



**CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
COMMUNITY PLANNING & PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING**

**Council Chambers, City Hall
175 – 5th Street North
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701**

**November 10, 2020
Tuesday
2:00 P.M.**

MINUTES

Present: Christopher “Chris” A. Burke, Chair
C. Copley Gerdes
Thomas “Tom” Whiteman
Jeffery “Jeff” M. Wolf
Will Michaels, Alternate
Lisa Wannemacher, Alternate

Commissioners Absent: Sharon Winters, Vice Chair
Keisha A. Bell
Jeff Rogo
Gwendolyn “Gwen” Reese, Alternate

Staff Present: Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Elizabeth Abernethy, Director, Planning and Development Services
Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist II
Ann Vickstrom, Planner II
Britton Wilson, Planner II
Michael Dema, Assistant City Attorney
Katherine Connell, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Development Services
Iris Winn, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Development Services

The public hearing was called to order at 2:02 p.m., a quorum was present.

I. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR

II. ROLL CALL

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. MINUTES

The minutes from the October 13, 2020 meetings were approved unanimously

VI. LEGISLATIVE**A. City File 2020 3rd Amendment to Development Agreement**

Request: A third amendment to the 2010 Development Agreement (DA) pertaining only to the eastern residential portion of the site, proposing an increase to the size of the proposed skilled nursing facility building, necessitating an increase to the overall allowable sq. footage from 261,795 sq. ft. to 276,794 sq. ft. an increase of 14,999 sq. ft. or 5.7%

Staff Presentation

Elizabeth Abernethy gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation

Allan R. Brown, Prevarian Companies, spoke in support of the project and was available for questions.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Executive Session

Commissioner Burke: Thank you, I would like to comment that as I was reading through the changes it seems like your developments are changing. It is a reflection of our community; I see you have to separate more because of the Coronavirus, and you are also increasing your memory care beds.

Allan Brown: That is correct, the projects that we were very well received, we have a number of people who already have applications to move into the community. The skilled nursing, especially though, they have required additional isolation rooms, in response to the pandemic. As a result, the building got bigger, as Liz described, considerably larger. In order to comply with that requirement, or likely requirement of the state we have had to increase our allowable sq. footage and density slightly. It will be a complete continuum of care from independent living to memory care and skilled nursing all in one site. It is very exciting, and we are thrilled to be here, we can't wait to open.

Commissioner Burke: It looks like you are building a great project and we are lucky to have you here and we appreciate that.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you, did you travel all the way from Texas?

Allan Brown: Yes ma'am.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Welcome, thank you for coming all this way.

Allan Brown: It is my pleasure to e here I love it here.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Was it only the individual rooms that you had to increase, or did you also have to increase common areas, like cafeterias, meeting areas, and lobbies?

Allan Brown: Sure, that is a great question. The state so far, and most of this is driven by the skilled nursing facility, which is yet to be built and the state, obviously like everyone else, is trying to figure out what to do next. They made recommendations to skilled nursing providers that they increase the number of their isolation rooms. Wo right now it is patient care areas primarily, not so much common areas, simply because obviously the transmutability of the virus and keeping people isolated, they want more capacity in skilled nursing facilities, given all the problems we have seen in skilled nursing facilities. Right now, that is what we understand is required, that is how we are reacting.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you.

Commissioner Burke: Any other questions? Yes, we will start with Mr. Wolf.

Commissioner Wolf: Again, thank you, this is more of a technical question related to my understanding of construction, but did they require any changes in your mechanical ventilation system in terms of air.

Allan Brown: To date no they have not, that is also an excellent question. They have not but they are all ready with the HEPA filtration systems, they are already stringent, it is possible, certainly. So far we have not heard anything about that.

Commissioner Wolf: Thank you.

Commissioner Burke: Commissioner Michaels.

Commissioner Michaels: Yes, thank you, I would like to comment as a former director if a retirement community. The continuing care retirement community concept that you have here is very progressive and very forward looking, the idea being that you can have independent living, assisted living and skilled care all in the same site so that if you graduate, if you will, from independent living to skilled care you do not have to leave the community that you were originally in. It is great concept and I am glad to see this being added.

Commissioner Burke: Yes, thank you, this is an exciting project, Commissioner Gerdes.

Commissioner Gerdes: Yes, thank you, just two quick, I guess, one question and two quick comments. Was the increase in memory care beds a reaction to the need inside the City of St. Petersburg or was that just a move because of the new pandemic?

Allan Brown: Well, the increase in memory care beds is always been a part of this plan. We have two wings now and anticipated building a third one. So far given memory care, people do not plan to go to memory care so to speak so it impossible for us to know right now. We anticipate given the interest we have, we will be building that additional memory care wing, it is about 20 beds for memory care. So, no we have not had a pandemic response, that has drive that so far, but it is probably just going to be more of a market response. We see the need based on the people that are interested in moving to the community.

Commissioner Gerdes: I was happy to see the increase; it is a need we have here in St. Petersburg. At the same point working somewhat in that industry, my two quick comments, I agree with the continuation of care, it is a huge deal, it is a way for people to have long term care and it is great to see that on the left side of town.

Secondly, I live about a 4 iron away from this facility, and you guys have done a great job not really impacting the surrounding community, so kudos to you and thank you for doing a great job.

Allan Brown: Thank you, is your father Charlie Gerdes by any chance?

Commissioner Gerdes: Yes, depending on how you think about that.

Allan Brown: Okay, well your father was, I am a big fan of your father. He is a remarkable man and was instrumental on helping us work with the neighborhoods. The neighborhoods were very resolute in the requirements in what we had to do with construction. It is a big project 165,000 sq. ft. of construction over there. It could have been disruptive, and we have done our best not to be, so I appreciate your comments about that.

Commissioner Gerdes: I knew he was a big part of the property from the beginning, but he did not tell me to say that or anything. v

Allan Brown: No, I get it, I appreciate it, nonetheless.

Commissioner Burke: Anyone else? Okay I would entertain a motion for approval, if any one is interested, and if you would, if you do want to make a motion please raise your hand okay, Mr. Wolf.

Commissioner Wolf: I move approval in accordance with the staff report.

Commissioner Burke: We have a motion for approval by Commissioner Wolf and we have a second.

Commissioner Gerdes: Second.

MOTION: *Commissioner Wolf made a motion approving the application for third amendment to the 2010 Development Agreement.*

Commissioner Gerdes Seconded.

VOTE: *YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Wolf, Wannemacher
NO – 0*

Motion passed unanimously.

VI. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. City File 20-90200081 Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of historic windows and new construction of an addition at 3200 8th Avenue North, a contributing property to a local historic district.

Staff Presentation:

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report

Applicant/Owner Presentation

Owner, Joseph R. Warpinski spoke in support of the application and was available for questions

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

Waived by City Staff.

Joseph R. Warpinski: One question one of the proposals is to approval with the conditions that the windows be more consistent with the front of the home as opposed to the breezeway. The breezeway was closed in a number of years ago, if you look at the addition, I don't know if we can bring up the photos that she showed. There really are two sections, there is the garage that is being enclosed and then there is going to be the new construction which will be the new garage. One of the things we consider least is, if possible to have the breezeway to have windows continue across where the old garage is just because that will, in the addition we are building, that will be windows into a bathroom and a closet. Putting a larger window on the side on the house it is not functional. It would require us to completely change the plans because you don't want a huge window like that directly into your shower. You would maintain the windows that are already there and have been there for as far as any of us know. Obviously, they were not part of the original construction. We completely understand putting in larger windows for the garage. I just wanted to see if that as a possibility, if there were conditional approvals?

Commissioner Burke: Ms. Duvekot, are you concerned, there are two sets of ribbon windows, I know you were concerned about them too. One of the, in your recommendation of approval, you ask that those ribbon windows be changed out for something more appropriate. He is asking what would your tolerance be if he was to leave the windows, the ribbon windows and the one section but not I the other, can you address that please?

Laura Duvekot: Sure, given the fact that it is a street side yard, I think that might conflict with the zoning requirement as shown on condition 1. (c) requires that the sashes need to be square or vertical. I do not think that would be permitted under just general zoning.

Commissioner Burke: So, this is not something that is particular to this historic neighborhood, this is something that is in the City code.

Laura Duvekot: That is correct, that is an NT-2 (Neighborhood Traditional 2) requirement because it is a street side yard. In this case it is a COA recommendation but not necessarily because of the COA the way it actually underlies, it is part of the NT-2.

Commissioner Burke: Is there a limit to the amount for square footage for the ribbon windows can be or is it just zero, you are not allowed to do it?

Laura Duvekot: I understand it to be just the orientation of the shape, that they, it cannot be a horizontal rectangular shape if it is on a street side yard. IS that correct Derek?

Derek Kilborn: Yes, there are a few points on that one, first we did speak with zoning about this and the individual square windows assembled in a row (inaudible), we do look at that as a horizontal window, o that would not be compliant with this. I think the other thig that is important to remember is when you are considering this particular request and the condition here is that there is an already existing ribbon window, and through this condition we are not asking that the Commission consider and the property owner change the existing ribbon window we are only putting this in as a condition for the new addition that would follow.

Commissioner Burke: So you have no choice if this is, that has nothing to do with your department? If he would like to change those windows and use ribbon windows he would need to go for a variance?

Derek Kilborn: That is correct, it is not the COA process in this instance it is the standard zoning requirements for Neighborhood Traditional zoning.

Commissioner Burke: Okay, during this process Commissioners can ask questions, Commissioners Wolf.

Commissioner Wolf: Yes, maybe I misunderstood, I thought you were saying that you could probably live with in keeping the existing ribbon and just wanted the other, potentially change the new windows.

Joseph R. Warpinski: Correct, and if we can just g back one slide, thank you. One more maybe, the one where you can see all three. The blue is the existing and there was no intention to change that, what I was asking was if it is going to be a condition of approval the section in the middle, to allow the ribbon windows, just because behind those windows would be a shower and a closet. The section on the left side, we understand wanting full size or larger windows more appropriate, with the original building for that, that is no issue at all.

Commissioner Wolf: I understand, I bring that up because I have addressed the same issue on other homes, including minor modification of my own. What we worked out with the City was the appearance of a window with, where perhaps you keep your ribbon window on the top but the openings on the outside are changed with trim and possibly some recess or detailing so it looks like an opening without necessarily being an opening and in zoning they were willing to look at that as sufficiently breaking the elevation so that maybe that is some possibility for you. Subject to, again, how that might be properly incorporated into a historic appearance.

Commissioner Wannemacher: I sincerely appreciate that the functionality of a bathroom and a closet, especially on the street façade, you want natural light into both of those spaces, I can understand that as opposed to artificial light. I really just cannot get past the fact that ribbon windows are not, they are clearly not allowed by City Ordinance, City Code, despite the fact that it may appear you are matching what is already there, adding something that does not meet code, it doesn't make it right so I do really appreciate your offer to enlarge the window with the new garage, so that matches the front façade, and quite honestly I'd, you also need to look at the appearance and the spacing of the vertical mullions they do not even match the existing spacing vertical mullions in the existing ribbon window. Another thing, I am not sure if anyone noticed, Jeff you probably did, the existing garage door opening, has been widened in fact for the ribbon window in that middle section. It is kind of curious as to why they would make the ribbon window even longer then the existing framed opening and header because they could have just reused the existing header above the existing garage door. There are light fixtures that really replicate natural light, maybe it would be better to not put windows in at all. The closet specifically, natural light on clothes can fade them so maybe just go back and reconsider possibly a square window or something that is more compatible with the existing windows, just above the tub and eliminate the

wndow completely at the closet because then you would not have to expand the header. I would not be able to approve this elevation with those windows.

Joseph R. Warpinski: If I may, I appreciate that, I completely appreciate this is not ideal, so this is why we are trying to figure out what works best for the neighborhood, for us, for the City, for everything, so I appreciate your comments and concern and I understand the truly. We spoke about, and there were reasons why, with the number of windows and the spacing to make it look as consistent as possible. If it is necessary to have, and really, ultimately we are looking for approval, if it is contingent on a change to the windows, we would like to not have to make changes but we completely understand if that is what it is going to require. This process is in place for a reason and we understand that.

Commissioner Burke: We appreciate your understanding. Let's move through and you will have additional time as we go through. Any other questions on cross examination of the City?

Joseph R. Warpinski: No.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived by City Staff and Applicant.

Executive Session

Commissioner Burke: There are six conditions on this, and we have only spoken about on, the ribbon windows do you have concerns with any of the other six conditions?

Joseph R. Warpinski: No, we have talked about them with our general contractor and understand.

Commissioner Burke: Okay, I do not believe that we have any authority today to pass this without he first condition, is that correct? We cannot supersede the existing code.

Derek Kilborn: Well what would happen is you are only looking at the certificate of appropriateness, so if the commission found the ribbon windows acceptable and voted to approve them, the applicant would, effectively not be able to get through the zoning process. You can still proceed to a decision, but they would not be able to secure a permit through Development Review Services in the absence of a variance. The reason that we set this up here is that the process can be allowed to continue, they can work on getting other steps done for the addition while they maybe work out some final changes to the window layout and design and they can coordinate that through Laura Duvekot and not have to come back to the Commission for another hearing.

Commissioner Birke: Okay, any other comments or questions? Mr. Whiteman.

Commissioner Whiteman: I just have a question for Laura, just for my own knowledge. It says square or rectangle or vertical, so if he took the ribbon windows split it in two and made it to vertical windows does that work?

Laura Duvekot: Yes, if it becomes a horizontal or a vertically orientated rectangle, then yes, they can be quite small.

Commissioner Whiteman: I understand, okay, thanks.

Commissioner Burke: Any other questions? Mr. Wolf.

Commissioner Wolf: Again, separating the zoning requirements for fenestration and breaking up of mass, that has been done with fake windows, their trim and detail is made to look, to break up the fenestration from a zoning point at issue, separate from whether it would be historically accurate, but I do understand if you got a bathroom and you are trying to keep a window out or a shower or something like that you might want to keep something that is more clerestory type of height for a shower range, but I wanted to ask Commissioner Wannemacher, who is an architect, about the possibility if you have ever done anything like that where just details on the outside of trim etcetera to make a window look like a square window with maybe a portion of it is a real window with a section that is just architectural detail.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Yes, potentially you could imagine two, or, let's make it easy one two foot square punched opening up high, that there is real fenestration in but then two more or three more two foot by two foot sections on the outside where you have got the trim, the window trim, sill, head, jam, and then a recessed panel of a different material and so essentially it appears on the outside that you have a vertical window but you have just got a two foot by two foot punched opening up at the top. That would allow some natural light, that is what see maybe happening at the shower potentially. It is harder to do in the closet are though.

Commissioner Wolf: I throw that as a way that you may be able to get by with zoning because I would suggest that we go in the direction of allowing Staff to find a window or architectural arraignment of apparent windows that is satisfactory at Staff level and then that would give you some working room to try and come up with some other details that would satisfy the zoning requirement without having to go for a variance.

Joseph R. Warpinski: I appreciate that.

Commissioner Burke: Any other questions, concerns or comments? Mr. Warpinski, one of the things about coming here is that you get a lot of great advice without having to schedule an individual appointment, we have an architect who has been working in the City and historic preservation for years and someone who has been involved in numerous projects. Hopefully they have given you some good direction.

Joseph R. Warpinski: I truly do appreciate it.

Commissioner Burke: I think it would be difficult for me to get a motion here that would not include the six conditions, I don't think that is going to happen, but you did seem to be open to a motion that would include all six of those conditions. Is there anyone willing to make a motion for approval on this with the six conditions outlined by the City?

Commissioner Wannemacher: I will go ahead and make that motion, for approval subject to the conditions of the Staff Report.

Commissioner Burke: Okay, do we have a second? Commissioner Whiteman, we have a second. Okay if we can call for a vote please.

MOTION: *Commissioner Wannemacher made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of historic windows and new construction of an addition at 3200 8th Avenue North, subject to staff conditions.*

1. The proposed ribbon windows at the garage enclosure and addition be replaced with vertically oriented openings that are compatible in size with original openings found on the primary residence. While an important consideration for any Certificate of Appropriateness, this change is also required by the *building and design standards* for all properties zoned NT-2 (Neighborhood Traditional) regardless of designation status. Pursuant to City Code Section 16.20.010.11:
 - a) At least 30-percent of the street-side façade shall consist of fenestration and architectural details and features;
 - b) At least 50-percent of the required fenestration shall be transparent (i.e. window glass);
 - c) Window sashes and glass shall be square or vertical.
2. Windows will be installed to be setback within the wall plane and feature a reveal of at approximately two to three inches to provide consistency with existing windows at subject property.
3. Three-dimensional, exterior muntins be applied to all windows to replicate the configuration of the historic windows, *or*
4. Internal muntins be applied to all horizontal sliding windows to replicate the configuration of the historic windows.
5. All other necessary permits shall be obtained. Any additional work shall be presented to staff for determination of the necessity of additional COA approval.
6. This approval will be valid for 24 months beginning on the date of revocation of the local Emergency Declaration.

Commissioner Whiteman seconded

VOTE: *YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Wolf, Wannemacher*
 NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

B. City File 20-90200087 & 20--54000059

Contact People: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451 & Ann Vickstrom, 892-5807

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new single family residence at 700 31st Street North, a vacant parcel located within a local historic district.

Staff Presentation

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Certificate of Appropriateness.
 Ann Vickstrom gave PowerPoint presentation base on the variance request.

Applicant\Owner Presentation

Catherine Coyle, Domain Homes, Inc., spoke in support of the requests and was available for questions.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

Mark Carman, 3127 8th Ave. N., addressed concerns re. the lack of historic attributes in a historically designated

neighborhood.

Cross Examination:

Waived by City Staff and Applicant.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived by City Staff and Applicant.

Executive Session:

MOTION #1: *Commissioner Wannemacher made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new single family residence at 700 31st Street North, a vacant parcel located within a local historic district subject to staff conditions and one additional condition. The applicant must work with City Staff to make modifications to a minimum of two columns in the design consistent with the neighborhood and as set forth in the Staff Report.*

Commissioner Whiteman seconded the modification motion.

VOTE: *YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Wolf, Wannemacher
NO – 0*

Motion passed unanimously

MOTION #2: *Commissioner Whiteman made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new single family residence at 700 31st Street North, with the additional condition.*

1. All windows will feature contoured, three-dimensional external muntins and be recessed approximately 2” to 3” within the wall plane.
2. New landscape features, including any fences or enclosures, will be administratively approved as part of this COA application. New fencing will be constructed of wood or decorative metal, as recommended by St. Petersburg’s Design Guidelines for Historic Properties.
3. All relevant Building and Zoning criteria will be met. Fenestration will be added to the south elevation to satisfy Zoning code and additionally reviewed administratively by historic preservation staff.
4. Staff reserves the ability to return this proposal to Commission for further review if the above conditions are not appropriately satisfied by submitted revisions.
5. This approval will be valid for 24 months beginning on the date of revocation of the local Emergency Declaration.

Commissioner Wannemacher seconded the motion.

VOTE: YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Wolf, Wannemacher
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously

MOTION #3: Commissioner Wolf made a motion approving the variance in accordance with the Staff Report.

Commissioner Whiteman seconded the motion.

VOTE: YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Wolf, Wannemacher
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously

D. City File 20-90200042

Contact Person: Laura Duvekot, 892-5451

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to 2855 8th Avenue North, a contributing resource to a local historic district.

Staff Presentation

Laura Duvekot gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation

Applicants were not present

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

Waived by City Staff

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Waived by City Staff

Executive Session:

MOTION: Commissioner Wolf made a motion approving the Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to 2855 8th Avenue North

Commissioner Gerdes Seconded.

VOTE: *YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Wolf, Wannemacher*
 NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

VII. LEGISLATIVE

B. City File LGCP-CIE-2020

Contact Person: Britton Wilson, 551-3542

Request: City initiated application to the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to the Annual Capital Improvements Element (CIE) Update for Fiscal Years 2021 to 2025.

Staff Presentation

Britton Wilson gave a PowerPoint presentation based on the Staff Report.
Claude Tankersley, Public Works Administrator, was available to answer questions.

Executive Session

Commissioner Burke: Thank you very much I know that the Commissioners have all had this sent to them ahead of time because there is a lot of detail to it. Before we do anything else let's just make sure, is there anyone here for the public hearing, that we are aware of?

Clerk: No, there is not.

Commissioner Burke: Okay, there is not, we can then open this up to executive session. Do we expect Mr. Tankersley to do a presentation or is he here to answer questions?

Derek Kilborn: He is here to answer questions and he can expand at that time.

Commissioner Burke: Ok then can, would we address those, Britton would you like to take questions, would they go right to Claude Tankersley, what would you prefer?

Britton Wilson: If they are related the Water Resources Department, it could be directed to Mr. Tankersley.

Commissioner Burke: Okay thank you. I know that we are going to have a lot of questions here and anyone, at this end of the room, need to kick anything off? No? Mr. Wolf, anything from you?

Commissioner Wolf: No, I saw a memo from Commissioner Michaels.

Commissioner Burke: Okay, Mr. Michaels.

Commissioner Michaels: Alright, maybe just to preface this, back in September I had asked some questions relating to the drainage level of service standards, at that time it was indicated that a special presentation would

be made regarding those standards, I believe at the next meeting, the October meeting, that was then rescheduled to the November meeting. In the meantime, the Administrator of Public Works, Mr. Tankersley, had contacted me asking what exactly it was that I had questions about, so I did reply to his request for information. I understood, last week, that a decision was made to I believe the presentation was scheduled for today, but a decision was made to make the presentation to the City Council at the Committee of the Whole meeting, rather than to do the commission here today. I do think it would be helpful to the commission to actually have a presentation, presented to us so that we can interact with Staff and Mr. Tankersley and others that may be participating. Then we have this Capital Improvements matter before us today, on the agenda, and this again has the same level of service standards that we had before us a couple of months ago. The questions I had at that time, I still have, and I responded in a memorandum to the Staff. I was invited to submit a written memorandum, which I understand will also be forwarded to the City Council for their information. I have written out my questions regarding the drainage level of service standards and they also apply to the issue that is here before us today. I will ask the questions, the Staff has already seen these, so they are aware of what the questions are. Again, the big picture here today and I believe I read in the news that we are on the verge of having another record breaking hurricane season and this whole issue of storm intensification is vital to the City and our community as it is to the entire state. This may seem like a technical matter here, these level of service standards, but they are, to me, critical. They are something that we need to fully understand and be assured that we are moving forward and meeting the appropriate standards to try and provide the best possible protection to our City. As I pointed out in the memorandum, I do understand that the City has been doing a great deal to improve our infrastructure regarding drainage and related issues. The financing has been just as important, a great deal to improve our infrastructure as it relates to drainage and related issues, we have done a great deal both in improving the infrastructure and the ready, a lot of that is underway. The financing of that has been just as important as the actual work being done and that is appreciated as well. I did have questions, basically these are questions to ask to get clarification on exactly what these standards are and exactly what they mean. For the purposes of the public, let me just read them one by one and then I understand Mr. Tankersley is going to respond to them or other Staff.

Clerk: I am just making sure that he can hear us, (checks sound).

Claude Tankersley: I can hear you.

Commissioner Michaels: The first one relates to page 4 of the Staff Report on the Capital Improvements Element where it is stated that “due to the backlog of stormwater improvement needs and the time to implement improvements to the municipal drainage system, *existing conditions are adopted as the level of service.*” My question is what does that mean? What exactly does that mean?

Claude Tankersley: Certainly, thank you Mr. Michaels, I appreciate these questions.

[Brief pause to work with audio]

Claude Tankersley: Okay I will speak as loudly as I can. First of all, thank you to Mr. Michaels for the very good questions and I am glad I am able to discuss them with you guys today. These are not the type of questions and the level of detail I will be going into with the Council. So, I am sorry for the confusion in the scheduling of my presentation to you today. Specific to the question you asked I can certainly understand how that sentence can be misleading. Trying to tie the existing conditions to the backlog of stormwater improvements is probably not the best way to present it. What we mean by existing conditions are adopted, what we mean by that is we commit to provide a level of service for accepting stormwater from a piece of property or parcel, at the level of service that is currently provided. For instance, if a parcel, currently, as the

way it is developed, currently, is providing us with twenty (20) cubic feet of storm water runoff during a typical storm, then that is the level of service that we will continue to meet. The idea is that as long as the stormwater from a redevelopment does not exceed the amount of storm water that is currently being discharged to the City facilities, then that is the current level of service. At some point that may change, but it is not going to change anytime soon, and it is going to take a lot of conversations among the public and the City and using the science to backup the change to make those changes. Does that answer the question?

Commissioner Michaels: So then I am hearing that this is a matter for City staff judgment as opposed to a metric we have with most of the other levels of service.

Claude Tankersley: That is correct, it is not an easy to assign a metric like we have for water or for sewer. For stormwater there is two things that we want to see in the level of service that we will provide. One is in terms of stormwater quality and the other is in terms of stormwater quantity. The City has guidance and regulations on the quality and quantity of stormwater that will be discharged to our system but also SWFMD (South West Florida Water Management District) is the agency for those stormwater improvements, also. The process for going through the permitting through SWFMD and the City is the level of service that we will continue to have, it is not a specific metric.

Commissioner Michaels: Okay thank you, the next question is on page 5. There is reference there to a standard based on quote, “a minimum design storm of 10-year return frequency, 1-hour duration.” My question there is when was the standard first established, and is this still an adequate standard given the present environment of climate change and increasing storm intensity?

Claude Tankersley: So, a 10-year return frequency, 1-hour duration storm for Pinellas County and St. Petersburg is approximately equal to 3.2 inches of rain in 1 hour. These standards were first established many decades ago by federal and state agencies and they were established across the state of Florida, they are very specific to your location. The 10 year return frequency, 1 hour duration storm for St. Petersburg is an will be different then it would be for Bradenton or Tampa or Clearwater or anywhere else. It is based off of historical data. We recognize that as climate change is occurring some of this historical data may no longer be applicable, we are very much aware of that. We do not have yet enough data to feel confident that we know what the new 10 year return frequency might be. It is one of those things we don’t want to go off on our own and develop our own standards, we want to keep our standards consistent with the federal, state, regional and county authorities, we use the same rainfall data as SWFMD uses, as the county uses as the state uses. I do not know when, these curves, we call them curves because it is a curve that relates the intensity of the storm to duration of the storm, we do not know when these curves will be updated. We have not received any information as to when these curves will be updated. I cannot tell you whether it will be updated within five (5) years, ten (10) years, and the City does not take the lead on updating those standards.

Commissioner Michaels: And how long has this particular standard been in place?

Claude Tankersley: The standard that we use was published back in the 1990s. I am not sure when exactly in the 90s the historical data was compiled, I suspect it was historical data that looks throughout the twentieth century period that we had on record, probably from 1900 to 1990. That is when it was published in the 1990s and we continue to use those curves today.

Commissioner Michaels: Again, thank you, my next question relates to page 6, under sanitary sewer, it is noted that the “highest annual average daily flow rate” is calculated using 1990 census data for functional population. Should this be updated to utilize the 2019 functional population reference on page 3 (285,316)?

Claude Tankersley: I have no objection to changing the population, but I am not sure it will change the highest annual average flow rate. The reason for this is that even though the population in the City has increased since 1990, the amount of water that each person in the City uses has significantly decreased. The highest annual average daily flow is the population times the per capita daily flow that we expect from our citizens and that per capita daily flow was much higher in 1990 than it is now. I have not done the calculus, but I strongly suspect that if we were to use the 2019 functional population as well as 2019 actual per capita flows, that the level of service would actually be lower than it was in 1990. Our system was designed to handle everything that we had in 1990 and so therefore it is probably more of an academic exercise than having a true impact on what we are able to handle.

Commissioner Michaels: So the calculation could be somewhat different but you are expecting the results to be the same?

Claude Tankersley: Yes, the calculations would be different and if the calculations are, I expect the results would be less because we are actually seeing less flows on an average daily basis to our treatment plants now than we were ten (10) years, twenty (20) years ago. We are also treating and seeing less water being treated and sent out for public drinking than it was ten (10), fifteen (15), twenty (20) years ago. Even though the population has increased, we as a population have decreased the amount of water we use per person. That decrease has offset the actual increase of population.

Commissioner Michaels: Thank you those are important points. My next question is also on page 6, where it is noted that since 2015-2016 the “peak weather wastewater treatment capacity has been increased 40%,” and additional infrastructure improvements are underway which I said earlier is very important and most commendable. However, what is the standard or goal (new level of service standard for peak weather) that the City is seeking to achieve in this regard?

Claude Tankersley: We actually do not provide goal or standard for peak wet weather wastewater treatment capacity. These goals for the Comprehensive Planning are goals based off of development and population. The peak wet weather flows are not related to population, they are related to the condition of our wastewater system, over time the wastewater system allows more ground water and stormwater to leak into the system so we have more flows during those wet weather events. Those flows are dominated by the wet weather event not by the population. If I may give you an example, right now the population we serve send approximately twenty seven (27) million gallons a day of human created sewage to the City. Our treatment plants are designed to handle an average flow of fifty six (56) million gallons per day. The plants can handle an average flow of 56 million gallons a day, but we are only getting about twenty seven (27) million gallons a day from us humans. Now on an average day, we do get some brown water and some stormwater into our system. It is an additional seven (7) million gallons per day on an average day. During a storm, we can see those peak flows jump to 150 million, but the amount that the population is providing is still twenty seven (27) million, so now you have almost 80% of that water that is coming through the system is coming from stormwater and groundwater and it is not related to population. That is why we set the standard level of service to be based off of population for the average annual daily flow. We do build our plans and build our systems to handle short term peak flows. If you can imagine for your car, you are driving your car and you drive your car on an average of, on about, you are going on a trip, 60 miles an hour, that is your average speed, that is what your car was designed to go about 60 miles an hour on average, and that is what you usually drive. If you are on a trip and all of a sudden you need to avoid an accident or you need to pass someone on the road, you can get your car up to 80/100 miles an hour for a short period of time and your car can handle that, your car is not designed to handle 100 miles an hour all the time, but it can handle it on short periods. Our wastewater treatment plants are the designed exact same way, they are

designed to handle and average daily flow of fifty six (56) million gallons a day but they can handle on short periods during wet weather events, now with the improvements we have made, they can handle, 150 million gallons in a single day. That kind of flow, we cannot handle day after day after day, only on peak periods. That is why we do not set our level of standards for peak wet weather because peak wet weather flows are a function of leakage into the system, not a function of development and population.

Commissioner Michaels: Okay, again, thank you. I appreciate you responding to my questions. You have provided a lot of useful information for us to reflect on and I do very much appreciate the longtime service you have provided to the City and the outstanding job that you have done. I do think it is still important for the Commission or at least for myself to get a presentation on the integrated water resources master plan which is on the way and there are some other related plans, which I understand is connected to the goal here. Significant sea level rise vulnerability assessment for our City and an eventual plan that will address the measures that are needed to deal with that. Thank you very much.

Claude Tankersley: Thank you.

Commissioner Burke: I would like to comment, I can't believe I heard what I just heard, I mean that is the first time I understood, why are we

MOTION: *Commissioner Whiteman made a motion approving the application to the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to the Annual Capital Improvements Element (CIE) Update for Fiscal Years 2021 to 2025.*

Commissioner Wolf Seconded.

VOTE: *YES – 6 –Burke, Gerdes, Michaels, Whiteman, Wolf, Wannemacher
NO – 0*

Motion passed unanimously.

VIII. UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Derek Kilborn gave the Commission updates re. past matters that have come before the Commission and the status of each matter; upcoming CIE update, and the upcoming public works updated from the director.

VIII. ADJOURN

Commissioner Gerdes made a motion to adjourn.
Commissioner Wolf seconded.

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 4:30 P.M.