

APPENDIX II

Collier County RLSA Issues & Concerns List

As of November 5, 2007

Compiled by Nancy Payton/FWF

-
- Revisit sending and receiving designations – telemetry & GPS, FWC's Least Cost Analysis, Eastern Collier Study (Smith, Ross & Main), FWC's SR 29 Dispute Resolution Letter, and Kautz, et al (all have been submitted to the county for data and analysis)
 - Corner of Oil Well Road and 29 – particularly the northwest corner – change to sending to protect important panther travel corridors [panther 131 found dead 04/16/08]
 - No development south of Oil Well Road
 - More upland buffers for Camp Keais Strand & OK Slough
 - More lands east of 29 into sending or protective status – this is ACSC land
 - Require exotic clearing and ongoing management/maintenance for designated stewardship sending lands
 - Establish distances between villages and towns; and distance from Immokalee
 - No hamlets or “compact rural developments” [compact rural development could be a “Coconut Point,” - no cap on size of some types of CRDs]
 - What happens to baseline density – should disappear as in Rural Fringe TDR program
 - Agriculture preservation in receiving areas – incentives? What is left after towns/villages are built
 - Revisit wildlife values on farm fields – caracara, sandhill crane, burrowing owl, gopher tortoise...
 - Incentives for restoring farm fields in receiving areas
 - No panther credits from sending lands that will be surrounded or significantly diminished in value by development
 - Review easement language and who holds the easements – possibly FWC should hold, but no stewardship easements to be held by private entities
 - Need for Smoke easements
 - Explore Dark Skies
 - New roads and road improvements including potential I-75 interchange must be included
 - Tie transportation planning to conservation goals
 - Stronger language for wildlife underpasses and a map of locations
 - Need for Buffers and language to address human-panther/bear/other wildlife encounters
 - Clarify how RLS interacts with state and federal permitting agencies
 - What is fate of remaining uses on designated sending lands and suggestion of removing those remaining uses to meet mitigation obligations
 - Remove all layers at one time – concern that several layers are contrary to conservation and/or agriculture preservation goals
 - Clarify what is included in Ag 2 and Ag 1 – concerns about aquaculture
 - Allow non-native, non-invasive plantings if beneficial to wildlife
 - Establish time period to opt into program- both sending and receiving
 - Better handle on potential credits and restoration credits that can be generated - too many credits?
 - Procedures for recording and handling changes in ownership of SSA lands
 - When sold who is responsible for carrying out SSA obligations