

Chapter One

Public

Participation

Chapter One – Public Participation

Engaging the public in the evaluation and appraisal of the Comprehensive Plan is challenging. While County staff undertook several specific exercises to obtain input and feedback from stakeholders, public outreach and involvement is really a full-time, year-round activity, requiring the planner to continually be listening in all forums and settings, not just those devised for the EAR.

Described below are the specific events used to gain input and insight into the long term desires of the County's citizens, business community, educators, regulatory agencies, etc. In addition to these activities which were specific to the EAR, several other methods of obtaining input into the evaluation and long range planning process were described within the introduction section of the EAR.

EAR Kick-off Meeting at the Southwest Regional Planning Council

On August 26, 2009, County staff attended a workshop, at the offices of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council, in North Fort Myers to meet with DCA representatives and representatives from other state and regional agencies to discuss the EAR process, learn of issues considered important by the DCA staff, and to learn how neighboring local governments intended to respond to issues identified by the State.

Inter-Governmental Kick-off Meeting

On September 8, 2009, Comprehensive Planning hosted an EAR intergovernmental meeting. The meeting offered an opportunity to fellow staff from local City agencies to identify and discuss areas of concern with respect to intergovernmental items or issues common to fellow governments. In addition, this meeting provided an opportunity to discuss sharing data, to discuss new data that must be generated, and the analysis necessary to address those issues identified as outdated, problematic, or where compliance has not occurred or is no longer practical.

Meetings with County Departments

Early on in the EAR development process, planning staff met individually with most of the County Departments. For the entire "life" of the County's Comprehensive Plan, most of the County Departments have been actively involved in the front end of the planning process, including in the development of policies, as well as in implementing the actions, programs and projects that fall out of the Plan. It is the ongoing involvement at all levels of County operations in the comprehensive planning process that have resulted in a Plan that is meaningful and realistic, and can be effectively implemented. Although a formal meeting was arranged with each Department early in EAR development, in actuality, the coordination and collaboration is constant and ongoing. In many cases, Departments have recommended specific amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

Co-ordination with Other Agencies

Staff interacted with the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) concerning their expectations for the County's EAR. Overall, SWFWMD's big areas of concern for Collier County fell under the heading of Water Resource Protection and Climate Change. For Water Resource Protection, the subject areas highlighted by the District were: flood protection and water quality, vulnerability of

potable water supply to contamination and demand rate for water supply projects. Under the heading of Climate Change, strategies to protect water supplies and potential saltwater intrusion were highlighted. For the assessment of the Economic Element of the GMP staff co-ordinated the review efforts with the Collier County Economic Development Council, not-for-profit organization whose mission is to diversify the economy and create high wage jobs

County and Departmental Website

The EAR webpage described the purpose and value of the Comprehensive Plan and went over the EAR process, summarized meetings and events related to the EAR, and importantly, provided a location for people to track the list of issues as it developed throughout the public participation process, and the review schedule and results of the advisory board EAR workshops held in the summer of 2010.

EAR Public Meetings

Throughout the spring of 2010, planning staff conducted 3 workshops around the County. The locations of the public meetings were distributed to the various areas within the County to provide ease of access to a majority of the County's residents. The workshops provided people with the opportunity to hear staff presentations concerning the purpose, scope and schedule of the EAR, ask questions about the Comprehensive Plan and the EAR process, provide comment to what they felt was working and what could be improved within the County, and to meet County staff from several different Departments. While turnout at the workshops was not overwhelming, the input received from the public, as well as municipal staffs attending the workshops, was important and contributed to the development and refinement of issues and opportunities. Below is a listing of the Public Comments received at each of the three public participation meetings.

The 1st EAR Public Participation Meeting held at the North Naples Regional Park on January 25, 2010. The comments received from those in attendance have been grouped associated with the major issues identified by the County and DCA. Following the issue cited will be the corresponding objective or policy within the GMP elements to which it pertains.

For the comments received over the course of the three public participation meetings for the EAR, staff did not attempt to generalize and/or categorize the comments, but rather, as mentioned, linked the comment to the appropriate policy and/or objective in one of the GMP elements, where applicable. Each public comment that is linked to a policy or objective will be noted in Chapter Two of the EAR. This approach will allow the reader understand how the public comment relates to staff's analysis of the policy or objective and what, if any modifications, revisions, deletions are being suggested. It should be noted that a number of the comments received are either issues dealing with the programmatic delivery of services provide for by the various departments/divisions of the County or are observations from the individual related to issues outside of the purview of the GMP policies and objectives. These comments have been designated accordingly.

The 1st EAR Public Participation Meeting was held at the North Collier Regional Park - Administration Building - Room A-6 on January 25, 2010, below are the comments received.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

- Encourage smart growth principles – mixed use, urban infill, walkable communities, alternate transportation modes, and more green space. *Objective 7 of the Future Land Use Element.*

- Encourage “experimental” zoning – cluster housing in single-family zoning, guesthouse permanent occupancy. *Policy 5.6 of the Future Land Use Element.*
- County should create Walk only districts – by design or retroactively (close off streets) – and not limited to commercial areas. *Policy 1.1 of the Future Land Use Element.*
- County should Reserve right-of-way for light rail. *Objective 6 of the Future Land Use Element and Objective 4 of the Transportation Element.*
- Elements of the GMP need allow and encourage parking spaces for compact and micro cars – with parking space credit. *Land Development Code*
- County should be recognizing LEED principles (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Green Building Rating System™ of sustainable green building and development practices and eliminating code barriers to using alternative (green) building materials. *Objective 6 of the Economic Element.*
- County should be recognizing LEED principles (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Green Building Rating System™ of sustainable green building and development practices. *Objective 6 of the Economic Element.*
- Regarding Item No. 2 (above) –Change the TDR program to require use of TDR’s to obtain additional density (cluster housing, guesthouses). *Policy 5.3 of the Future Land Use Element.*
- Elements of the GMP need to provide more incentive for non-motorized (or Mass Transit) development. *Objective 12 of the Transportation Element*

TRANSPORTATION

- County not adhering to Greenway Interconnectivity Policy 4.2 of Transportation Element - the County “shall provide an interconnected and continuous bicycle and pedestrian system by constructing improvements identified on the 2030 Pathway Facilities Map series as funds permit”. *Policy 4.2 of Transportation Element.*
- County should be studying ideas for a 5-Year work program for pathways (no current program). *Policy 4.5 of the Transportation Element.*
- County not adhering to Policy 4.7 of Transportation Element – bike lanes included in resurfacing projects - the County “shall incorporate bike lanes in roadway resurfacing projects as is physically possible and will not result in a safety or operational problem”. *Policy 4.7 of Transportation Element*
- Intergovernmental cooperation involving the County not strong enough to achieve the intended functional sidewalk/path Interconnectivity with school property (pathways). *Objective 4 of Transportation Element*
- County should be studying ideas to allocate existing lanes to public transit, including dedicated transit lanes, restricted SOV lanes, carpool lanes, etc... *Objective 12 of Transportation Element.*
- County not offering adequate access to Mass Transit, including enhanced routes, dedicated mass transit lanes, etc... *Policy 12.10 of Transportation Element*
- County not doing enough to require mix of land uses. *Policy 5.6 of the Future Land Use Element.*

EASTERN LANDS (RLSA – RFMUD)

- Adjustment to Transfer of Development Rights (2005) program not producing desired result. *Wholesale comment on Overlay*
- Application process for severances & transfers not fair to all receiving agencies. *Land Development Code*

- Need more specifics of Land Management Plan required for TDR credit No.3. Cost associated with severance process prohibited. *Land Development Code*
- The County should develop a unified LMP for area. *Future Land Use Element – Rural Fringe Mixed Use District Overlay*
- County should be studying ideas for TDR's to be applied beyond RFMUD. *Future Land Use Element – Rural Fringe Mixed Use District Overlay-Additional TDR Provisions*
- County should be studying ideas to have a TDR education program. *Programmatic*
- TDR's should be open to be used in Urban Area. *Future Land Use Element – Rural Fringe Mixed Use District Overlay-Additional TDR Provisions*
- Look at Marion County TDR Program. *Informational*
- County should be studying impacts of RLSA potential development and their effect on Estates (i.e. ground water, drainage, long-term effects). *Policy 3.1 of Future Land Use Element – Rural Lands Stewardship Area Overlay*
- LRTP not showing specifics of RLSA. *Informational*
- County Government not providing awareness of development schedule of C.R. 951. *Informational*

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- County does not do enough to provide housing opportunities in close proximity to employment centers. *Policy 1.4 of the Housing Element*
- County does not do enough to encourage or mandate workforce housing component for development. *Policy 1.3 of the Housing Element*
- Waivers for impact fees for affordable housing projects. *Policy 2.10 of the Housing Element*
- County does not sufficiently address low income housing (provide incentives). *Policy 2.3 of the Housing Element*
- County should provide land for affordable housing. *Policy 2.10 of the Housing Element*
- County should be studying ideas for multiple units on single-family lots. *Future Land Use Designation Description Section – Density Rating System.*
- County should be studying ideas for lofts above garages, etc. to provide affordable housing opportunities. *Future Land Use Designation Description Section – Density Rating System.*
- Coordinate transportation network with location of affordable housing units. *Policy 1.4 of the Housing Element.*

CLIMATE CHANGE

- County should be studying ideas to target Green House Gas sources – besides transportation.
- County should be studying ideas to address lack of energy efficiency plans.
- County should be studying ideas to address need to plan for Sea Level Rise.
- County should be studying ideas to access & connect State Parks with County Network.

WATER RESOURCE PROTECTION

- County should re-evaluate monitoring and maintenance procedures for nutrient loads/pollution/water quality. *Objective 1 of the Drainage Sub-Element.*
- Improve public participation outreach and involvement for watershed management planning.
- The County needs better outreach and education with user-friendly terminology and use illustrations.
- The County Watershed Management Planning needs to be holistic – more than just water.

The 2nd EAR Public Participation Meeting was held at the University of Florida/Collier County Agricultural Extension Offices on February 23, 2010. As provided for at the first public participation meeting the comments received from those in attendance have been grouped associated with the major issues identified by the County and DCA. Following the issue cited will be the corresponding objective or policy within the GMP elements to which it pertains, if applicable.

CLIMATE CHANGE

- Promote and encourage safe bike/walk, including education to improve safety of bike/pedestrians routes to reduce number of miles driven, especially school drop-off. *Policy 4.2 Transportation Element.*
- Reduce gaps between CAT stops. Explore feasibility of bike rentals at CAT stops to minimize gaps in the existing networks of bike/pedestrians pathways. *Programmatic*
- Increase mass transit availability (CAT). *Policy 12.10 Transportation Element*
- Create bike/pedestrians pathways on canal banks to separate bike routes from vehicle traffic. *Programmatic*
- Do not use Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction as an excuse to build more commercial in neighborhoods where they were not planned nor vetted through a local master plan process. *Observational*
- Flooding as a result of climate change will affect current population estimates, County needs to revise estimates. *Observational*
- Include more bridges (Golden Gate Estates) to reduce fuel consumption and safety.
- *Policy 9.3 Transportation Element/ GGAMP Restudy*
- Create County-wide storm water management to address sea level rise. *Policy 2.1.5 Conservation and Coastal Management Element*
- Standards to address Climate Change need to be different for Golden Gate Estates (than urban coastal zones). *Observational*
- Allow low density areas in Golden Gate Estates. *Observational*
- Make CAT cost more affordable. *Observational*

TRANSPORTATION

- Public safety in the Estates has been ignored – *Observational.*
- Paving not followed through on local roads – *Programmatic*
- Proposed Transportation Corridors thru Estates never contemplated by Master Plan and is inconsistent with the GGAMP. *Observational*
- Vanderbilt Beach Road not necessary – inconsistent with GGAMP. *Observational*
- Taking of homes for Vanderbilt Beach Road not necessary. *Observational*
- Extension of Green Blvd and Wilson Blvd – not consistent with GGAMP. *GGAMP Restudy*
- Transportation – Mobility Plan will Change Rural Character. *Observational*
- Bridge the waterways – instead of 4-6 lane roads to reduce miles traveled. *Policy 9.3 Transportation Element/ GGAMP Restudy*

- Multi paths should be developed separate of roadway. *Policy 4.2 of Transportation Element.*
- Better linkage between Transportation Planning and Land Use is needed. *Objective 5 Transportation Element.*
- Loop around Estates do not go through it to carry traffic. *GGAMP Restudy.*
- Long Range Transportation Plan needs to be incorporated further into GMP – recognize character of sub-districts. *Objective 5 Transportation Element.*
- Transportation feasibility between sub-districts (RLSA, RFMUD, Estates) needs greater coordination. *Objective 5 Transportation Element.*
- Interior Commercial Development in Estates not consistent with GGAMP. *GGAMP Restudy.*
- Eighth Street is a residential road – Fair Grounds should stop using for all events. *Programmatic.*
- Estates Road Network needs to be planned for build-out, with street width and locations clearly shown. *Programmatic.*
- More ECO friendly landscaping and water efficient medians. *Programmatic.*
- Widen Oil Well Road to State Road 29 and expand State Road 29. *L RTP Programmatic.*
- Bridging of Wilson Blvd South should never be proposed. *Programmatic.*
- I-75 interchange should not route traffic thru Estates. *L RTP Programmatic, GGAMP Restudy.*

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- Maintain viability of below market rate housing (particularly multi-family units) as transitional housing. *Observational.*
- Increase public assistance to affordable housing, possibly maintaining and administrating units (existing) for present and future occupants. *Programmatic.*
- Stop steering affordable housing into the estates. Partner with realtors to improve the image of the estates. *Observational.*
- Maintain unoccupied housing units. *Programmatic.*
- Increase focus of affordable housing to multi-family units from single-family. *Programmatic.*
- Promote owner occupied units/rent-to-own units. *Programmatic.*
- Develop a program to monitor absentee owner activities. *Programmatic.*
- Waive impact fees for development of affordable housing. *Policy 2.7 Housing Element.*
- Reflect actual vacancy rates within CIGM. *Programmatic.*
- Identify threshold of affordable housing within geographic area – and allow no affordable housing in that location if thresholds crossed. *Policy 1.4 Housing Element.*
- Issue of affordable housing in Golden Gate Estates – Is it a good idea to explore potential? *Observational.*

EASTERN LANDS (RLSA – RFMUD)

- Increase developer credits during RLSA revisions. *RLSA 5-Year review amendments – Observational.*
- Credits for underground assets? (Mining) *RLSA 5-Year review amendments – Observational.*
- Panther overpasses and underpasses (do they work)? *Programmatic.*
- Define primary and secondary panther habitat. *Programmatic.*
- LOSS for concurrency has not been proven by data and analysis for the new changes proposed to the RLSA Overlay. *Observational.*

- Don't use Golden Gate Estates as thru-way for access to the coast. *Observational.*
- Don't build roads in advance of development and population. *Observational.*
- TDR program is inefficient. *Observational.*
- TDR program doesn't incent transfers sufficiently for developers. *Future Land Use Element (FLUE) RFMUD.*
- Envisioned market for TDR's is non-existent (don't sell) *Observational.*
- Further incent transfers into urban infill (clause is unclear and needs to be expanded). *Future Land Use Element (FLUE) RFMUD.*
- Provide further incentives from sending to receiving. *Future Land Use Element (FLUE) RFMUD.*
- Rural villages envisioned within receiving areas don't provide sufficient commercial capacity. *Observational.*
- Design and criteria for commercial locations within the villages isolate them from major transportation corridors (making them not viable) *Future Land Use Element (FLUE) RFMUD.*
- No new high speed (> 36 mph) roads built in RLSA and Rural Fringe Sending Areas (low speed essential for wildlife preservation) *Observational*
- Commercial development on the interior of Golden Gate Estates goes against the Master Plan and should not be allowed. *Observational.*
- The taking of homes instead of a golf course for the Vanderbilt Beach Extension should not be allowed. *Programmatic.*
- Proposed RLSA amendments in Collier County did not address any concerns from DCA (7 written concerns from Tom Pelham). *Observational.*
- RLSA and RFMUD need to be compatible with Golden Gate Master Plan. *Observational.*
- When RFMUD was created, land use restrictions eliminated functionality of Golden Gate Master Plan – Ex: Proposed location for estates commercial. *Observational.*
- RLSA has encouraged premature conversion of agriculture by:
 - Only low quality agriculture has been protected
 - By using eminent domain to provide transportation corridors
 - Refusing to address DCA concerns
 - Using Section 189 Districts to bypass Florida's Growth Management Laws*Observational.*
- GMP Elements (like RLSA, RFMUD, and Golden Gate Master Plan) need to address the effects they have on each other: Services, Transportation, Land Use. *Observational.*
- Where is the Master Watershed Management Plan? *Policy 2.1.5 Conservation and Coastal Management Element.*
- Receiving Areas in the RFMUD need to be changed to allow services including business, commercial and industrial can be located there to support not only the RFMUD, but adjacent Golden Gate Estates and surrounding Communities. *Observational*

DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

- Fairground activities have escalated over time – both the frequency and intensity of events disrupt the tranquility of surrounding Golden Gate Estates. *Observational.*

- Need Rural Standards for East of C.R. 951 (development standards, roads, dark skies, etc.) *Policy 1.5 Capital Improvements Element*.
- In Golden Gate Estates, commercial development was [mostly] to occur on periphery, and [interior] commercial was to be small scale/small magnitude. Peripheral commercial can be larger in magnitude – that is acceptable. *Observational - GGAMP Restudy*.
- There should be a minimum residency period requirement to serve on Committee(s) that can change, or influence change to, the Golden Gate Area Master Plan (GGAMP), e.g. 5 years. *Programmatic*.
- For development in the Rural Lands Stewardship Area (RLSA), Golden Gate Estates residents are not included/engaged – their input is not sought though RLSA development may impact GGE. *Observational*.
- Proposed large commercial development at Golden Gate Blvd. and Wilson Blvd. is out of character, destroys aesthetics [referring to proposed GMP amendment petition CP-2008-1]. *Observational*.
- Staff involved in projects, plans, etc. need to have familiarity with the affected area. Staff should live in the area or at least tour the area to get familiar with, and better understand, the area. *Observational*
- More comprehensive approach needed when planning east of 951; GGE, RLSA, Rural Fringe Mixed Use District (RFMUD) planning affects one another (drainage, roads, resources, commercial and industrial services). *Objective 4 Future Land Use Element*.
- Need to plan for Golden Gate Estates long-term – consider build-out. *Observational*.
- Road corridors serving urban areas should be routed around rural areas so as to maintain community character. *Observational - GGAMP Restudy*.
- Plans for east of 951 aren't flexible enough to accommodate change in growth rate. *Observational*.
- The Collier Interactive Growth Model (CIGM) is slow to react to demographic changes. *Observational*.
- Need a Community Center within Golden Gate Estates. *Observational*.
- Need larger, more effective buffers around commercial development and County projects when near/affecting nearby residences. *Programmatic*.
- Goals, Objectives and Policies (GOP's) of the GMP are not adequately implemented. *Observational*.
- Need more public arenas for homeowners to voice concerns and opinions about topics/problems affecting them, e.g. fairgrounds activities, water treatment plants, mining operations. *Programmatic*.
- For Vanderbilt Beach Road Extension, should take golf course land [for needed right-of-way], not homes. *Observational*.
- During moratorium period (reference June 22, 1999 Final Order from Florida Administration Commission), the County did not adequately address environmental issues, nor where/when/if additional development would be permitted, including agriculture. *Observational*.
- Changes to the GGAMP should be the exception, not the norm. *Observational*.
- One or more East of 951 Horizon Committee Members suggested urbanizing Golden Gate Estates. Need to preserve the rural character, per the GGAMP. *Observational*.

- Should focus on SR 29/82 bypass as an industrial development center based in Immokalee Area. *Observational.*
- Question whether RLSA development showing fiscal neutrality. *Policy 4.8 RLSA Overlay – FLUE.*
- County policies encourage premature conversion of agriculture lands – when there’s no need for more residential lands. *Observational.*
- Planning period for GMP should be extended beyond 10 years. *Policy 5.4 CIE.*
- Provide concurrency with Transportation projects/plans. *Policy 2.1 Transportation Element.*
- Need a re-study of GGAMP – need to program for it and provide funding. *Observational.*

WATER RESOURCE PROTECTION

- With a future unpredictable climate we cannot depend on previous historical levels of water. *Observational.*
- Develop new tools to predict future water availability. *Policy 1.3 of Potable Water Sub-Element.*
- GMP elements need to consider the effects they have on each other and;
 - Available water supply
 - Waste Management (Landfills)
 - Drainage *Observational.*
- If and when sea levels rise, what has the BCB done to keep water in the Eastern Collier area fresh and apart from encroaching seas? *Observational – Major Issue- Climate Change.*
- The County has let the residents down by acquiescing in the FIRM. *Observational.*
- The County has failed to provide guidance to the people who will need a LOMA. *Programmatic.*
- The County has failed to limit growth based on available resources. *Objective 2 (Financial Feasibility) Capital Improvement Element.*
- The County has failed to consider the cumulative effect of deep aquifer withdrawal. *Observational.*
- The County has failed to develop a County-wide Storm Water Plan. *Objective 2.1 Conservation and Coastal Management Element.*
- Canals not cleaned (algae and weeds cover canal along Frangipani Ave.) Algae sheet sunk (causing future problems for fish and drainage). *Programmatic.*
- C 7 connector has better flow due to culverts being installed. *Observational.*
- FEMA elevations too large a burden during severe recession. *Observational.*
- Need more efficient water management of rural areas east of CR951 to prevent flooding and being rezoned to flood area. *Observational.*
- The new Flood Insurance is unacceptable. *Observational.*
- The County should protest FIRM. *Observational.*
- If flooding is a problem, don’t allow additional buildings and asphalt (which can impact their neighbors). *Observational.*
- Ditches and swales are not being cleaned and cleared; and driveways do not have proper culverts. *Programmatic.*
- Standing water only 3 times (’95, ’06 and ’08) the same time the county took readings. *Observational.*

- County Government has failed to implement the Watershed Management Plan into which all other Construction and Coastal Elements, Goals and Objectives were to be involved. *Observational - Objective 2.1 Conservation and Coastal Management Element.*
- Disappointed with County's failure to put the '89 GMOP LDC into place in a timely manner. *Observational.*
- County has failed to address sustainability and quality of life for all resources. *Observational.*
- The '89 GMP required that all aspects will be evaluated, watershed by watershed, where is that guidance? *Observational - Objective 2.1 Conservation and Coastal Management Element.*
- All development in the urban zones and outside should be considered and evaluated after each watershed and its characteristics were developed. *Objective 2.1 Conservation and Coastal Management Element.*
- Failed to put into place a Watershed Management Plan. *Objective 2.1 Conservation and Coastal Management Element.*
- Dropping water table in GG Estates, GG Estates water resources are being used by City and other areas without benefit to GG Estates. *Observational.*
- Re-use water – can it be turned into a drinking water source? Potential waste of re-use water is a concern (If there is no demand, why pay for treatment?) *Policy 1.1 Potable Water Sub-Element.*

The 3rd EAR Public Participation Meeting was held at the Collier County Board of County Commissioners BCC Chambers, 3rd Floor Administration Building on March 15, 2010. As provided for at the first two public participation meetings the comments received from those in attendance have been grouped associated with the major issues identified by the County and DCA. Following the issue cited will be the corresponding objective or policy within the GMP elements to which it pertains, if applicable.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

- Need consolidation of fire districts. *Programmatic*
- Better coordination between School Board (sitting) and County Government (locate schools where infrastructure is available or planned). Same for EMS and Fire Stations – all facets of infrastructure. *Policy 2.6 Intergovernmental Coordination Element (ICE)*
- FEMA (under DHS), SFWMD, DEP, USACOE, Collier County Stormwater – need to coordinate water resource management (surface and storm; water supply for municipal resources). *Policy 1.4 Potable Water Sub-Element*
- Better coordination between MPO and Comprehensive Planning (Land Use and Transportation). *Programmatic*
- Better coordination between Parks & Recreation; and Libraries (co-locate). *Policy 1.6.1 Recreation and Open Space Element (ROSE)*
- Better coordination between Schools and Parks & Recreation (co-locate). *Policy 1.1.2 ROSE*
- Need Rural Development Standards for non-urban areas. *Policy 4.1 Future Land Use Element (FLUE)*
- Establish single authority for fire plan reviews. *Programmatic*

TRANSPORTATION

- Integrate MPO and LRTP. *Programmatic*
- Transportation Planning should be part of Master Plan. *Observational*
- Education enforcement of laws and rules – 3’ clear to bikes/pedestrians. *Programmatic*
- Establish a minimum Level of Service for multi-model needs. *Policy 1.5 Capital Improvements Element & 12.8 Transportation Element*
- Develop bike share with transit. *Observational*
- Formalize lime rock road policy. *Observational*
- Strengthen 4.6 and 4.7. *Policy 4.6 & 4.7 Transportation Element*
- Stress interconnection and continuity. *Policy 7.3 FLUE*
- Adopt Rural Road Section Standards – Lighting, Landscape and Water. *Policy 1.5 Capital Improvements Element & 12.8 Transportation Element*
- Fair and equitable impact fees – Too high today/unfriendly/too busy and most cost effective design and construction to reduce fees. *Observational*
- Dead ends, (i.e. Vanderbilt Beach Road ends at DeSoto); build when population supports. *Policy 1.2 CIE*
- MSTU should pay for own Administration Costs – 10%? *Observational*
- Integrate road water management with land use and water quality parks. *Programmatic*
- Pathways added to requirement for concurrency. *Policy 5.1 CIE*
- Policy 5.1 – add pathways. *Policy 5.1 Transportation Element*
- Add linear greenway parks to connect facilities. *Programmatic*
- Better facility and location planning for schools with coordination of county infrastructure. *Objective 3 Public Schools Facility Element*
- As appropriate, add complete street/non-motorized. *Observational*
- Strategic Park and Ride Transit and Economic Analysis. *Programmatic*
- Red light enforcement may be contrary to tourism. *Observational*
- Educate public on Level of Service. *Observational*

CLIMATE CHANGE

- Increase Mass Transit instead of road widening. *Policy 3.3 Transportation Element*
- Increase bike lanes. *Policy 4.5 Transportation Element*
- Need to address sea level rise due to climate change. *Observational*

WATER RESOURCE PROTECTION

- County has no Flood Plain Management Plan. *Policy 6.3 Drainage Sub-Element*
- No coordination with Big Cypress Basin; SFWMD; FEMA and DEP (ex: - Picayune Strand Restoration project was completed without consideration of the effect of the RLSA on the flood plain). *Observational*
- Where are the Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan and the Comprehensive Water Resource Management Plan? *Policy 1.5 Drainage Sub-Element*
- When are the efforts going to be:
 - Funded
 - Delivered

- Scheduled
- Where is monitoring and maintenance of water resource? *Potable Water and Drainage Sub-Elements*
- Watershed/Water Resource Management needs to be holistic
- Environment/Development/Conservation/Recharge/Recycle/Reuse/Alternative Water Resources *Observational*
- The County needs to establish a Stormwater Utility fee to address needed improvements and to address EPA's implementation of the NNC (Numeric Nutrient Criteria). *Observational & Policy 1.5 Drainage Sub-Element*

EASTERN LANDS (RLSA-RFMUD)

- TDR Program not working. *Observational*
- Natural Resource Studies not detailed enough. *Observational*
- Not enough TDR's to use for density in Receiving Lands. *Future Land Use Element (FLUE) RFMUD*
- Allow other uses on Receiving Lands (Non-residential). *Future Land Use Element (FLUE) RFMUD*
- RFMUD Plan not compatible with Estates Master Plan. Lost commercial opportunities for the Estates due to RFMUD Plan. *Observational*
- Consider modifying Rural Village Design Standards (Street Layout). *Programmatic*
- Consider convertibility of RLSA Density to RFMUD (SSA's to Receiving Lands). *Future Land Use Element (FLUE) RLSA & RFMUD*
- Consider "Banking" of TDR's for smaller parcels. *Programmatic*
- Allow conversion of some Receiving Lands to Sending. *Future Land Use Element (FLUE)RFMUD*
- Engage Estates residents with eastern lands development. *Programmatic*
- Allow owners of Receiving Lands to convert a portion of those lands to Sending Lands in order to get more TDRs to use on their remaining Receiving Lands. This process should be available through a rezoning-like process rather than requiring a comprehensive plan amendment.
- Increase the TDR Credits formula for Base TDRs to more than the current one (1) base TDR per five (5) acres. In designated Receiving Areas allow a density of greater than one unit per acre with the use of TDRs and not limit density above one unit per acre to only Rural Villages. Non-villages should be able to go up to 2 units per acre. Like the RLSA, rural villages should be able to go to 4 units per acre.
- Remove/modify the very detailed and unworkable requirements for development of a Rural Village. Increase the TDR Bonus multiplier in a Rural Village to make it economically viable. At the present time, the TDR program is too expensive for a higher dense village. As density increases, average prices come down.
- Remove the minimum required purchase amount of \$25,000 for a Base TDR and instead let the market work to determine TDR prices.

- Protect existing TDR holders but drastically revamp the current program such that it is less costly to develop in receiving areas.
- Encourage the establishment of mitigation banks in the Rural Fringe for listed species.
- Another option to consider is to establish separate overlays for each of the four distinct Rural Fringe development areas, similar to the North Belle Meade Overlay which has its own set of development standards.
- The current Rural Fringe provisions of the GMP already call for the County to consider the feasibility of establishing a “TDR Bank” to be administered by the County or some other non-for-profit government, or quasi governmental agency with the objective of making funds available to support the TDR program by offering initial minimal purchase prices of TDR credits. The County should create a TDR bank.
- Consider allowing owners of large tracts in the Rural Fringe the option of utilizing the standards and procedures of the RLSA program.
- Allow for the ability to transfer a certain percentage of density credits from the RLSA to the Rural Fringe.
- There is a need to have different more favorable treatment for owners of Sending Land parcels of twenty (20) acres or less to facilitate their participation.
- Extend the early entry bonus another 2 years, due to the protracted real estate and economic slowdown.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- Create jobs to minimize the need for affordable housing. *Programmatic*
- Eliminate impact fees for affordable housing units. *Policy 2.10 Housing Element*
- Utilize existing housing stock for affordable housing, e.g. foreclosure properties. *Observational*
- Provide for various stages of transitional housing for varying income levels. *Policy 2.2 Housing Element*
- Mandate affordable housing within all developments; residential and mixed-use. *Policy 1.3 Housing Element*
- Provide public transportation proximate to affordable housing units. *Policy 2.11 Housing Element*
- Defer impact fees for affordable housing. *Policy 2.10 Housing Element*
- Provide density bonus incentives for the development of affordable housing units within mixed-use developments. *Policy 2.9 Housing Element*
- Stop the perpetual loss of affordable housing units by prohibiting the conversion of those units to market rate units. (Property owners receive the benefit of increased density for constructing affordable units, but then these unit types eventually go away and become market rate units.) *Programmatic*