number of trips during the peak hour is close to that of the Commerce Park Plan, ingress and access combined, the key difference is that those trips would be distributed evenly in both directions in the Market Plan, but would be mostly ingress or egress in the Commerce Park Plan, which would translate on more road capacity needed to accommodate the new auto trip during the peak periods.

All plans offer good pedestrian and bike network, although the Commerce Park Plan offers less building frontages and wider blocks, which makes walking, biking, and accessing transit, less attractive.

The Greenway Plan offers similar internal capture rate to the Market Plan, and a permeable road network conducive to walking, although it has indirect connections into and through the site which makes it less suitable for transit. Similarly, the Village Plan land-use program also reduces the external trips given the mix of uses, but its road network offers few direct east-west routes, and the separation of uses within the site could lead to internal driving trips.

ENVIRONMENTAL & INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS

Cost of Infrastructure / Unit	★
Cost of Infrastructure / Acre	★
Utilization of Infrastructure	★
Segregation of Uses	★
Topo Considerations	★★★
Open Space Preservation	★★★
Potential Wetland Impacts	★
Flood Protection	★
Hydrological Impacts	★

Cost of Infrastructure / Unit	★★★★
Cost of Infrastructure / Acre	★★★★
Utilization of Infrastructure	★★★★
Segregation of Uses	★★★★
Topo Considerations	★★★★
Open Space Preservation	★★★★
Potential Wetland Impacts	★★★★
Flood Protection	★★★★
Hydrological Impacts	★★★

Cost of Infrastructure / Unit	★★
Cost of Infrastructure / Acre	★★★
Utilization of Infrastructure	★★
Segregation of Uses	★★
Topo Considerations	★★
Open Space Preservation	★★
Potential Wetland Impacts	★★★
Flood Protection	★★
Hydrological Impacts	★★

Cost of Infrastructure / Unit	★★★
Cost of Infrastructure / Acre	★★
Utilization of Infrastructure	★★★
Segregation of Uses	★★★★
Topo Considerations	★★★★
Open Space Preservation	★★★★
Potential Wetland Impacts	★★★★
Flood Protection	★★★★
Hydrological Impacts	★★★★

Summary Rating ★

Summary Rating ★★★★★

Summary Rating ★★

Summary Rating ★★★★★



ENVIRONMENTAL / INFRA. ASSESSMENT - METHODOLOGY


Total sum (maximum 50) Plan	14 Commerce	49 Market	32 Greenway	45 Village
Cost of infrastructure per unit	1 No residential uses	5 Lowest cost of civil infrastructure per housing unit, mainly because of greater density. Provides better opportunities for utilization of the civil infrastructure for multiple users	3 Relatively higher costs per unit based on lower number of units	4 Higher costs per unit than the Market plan based on lower density, in overall lowest infrastructure requirements
Cost of infrastructure per acre	1 Highest costs per acre considering the increased needs for drainage and thoroughfare for commercial uses. Lower capacity for using multiple distributed green infrastructure components	5 Lowest costs per acre based on the highest density and the more optimized and distributed network of services for linear infrastructure. Best potential for larger number of distributed green infrastructure components, which will reduce costs	4 Segregation of industrial and residential uses will result in relatively higher costs per acre due to reduced utilization and higher initial costs and long term operation and maintenance. Relatively lower overall potential for green infrastructure components because of the presence of large industrial areas	3 High cost per acre based on requirements for greater length of streets and utilities for connecting services of a lower number of users, excellent potential for implementing green infrastructure
Utilization of infrastructure and sustainability	1 Lowest utilization of infrastructure considering lack of multiple uses, this will also have the largest costs for operating and maintenance. Lack of preliminary knowledge of the needs of future users may result in less optimal design of infrastructure and least sustainable infrastructure which will also need to be modified for each new user	5 Best potential utilization of infrastructure for multiple uses will reduce the overall operation and maintenance by having a demand which is more uniform and less subjected to peaks. Larger number of residential users will result in better predictability and continuity in terms of most sustainable infrastructure utilization in time and space	3 Infrastructure utilization will be variable with location based on the segregate industrial and residential uses, however overall utilization is expected to be lower and will result in larger initial and operation and maintenance costs	4 Relatively lower needs for infrastructure is combined with low density and will result in larger operation and maintenance costs because of lower number of users
Segregation of uses and phasing	1 Largest segregation of uses. Industrial users may have varying and less predictable requirements for infrastructure types and capacity and it will be challenging to develop a plan that can satisfy a potentially broad range of unknown users	5 Least segregated and most predictable initial user's phasing needs and capacities. The high residential number of users will result in more predictable uses infrastructure needs and phasing	3 Segregation of land uses will result in different infrastructure requirements for the residential sections and the potential industrial uses not known at the time of development of this plan	5 The infrastructure requirements for the agricultural and residential sections are simpler and better understood in comparison to potential industrial uses not known at the time of development of this plan
Topography considerations	3 The plan follows the topography and will not require additional modifications or grading, however large prime areas (at the northwestern corner) are used for parking and for industrial land use	5 Best considerations of topographic features placing the residential areas at the highest and best location, also expected prime area. The location of the industrial area is in proximity to the retention areas at the east side which is the most optimal for environmental purposes	3 This plan uses the highest elevations for industrial areas and surrounds the residential areas with industrial areas which is challenging for management of stormwater and has less optimal utilization of topography (placing large impervious areas at the highest spot)	5 Excellent consideration of topography features, positions very well all urban components, considering open space and placing built environment at locations which are beneficial for hydrology and drainage

ENVIRONMENTAL / INFRA. ASSESSMENT - METHODOLOGY

Total sum (maximum 50) Plan	14 Commerce	49 Market	32 Greenway	45 Village
Open space preservation	3 Highest open space preservation, however, introduces highest fraction of imperviousness distributed over almost half of the project area which will offset any gains of open space and will require using larger areas of open space for mitigation of stormwater	5 Distributed open space within the plan and preservation of large open space area at the southwest section provides most optimal approach to protecting open space and use within the urbanized areas	3 Adequate preservation of open space, however large impervious areas are present at higher ground elevations which will cause increased runoff towards residential sections and will place additional demands for open space	5 Village plan provides largest open areas based on the considerably larger agricultural areas
Potential wetlands impacts	1 Greatest wetland impacts considering the proximity of large directly connected impervious areas and the topography slope which predisposes runoff towards wetlands	5 Lowest impacts expected based on the distributed large number of green areas within the project which provide infiltration and correspondingly improve water quality and aquifer recharge, therefore reducing potential impacts.	4 Larger wetland impacts expected in comparison to Market and Village plans considering the large directly connected impervious areas at the north and northeast sections and potential increase runoff towards the wetlands to the southwest	5 Lowest impacts expected due to the preservation of large pervious areas which will ensure wetland protection. Larger distances from the wetlands will reduce impacts
Flood Protection and Extreme Events	1 Lowest flood protection capacity based on excessive directly connected impervious areas introduced by industrial land use and combined with topography slope	5 Best flood protection capacity due to low directly connected impervious areas which and multiple green corridors which provide storage and disconnect impervious areas	3 Lower flood protection capacity due to large directly connected impervious areas located at project periphery and highest topography	5 High flood protection capacity due to large open space, low density and imperviousness and locating the industrial areas in the East and Southeast sectors of the plan
Hydrologic impacts and water quality	1 Greatest hydrologic impacts by adding large impervious areas which are concentrated in one section of the project area, Highest potential for runoff impacts on downstream water quality and lowest aquifer recharge capacity	4 Lowest expected overall hydrologic impacts because of the lowest industrial areas and most optimal space distribution and land use assignments. The distributed green areas and low directly connected impervious areas result in best opportunity for aquifer recharge as opposed to generating runoff	3 Medium hydrologic impacts, negative impacts from the large industrial areas around the residential areas in the center. The industrial areas result in expected reduced aquifer recharge and elimination of the natural infiltration process, and higher potential for water quality impacts	5 Lowest expected hydrological impacts, however with potential water quality impacts caused by potential use of fertilizers for the agricultural areas.

Note: All plans implement best stormwater management practices, look into reducing infrastructure costs by implementing Green Engineering infrastructure and optimize open space and built environment, however environmental impacts are unavoidable and are presented as challenges. Environmental and infrastructure impacts are compared by providing qualitative scores indicating particular aspects of the relations between natural environment impacts, development intent and hydrologic impacts

COMMUNITY SURVEY PREFERENCE




MODULAR BLOCK TYPES


Block Intensity

Density


Low Intensity SF




Farmstead
.17 du/ac
1 story




Rural
1.19 du/ac
150x250 lots
1 story




Suburban
3.96 du/ac
90x110 lots
1 story



Front Loaded
4.75 du/ac
75x110 lots
2 stories




Rear Loaded
7.13 du/ac
50x100 lots
2 stories




Cottage
9.11 du/ac
40x100 lots
2 stories


Med Intensity SF



Duplex
12.87 du/ac
30x98 lots
2 stories



Townhouse
14.26 du/ac
25x98 lots
2 stories




Cottage Court
18.22 du/ac
140x98 per court
26x54 per cottage
2 stories




2 Over 1
38.02 du/ac
25x60 lots
3 stories


Multi-Family



Walk-up (4 pack)
20.59 du/ac
70x98 lots
2 stories



Walk-up (6 pack)
30.89 du/ac
70x98 lots
3 stories




Multi-Family
44.36 du/ac
MF: 245,488 sf /
224 units
3 stories


Mixed-Use



Live / Work
28.51 du/ac
25x50 lots
3 stories




Office & MF
28.12 du/ac
MF: 125,990 sf / 142 units
Office: 73,800 sf
Total: 199,500 sf
3 stories MF, 2 stories Office



Retail & MF
33.27 du/ac
MF: 180,392 sf / 186 units
Retail: 90,196 sf
Total: 270,588 sf
3 stories


Single-Use Commercial




Small Office Park
Total: 76,800 sf
1 story



Medical Office
Total: 80,000 sf
2 stories



Office Park
Office: 94,500 sf
2 story



Retail
Total: 118,900 sf
2 stories




Office Condos
Total: 123,200 sf
2 stories




Hotel
Total: 155,500 sf
288 keys
3 stories


Industrial




Commerce Park
9.11 du/ac
40x98 lots



Business Industrial Park
Total: 72,000 sf
1 story




Warehouse
Total: 85,900 sf
1 story




Makerspace
Total: 111,300 sf
2 stories


BLOCK FLEXIBILITY





Cottage Courts (Medium Intensity Single-Family)



Retail (Single Use Commercial)



Medical Office (Single Use Commercial)



Maker Space (Industrial)




Business Industrial Park (Industrial)

BLOCK TYPES KEY


Block Intensity

Density


Low Intensity SF




Farmstead
.17 du/ac
1 story




Rural
1.19 du/ac
150x250 lots
1 story




Suburban
3.96 du/ac
90x110 lots
1 story



Front Loaded
4.75 du/ac
75x110 lots
2 stories



Rear Loaded
7.13 du/ac
50x100 lots
2 stories




Cottage
9.11 du/ac
40x100 lots
2 stories


Med Intensity SF



Duplex
12.87 du/ac
30x98 lots
2 stories



Townhouse
14.26 du/ac
25x98 lots
2 stories




Cottage Court
18.22 du/ac
140x98 per court
26x54 per cottage
2 stories




2 Over 1
38.02 du/ac
25x60 lots
3 stories


Multi-Family



Walk-up (4 pack)
20.59 du/ac
70x98 lots
2 stories



Walk-up (6 pack)
30.89 du/ac
70x98 lots
3 stories




Multi-Family
44.36 du/ac
MF: 245,488 sf /
224 units
3 stories


Mixed-Use



Live / Work
28.51 du/ac
25x50 lots
3 stories




Office & MF
28.12 du/ac
MF: 125,990 sf / 142 units
Office: 73,800 sf
Total: 199,500 sf
3 stories MF, 2 stories Office




Retail & MF
33.27 du/ac
MF: 180,392 sf /
186 units
Retail: 90,196 sf
Total: 270,588 sf
3 stories


Single-Use Commercial




Small Office Park
Total: 76,800 sf
1 story



Medical Office
Total: 80,000 sf
2 stories



Office Park
Office: 94,500 sf
2 story



Retail
Total: 118,900 sf
2 stories




Office Condos
Total: 123,200 sf
2 stories




Hotel
Total: 155,500 sf
288 keys
3 stories

Industrial




Commerce Park
9.11 du/ac
40x98 lots



Business Industrial Park
Total: 72,000 sf
1 story



Warehouse
Total: 85,900 sf
1 story




Makerspace
Total: 111,300 sf
2 stories

COMMERCE PARK PLAN




COMMERCE PARK ENTRY FROM FRANK REEDER




COMMERCE AERIAL VIEW FROM 9-MILE RD



COMMERCE PARK PLAN: SUPPORTING DIAGRAMS



- Block Intensity**
- Low Intensity
 - Medium Intensity
 - Multi-Family
 - Mixed Use
 - Single Use Commercial
 - Industrial



- Thoroughfare Hierarchy**
- Primary
 - Secondary



- Open Space**
- Open Space
 - Water Feature / Ponds



MARKET PLAN




MARKET PLAN NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER



MARKET AERIAL VIEW FROM 9-MILE RD




MARKET PLAN: SUPPORTING DIAGRAMS



Block Intensity

- Low Intensity
- Medium Intensity
- Multi-Family
- Mixed Use
- Single Use Commercial
- Industrial



Thoroughfare Hierarchy

- Primary
- Secondary




Open Space

- Open Space
- Water Feature / Ponds

GREENWAY PLAN




GREENWAY PARKWAY



GREENWAY AERIAL VIEW FROM 9-MILE RD




GREENWAY PLAN: SUPPORTING DIAGRAMS



Block Intensity

- Low Intensity
- Medium Intensity
- Multi-Family
- Mixed Use
- Single Use Commercial
- Industrial



Thoroughfare Hierarchy

- Primary
- Secondary



Open Space

- Open Space
- Water Feature / Ponds

VILLAGE PLAN




VILLAGE FARM CENTER



VILLAGE AERIAL VIEW FROM 9-MILE RD




VILLAGE PLAN: SUPPORTING DIAGRAMS



Block Intensity

- Low Intensity
- Medium Intensity
- Multi-Family
- Mixed Use
- Single Use Commercial
- Industrial



Thoroughfare Hierarchy

- Primary
- Secondary



Open Space

- Open Space
- Water Feature / Ponds

Committee of the Whole

5.

Meeting Date: 12/08/2020

Issue: Hurricane Sally Update

From: Janice Gilley, County Administrator

Information

Recommendation:

Hurricane Sally Update

(Janice P. Gilley - 30 min)

A. Board Discussion

B. Board Direction

Attachments

No file(s) attached.

Committee of the Whole

6.

Meeting Date: 12/08/2020

Issue: Accenture Presentation

From: WESLEY HALL, Assistant County Administrator

Information

Recommendation:

Accenture Presentation
(Wesley Hall - 30 min)

- A. Board Discussion
 - B. Board Direction
-

Attachments

No file(s) attached.

Committee of the Whole

7.

Meeting Date: 12/08/2020

Issue: Children's Services Council Briefing

From: Janice Gilley, County Administrator

Information

Recommendation:

Children's Services Council Briefing

(Janice P. Gilley - 15 min)

A. Board Discussion

B. Board Direction

Attachments

No file(s) attached.
