

MINUTES OF THE COLLIER COUNTY  
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
Naples, Florida  
June 5, 2024

LET IT BE REMEMBERED, the Collier County Development Services Advisory Committee, in and for the County of Collier, having conducted business herein, met on this date at 3 P.M. in REGULAR SESSION at the Collier County Growth Management Community Department Building, Conference Room #609/610, 2800 Horseshoe Drive North, Naples, Florida, with the following members present:

Chairman: William J. Varian (excused)  
Vice Chairman: Blair Foley (Active Chair)  
James E. Boughton  
Clay Brooker (excused)  
Jeff Curl  
David Dunnivant  
John English  
Marco Espinar (excused)  
Norman Gentry  
Mark McLean  
Chris Mitchell  
Robert Mulhere  
Laura Spurgeon-DeJohn  
Jeremy Sterk  
Mario Valle  
Hannah Roberts–AHAC non-voting

ALSO PRESENT:

James French, Department Head, GMCD  
Thomas Iandimarino, Director, Code Enforcement Division, GMCD  
Christopher Mason, Community Planning & Resiliency Division, GMCD  
Richard Long, Director, Building Review & Permitting Division, GMCD  
Drew Cody, Supervisor – Project Management, PUD  
Cormac Giblin, Housing Policy & Economic Development Division, GMCD  
Jay Ahmad, Director – Transportation Engineering, Transportation Management Services  
Captain Brian Horbal, North Collier Fire Review  
Michael Stark, Director – Operations & Regulatory Management, GMCD  
Mike Bosi, Director – Zoning, GMCD  
Diane Lynch, Management Analyst II/Staff Liaison, GMCD  
Rey Torres Fuentes, Ops Support Specialist I, GMCD

*Any persons needing the verbatim record of the meeting may request a copy of the audio recording from the Collier County Growth Management Community Department.*

**1. Call to Order – Vice Chairman (Acting Chair)**

**Vice Chair Foley** called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

A quorum of 12 was present in the boardroom; two members joined later.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

*The motion to approve the agenda passed unanimously, 11-0.*

**3. Approval of Minutes**

**a. DSAC Meeting – May 1, 2024**

*The motion to approve the minutes was passed unanimously, 11-0*

**b. DSAC–ROW Meeting – April 29, 2024**

*Vice Chair Foley has a correction at the bottom of page 3 of the minutes, where it has: Further discussion ensued, Bullet Point: Different permitting if it is an STP or PPL – Mr. Foley sites correction to make it SDP*

*The motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously, 11-0*

**4. Public Speakers**

(None)

**5. Staff Announcements/Updates**

**a. Development Review Division – [Jaime Cook, Director]**

*Vice Chair Foley states that maybe we'll come back to her later*

*[Mr. Gentry joined the meeting at 3:07] [Ms. Spurgeon-DeJohn joined the meeting at 3:08]*

**b. Code Enforcement Division – [Thomas Iandimarino, Director]**

*Mr. Iandimarino told the board:*

- This is going to be a double renewal season. So please, those of you who need to renew your licenses, make sure you get that in place. The Governor passed a bill to keep the licenses in the county for one more year, up until next year. It was supposed to be last year. He re-signed it. So, the licenses are going to be back in place again this year as well.

**c. Community Planning & Resiliency Division [Chris Mason, Director]**

*Mr. Mason addressed the board about variances, specifically flood variances:*

- A lot of information regarding variances, two things to consider: Number 1, the National Flood Insurance Program. Number 2, the Florida Building Code. The variance often goes against the Florida Building code. So, within our flood ordinance,

- we have a section that's about 4 or 5 pages that explains everything about variances as it applies to our operation.
- What I would say regarding Variances, is for one to be issued for elevation purposes. That is generally what folks are looking for in a variance, but we have not seen in my tenure here. I have not been posed with such an issue looking for a variance to elevate, or not to elevate, a single-family home or commercial structure.
  - Through my dedicated research through FEMA's documentation, because they do have documentation; it's not codified, or they're basically desk references: A property owner would have to demonstrate that there is some unique characteristic on that property that would not allow them to elevate to the required base flood elevation, which would be in our ordinance as well as in the Florida Building Code. There would have to be something very specific, and very unique for that to even come into conversation.
  - On the other hand, regarding Historic Structure Variances, you're not going to be looking at elevating structures. You're looking at the 50% rule, to bypass the 50% rule, if a structure is eligible to be on that National Historic Register.

**d. Building Review & Permitting Division [Richard Long, Director]**

***Mr. Long addressed the Board:***

- A couple of things that aren't on the DSAC report: There are 2,400 total reviews pending in the system right now. And that includes all reviews: trades, planning, zoning.
- Last month, we finalized 4,258 permits and issued 60 TCOs on top of that.
- For the last 12 months, we've had 50,187 permits applied for. So that average is about 4,182 per month.
- There are 1,200 permits that haven't been routed yet, so they're working on that, in addition to the 2,400 reviews pending.
- Other than that, everything else is in the report.

**Mr. Mulhere** asked if you get your final inspection, whatever the kind of permit is, and it's approved; is it automatic that a certificate of occupancy is issued?

**Mr. Long** said on some of the smaller permits where there's nothing else going on with them; Yes, the system will recognize, and they'll go ahead and auto.

**Mr. Mulhere** asked so otherwise you have to ask for them?

**Mr. Long** said otherwise, it goes into a queue. So, it's kind of automated. Once that last inspection is approved or passed. Then the system turns it into inspections completed, creates an activity, and then goes into the queue for Donna's group to go in after it and start the CO process.

**e. Public Utilities Department [Drew Cody, Supervisor-Project Management]**

***Mr. Cody addressed the Board:***

- Nothing too exciting on the operation stuff. You guys have the charts. We're generally meeting our targets right there.

- Potentially, before the next meeting, because you guys are right up against the 4<sup>th</sup> of July, we may be reaching out to the Utility Subcommittee to start scheduling a first look at updates to Utility Standards Manual.
- We're expecting our first look to start the internal staff reviews from the engineering consultant in the next week or so here. That could push us out towards the end of July, or early August. And we'd want to schedule that before you guys have the August meeting.

**f. Housing Policy & Economic Development [Cormac Giblin, Director]**

*Mr. Giblin acknowledged himself before the Board and noted that there was nothing formal to report this month.*

**g. GMD Transportation Engineering Division [Jay Ahmad, Director]**

*Mr. Ahmad provided an update on a few projects in design and construction:*

- Tonight, we have a public information meeting for Vanderbilt Beach Road Extension, Phase Two. As you know, Phase One is from Collier to 16<sup>th</sup>. Phase Two starts from 16<sup>th</sup> and goes for two miles east, to east of Everglades Blvd.
- The roadway itself is at 30% design stage, and the public information is being held at IFAS by the Fairground off Immokalee Road.
- About the project: We're similarly from east of Wilson. Two lanes to be constructed from east of Wilson to 16<sup>th</sup>. And we're continuing that all the way to Everglades Blvd. But we're buying the right of way for four lanes suburban high speed, kind of rural, section. In that footprint, in the future say 50 years from now, hopefully, it can go from four lanes to six lanes. So, we're buying the ultimate right of way for that project. The final design we're hoping to complete by later in 2025, sometime this Spring. And beginning construction almost at the completion of Phase One. Hopefully that construction is seamless and continues east further to 16<sup>th</sup>.
- A second project to update you on is we are taking an item to the Board early this summer to approve the design of four bridges in Golden Gate Estates that basically connects one on Wilson, just South of Golden Gate Blvd: the other, 10<sup>th</sup> Ave SE between Everglades Blvd. and DeSoto. 62<sup>nd</sup> Ave between Everglades and 40<sup>th</sup> St NE. And 13<sup>th</sup> St NW, Golden Gate, and the future VBRX right of way, that short distance there. Of course, the 5<sup>th</sup> was approved by the Board a while ago. 47<sup>th</sup> Ave. which was a part of the Project Development and Environmental Assessment that FDOT did a few years back. That is a grant project, and why we separated the four from the rest. The design contract we negotiated with 5.4 million to do the design of the four bridges with Atkins. The design should start shortly after the Board's approval. We anticipate the construction will be in stages as funding allows between 2026 and 2028. Currently, I think there's \$26 million in the budget for all these projects. So, it's not going to do all these five bridges. Most likely, we'll do possibly one or two bridges with that fund. And the Board will have to identify other funding.
- We are getting ready to bid the Vanderbilt Beach Road again, West of Airport (or, by Pelican Marsh), W to U.S. 41, and currently its four lanes will be six lanes. There's a major crossing; Box Culvert, just west of Goodlette, that will narrow the traffic lanes

- from currently four to two during construction. So, please avoid that area when we're in construction. We put in the specs that it should be done in two months, and it should start after season. And we'll advertise it with the media and so forth when the time comes.
- **Vanderbilt Construction:** It's going Vanderbilt Extension from Collier to 16<sup>th</sup>, including Massey. There are eight crews doing drainage. Construction throughout the bridges is pretty much done. There are three bridges within the project over canals: Curry Canal, Corkscrew, and Orange Tree Canal. We are on track. It's on time, about 45% complete in construction. We're on track to complete by end of 2025 or later in that year.
  - **The Logan Roundabout:** Logan just north of Immokalee Roundabout by Olde Cypress, it's almost complete. Traffic is using it and they seem to be getting used to it. So far, so good.
  - **Tiger Grant Project:** Project in the city of Immokalee. It includes 20 miles of sidewalks, bike lanes, and trails. There's a transfer station for CAT. And so far, we've built about half of it. Out of the 22 miles of sidewalks, we've built about 11 miles. And the Transfer Station is done. It's a design-build: Quality, Q. Grady Minor is doing the design. They're almost done 100% with the design, and construction of the rest is continuing. It should be done by the grant requirement before March 2025. It's a little bit behind schedule, and hopefully Quality can catch up with additional crews that they're promising.

**Mr. Curl** comments on the stretch of 16 between Everglades and DeSoto. The speed limit drops. It's normally 45 throughout the Estates. But that one, with the two schools there, is 30. So, that will be the oddball as you go down Vanderbilt---all the way through, I guess Rural Lands West, eventually that's going to be one of their main entrances too. Is the County planning to keep that 30 mph, or eventually it'll be 45 like it is everywhere else?

**Mr. Ahmad** asks are you talking Everglades Blvd. itself?

**Mr. Curl** says no, on 16<sup>th</sup>, itself. Where the schools basically access 16.

**Mr. Ahmad** says I will look into that. I don't have the answer to that.

**Mr. Curl** states that's the only pushback you're going to get out there because I know about a year ago, they were already complaining about speeders on that road. Maybe, just give them a hat tip that eventually a speed limit is coming.

**Mr. Ahmad** says Okay, I'll get back to you. We do have a project: 16<sup>th</sup> Street, from Randall to Golden Gate Blvd - Building a bridge, adding shoulders and sidewalk to that roadway. And that is also the speed there, 30 mph. It's similar to 8th St – Even though we put a bridge there, people are flying through it.

**Mr. Curl** agrees, saying yeah, the Sheriff department gets some good revenue on that road.

**h. Collier County Fire Review [Michael Cruz, Assistant Chief, Fire Marshall]**

(No Report)

**i. North Collier Fire Review [Bryan Horbal, Captain]**

*Captain Horbal makes a few announcements to the Board:*

- Chief Coxwell retired. He was our Assistant Chief of Life Safety. So, Sean (Lintz) the Fire Marshall, is kind of doing both roles now.
- May Building Reviews: We had 664 reviews, with a four-day average for the month of May. And we had about 1,400 new construction inspections. That's just new construction, not any existing buildings.
- For our Plan Review and Planning Permits: We had 40 planning meetings and planning permits with a two-day average.

**j. Operations & Regulatory Management Division – [Michael Stark, Director]**

***Mr. Stark provided the May report:***

- The Department received 5,088 permit applications with a fiscal year date total of 32,997 permit applications. 278 of these permits were related to Hurricane Ian. And we continue to hover right around the average turnaround time of 1.3 days.
- We welcomed 1,111 customers to our business center and satellite offices. And the staff answered 6,465 calls in our call center.
- Our Team and the Vendors continue to test the texting function that we talked about the last time. We faced a couple of different delays as far as the testing. We want to make sure before we roll this out to the public, that it's correct. We are looking at more of an August 2024 for full roll-out and deployment.
- At the last Board meeting, the Fire Fee Interlocal Agreements were approved, and I wanted to thank Cheryl Soder and Jason Badge on my Team for their participation in that project that as well. This was to align Fire Fees across the board to make sure we worked with the Fire Department on that as well.
- We continue to work through the fiscal year 2025 budget process. Last year, we hovered right around a \$96 million operating budget. And with taking on several new divisions, including Conservation Collier, we're somewhere in the range of about \$210 million now. So, it's increased with the same staff that we had from last year as well. So, we may be coming back for more people.
- We have a Fee Schedule update that I'm going to turn over to Mr. French very quickly here. We have the Executive Summary, and we're planning on going to the Board meeting on June 25<sup>th</sup>. He (Mr. French) is going to say a few words on that for us.

***Mr. French addresses the Board regarding fee increases:***

- We're trying to think about strategy and how this goes with the Board. I didn't want to put this in front of the Board until after they had a chance to review the budget. But I did tell you I'd come back with the numbers with regards to fee increases.
- The goal here is that we would use Raftelis to come in and do a fee study after this fee increase that we would be requesting; start with Fund 113 on the Building Side, and then once that's completed, we'll enter into another fee study to look at the planning and engineering fees. So, at least we know how we measure up against what the cost is to actually provide the service. Again, the reason why we're focused on 113 vs. 131; it is the one in most dire need. I don't want to say crisis. But we recognize that this will be the end of our Carry Forward as well as our Reserve Fund balance.

- Carry Forward: it's just the dollars you were allotted that you did not use that year. It's not additional money you made, because when we make money in one year, we can't book it for use in the same year. It's carried onto the next year, and that establishes your budget for next year.
- To go over the fee very quickly, the FEMA Review fee (we do thousands of these; we charge nothing for those) was a requirement of the 2017 updates to the Florida Building Code. We've never had a line on our fee schedule, so we can't charge for that review. Now, these are not Building Plan reviewers. They are certified Flood Plain Managers that are required to perform this review.
- The alternative is that we would have to incentivize and make it a requirement for our Building Plan reviewers to go get this certification, so we meet the conditions set forth by either the State model or FEMA.
- At this point, we're just going to charge the exact same fee that we charge for a typical review, which is currently \$50. Yes, it's a new fee. But that's going to offset the cost. Right now, you have about six or seven people in there that are paid for by Fund 113, but they are generating zero revenue. There's no revenue on that.
- The Permit Extension fee right now is 10% of the original Building Permit or \$100. We would take that to \$150. Ever since Hurricane Ian and Rick Scott introduced the economic downturn, the Governor signed an executive order called Tolling Ordinance or Tolling Provision. It covers all development orders, which includes Building Permits. So, any of these permits, I still have an obligation. The State law will never change. They still expire in the system after six months of the last passing action. I have to go back and review them. Now, I have to go and stand them back up. There's a great deal of staff time involved with those that will not have an immediate impact on many of the permits that are still sitting in the queue. But the Governor gives a time period, and that time period continues to be extended. Now, we're well beyond the two years. Even though the Storm has not been quite two years, it had a claw back for any permits from a particular date because of the effect of Hurricane Ian. So, no matter what, I can't charge a fee for any of these permits. What's happening is many of these Contractors are done. They just haven't called in their final inspection. Many Contractors may have gone out of business. So, we're dealing predominantly with Closing or Title Companies and Realtors more than we are with Contractors. It creates a little bit of a dilemma because some of those Contractors weren't from here. They may have just come here and got a state license to respond to the Storm, and they're gone. So now, the Property Owner is stuck with it. They can't get a closing on the house. Even though we're alerting the Property Owner as well as the Contractor on the permit, we're getting very little response. Now, Evelyn Trevino in our shop, and Mike's group has focused on some of the collection of these fees, closing them out. But we also have until the last Board meeting. The Board had reduced the fee for anyone who could demonstrate that they had Homestead Exemption and suffered damage from the Hurricane. They got 50% off. On top of which, they never have to close out the Permit. No Offense, but they're very savvy business people that have learned to game the system: if they don't have to close out the Permit, no one's putting pressure on them, and they're still under the protection of the Tolling Ordinance, it doesn't matter. The house never lost its CO. It's just that I never got a certificate of completion on the work. So, I've got no enforcement ability to make them close. I can only try to incentivize them to close. Ultimately, it will be the Property Owners to get stuck with this, or you, as an industry,

paying for all the staff time to close these out; because eventually, these homes will sell, they'll try to refinance, and the titles will all be clouded.

- The alternative is that the General Fund pay for staff time because I've got to pay the staff to do work; they've got to be trained and licensed. Or it would be put on the backs of the Developers or those who pull permits. And that's pretty much been our model.

***Director French questions if the Board would support him getting General Fund dollars to offset this, predominantly because You and Your Clients pay these permit and development fees.***

- The Permit Inspection Fee was originally \$65 and was lowered over time to \$45. Our current cost to provide inspection is \$64.80. So, this is a break even. As well as with the reinspection fees, (time-specific) which is currently \$120. That fee would go to \$130. And the reason why is that Time Specifics are predominantly for concrete work. So, that's where I've taken an inspection and inspector off route and lost the efficiency of that person for a period of time until that inspection can be completed. We still want to offer that.
- The Private Provider Fee: We're not allowed to call that an inspection. But there's a great deal of work that goes into the Private Provider. Again, the local authority having jurisdiction, whether it's a city, county, or town, they are responsible for issuing permits. Private Providers cannot do that; they are responsible for ensuring the Florida Building Code standards are followed, and Issuing a Certificate of Completion or Certificate of Occupancy. That is not the Private Provider's role. It says that I must offer that service at a discounted rate. So rather than charging \$65, it's \$58 per review. We've maintained that 10%. But it just barely covers the cost of staff.
- These are the reviews and inspection fees. I promised you that I'd bring the numbers, and these are the only ones that will be on there.

**Mr. Mulhere** said this is just the fees that will be increased because you can do that now, you can immediately collect fees for things that you're unable to collect. But aren't you also looking at everything else?

**Mr. French** said this is what I'm able to defend and measure without any second thought. I can defend these numbers all day. We are going to move forward with Raftelis. We need to look at everything. With larger buildings, on the Commercial side, it's a percentage of the cost of construction based off of the International Building Code; their table. We found a way to find reductions there. I don't know that we need to touch that one. But I'm telling you where we're losing is on the individual inspection, or on this FEMA review. All of these fees that I've mentioned here, other than the FEMA review, are all associated with an inspection.

**Mr. Mulhere** said not that I'm not a proponent of significantly increased fees, but you have said a couple thousand FEMA reviews.

**Mr. French** responds your biggest holdup on your time delay is FEMA.

**Mr. Mulhere** said what I'm asking is how many is that? \$50 – If you did 2,000 that's \$100,000.

**Mr. French** says every structure needs a FEMA review, so it's thousands.

**Mr. Mulhere** asks so this fee, would likely pay for the cost of those?

**Mr. French** replies yeah, absolutely. This is consistent with what we're charging for other users.



**Mr. Mulhere** said my only reason for asking was if there was a differential – Is a single family \$50, but a commercial structure \$100? That was my only question. I trust your judgment.

**Mr. French** says so with FEMA, it's a little different. We look at the envelope of the building versus the individual units in order to justify the value. I don't want to say it's easier, but if we can get an applicant to better participate with us versus just relying on property appraiser data, it makes the review go by faster.

**Mr. Mulhere** says it's a little more complicated if you're talking about the 50% rule. This has nothing to do with that, right? That's somebody in the Building Department.

**Mr. French** said so it does, the 50% rule is always in effect. It's your SISD, your substantial improvement because of substantial damage. That's where it gets much more difficult because although we can use the FEMA calculator to estimate your construction value; to put a structure back together that's been impacted by a storm, I have to take in account everything from cabinets, tile, baseboard. So, for those things that you wouldn't typically have to identify with in your plans, With SISD, you have to identify much more.

**Mr. Mulhere** says again, my only reason for asking is there a bright line – is there a line where this is more complicated? Therefore, it takes more time. Therefore, it should have a more reasonable fee or, a better fee, or stronger fee, as opposed to something that is typically an hour of somebody's time.

**Mr. French** said so the differential in the pay here is that although we do have a licensed professional engineer, so we're paying that engineering cost. It's the review staff underneath; it would not be typically higher than an entry-level employee, somebody we can train, we can qualify them for the test. But it still does take some time, there's still a cost associated with those.

**Mr. Mulhere** asked so you think 50 is appropriate?

**Mr. French** replied I think it is more than reasonable, and I will make the number work the best we can.

**Mr. Gentry** said the Private Provider fee: I just want to make sure I understood that \$58 review. Is that an inspection fee – for every inspection, it's a discounted fee?

**Mr. French** replied by State Law I am not allowed to say it's an inspection fee. So, under the definition of the Statute, No.

**Mr. Gentry** asked it's not a one-time per permit fee?

**Mr. French** said it is for every time they result in inspection. I am required to audit that, and I may have to go out to the field to see why you cut a hole and high-tension concrete.

**Mr. Gentry** said I just want to understand the actual overall impact to a permit because I just didn't know. The actual inspection fees, if you hire a Private Provider, a client is not necessarily paying that initial \$65 inspection fee.

**Mr. French** said they're paying the private provider fee plus they're paying our fee because we're still responsible

**Mr. Gentry** said I just want to understand that they're paying the private provider fee plus the \$58.

**Mr. French** responded we still have an obligation to do that.

**Mr. Gentry** said honestly, going back to the timed inspection fee, you got to keep that because that is valuable.

**Mr. French** responded its only concrete pours. On occasion, it might be electrical, but it's very rare.

**Mr. Gentry** said it's mainly in the structural phase and that's a very big benefit.

***Mr. French addresses the Board about his work over the past month at Domestic Animal Services:***

- Conditions there are pretty tough.
- He and a Team of Others walked the site and had to put it on fire watch.
- A number of rodents in the building had chewed the wires to the life safety system, in addition to its being disconnected. Due to this, we are redefining how we look at these things with regard to maintenance permits because our own facilities management team worked a little bit out of their scope.
- We recognized for every night that a dog or cat is there, it's in the upward sum of somewhere between \$30 and \$50 a night to keep an animal. And to maintain a No-Kill status, you have to have a 90% or better live-release rate. And that's monitored and reported to the University of Florida.
- We are doing everything we can to promote the conditions. Growth Management answered the call. The County Manager initiated a program to allow employees to foster some of the pets and bring them to work because they are much better acclimated amongst people and introducing them makes them more likely to get adopted.
- We're not in crisis, but we're treating this like a Hurricane. So, every day, myself or Mr. Stark are trying to get their money and their systems right.
- And the compliment goes to the Board for holding us to a level of accountability that has set the standard for this County.
- We have some amazing partners, like Hannah and Cormac who have reached out to others for help like Pat McDowell with McDowell Housing Partners. A consideration that we may want to bring forward is that Pat offered to waive all the pet deposit fees for animals under 35 pounds that was adopted from County DAS, for not just the properties where he occupies space on County-owned lands, but for all of his projects in Collier County.
- Other Partners like Randy Johns and Tommy Houchin have walked the DAS property because these guys understand big steel buildings with concrete. Jack Mulvena came out and toured the facility. He reached out to our veterinarian staff to figure out what our needs are.
- We're cleaning DAS up, it's not critical, it's just taking a lot of work. I really want to be done in three months.

**k. Zoning Division [Mike Bosi, Planning Zoning Director]**

***Mr. Bosi reported:***

- Good News: We're filling our two Planner 3, which is our highest staff level planner. One applicant has accepted, and we're hoping the second one will do so as well. So, we'll be staffed in that regard.
- The Planning Commission has a little hiatus. The two meetings that were originally scheduled for the Planning Commission have been taken by the Board for budgetary workshops, so we had to cancel both of our June meetings. The first meeting in July is cancelled as well due to it being on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. So, we have a hiatus on the

- Planning Commission until the 18<sup>th</sup>. We're going to pick back up with Fiddler's Creek, the third full day. Hopefully, we're going to get done with that.
- There are probably four other petitions that we have on it. But I'm saying this because we're getting into a little bit of a backlog on the Planning Commission that is eventually going to lead to a backlog of the Board of County Commissioners.
  - We have restrictions in terms of what types of petitions we are allowed to take June, July, August, and September. So, we are going to have to backload it with some more of our controversial items within October and November.
  - Some of our petitioners, especially for some of our affordable housing projects, have put those on indefinite hold until the end of the election season. So, we're probably going to have some backlog again within the early fall.
  - And then after election, we're probably going to have a pretty heavy press. November and December only have one Board of County Commissioners meeting. It's going to be a difficult December, but we'll work through it. So, January is going to hit and we're going to have a backlog again.
  - We have a pretty steady request in terms of the entitlement side of shop, for at least pre-application meetings and the number of petitions our individual planners are holding within our zoning division.
  - Our zoning division planners have been stable in terms of staffing. We haven't had a lot of turnover. So, hopefully, Bob and his development partners aren't too displeased with the turnaround that we are providing for.
  - We're getting ready to kick off the AUIR-CIE. We have our population numbers done. From Bieber's perspective, more of the same from the last two years. They expected about a 1.45% annual increase over the five- and ten-year period. We're about 1.47% for this iteration. No real great departures which is good in terms of the Capital Improvement Program. That steady stream is easy to account for.
  - We expect another year where we're going to continue to put forward. AUIR-CIE's going to meet the needs of the growth we expect over the next 5 and 10 years.
  - Finally, a couple of meetings ago, The Board of County Commissioners asked us to pick up the Golden Gate Area Master Plan (the rural Estates, not the full urban and Golden Gate City, just the rural Estates) to take advantage of the East and 951 version 2 Committee. Parker Klopff from our comp planning team has been staffing that Committee trying to identify issues that are important to the rural Estates folks. They, and I believe Commissioner McDaniel, this next meeting are going to bring another request to extend that for another year. And then what we envision, once they have finalized their individual meetings on subjects and have their list of priorities, we're going to start intertwining the Golden Gate Area Master Plan. Issue Policies and bring those to that Committee. They'll help guide us as we move forward in the public planning process.

**Ms. Roberts** asked who maintains the planning and zoning GIS maps for your department, or is general?

**Mr. Bosi** said Jason Regula and his team are the ones who maintain it.

**Ms. Roberts** said I thought at AHAC we had talked about, I don't know if it was through Live Local or if it's a revision to the Affordable Housing code, but proximity to a CAT bus stop might get you relief on some parking requirements now, or did I make this up?

**Mr. Bosi** said that has changed. The original one in State Bill 102, which was the first Live Local, said that if you're within ¼ mile or ½ mile of a major transit stop, the county must consider it. Now, the change has been, you have to be considered if you're near a transit stop, any transit stop. There's no qualification to it. But there is a requirement, if you're within ½ mile of a major transportation hub, then you get an automatic 20% reduction of the parking required.

**Ms. Roberts** asked is there a way to get those Hubs

**Mr. Bosi** said his LDC team was interacting with your DSAC LDR subcommittee to bring the definition of what a major transportation hub is to the Board of County Commissioners. And the way they've defined that was those three facilities within Immokalee, within the main government facility, and the other one on Davis Blvd., the transfer station. Those are the three that are going to qualify for the major 20%.

**Mr. Bosi** said I think I provided an update. You know the Board of County Commissioners did provide us more clarity in terms of the application of Live Local, in terms of the Major, the way they restricted it. It has created a little bit more anguish within some of the developers trying to utilize Live Local because 67-70% of the urbanized areas is PUD. And if you exclude PUD's, you've excluded a good portion of the area from being that opportunity. But we'll work through that. That's Board policy, and we implement Board policy.

**6. New Business**

(None)

**7. Old Business**

(None)

**8. Committee Member Comments**

**Mr. Mulhere** said what a wonderful job as Chair you've done.

**9. Adjourn**

*The motion to adjourn passed unanimously, 13-0.*

**There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by the order of the chairman at 3:52 p.m.**

**COLLIER COUNTY  
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**William Varian, Chairman**

These minutes were approved by the Committee/Chairman on 8/7/24, as presented (choose one) , or as amended \_\_\_\_\_.