

TRANSCRIPT OF THE AUIR MEETING OF  
THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
Naples, Florida  
November 10, 2010

LET IT BE REMEMBERED, that the Collier County  
Commissioners, in and for the County of  
Collier, having conducted business herein, met  
on this date at 9:00 p.m. in SPECIAL SESSION in  
Building "F" of the Government Complex, East  
Naples, Florida, with the following members  
present:

Fred Coyle, Chairman  
Donna Fiala  
Frank Halas  
Tom Henning  
Jim Coletta (By Speakerphone)

ALSO PRESENT:

Jeffrey Klatzkow, County Attorney  
Leo E. Ochs, Jr., County Manager  
Mark Isackson, Director of Corporate Financial

Planning

Ian Mitchell, Executive Manager to BCC

CHAIRMAN COYLE: We've got a quorum.

Ladies and gentlemen, the AUIR meeting is in session. Will you please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Can you hear us now?

I don't think he's there.

Okay. All right, Nick, it's all yours.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Good morning, Commissioners. For the record, Nick Casalanguida with the Growth Management Division.

First of all, I wanted to thank you for this meeting, because it's a combination of two projects that you have, both the AUIR and CIE.

I won't belabor this, and turn it over to Mike real quick, but I want to commend staff on the record for the work they've done. Because this was a quite interesting proposal we brought forward to you in May, which you approved, which is the combining of the AUIR and the CIE.

In the past many times you've had issues because both of them have been snapshots in times and you kept different fiscal numbers. This year you have them both at the same time in front of you with the same financial numbers.

So that said, I'd like to introduce Mike Bosi, and he'll take you through this project review and we'll go from there.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, thank you very much.

Mike?

MR. BOSI: Thank you, Nick.

Mike Bosi, Comprehensive Planning. Good morning, Board of County Commissioners.

As Nick stated --

(Audio interference.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: We can't make a motion with that.

MR. MITCHELL: No, I'll speak to him off-line.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Tell him to put it on mute while he's got us on hold.

MR. BOSI: As noted by Mr. Casalanguida, and I've been the project coordinator for the AUIR for the past four-and-a-half, or four years, this is a departure from the prior years. The prior years the AUIR and the CIE have always been a separate process.

And there's two main distinctions that we're going to encounter this year, and I'm going to go over that, in regard towards how it's going to affect the mechanics of today's proceedings.

One departure from the past was the Productivity Committee. The Productivity Committee has always been part of the review process of the AUIR. This year the Productivity Committee opted out of reviewing the AUIR because of the lack of projects that are being put forward. Their analysis is concentrated within the fiscal realm. And based upon the lack of projects that are being put forward, they felt that their efforts and energy would be better serving the Board of County Commissioners in this county focused in another direction. So it was only the Planning Commission that had reviewed the AUIR and the CIE.

And the second is that this is -- this is the first time that we've ran the AUIR and the CIE in tandem. And it's designed -- the premise was to eliminate a lot of the inefficiencies, the discrepancies between the numbers that were presented within the AUIR, which was heard by the Board of County Commissioners traditionally in November, and the CIE was heard by the Board of County Commissioners in March. Same projects being put forward, but because of the snapshots in time between the revenue and expenditures projections, there was discrepancies between the two.

May 25th, Board of County Commissioners meeting, the Board decided upon staff's suggestion that combining the two eliminated those deficiencies, but also saving the taxpayers dollars in terms of

duplicative meetings, streamlining the process was something that we wanted to do.

We were a little unsure of how it was going to work. We feel that it's been successful. And one of the things that we're going to ask, and it's based upon the Land Development Code and the provision related to the AUIR and how it relates to the CIE. 6.02.02 of the Land Development Code says that the findings of the AUIR, once approved by the BCC, will form the basis for the preparation of the next annual update and amendment of the CIE for Category A facilities.

Based upon that, we're going to hear the AUIR as we traditionally hear it with the section by section review, and then asking the Board to make their traditional motions regarding that project. Close that special meeting for the AUIR and then open up the CIE adoption hearing. The projects contained within that CIE adoption hearing will be the same projects that were just gone over for the AUIR portion. So that should just be a procedural manner. But we do want to bifurcate the two processes based upon the Land Development Code provision stating that the AUIR should be approved first before the approval of the CIE.

And that really concludes the comments related to the mechanics of the day of how we move forward.

Within the executive summary there were two recommendation memos that were provided. One was Exhibit A, and that was regarding the Planning Commission's recommendations for the AUIR, which they heard on September 20th. And there was Exhibit B, which was the Planning Commission's recommendations for the CIE, which was heard on October 21st.

One of the things, there was a slight difference between the AUIR and the CIE, and it related to transportation and improvements contained within the transportation section.

What had happened between the 20th of September and the 21st of October related to transportation and the projects that they're putting

forward was the Board of County Commissioners approved the impact fee reduction for transportation, which put a downward adjustment upon the revenues that were available.

Well, that downward adjustment upon revenues available had a corresponding effect upon the projects that we're putting forward and the timing of those projects. And Mr. Feder will provide a much better detail of those.

But those two recommendation or memorandums have been attached to the executive summary. And the books that were provided to the Board of County Commissioners have been updated so they reflect the recommendations of the Planning Commission regarding both the AUIR and the CIE.

One of the things that you'll notice, and it was part of the executive summary, was this was a third departure, and it's related to the University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research.

Now, that is the official population projection entity for the State of Florida. We're required by statute to utilize those population projections. This was the first year that compared to the prior year that we actually had projected an increase in the population we're expecting within the five years. The prior year we expected 24,000 people over the previous five years. This year that's been upped to 32,000 people.

Now, not tremendously in terms of magnitude of an increase, but it is significant I think in this inset, it's the first time it's a departure that we started to see that we're not treading downward, but it's a slight increase. As staff we are kind of in a wait and see approach on that.

It's good, you hear the economic news, the reports that are out there that there is a firming of the economy, and it seems that the financial situations do seem to be improving, but by no means are ready to say that our growth rates are ready to get back to what they were in the previous years.

So we as a staff look at it, are encouraged that the conditions may

be firming up, but we continue to analyze those next needed improvements and making sure that they're the most efficient expenditures of the public's tax paying dollars.

One last note, and it's related to the recommendation from the Planning Commission related to parks in your original parks levels of service.

Regional parks levels of service has been a very highly debated and --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Contentious.

MR. BOSI: -- and discussed aspect of the levels of service for this county over the past four years. We've had levels of service special meetings off -- related to the AUIR. In May of 2007 and 2008 we did a population study trying to get a better handle upon what is the appropriate levels of service.

This year, and it was based upon the direction that the Board had provided us last year, was give us more options, give us more options related to levels of service. We had provided those options to the Planning Commission, and they recommended that the Board of County Commissioners adjust the levels of service from 2.9 to 2.7 acres per thousand population. And that was based upon the recognition of the state and federal lands that are available, but also the recreational facilities that are provided by the individual gated communities in private development.

And it's trying to find a better balance for what's the appropriate levels of service standard related to that. And that was the one departure for an adjustment to the levels of service standards contained within the book.

And the last point I would make is any of the Commissioners who would like to give these books back to me at the end of the meeting, I'd appreciate it, because we have to get 10 copies to the DCA and to the various state reviewing agencies. And if we don't have to send out a

request for duplicate copies, save some money, we appreciate it. But also if you want to take it home and add it to your collection, we also understand that as well. And that's your purview.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Gee, that's nice, thank you.

MR. BOSI: With that, that concludes my overview remarks.

Any questions in terms of the mechanics of how we move forward?

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Just an observation, Mike. It's my clear recollection that it was the Board who asked that you combine these two processes and change the process. You didn't have to explain to us why it was done. But nevertheless, thank you.

There is an ordinance, I'm sure, that the county has that if the Board has a recommendation that is good, the staff takes credit for it. So I just wanted to make sure you're aware that we are aware of that, okay? Thank you.

MR. BOSI: Thank you.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Coletta is on the line now.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. Can you hear us, Commissioner Coletta?

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: I can hear you perfectly. I'm going to keep off. Whenever you need me to speak, I'll come off mute. But then when I end what I have to say I'll go back on mute so you don't have to listen to the background road noise.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. To make it easier for you, Commissioner Coletta, we're not going to ask you to speak.

We need to have a vote to permit him to participate by telephone.

COMMISSIONER HALAS: So moved.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Second.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: A motion by Commissioner Halas and second by Commissioner Fiala to approve. All in favor, please signify

by saying aye.

Aye.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN HENNING: Aye.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Any opposed, by like sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, you're approved to participate, Commissioner Coletta.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, Mike, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: On the executive summary.

You said the PCC's (sic) recommendations are incorporated in it.

Now, are you saying that the changes have been made to each of the elements based upon the Planning Commission's recommendations?

MR. BOSI: Correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay. The second thing is, on the second and third page of the executive summary, you have a chart in there with the BEBR assessments. And on the second page of the chart it's showing from 2008 to 2009 a slight reduction in their estimates, but the percentage of growth has increased. I don't understand that.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Would you mind if I --

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Yeah, please.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: The percentage of growth is based upon the five-year growth projections, I believe. It's annualized for the five years.

MR. BOSI: Correct.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: It doesn't calculate the percentage of growth from year to year. That's the difference, I think; is that correct?



MR. BOSI: Yes, that is correct. That's just for the five-year window that they're providing for that specific year, not a comparison.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay, well, so the -- each of the elements are based upon the BEBR numbers. Now, does that reflect it per year based upon the BEBR numbers, or is it based upon the five-year?

MR. BOSI: No, it's based upon the five-year. The five-year window is what we're required to maintain our levels of service at. And each year that BEBR provides us new numbers we have to make the adjustments to the projects that are being proposed to reflect the new projection. So it's a constant moving picture.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: How will the -- or will the census affect the CIE -- AUIR/CIE?

MR. BOSI: Well, the census has the potential to affect the CIE in a particular way of in terms of the determination of the persons per household. The persons per household has a dictation upon the population projections that are utilized based upon our dwelling units, based upon what that more detailed information is. Because the persons per household that's being utilized is 2.39, which is dated to 2000. That's a component of the factors utilized by BEBR when they tally up the total formula for how the projections are applied.

And they'll also true up the vacancy rate. And the vacancy rates that are discovered within the census will be provided to the University of Florida, the BEBR projections, and that will also have an effect upon what the population numbers are.

So the numbers that we get beginning next year should start to reflect the truing up that the census allows for in terms of the actual counts, what's being experienced on the ground, so to speak.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: In true population.

MR. BOSI: In true population, yes.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: So we may see a dramatic

change next year.

MR. BOSI: We most certainly may. We may see a dramatic change based upon the vacancy rates that are currently experienced within our housing units. And that may -- we may find next year with our population numbers that we have another reduction, even though it seems like the economic indicators are leading -- would provide a different picture. But that census information may be utilized or may be significant enough to cause a reduction within our population. And then the capital programming would be adjusted appropriately based upon what of those numbers would come out.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: I think there are a couple of things you need to consider, Mike. One is that the census was taken earlier this year. So when we get it, it will be a year old. So whatever the economic indicators are right now will likely not be reflected in that census count.

But the thing that has always troubled me, and I know that -- I don't believe you have an access to an actual figure on an annual basis anyway. There's no way you can tell us how the BEBR number compares with the actual population from year to year, except when you have a census, and it's every 10 years. So it is inaccurate.

But the one thing that bothers me a little bit is that the BEBR estimate has always been a little too high as we've gone through history over the past several years. Is there a reason to believe that the 2010 BEBR estimate of 333,600 people is more accurate than the ones we have had in the past?

MR. BOSI: I don't think that there's been any departure or change within their population projections so that we can draw that conclusion.

And I guess there has to be a level of an acceptance by everyone involved within the process that understands that population projections and even the estimates they provide for what's here right now, there's

always a range of accuracy that's not 100 percent.

And that's just when you deal with projections, when you deal with estimates, that there has to be that understanding that within a five to a 10 percent range of error, that that probability does exist. And that -- and based upon that, the strict accounting that everyone would like cannot be applied on a regular basis because of that standard, that deviation from what the reality is to what's being projected.

And I couldn't say by any means that I'd be more confident within these numbers compared to the prior numbers, because I always know that there's a five to 10 degree inaccuracy that's inherent to the projections that are contained.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, thank you.

MR. BOSI: And one last mechanic thing. Before we start, and traditionally, as presented within the book, we go through transportation, stormwater, to Category A. But two years ago we started a departure. Just for the first responders that are contained within our AUIR/CIE, we normally allow the dependent fire districts to make their presentations at the beginning so they can get on to their important work later on. But that's at the discretion of the Board of County Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Thank you, Mike.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Commissioner?

CHAIRMAN COYLE: I'm sorry, Commissioner Fiala.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: That's all right.

How many people do we estimate is in a household? Are in a household, excuse me.

MR. BOSI: The current official statistic is 2.39. Now, what David Weeks has developed within our individual population allocation methodology, because we get a final number for a countywide population number, it's not segmented down to geographic areas for the county. Well, David's developed a specifics, it's based upon traffic

analysis zones, which we have over 200 currently within the county, and we're set to increase that to 400. So each of those TAZ's has a persons per household estimate within those. And that varies by degrees, by the geographic areas. But until the official census numbers comes out, it's 2.39, which is our persons per household.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: So my second question is, do we ever take it a step further and get ahold of FP&L, who would have probably have a more specific count of how many households are in Collier County than anybody else because they serve everybody in Collier County, other than Marco Island, and we could always get that figure? And then -- and multiply it out to see what that estimate would be?

MR. BOSI: No, no, no. And even if we did that, that would only be for our own internal in-house utilization, sort of like we do utilize an in-house utilization of persons per household by TAZ. We're required by statutes to accept the population numbers.

And a point that probably needs to be made was, and it relates to Chairman Coyle's comment about it's always been a little bit too high, we recognized that in 2007, when the Board of County Commissioners -- again, staff is taking credit for what the Board recognized. The Board recognized that we were utilizing the BEBR high population numbers, which is no longer appropriate for this county. And the Board directed staff to, through discussions with DCA, to adjust from a BEBR high to BEBR medium with the 20 percent population -- increase in population to account for seasonal residents.

But there has been that feeling that BEBR high was a little bit too high. And I think these past two years we made that adjustment to BEBR medium, but we still have that feeling that maybe BEBR medium is still a little bit too optimistic. And we continue to make those adjustments.

One of the things, I guess, the advantageous portion of this process, and it's also a disadvantageous, is we do this every year. And every year. So see those projects that in year four and five, those outer years, those are real -- those are tentative, those are tentative to make sure that those population increases that we've expected are continuing, so we're not going to migrate those four and five to two and three, to closer to reality until we really see that the population that we're calling for within those five years is materializing over that year to year basis.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Commissioners, if I could just interject a comment. And the corollary to that is that within this document I find a number of cautionary statements about not pursuing certain capital improvements as aggressively as we should.

But by using a higher BEBR estimate than we think is reasonable, it insulates us from the bad consequences of that decision. So when Norm gets up here and tells us he needs \$15 million more for capital improvements because the population is going to double in the next three years, that will help a little bit, right?

MR. BOSI: It's a terrific observation, correct.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: I'm just kidding, Norm.

Commissioner Halas?

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Yes, you touched on exactly what I was going to say. First of all, Mike, I want to thank you and your staff for putting together all this information. I know with the lack of personnel, it's very taxing, so I appreciate all the time and effort that goes into this.

I believe there's three BEBR numbers. You've got the high, the medium and the low. Would it be advantageous for us to look at the low number, or do you think that that would put us into a serious problem in the future?

MR. BOSI: My own personal assessment in terms of that situation, I think if we see another year where the growth that we -- that

BEBR and we are expecting doesn't start to materialize, I think that may be the appropriate time to say, you know what, maybe this is a different reality, maybe this is a new norm that's going to be experienced for Collier County.

But as I drive in -- as I drive into work every day and I look around and the humidity's gone and the sunshine is apparent and there's no smudges or clouds in the sky, the same things that have attracted individuals to this environment, they're still readily abundant. And I'm not sure if I'm ready to say that the lure of Collier County has been diminished.

I think that there's been such a structural transformation in issues within the macro-economic environment that has prevented the migration of individuals from one location to another. I read an article about last year -- 2008 and 2009 was the lowest in 35 years of individual migration from one place to another. And it had everything to do with the lack of economic opportunity and the lack of financing opportunities.

I think as those situations become a little bit more solidified, as they become a little bit more whole, as they heal themselves, as money becomes more available for those type of opportunities, I think we will start to see that appreciation, a more of a steady growth within our population. But I think if we have another year that maybe that discussion is appropriate, that we start thinking about adjusting from that BEBR medium to BEBR low.

COMMISSIONER HALAS: One thing I have noticed is the increase of traffic at this time of year compared to a year ago. Our roads are getting to the point -- the volume of traffic is getting close to what we had in 2006, 2007 as I drive around the community.

MR. BOSI: That's a perfect segue, really, towards what I was going to point out is, when Norm makes his presentation, he's going to let you know that the prior two years we had dropped, their volumes had

dropped. This year the departure that BEBR has provided has been reflected also within the transportation counts that we actually saw an increase within the utilization of our transportation system. So I'm not ready to say that we're in --

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: I've turned my light on, whenever you get a chance.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yeah. Mike -- and just to close this discussion out, next year with the census numbers, it's going to give you the chance to true it all up, so you'll know where you're going, we can make a decision as to what we do.

Commissioner Coletta?

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Yeah, Commissioner Coletta here.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yes, do you have a comment?

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Yes, if I could, I have a couple questions, I'm going to get both of you at the same time, so I can turn this phone back on to mute again so you don't have to tolerate the road noise.

My first question is, do we expect to see any significant shift as the data is released from the 2010 census? That's the first question.

Second question is, is this AUIR and the Capital Improvement Element that we're looking at now, and the requirement of it, is this more or less guidelines, or if we don't do it, is there some legal repercussions that we would suffer from the state?

I'm going back to putting this on mute.

MR. BOSI: I'll address the second question first. That second question related to our Capital A facilities that are in our CIE, we have adopted levels of service standard. If we do not maintain those adopted levels of service standards, that is when the state, the Department of Community Affairs could step in and say we are not -- we are not fulfilling the commitments that are expressed within our Growth

Management Plan, and there could be consequences associated with that, whether it be inability to amend your Growth Management Plan, whether it be punitive financial remedies. Not sure, but there are potentials if we do not maintain the levels of service that we've expressed within the Growth Management Plan for the CIE.

The AUIR portion is a little bit different. The Category B facilities, which aren't part of our CIE, that, you know, more of your law enforcement, your jails, your libraries, those government buildings, those aren't tied to any punitive damage for the state, but they have consequences potentially for the impact fees that we collect. We obviously can't charge more than what we're providing, so -- in that relationship.

And then we touched about it earlier, Commissioner, and it was brought up by Chairman Coyle, related to the census, the 2002 census. Personally on staff we don't know what to expect other than we know that there will be an influence upon the numbers. And there will be -- we've utilized the term a truing up of some of the conditions that are utilized to project our population and our estimate.

So there will be influence from the census based upon the next year when we're doing this while I'm standing before you. We'll have some comments, we'll have some analysis to say what was the effect of the census upon those numbers. But what exactly those particulars are at this time, I couldn't determine. But I do know that they will have an influence.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Does that answer your question, Commissioner Coletta?

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Yes, it does, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Commissioner Coletta, Commissioner Halas wants to know if you're driving on a limerock road.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: When it comes to limerock



roads, you can't build enough and you can't build them fast enough. And I understand at the last meeting Commissioner Coyle gave me a total endorsement to be able to go forward with them.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: That's true. We're going to have all the hard surface roads in Immokalee turned into limerock roads. Thank you.

Okay, Mike.

MR. BOSI: And that would conclude my -- and we can take it as the order of the book or how the order the Board would prefer.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Why don't we just take it in order. Whoever is first.

MR. FEDER: Commissioners, for the record, Norman Feder, your administrator for the Growth Management Division. I'll be covering transportation and stormwater. If I can call your attention though before we get started, and I apologize for a little bit of housekeeping.

Under the staff -- and Mike, I apologize, I just noticed this as we're up there. Under recommendation number three on both Page 4 of the executive summary and Page 7 of the staff report, if I can call your attention to that before I get started.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Page 3 of the executive summary?

MR. FEDER: Page 4 of the executive summary, recommendation number three. And also Page 7 of the staff report that follows, same recommendation, number three.

On the fourth page you've got recommendations under the executive summary, and on Page 7 of the staff report you've got recommendations. They parallel each other. Recommendation number three, I've got a request, a minor edit on.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: We have different numbering systems than you. Maybe we do. Hold on. You said seven of the staff report.

MR. FEDER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, got it.

MR. FEDER: And you got recommendation number three --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yep.

MR. FEDER: -- shown there?

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yep.

MR. FEDER: That recommendation, the clause at the very end until the Fiscal Year 10-11 end of third quarter status report. I'm going to recommend that you strike that because you should end it based on realtime concurrency that there's a available capacity under our realtime concurrency. We again are doing realtime concurrency. We are not using an AUIR until the next AUIR. So --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: So we just stop the sentence at realtime declining balance ledger.

MR. FEDER: To support development order issuance, period.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, period. And strike until the end of FY10, 11, end which third quarter status report. Is that what you want to do?

MR. FEDER: We can have realtime concurrency as opposed to a period of time.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay.

MR. FEDER: Thank you very much for that indulgence.

Transportation, starting -- I'm going to take a chance here, on my Page 17.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: All right, hold on. And that's under Category A.

MR. FEDER: Category A, county road.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: And I appreciate if everyone would just get to the bottom line. And we don't need a description as to how you got there, we'll ask those questions, if we have any.

MR. FEDER: By all means. Your bottom line is shown here

that we're balanced on Page 17, a total program over the five years of 239,646,000.

Page 18 reflects how that has changed since your prior AUIR. And basically, as you can see, the program has gone down quite a bit. As a matter of fact, your capital projects in 2008 were 861,209,305, as reflected in that larger chart here, and 60 million today.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: But the reason for that is that we don't need those improvements as early as we previously --

MR. FEDER: As you'll see, we're generally meeting our concurrency with minor exception. We're working towards those.

And I will say that we don't work on a population basis, we work on traffic counts. But having said that, generally your statement is true, Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, thank you.

MR. FEDER: As you'll see going through, and I won't belabor it, as the Commissioner noted. On Page 19 we make a discussion on the fact that one of our biggest emphasis area rather than capital is on the maintenance and operation. We added considerable lane miles and improvements, signalization and the like to the system. That's become a bigger and bigger focus. I brought that to your attention the last three AUIR's.

And also on Page 20, that while we're in pretty decent shape, as Commissioner Coyle has pointed out, with all the efforts that we made the last 10 years, we do have a fairly high vacancy rate and our traffic counts are starting to move up about two-and-a-half percent this year, although they were down the two prior years.

Page 22 --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Norm, let me ask you a question there. Is there any way for us to determine whether traffic counts are up because of the number of visitors or because of the number of year-round residents? Is there any indication that would help us --

MR. FEDER: You can do some level of origin destination, which we haven't done, to try to catch that. But generally what we're using is putting in count stations and traffic counts, which don't give you that indication.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: I understand the difficulty in doing that, yes.

MR. FEDER: On Page 22 is our five-year work program. The results, as was pointed out, obviously the revenues are significantly reduced. We've met quite a bit of the demand, as you'll see under the following pages.

The program is at 60 million now, and what I need to make sure that you realize, what you have in this program is, other than moving forward this year with 951 and Davis efforts, which are shortly to be let to construction, and we reduced the estimates on that as you see here, that negative number, just to explain those in 10, were to be able to keep the two construction projects that you have remaining in the program.

Both of those are supported by grant funding. In the case of the one where we reduced both the available dollars after Santa Barbara construction in 10 and reduced both the Davis, the 951 and the right-of-way for Vanderbilt Beach Road extension, so you see those negatives in 10, already approved budget, were to keep the project on Collier Boulevard where I have seven million in state trip funding supporting that construction that you see in 14, we also have predominantly through developer contribution agreements a state Sig-P grant, some monies from the resurfacing project with the state that we're going to do and take the balance, and some county monies. 951 at U.S. 41 and 5th-15 is the only other construction project.

The rest of the program is minor right-of-way mainly to work with voluntary negotiated purchase to keep projects moving and also to meet concurrency, as I'll mention in a moment.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. Norm, just as a general view, can

you tell us about the trend of state and federal grants for road maintenance or construction?

MR. FEDER: Mainly on construction, there's very little in the way of grants on maintenance, although we have taken on an asset management the maintenance of the state system within Collier County. And we're looking to renegotiate that. And so far we've done well under that as far as the monies received and the work performed in keeping the system up.

As far as the capital area, we've been very successful, but it's all discretionary funding. The trip, Sig-P, you need to apply and receive. Staff has done an excellent job, the OMB office, assisting us and our grants office. And we've been pretty successful as you can see across here. I almost have more in grants, almost as much in grants as I have in impact fees in this program.

And that's the key point I wanted to make here. The 60 million that you see is entirely funded, all the capital above the line projects are entirely funded by either impact fees, grants or developer contribution agreements.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: No general fund.

MR. FEDER: No general fund and no gas taxes per se. Now, in debt service, I do have gas taxes and general fund. I no longer have the general fund replacing the gas tax used on the bonding. Now, that was not bonding of impact fees, it was bonding of the shortfall that we experienced during the '90's. And in 2000 we had a significant backlog. And that backlog we funded from both two issuance of bonds under utilizing the gas taxes, the support of it. And was to be some ad valorem on an ongoing basis, 24 million at one time, reduced now.

But nonetheless, that's the only bonding we have, and that's the only area in the capital program, but it was for the backlog that you have any ad valorem supports, sir.

Page 23 is just sort of a summary of what you saw previously.

Any questions, I'll be happy to answer.

Twenty-four, 25, basically giving you your realtime concurrency and showing you where you stand based on service volumes against what we're actually tracking out there and what we show is coming off of vested. And as you know, we're not pulling the vesting off right now because of that vacancy rate as we stand right today.

The meat of the issue, as far as the AUIR, which is supposed to be a snapshot of whether or not we're meeting our level of service or concurrency. And our level of service is D and E, which is basically the lower end of the level of service spectrum for transportation.

On 26 shows you that we do have an existing deficiency on Golden Gate Boulevard. Unfortunately there, as you saw, we had to reduce all the right-of-way in the program. But we are maintaining, be it at a small level, a continued right-of-way acquisition, which should suffice our issues with DCA to show them that we're making progress towards trying to meet that deficiency.

You see when I bring in my vested trips, I've got some other segments. The good news is on each of those I have projects slated or moving, so they're being addressed.

And then the last one on 41, which of course the grade areas are the state system as well. But that last one, Tamiami Trail, we worked with the state to advance the PD&E. They do have design but we don't have other phases programmed. It is a state facility.

And then you see that we see a couple coming on very shortly in deficiency. And we basically are addressing those sufficiently to go to DCA and note that we are in compliance with our level of service in transportation.

You've got the TCMA areas. They are operating well. That's what you see on Pages 28 and 29. Basically we say that all the segments in total should operate at level of service, and they do.

Twenty-nine point one is just showing you what is carry-forward

item when you see that, so you know what was out there.

And then on Pages 31 and 32, basically summarizes what was in the AUIR and all the figures to give you your Capital Improvement Element.

And I'm open for any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Commissioners, any questions?

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Good presentation.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Good to go. Thank you, Norm.

MR. FEDER: Appreciate that. And if you'd like to, I can jump into stormwater. This one can be fairly brief. It's an important program, but nonetheless, we were at .15 mills of an allocation to stormwater that's been modified under the current financial situation to a .1 mills.

Plus it is one of the funds that is very definitely millage neutral, because as the millage rate goes down, assessed values go down, that millage rate produces less revenue, and that's been the trend.

Basically the bottom line in the stormwater program is, other than meeting requirements for NPDES and a little bit of planning, a couple of monitoring areas like the Freedom Park, essentially your whole program is L.A.S.I.P. We did just recently meet with the Corps to talk about what happens if we have to extend the time frame, because based on current revenue stream, we don't know if we can get to it by 15, which is the permit provisions.

They gave us an indication that we probably can get a permit extension; however, they also noted that we might have to meet current standards relative to species and flora and fauna and nitrates. They weren't very clear on what that was. So we're continuing to pursue to try and finish the project within the available funding. As you see, our focus is almost pretty exclusively on completing the L.A.S.I.P. project.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Good, thanks.

Does that bring us -- any questions then? Norm is pretty much

finished, I think, right?

MR. FEDER: Yes, I am, sir.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yes, Mike.

MR. BOSI: And one interjection before we hear public utilities. Both Chief McLaughlin and Chief Rodriguez from the dependent fire districts were wondering if they could -- they've got a relatively short presentation, meaning there's no projects that are being proposed. They were just wondering if they could cut in line, so to speak, to be able to get in and get out --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Sure.

MR. BOSI: -- it shouldn't take more than three minutes to get those two components done.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Would you yield your time?

MR. DeLONY: I yield my time always to those guys. If they don't have guns, they've got fire axes for sure.

MR. BOSI: And that's Page 179 is the start of Isles of Capri within your book.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: All right, thank you.

CHIEF RODRIGUEZ: Good morning, Commissioners. For the record, Emilio Rodriguez, Chief of Isles of Capri. And this year on our AUIR we do not have any capital. It's the same as last year. And I'm here to answer any questions that any of the Commissioners might have.

Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Commissioner Henning.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Proposed to put a station in, I believe it was Fiddler's Creek or Hamilton.

CHIEF RODRIGUEZ: On Mainsail Drive, sir.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Mainsail Drive.

CHIEF RODRIGUEZ: Yes, sir. We are still looking at that. We have had several meetings with the Marco Island airport. They do have some land that they say that they were willing to work with us, but



at this time we do not have the funding to build any joint station there with Collier County EMS.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Impact fees?

CHIEF RODRIGUEZ: We do not have sufficient impact fees for that.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Are they stable or going down dramatically?

CHIEF RODRIGUEZ: They are not moving at all, sir. We have no construction in the district sufficient enough to bring our impact fees up at this time.

We have two highrises that were not built on Mainsail Drive out of the five. And those are put on hold right now. They have not been canceled completely, but they are on hold. So that will probably be --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. Good.

No questions? Okay. We'd just like for you to stay until the end of the meeting and we'll probably have you come up.

CHIEF RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Thank you.

MR. BOSI: And Ochopee is 193.

CHIEF McLAUGHLIN: Good morning Chairman, Commissioners. Alan McLaughlin with Ochopee Fire Control District. We have no proposed changes from last year's either. I'm here to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: That was a quick presentation.

Any questions?

COMMISSIONER HALAS: No.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, good. Thank you very much.

MR. BOSI: Thank you, Chief.

MR. DeLONY: Sir, I'd like to introduce Nathan Beals, who works on the Public Utilities staff. He's our planning guru, and I'd like to -- in the interests of the efforts made by the County Manager to ensure

that we have sustainability in our county staff, I'd like to have do the Public Utilities presentation. My staff and I are standing by for any of your questions as well.

Nathan.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: You will be able to conform to our other guidance and get to the bottom line and lead us through --

MR. BEALS: Good morning, Commissioners. Nathan Beals for the record. I'm here to answer any of your questions.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Are you doing all the public facilities?

MR. BEALS: All the public utilities, water, wastewater and solid waste.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: I have some questions.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: On your solid waste, do you have any actuals? I was looking for actuals on the tonnage per year. I know you have the population and estimates per population. But do you have any annual actuals?

MR. BEALS: On Page 73, under column four, years 2000 through 2009 are the actual tonnage disposed.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay. So you, in 2010 -- '09 to 2010 has gone down 4,000 tons?

MR. BEALS: That was what we projected at the time of this -- the AUIR. That was an estimated -- 2010 was estimated. We did not update it for actual through October. But it's pretty close.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay. So you see a significant increase of actuals from 2010 to 2011?

MR. BEALS: Well, in 2011 forward, the tons per capita disposal rate is the average of the three prior years. And with those three years being .6 of one, .54 and .52, that made the carry-forward a .55.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Well, that's the -- that's based upon -- column three is not actuals. Column four --

MR. BEALS: Column three is actuals from 2000 through 2009.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay, those are per capita disposable rates per the rate per -- oh --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Person.

MR. DeLONY: I'm going to help you here a little bit.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: You lost a little bit of hair.

MR. DeLONY: What I would try to do is, on Page 74, if you look at note three. On note three it details to you how column three is calculated. And just to give you a chance to familiarize yourself with that, I believe Mike, help me, it was about two years ago, I came to you, and we were doing such a great job in recycling, and reducing our per capita disposal rates. It's taken instead of projecting forward our five years -- past five years of experience, it was my recommendation, you accepted it, that we only look at the first -- the next three.

Because if you look, if we were to go five years our forward looking disposal rate would be about .6, .62, something along those lines. That's not reflective of what we're going to see with the recycling initiatives and the cycling, the response that we've had with the county. The .55 is more reasonable of a planning figuring going forward.

And so that's how we got to the tons per capita disposal rate, sir. In terms of calculating that, it's a three-year look back. And then projecting that three-year look back forward over the period of consideration for the AUIR concurrency. And we hope to beat it. That's our intent.

This is recycling month, November.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Correct. So what's our capacity of landfill space? If you take a look at -- and this really is reflective of the building in Collier County. From 2006 forward, it's gone down. Is that a fair statement?

MR. DeLONY: No, I think it could be. Absolutely. Economic activity is going to have an effect on this number also. I think equally effective and equally impactful is the diversion to the landfill. These figures that you see in column four are actually those tons which are actually going to the hill. This is buried tons. This is not total aggregated tons. We're somewhere around 800,000 tons plus in the aggregate but only 200,000 therein about as that you see on this chart on column four actually going to the hill.

It's the hill, that we bury, that we have to maintain concurrency on in terms of air space availability for those disposal tonnages.

If we're able to divert it. We discussed, not yesterday but the previous meeting, about some work we're trying to do with Lee County now to further divert some of our brown goods, for example, that would normally be buried. If we can take those away from being buried and at the same and equitable price send them to Lee County, we're going to come back to you all with that proposal. The key is to preserve the air space in the hill. That's the concurrency that we're looking for in AUIR.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay, the air space that you have, have you included all the other activities in the previous year with that air space?

MR. DeLONY: Yes, sir. And that's the ticket of using this calculation that you can see in column three, is that that will aggregate the experience of that diversion, and then we'll use that experience in driving forward our projection of utilization of that air space on a population-driven basis.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: So in the landfill footprint, we have recycling there of C and D. We have recycling or horticultural waste.

MR. DeLONY: Diversion, yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: And that is -- since that is a cumulative of the -- what happens there, we're going to remove that,

locate it to the north a little bit, so you're going to include that available space for landfill.

MR. DeLONY: The calculation we have, and it's actually depicted graphically on the chart with the 10 years of permitted landfill capacity, which I believe your book is Page 75, is a clear depiction of what's available in the hill for permitted air space. And all that area that's in our current permitted area is there.

Now, this is not reflective, if you would project that, of your decision of meeting before last to go to DEP for a permit to go up. So if we do, obviously we're going to have more air space and we're going to move that red dot further out in the future in terms of your decision point for either a new landfill or another alternative to disposal of waste that we cannot either divert or recycle in Collier County.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay, so it's not true that -- I'll wait till that person stops whispering in your ear.

MR. DeLONY: He got me, yes, sir -- I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: So the statement is not true that you're going to recapture that space that the C and D is taking place and the horticultural waste, that's already counted within the chart.

MR. DeLONY: That's correct, sir. That's all part of that build-out for that full footprint utilization, yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Commissioner Fiala.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Well, you answered my first question as far as the shipping of the waste, if the agreement is made to Lee County -- I mean, the brown stuff.

But the second thing I had, or the first thing, actually, is Page 51 you talk about existing and future water service areas. And in there you have a graph and it shows what areas are in the City of Naples and then what areas are served by the City of Naples. But that map, I -- it didn't seem to reflect, from the way I can read it anyway, that doesn't

mean I'm very good at reading maps, that Lakewood, Glades, this government complex, Bayshore, they're all in the City of Naples water service area. I know because I pay the 25 percent fee --

MR. DeLONY: Yes, ma'am, we'll take a look at it, but I believe it's correct. It's a very poor scale.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Okay, fine.

MR. DeLONY: Yes, ma'am. But I'll check and make sure that's correct, yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: I might add, the water tastes terrible. I wish I had county water. Maybe I shouldn't say that out in public, huh.

MR. DeLONY: That's okay, ma'am, we'll let you say that all you want, because we happen to agree with you. I don't necessarily think it tastes terrible, I think ours just tastes better.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: That was it. I just wanted to check on the map.

MR. DeLONY: Yes, ma'am, thank you. We'll make sure that that's there -- but it's a very poor scale, and so I would think that we're fine there. We just moved along township lines or -- as best we could depict --

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Other than that, or I just move into the City of Naples.

MR. DeLONY: No, ma'am, we don't want you doing that, we like your revenue.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Let's go back to Page 73.

MR. DeLONY: Seven, two?

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Seventy-three. And looking backward five years, the increases in peak population have been relatively small. In fact there was a small decrease in some years. But your projections for 2011 show a fairly substantial increase of 7,000 people. But yet the BEBR projections don't match that.

MR. DeLONY: I'll let Mike answer that. Mike provides us the population to be served.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, thanks.

MR. DeLONY: And remember, on this particular element, solid waste, we're looking everywhere, the entire county.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Well, you're also looking at the peak transient population.

MR. DeLONY: I'm looking at the number that's provided to me by those good folks over there to ensure that we're consistent across the board in the county the way we measure population by service area.

You might remember it was some years ago that we made sure that we were seeing -- the population was a fact across all service areas. So I'll refer to Mike for the answer.

MR. BOSI: The BEBR populations for April 1st for the unincorporated -- or for the county as a whole is 6,130 people. This projection that --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: That's an increase?

MR. BOSI: Yes, it was an increase of 6,100. And the increase that they're showing from 10 to 11 is basically reflective of that increase that the BEBR had projected for.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Now, have you added the transient population, the visitors or --

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: You did.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: To the -- that is included in the BEBR calculation.

MR. BOSI: Yes. But the BEBR calculation is static, that 6,100. We add the 20 percent increase and that gives you your seasonal population, which explains the numbers that they utilized.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, thank you.

MR. DeLONY: Sir, any other questions?

CHAIRMAN COYLE: That's it.

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Very good job.

MR. DeLONY: Sir, thank you.

Thanks, Mike.

MR. EASTMAN: Commissioners, I'm Tom Eastman, representing the school district. And the bottom line with our capital plan is that we have no new schools planned in the next five year period.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, that makes it simple, doesn't it.

MR. EASTMAN: Yes, yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Commissioner Coletta with a question.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Go ahead, Commissioner Coletta.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Yeah, I can't pick up any background. But I think you can hear me all right.

The question on the school district. With the amendment that just failed on our recent ballot issues regarding the class size, is that going to have any effect on the school district in the future, in the near future if they have to reduce class size? They're going to need more teachers. If they need more teachers, do they need more schools?

MR. EASTMAN: Commissioner Coletta, you're exactly correct. We will have to hire new teachers. We have no new schools planned, as I said earlier. That may change outside of this five year window, but we're doing rezoning analysis to address that matter to better utilize the facilities we already have.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, does that answer your question, Commissioner Coletta?

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Yes, that answers my question.



Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Thank you.

MR. EASTMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Thanks a lot.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if you're ready for Parks and Rec --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: We're ready for Parks and Rec, yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- but we're here for you.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: We're just trying to find out where you are in this --

MR. WILLIAMS: Page 90 would be a good place to start.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioners, just a couple points to start out. And certainly I'll be brief in whatever questions you might have.

First point to make is in regional park land we have several acquisitions over the time frame. What I'd want to point out to you, though, is all those acquisitions, with the exception of Big Corkscrew Island Regional Park, are intergovernmental transfers of various types. Isles of Capri is an example I'll mention.

We're working with Rookery Bay right now, they're developing a kayak/canoe launch, and we're working with them for an interlocal agreement for us to maintain the launch. And that would be counted as part of our inventory.

So we're looking at those opportunities. We're not making any recommendations as far as using impact fee dollars. The impact fee dollars are going primarily for debt service.

The other thing I wanted to point out that is I think significant is the ATV park. In previous years we've included 640 acres of regional park land with the ATV park in consideration. We've removed that this year, given the circumstances in where we stand with the ATV park. That was 640 acres --

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: When you get a chance, please.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- 640 acres greatly elevated what we had in regional park land. So we think that taking those acres out reflects a better indication of where we stand.

Just to pick up one other thing too with Mike. Mike mentioned a chart that we included. And if I can draw your attention to that. It's on page --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: It's at 92.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. I'm looking at Page 98.

And just, you know, part of the consideration this past cycle is looking at reducing level of service. The regional park land, the proposal that we're bringing forward for regional park land at 2.9 -- level of service, 2.98 acres level of service actually puts us in a deficit in the five-year window. And I may ask Mike to speak to that, whether that's problematic for DCA.

If we were to reduce level of service to 2.7 -- and basically you're reducing level of service to be better reflective of what you're able to accomplish during this time frame, we are slightly in a positive area, 42 acres to the good.

It may seem a little like cooking the books; however, I think part of the discussion that we've had with the Planning Commission and with the Board in regards to park land level of service is taking into consideration the state, federal and conservation lands that are available for folks to recreate. So we think that that's consistent with that philosophy.

But at this point our recommendation for community park land is requesting 1.2 acres per thousand, and for the regional park land we're requesting 2.7.

And I'll stop at this point and see if you have questions.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Commissioner Henning? Commissioner Henning.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Whoever. It doesn't make any difference. You can go first.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay. Amy, I'm going to need some help on this, please.

On Page 79, your chart of land values, the added projects from -- well, next year the FP&L greenway. Now, when the -- our impact fee consultant was here I asked him, when you figure what impact fees are, do you use the figures within the AUIR and the CIE? And his statement was yes.

Will this chart be used to reflect impact fees?

MS. PATTERSON: Is your question for a future update of parks impact fees? Right now the parks impact fees were just updated last year. So when we go into the next update, that would be in 2012, and they would gather all of the pertinent information at that time, including the documentation in the AUIR as well as any subsequent purchases or acquisitions that are made by parks.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay. Thank you for that answer. And that is my concern is --

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: When we get a moment, I would like to have a say in this too.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, we've got you on the list.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner, I think your question is, and a valid one, is with the \$230,000 an acre, we have an estimated value of that transfer of \$8.2 million. And your question is whether that would be included -- that price tag be included in the impact fee calculation. Did I follow that correctly?

COMMISSIONER HENNING: That's where I'm going, yes.

MS. PATTERSON: And the answer to that is no. Just -- the acreage calculation, the cost per acre calculation that's being used for the AUIR in no way dictates the cost per acre that we use as a component in the impact fee. They look at actual acquisitions, the

actual purchase prices of land that they purchased, and also the value of their inventory at that point in time.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Well, the acreage on this one will be a part of the calculation; is that correct?

MS. PATTERSON: Is this -- I'm sorry, I don't --

COMMISSIONER HENNING: The acreage of like let's say the FP&L greenway trail of 37.5 acres, that is -- that will be a part of that calculation.

MS. PATTERSON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: So the application of it is that 37-and-a-half acres would be whatever the cost is, that would be included. So --

MS. PATTERSON: The value at the time.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: The value at the time.

But the issue is it is not a transfer of funds, but we are applying the acreage and applying per cost of that acreage, and that would be the outcome of the impact fees.

MS. PATTERSON: Are you concerned -- if I can get a clarification, your concern is the assignment of the value to that acreage?

COMMISSIONER HENNING: No, you already said it's not going to be assigned a value. But you are assigning the acreage.

MS. PATTERSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: And the acreage cost. When you have the acreage included in it, even though it didn't cost you anything, there is assigned a value to that.

MS. PATTERSON: That's correct. It adds to the inventory of parks.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: It adds to the inventory of the parks, and the value of that per acreage is added.

MS. PATTERSON: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Therefore, the -- even though that we have an increase of acreage per population at no value, zero value, didn't cost us anything, it will reflect the outcome of the impact fees.

MS. PATTERSON: It potentially could, that's true. And there's a lot of ways we can go with these. This has been an ongoing discussion, and not just this impact fee, but in others, of how to handle donations --

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Correct.

MS. PATTERSON: -- at what level it's appropriate to include them and at what value.

So these are one --

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Or any value. Or should it be a credit? Like what happens in transportation, when you have a DCA where you have a donation, per se, that is on the revenue side.

MS. PATTERSON: That's right.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: This is not going to be on the revenue side.

MS. PATTERSON: It could be treated that way. When we get there we determine -- as far as donations go, they're evaluated at the time that they're placed on the inventory, and oftentimes there's an associated credit that goes along that essentially discounts the value of that donation as far as how it affects the fee.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay.

MS. PATTERSON: So if that's -- and we'll make sure to note that that's one that needs to be looked at carefully for the 20 -- if it comes onto the inventory for the 2012 update, and be sure that we're appropriately placing it onto the inventory and appropriately crediting it or valuing it. And there's different ways you can do it, either by discounting the value or even by not including it on the inventory. There's different ways we approach donations. And this happens in

other facilities as well.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay. And I just wanted to point that out in -- could you keep me updated on how that's going to be done --

MS. PATTERSON: Sure, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: -- in the future?

MS. PATTERSON: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Or maybe meet with me? With all the e-mails that we get, it's hard to keep up with.

MS. PATTERSON: Sure, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Thank you.

And then another thing, the FP&L greenway, how are you going to maintain that? Is it going to be park-pristine maintenance or brush cut or something like -- and monitoring it, I'm assuming you're going to have parks and -- or the park rangers, you know, opening and closing the gates and that kind of thing?

MR. WILLIAMS: Correct. Well, we're working with transportation on the development, and worked with them on the construction, just with our input from a maintenance side. It's Bahia that they are laying on the -- around the greenway. There's not irrigation associated with that, so once the Bahia takes hold, I mean, we know that currently they're mowing that greenway once a month during rainy season. So, you know, we want to work with the homeowners in and around the property to maintain the greenway in a way that's appropriate and consistent with what their desires are.

We're looking at once a month initially, and during the dry season obviously we wouldn't need to mow as much. But that would be pretty much our maintenance plan.

We are talking with Commissioner Fiala about potential amenities that could be placed on the greenway. It's a two-mile stretch, so it's a considerable length.

We do have a philosophy that we've used at Freedom Park, I'll mention, where with reduction in staff we implemented an approach called pack it in, pack it out, where we basically expect people, when they go into the park, to take their trash with them. And that's been surprisingly well received. People are doing that.

So we will have some trash cans, some benches, minimal along the greenway, and we'll implement that philosophy.

I hope that answered your question.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: It does.

Is it a possibility -- the greenway, you're going to have some people that want -- who are just going to want to bicycle it or run it or something like that.

MR. WILLIAMS: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: But there's really little parking area, if no parking area, to utilize it, Commissioner Fiala. And I think it's opportunities for the neighboring communities to kind of adopt it and work with the park system to maybe close and open the gates. Just a comment.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: I think so too. Because it's kind of closed right now.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: I'm done, thank you.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Commissioner Fiala?

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Yes. Back to the FP&L freeway -- or greenway, rather, excuse me.

Did you just say you're putting benches and waste receptacles on there?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, ma'am. We plan to install on the ends of the greenway some benches and some trash receptacles. But the two-mile stretch, you know, there's a lot in between that. So we will have them on either end.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: You'll have them on either end.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Because there's no amenities on that thing, I was thinking of trying to get the community together to have fundraisers or whatever they can do, or people dedicate a tree or dedicate a bench or something so that we can have some kind of amenities on that thing. For two miles there's nothing for anybody to even sit down, so -- and you've got old people, so that's what he's talking about. And it's going to be a big effort. I don't know when we're going to get there.

So that is considered a park then?

MR. WILLIAMS: We consider it a linear park, yes, ma'am. And we have several like this. Transportation has for the most part developed a similar type of arrangements, pathways and whatnot. But, yes, a linear park.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Now, the one you just had also, but has a lot of amenities, in Vanderbilt. How come that's not on here?

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry, I didn't understand.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: The one on Vanderbilt that the DCA put in a lot of amenities, how come that isn't in here? Or isn't that greenway going to be a part of the parks?

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm not following your question, ma'am. Vanderbilt?

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Greenway.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Greenway.

COMMISSIONER HALAS: That was money donated by a --

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, I'm sorry. This is a transportation project. I would ask them to perhaps speak to that.

MR. FEDER: Commissioner, for the record, Norman Feder.

Right now that is a sidewalk project as opposed to a greenway like FPL. We're talking to Parks and Rec, like we have also sidewalks and multi-use paths on 951 and Immokalee. None of those are in their



system right now. They did take FPL because it's exclusively a pathway not associated with a roadway.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Okay, fine, thank you.

Now, my next question is where in your parks thing is the projection to be building the community center at Eagle Lakes Community Park?

MR. WILLIAMS: It's not part of the AUIR. It's not a part of the planning document that's used in terms of future facilities.

The AUIR addresses mainly looking at acres per thousand that are needed to meet the level of service. So facility improvements aren't a part of this exercise.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Okay. Where was Manatee Park then?

MR. WILLIAMS: Manatee Park as far as in the AUIR?

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Uh-huh.

MR. WILLIAMS: Manatee's already included as part of the inventory. It's not part of the 10-year projection. We have the -- we own the property and it's --

COMMISSIONER FIALA: It's not part of the 10-year projection?

MR. WILLIAMS: It's not part of -- we have the land, the land's in our inventory. So we're not making a recommendation in the next 10 years to acquire land for Manatee, we already have it in the inventory.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: But you're not making projections to acquire the land on any of these other projects, like Pulling -- or rather, like Pepper Ranch, we already have acquired it, Isles of Capris, we have it, Big Corkscrew, we have that, FP&L --

MR. WILLIAMS: No, ma'am, we have not acquired it. These are projections that we are seeking interlocal agree -- or intergovernmental agreements to acquire the property and for us to --

COMMISSIONER FIALA: We don't own Pepper Ranch?

MR. WILLIAMS: Pepper Ranch is owned and a part of Conservation Collier.

What we're recommending and what we're saying in the AUIR process is that we would like to work an arrangement with Conservation Collier to have 50 acres for recreational purposes. And we've talked to them about that.

The kind of use that we're looking at is like a trailhead. There's a lot of great pathways at Pepper Ranch. So our taking over responsibility for 50 acres to develop a trailhead for people that are interested in hiking is the proposal.

We don't have that agreement in play right now. There's a lot of questions about that with the ordinance with Conservation Collier whether that's doable, but it's part of our planning exercise that we would like to put forward in the AUIR.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Look, you know, a while back we had to move all of these remote controlled airplane guys off of Manatee because we were going to build a park there, right? And so we told them that they had to clear out and find another place.

Now since then we've allowed them to bring in their electric planes to use it because we're not doing anything on there. We did have money set aside to at least begin the project. We --

MR. WILLIAMS: Money's still in the project for Manatee. There's a little over \$2 million in that project.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Well, now, are you sure? Because the Commissioners, when I asked to take that money and put it into the community center so we could finish the park at Eagle Lakes, they had instead put it into reserves.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm just showing you a print-out that I got this morning. It's our SAP system that reflects what projects that we have with parks.

What I'll do is point to you -- I don't know if we can zero in on this.

But -- and I'm doing an eye chart for you, I apologize.

Manatee Park, and I don't know if you can follow my finger, but we've looking at, we've got \$2,071,000.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: So that's still in there, it isn't gone?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Okay, it wasn't put in reserves?

MR. WILLIAMS: It wasn't put in reserves. It's in the project.

And I believe with the Board's direction at the time when the discussion about Eagle Lakes and Manatee came to be, the discussion was to not move the money from the project but to keep it in the existing project in case it was needed for debt service.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Okay. Now, I want to know when it's projected that you're going to do something in Eagle Lakes to finish that park. You've got 1,000 Habitat homes there and still going, you've got all the Section 8 housing, and yet you have no place for these children to even seek shelter at a park there.

And yet we continue to add things to other parks and we haven't even taken care of the park that's been built in 1997. When are you going to do something about that?

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, ma'am, I would tell you that the Board has directed us to develop a master plan, and that is in play. We had a community meeting in October. We invited people from all over Collier County to come and talk to us and help us with the priorities of what needs to be next --

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Do you see any urgency in that at all, being that there's only one very small community center in all of East Naples?

MR. WILLIAMS: Ma'am, I agree. I totally agree that we need it. But you're asking me as far as when are we going to plan it. We're bringing you a master plan in January. That hopefully will give you that information that you need in terms of what priorities that we need to

take as Parks Department.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: You better know I'm going to be watching carefully, right?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Commissioner Coletta?

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Yes, thank you very much.

I'll tell you what, I have some real concerns with the idea of dropping the requirements for the ORV park. Listen, at this point in time, that is not a good idea, and I'll tell you why: We're in the process of a lawsuit with Water Management to supply the park or the money for it. If we suddenly write this out of our program, we lose any negotiating ability whatsoever. They could come back with the comments, well, the county wrote it off, there's no longer a public need, so why should you come to us for the money to build it.

So please, rethink this one, would you please.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Coletta, Mr. Chair, just to make a point, and this is a planning document for acquisition of land to meet our level of service.

We're making a recommendation that we not include it, because we can't see that this land is coming in any time in the near future.

If that would change, if there was success with the litigation with South Florida Water Management and that would be available, then we would include it in the AUIR. Us not including it in the AUIR does in no way affect the litigation and discussions that are going on with South Florida Water Management. It's just staff's perspective that from our standpoint we don't see the 640 acres as being in that five-year window.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Yeah, if I may, I'm sorry if I interrupt at inappropriate times. When I go for feedback to regular folks, there is no voice coming from the other end. So can only I hope that I don't have anybody too mad at the other end.

Jeff Klatzkow, I hope you're sitting there right now. I think you're

pretty aware of the fact what we're up against with Water Management, and every part of this equation as we go forward is extremely important. I'd like to hear your comments on it, sir.

MR. KLATZKOW: Well, you know, I've given Jackie direction to take this to trial as soon as possible so we can get resolution of this.

From a planning document, whether it's in there or it's out there, I don't know that it's of any real relevance. The issue is going to be, you know, what was promised to the people of Collier County and what has not been delivered.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Did you get that, Commissioner Coletta?

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Yeah, I got it. But I still have grave concerns. It sounds to me like we're writing off that whole part of the population. They gave up their recreational pursuits to what is now the Picayune Forest with the idea we were going to be compensated. It's just one more nail in the coffin, as far as I'm concerned.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: What's the alternative, Marla?

MS. RAMSEY: Marla Ramsey, for the record, Public Services Administrator.

If you like, we have a number of notes in the AUIR. We could add a note that says that South Florida Water Management was to provide, you know, 640 acres and we have yet to see it so it's not included in our estimates at this time or something to that effect, if you would like us to do that to memorialize it.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Can we make note of the fact that we are filing suit to assure their compliance with the previous agreement?

MS. RAMSEY: We can put that in as a note if you wish us too, yes.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, and that we continue to pursue it until they come into compliance?

MS. RAMSEY: Yes, sir, we can do that.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Would that help, Commissioner Coletta?

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: That certainly takes us a lot closer to where we need to be. I thank you very much for offering those suggestions, Commissioner Coyle.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Thank you.

Then why don't we do that. I think it is important that we make clear our intentions, even if you're not including the acreage. Everyone should understand that we haven't abandoned the effort, okay?

That brings me back to Page 98. And you had suggested a level of service of 2.7, if I remember correctly. Let's make sure that we're all clear on what that really means.

If you adopt 2.7, at least my interpretation of the chart, it means that next year we're likely to be below the level of service for regional parks.

Next year we already know that we're probably going to be faced with additional cuts of maybe eight percent or more in general funding for property taxes.

Is it wise to adopt a level of standard -- a level of service standard that we know is going to put us into a deficit situation at a time when we don't have the money to really do anything with it?

MR. BOSI: Commissioner, I think it is wise. And the wise part of it is reflected at the end of the five-year -- the CIE, the capital improvement programming. We don't make the assessment after that first year of that five years, it's at the end of the five-year. And the reduction -- because right now we're at 2.9 and we're suggesting we go to 2.7.

So what that action does is actually places that deficit -- it shrinks the deficit, and at the end of the five years we are 42 acres on the plus side. Currently at 2.9 at the end of the five years we're at a 46-acre deficit. So the modification to 2.7 actually places us on the positive side of the ledger at the end of the five-year period.

It's because of the interdepartment transfers that will happen over this next five years. At the end of the five-year period, we will be whole. You are correct, next year until those transfers start to be materialized in the further out years, we will still be at a deficit, but the reduction to 2.7 gives us a less of a deficit than what we currently are.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Then I'm not interpreting your chart properly. Can you put that chart on the overhead and please explain to me how you reach those conclusions.

MR. BOSI: Within the chart we have a level of service options. And it's 2.2. And the reason why we picked 2.2 is that's the level of service standards that's indicated within the impact fees. We can't go below that unless we want to adjust our impact fee. So that was the floor.

The highest right now that we have is 2.9. That's our currently adopted levels of service, 2.9 acres per 1,000 people.

Basically at the end of the five-year period, based upon the BEBR population projections, at 2.9 we need 1,286 acres. That's what those numbers would translate to. At 2.7 acres per thousand, the required inventory drops down to 1,197 acres, a reduction in the acres that we need.

So the 2.9 requires us to have more acreages at the end of that five-year. 2.7 is less. And as you lower that levels of service standard, the inventory starts to increase, or that gap starts to increase where you become more positive.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: So using this chart, if we went with 2.7, at the end of five years we would have a surplus of 42.64.

MR. WILLIAMS: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: But if you go into the year after that, the sixth, seventh and eighth year, when do we go into a deficit? Which year would we go into a deficit?

MR. BOSI: You know, that is a tentative deficit. Because we

look at it, those improvements that we're going to be containing in years six through 10 are tentative at best.

If you look at -- on Page 96. Within your book on Page 96 it shows years 2015, '16 through years 2019 through '20. Those are -- that's six through 10. And if you look, the blue is the required -- the red is the acres available.

We dip below it in 2016, 2017, but we get a big jump from Captiva Pond and the Big Cypress acquisition. So we go -- the next year we're satisfying the required level of service.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, now let's talk about the ATV park. Suppose in the period of time between now and let's say three or four years we solve this problem and we recognize that acreage. What does that do to your calculations?

MR. WILLIAMS: Just one point I'd like to make about the ATV park too, just before Michael answers that is, the 640 acres that we characterize, as we've looked at this we realize that the entire 640 acres is not going to be usable recreational land. It's more than likely going to be extensive trails, paths, etc., you know, for ATV's to use. So it's going to be a considerable less amount of acreage than the 640 acres when we get down to it.

So just to mention that. You know, the question is if you have -- and the property that is at Lake Trafford, for example, it's a 640-acre parcel, but 200 acres of it is wetlands that won't be used, or part of it.

So, you know, it's what we can count as active recreational will be a question that comes to us as we get these lands.

I don't know if I've confused you, you've got that look. But I wanted to make mention of that if I could.

MR. BOSI: And to address your question, whatever we determine is the usable acreages that are provided from the district to us for that purpose, it will be included within our inventory and our



inventory will get an added boost or shot in the arm.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Will that include just the acreage of the trails on which the ATV's ride and it will exclude the trees that they ride by?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, no. Appreciate the question.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Then if it doesn't, why does it exclude the wetlands?

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, it's not active recreation, it's -- you know, it's a question that's come up in this discussion over the years as far as preserve land, do we count it as part of acreage required.

We actually went through an exercise this last cycle looking at the preserve lands that are in our existing parks and questioned whether we remove those from our acreage. And our decision was not to do that.

But there are some lands associated with a parcel that we might get that's not usable recreational. So the question will come up do we count that as part of the AUIR, as part of the level of service. I'm hearing from your comments that yes, we would.

And it's consistent with what we're doing now. For example, North Collier Regional Park, you know, it's a 200-acre parcel. We have 100 acres that are considered preserve, but that is all -- all that park is counted in our regional park calculation, so -- but it is a question --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Well, that's a discussion for later. But yes, I have some very serious concerns about the way you do that.

Some portion of those 640 acres will be included. And that portion that you would include at some point in time, as I understand it, is not reflected in any of these figures. But we're setting a level of service standard that ignores the possibility that we're ever going to get those -- some portion of those 640 acres. And I suspect there's other parcels that you have not considered.

You have not considered the potential recreation capability for Pepper Ranch. At least -- well, you are taking a look at it between 2014

and 2015, I presume.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: But there's no notation on this particular chart that you anticipate that sometime in the future you're going to have some portion of a 640-acre ATV park for recreation.

MR. WILLIAMS: We will make the adjustment to include that note as discussed, and can do that.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, but that has a bearing on the level of service standard in your chart on Page 98. Your chart on Page 98 would be substantially modified if you recognized a portion of that 640-acre ATV chart somewhere in that five-year period of time.

All I'm suggesting is that we should be realistic. We believe we're going to be able to solve this problem and get that property. Shouldn't some portion of that property be included in the inventory within the five-year period of time? Just as an estimate. Or should it not influence our decision to make a level of service standard selection that is realistic?

MR. BOSI: And for the purpose of the adjustment we will make to the levels of service if we do go to 2.7, that's not part of the discussion that we talk with DCA. We don't say we're going to adjust our levels of service because of planned acquisitions. We say our levels of service is based upon the recognition of the state and the federal and the private recreational amenities that are provided, and this is more appropriate as we have more moving forward.

What we plan to acquire to satisfy that level of service is part of the AUIR process but isn't a determining factor of what we should determine our acceptable level of services is at. That is more reflective of what is provided by those other outside entities. But I understand your point.

And to further kind of muddy the waters, the County Manager did point out that on Page 96, that original chart that we had provided

towards, would it be affected by the acreages of the ATV park? It would, and it would even be further reflected, because that chart shows that 2.9, the current levels of service. So it would be adjusted appropriately at the 2.7.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, Commissioner, you have a couple of options, I think. And one was one that was stated. We could put a note reflecting the litigation and the acreage so that it's kept. I think the other option that you're suggesting is that we could include some portion, anticipating the five-year window, the ATV park, some acreage.

My only point in -- if -- my recommendation would be to choose the former. And the reason is, I think that, you know, this question of the ATV park, the lands, whether it's going to come to us or not is still a matter of ongoing discussions.

The 640 acres, if you put it into the inventory, it's going to show that you have a tremendous excess of regional park land. And frankly, I don't know that that's a fair characterization of the regional park land.

You know, you have discussions of other parks that are in -- facility-wise in the planning. And I think going to adding those acres, until it's done -- I mean, for us in the next cycle, if the litigation is satisfied, we have some understanding that yes, we're getting the 640 acres of ATV, we would include it in the inventory at that time and show it in our plan.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: And then you would suggest a change in the level of service standard, I presume, for moving forward.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, and that might be the safe thing at this juncture. You know, keep 2.9, keep the ATV in a note --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: 2.7.

MR. WILLIAMS: Keep 2.7, okay.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: And go to 2.5 if you get the additional property, maybe, or whatever is reasonable.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, if -- if I'm hearing you right, if we put a note about the ATV, the recommendation is 2.7, it would be included in future AUIR cycles if it does come to be. That's --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Then we would have an opportunity to make a decision about adjusting level of service standard at that point in time. Okay.

Okay, any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yes, Mike.

MR. BOSI: Just one comment that is straightforward and doesn't require a lot of discussion, and actually is a recognition of the work that the Board of County Commissioners does, and through Marla and Barry with the parks department.

But last Thursday I was at Naples Community Hospital and Commissioner Halas and Commissioner Coletta were both there. And it was a presentation regarding sustaining excellence.

And they were at separate tables, Jeff, so there was no Sunshine issues. But --

CHAIRMAN COYLE: They were in the same room.

MR. BOSI: -- what it was for was the determination by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, a philanthropic organization from the State of Minnesota, that has made a determination, they went through every county in the United States, every county in Florida, and in Florida, Collier County was rated number one for health outcomes, meaning the healthiest citizenry of all the counties in the State of Florida.

And I think that has a direct bearing upon the commitment that this Board of County Commissioners has to the park system and the recreational amenities that are provided to our citizens.

So just a recognition of the good work that Barry and Marla does, and the direction that you provide, that has a direct and tangible effect

upon the health outcomes of our citizens.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: And when we add that 640 acres to the ATV, our health level will increase tremendously, so I'm looking forward to that.

Thank you very much.

We need to take a break; we're 10 minutes overdue. We'll take a break and we'll return in 10 minutes, okay.

(A recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, we're back in session.

I'm going to distribute these to the audience, members of the audience.

Chief, how are you?

CHIEF SMITH: Mr. Chair, I am fine, other than I have a little bit of a cold.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Just keep your distance.

CHIEF SMITH: I may not sound exactly like myself this morning.

We have our jail program on Page 109, Category B facilities, as a leadoff. The report remains static from last year. I'll entertain any questions if you'd like.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Anybody have any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: You've done a great job.

CHIEF SMITH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Really have. We appreciate your help in reducing our costs and maintaining the protection to our citizens.

CHIEF SMITH: I will give you a little bit of an update with regard to our 287-G program as it's relevant to jails. But to date we've sanctioned for removal of 2,680 illegal criminal aliens.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Oh, good for you.

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Fantastic.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Those are people who would otherwise be occupying our jails, I presume --

CHIEF SMITH: Correct.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: -- and committing more and more crimes.

CHIEF SMITH: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: 2,700 criminal aliens, right?

CHIEF SMITH: 2,680.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: And you've provided us information in the past about the fact that many, if not all of these, are repeat offenders. Is there any rule of thumb concerning the number of crimes each of those people might have committed over the period of time?

CHIEF SMITH: What we're finding in our study is that most of them have at least six criminal acts attributed to them prior to their removal.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Wow, that's a lot of crime off our streets.

CHIEF SMITH: It is.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Good job. Thank you very much.

CHIEF SMITH: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Those are just illegals.

CHIEF SMITH: That takes us to Page 119, and that is our law enforcement. And we do have some changes with regard to this. And I don't know if I was supposed to speak to them or if Amy was going to. But there was some discussion regarding the 1.96 officers per thousand population.

When we presented to the Planning Commission, they wanted a more relevant metric as opposed to population, so we're trying to like see if square feet makes sense.

So with that, I'll turn it over to Amy.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, thank you.

MS. PATTERSON: Good morning. Amy Patterson, for the record.

We're going to be talking about this in a little bit more detail when we look at the law enforcement impact fee in December. The law enforcement impact fee study will reset the level of service, based on current conditions.

But right now what we have is a level of service standard based on the past impact fee study of 1.96 officers per thousand population. We also have a cost per officer attributed to that.

And over time what's happened is we've had an inventory value based on those two components that's gone from \$98 million to \$157 million, based on AUIR calculations, indexing and a number of other calculating factors.

But what's causing this confusion then is if you bring that back down to a cost per officer, it looks like we have 949 officers, when the actual number of certified law enforcement officers right now is 656.

So obviously this is the ongoing problem, and we've had these discussions with the Planning Commission, is that the level of service and then how that level of service translates into the AUIR needs to be recalibrated.

And with discussions with Mike, what we're looking at is we know right now in the draft study that the actual level of service based on the 656 officers is a level of service of 1.84 officers per thousand population. We have an available inventory right now of 263,171 square feet and, like I said, 656 current certified law enforcement officers.

And so what seems to be making the most sense is to translate then that down to a square footage per officer, which can then easily be assigned a value. And therefore we know, as we need to add officers based on increases in population, we also know an attributable square footage that would need to be added, and that could be assigned a value.

As so this is going to get away from the more complicated calculation that we've been using with this cost per officer. So we've just changed the components a little bit.

We're not making a recommendation to change the AUIR for this year, but upon adoption of the impact fee study and that level of service, we will then ask for your direction to incorporate it going into the 2011 -- the 2010-11 AUIR.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: I have some questions about that. But go ahead, Commissioner Halas.

COMMISSIONER HALAS: I'm concerned. I know we've got a very low crime rate, but I'm concerned of how many officers that we're allocating here. I don't think you got much reserve. And that gives me some -- I'm a little concerned about that, because of the fact that we have a low crime rate. And that's one of the things that was brought up in that discussion, why this community is good. And I just don't want to see us going the opposite direction. I just don't want to see people burned out to the point where they can't retain the level of proficiency that they're doing now.

CHIEF SMITH: And all those are very good points, and thank you.

We have never used the AUIR as the rule or guide of how we budget or how we staff. We have always used the Sheriff's certification to the Board for what we need to do with regard to funding for our available staffing.

What they do with the AUIR, if I understand it correctly, and I don't presume to know everything about it, that's why we have good people like Amy and Mike. But what they're trying to do is come up with a number that suits the impact fee study. And that's all well and good, and we can ascribe to that. But understand that, you know, we still are going to staff with what we think we need to do the job.

If you look at the charts on here, what you're actually talking when



you adopt that as a level of service is going back to a staffing matrix that we haven't had here since 1985, which, you know, crime was a lot more severe then than it is now.

So, you know, we're keeping an eye on that. We keep an eye on the occurrence of crime, calls for service. Those are better indicators of when we need to bring on staff than the AUIR is. I think they're just trying to arrive at a point in time where they can attribute how much square feet of a building we need to accommodate a law enforcement officer. As most of you know, they're not occupying a lot of building for a lot of their day, they're out in the green and white doing what they do best in this county, so --

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Thank you very much for your explanation. I appreciate it. I think that gives a level of comfort to all the citizens, especially when you start talking about officers per thousand and how it relates to the impact fees and so on. Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yeah, it makes me feel more comfortable that you're using real life data rather than an AUIR for determining the staffing requirements. But AUIR must be ranked very high on the list of totally incomprehensible programs in the government. But nevertheless, thank you.

I have real, real concerns about why we would have a level of service standard based upon the amount of square feet that a Sheriff's employee should occupy. That might help you internally, but from the standpoint of a citizen who is interested in lower crime rates and greater safety, it means nothing. And so I guess I could appreciate your concern because of the internal calculations that are necessary by the AUIR, but I just don't get it.

MS. PATTERSON: If I may, we're not moving away from the officers per thousand population. But then for the purposes of the AUIR -- that will still be your adopted standard. Right now it's 1.96

officers per thousand. And that was based on the 2005 impact fee study. The current impact fee study is calling for a level of service of 1.84 officers per thousand population, based on existing conditions on the ground today.

If you want it to remain at the 1.96 officers per thousand, that can be done. And you could have a higher standard than your impact fee calls for. We could move down to the 1.84 officers per thousand. So that will be your standard. But then for the AUIR purposes, we'll take that standard and then apply the calculations to determine the things that need to be built for your work program.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, but wouldn't that be included in government buildings?

MS. PATTERSON: No.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: No? Why not?

MS. PATTERSON: We have a law enforcement impact fee. All the law enforcement buildings are included as part of the law enforcement fee.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: But wouldn't you include that in law enforcement buildings then?

MS. PATTERSON: Those are the buildings we're talking about building.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. All right. But I'm talking about staffing.

MS. PATTERSON: I understand. The level of service that has to be established involves the actual officers. But where we put those officers or the facilities needed to support those officers is the building side of the law enforcement impact fee.

I'm not being clear? The inventory of law enforcement for impact fee purposes is buildings, land, equipment, patrol cars, everything that you need for those officers to be able to serve the population on the capital side.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. All right. So you're merely taking that and converting it into a standard that helps you turn it into a capital improvement investment.

MS. PATTERSON: That's right. We're still starting with an officer per population, but we're converting it to a capital asset.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, okay.

Okay, Mike, you have a comment?

MR. BOSI: Yeah, just for clarification, there are no improvements being suggested by the Sheriff's Department for this AUIR. You will get an opportunity for this detailed discussion during the impact fee presentation that Amy will make, but for this purposes there are no proposed improvements.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, very good.

CHIEF SMITH: However, I would like to make a statement on the record that we understand the current situation absolutely, and we have been cooperating with the Board and with county staff to try to hold the line, because we all understand where we're at with regard to budget and funding, especially with regard to capital projects.

But I just want to keep out in front of the Board the understanding that at some point in the very near future we are going to need a substation in Golden Gate Estates. The calls for service, even though they're down slightly in other areas, that area has remained what they've been for the last couple of years. And with the widening of 858, it's now about 20 feet from our exterior door of this modular little mobile home that we've got sitting there on school property.

So at some point we'd just like to be able to have a permanent facility to service the residents of the Estates with regard to law enforcement.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, good. Thank you very much.

No other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, thanks.

CHIEF SMITH: For the record, Chief Greg Smith, Chief of Administration for the Collier County Sheriff's Office.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Now we're going to hear about libraries, right?

MS. MATTHES: Marilyn Matthes, Library Director, for the record.

Starting on Page 130, talks about libraries. And we have no capital improvements planned. And we're still buying books to meet the level of service standard for items per capita.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: And what effect do you think this recent trend towards electronic book access is going to have on the library system?

MS. MATTHES: Well, I couldn't buy my crystal ball, because we didn't have money for it, but what I tend to read is it's mixed. People really don't know right now. This -- with the technology improvements, people are buying more electronic devices and they've reading more books on line electronically, whether downloads or purchases directly from vendors.

The book publishing market still publishes an inordinate amount of print books annually. I think our population right now is still more book-centered than electronic-centered.

I go back to thinking about how your children learned to read. Are they going -- are the children of the future going to learn to read electronically or are they going to be better served by a print book that they can handle and mishandle and really get into?

So things are changing, but they're not changing that fast for public libraries. And we're kind of -- we try not to be on the bleeding edge of anything. We try to keep up with technology but to provide for all of the services that people want.

We've discontinued a number of formats through the years. Right

now we're discontinuing audio cassettes, books on audio cassette. And that's problematic for a few people who still have cassette players and don't have DVD players. But we make those transitions as it is appropriate for our population.

So yeah, electronics downloads are becoming more important, but still books are too.

What I hear mostly is that the fiction and straight text material is great on line, not so much all of the illustrations on the readers that are available today. So there's still a technology gap.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Thank you very much.

Questions from the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, thank you. Appreciate it.

EMS?

MR. BOSI: That's at 146.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yes.

CHIEF PAGE: Good morning, Commissioners. For the record, Jeff Page with Emergency Medical Services.

A few things I did want to point out is that our running call volume went up about six percent over last year, about 2,000 more calls. Additionally, there were another 1,000 transports, about half of that. As of last night, our current response time goal of urban under eight minutes is 81.7 percent, rural under 12 minutes is 86.6 percent, and the current percentage of call versus transport as of last night was 64 percent of the time that we respond to a call do we transport.

This really hasn't changed much from what you saw last year.

One thing I would point out, though, is on Page 153, that EMS cost per own station, that would drastically go down due to the impact fee study next year when you see it. So that would also bring down the figure on 146 of additional revenues required.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: And how much would it bring it down?

CHIEF PAGE: Well, I don't know quite yet, so -- I don't have those figures. But that's what we're anticipating anyway from the impact fee study.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. Anything else you want to highlight for us?

CHIEF PAGE: No. I was directed not to whine, so I won't.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Good.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: A question?

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yes, go ahead, Commissioner Coletta.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Thank you.

Just one, Chief Page, if you'd be so kind. I understand that some citizens have some concern over the amount of overtime that's being put in with EMS personnel, and concern has doubled.

And one is the fact that when you get too much overtime in, the person's efficiency, especially when they're working with people's health, safety and welfare, has a tendency to drop off.

And number two, the cost of overtime sometimes gets to be atrocious.

Has there been a recent cost study as far as overtime versus bringing on new personnel?

CHIEF PAGE: Not necessarily a study. But you have to remember, when they have those comparisons, that in EMS, overtime starts after 40 hours, and with the fire districts and law enforcement it's actually 53 or 57 hours, I'm not sure which.

So when you look at a -- the way that we do it is you take somebody's annual salary, and because of the way the schedules are, there's built-in overtime. So we have our employees start at a lower hourly rate to adjust for that overtime that they naturally have scheduled.

But the overtime has not been really significant. I mean, we have a number of part-time or job bank personnel that fill in those vacancies,

so -- we can certainly provide to you a comparison over the last three years of the overtime, but you're not going to see any significant change there.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Commissioner Coletta, that answered your question?

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Yes, very much so. Thank you, Chief.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. I'm a chief now.

CHIEF PAGE: Anything else I can answer?

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Commissioner Halas?

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Yeah, I think also when you start looking at percentage of overtime paid plus the cost of bringing on someone additional, you've got to look at the fringe benefits and all the other things that incorporate adding personnel versus paying overtime. And a lot of times you'll see that it's cheaper to pay overtime than to bring new people on board and pay them the salary plus all the fringe benefits that are entitled to them.

So -- but you've got to watch that. It's a fine line. And I'm sure that you've got a handle on it.

CHIEF PAGE: Yeah, we're currently fully staffed, so there hasn't been really an issue of that overtime filling in for vacant positions.

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Good.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Any other questions by Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER FIALA: No.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay.

CHIEF PAGE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: That brings us to our last item, which is county government buildings.

MR. CAMP: For the record, Skip Camp, Facilities Management Director.

You asked for the bottom line. We'll be doing nothing for the next

five years, maybe 10.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Have a good day.

Any questions?

Commissioner Henning?

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Mr. Chairman, I make a -- move to make a motion to approve the AUIR as presented, assuming that the Planning Commission's recommendations are within the --

MR. BOSI: And to point out the modification that as the recommendations contained in your book that Norm had provided as I put on the visualizer for three -- ending recommendation number three at the development order issue.

And also the understanding that the -- well, the recommendation for the AUIR for Parks be adjusted to 2.7 level of service. I believe that was the expression.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay, included in my motion is the recommended changes from the transportation administrator to strike partially number three to ending in declining balance ledgers to support development order issued. Parks and Rec to include the level of service to 2.7.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: For regional parks.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: For regional parks.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: There was a second?

COMMISSIONER HALAS: (Sneezed.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yeah, that was a second.

Second by Commissioner Halas.

Any further discussion?

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Question?

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yes, Commissioner Coletta.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Yes, did we cover the issue that you went in great detail regarding the off-road parks for the vehicles -- off-road vehicle park?



CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yeah, I think we covered that with staff, and staff understands we will be including that.

(Noise interruption.)

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Must be in a bar.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Wouldn't surprise me. There's a lot of those on those limerock roads out there.

MR. BOSI: Thank you, Board. I believe that's all we have for the AUIR.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, we have to have a vote on this. And we'll do the CIE next. All in favor, please signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Aye.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Aye.

Any opposed by like sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: The motion passes unanimously.

\*\*\*Now let's go to the CIE. Is there a motion to approve the CIE with -- to include the CCPC recommendations?

COMMISSIONER HENNING: So moved.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Second.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. Were there any other adjustments to the CIE?

MR. BOSI: No adjustments. Just a clarification with Jeff.

Jeff, do we need to officially close the AUIR and then open up the CIE? I'm not sure on the procedural aspect.

MR. KLATZKOW: If you'd like. But it's -- we know what we're doing here.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yeah, we've got a motion -- or do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay, motion by Commissioner Henning, second by Commissioner Fiala.

Is there something you want to tell us?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, Commissioners, thank you.

An inadvertent omission from your booklets. As part of a stipulated settlement agreement with DCA with the last change to the CIE, date changes as highlighted on your screen having to do with the schools' capital improvement program and their work program. Previous language had simply kept the old dates and indicated we would update them annually, and we had not done that at that time.

And the new language changes updates those dates and indicates that we will continue to update them annually.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Would it be acceptable to change the motion to include these changes?

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Is this language within the GMP presently?

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: And adopted?

MR. SCHMIDT: It is.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Okay, I'll make those changes to include.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: And my second.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: And the second, okay.

Any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: All in favor, please signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Aye.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Aye.

Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: It passes unanimously.  
Yes, Commissioner Henning.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: I just want to wish  
Commissioner Halas -- I understand he's going to be traveling  
extensively, I just wish you safe travels on your trips.

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Motion to adjourn?

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Is that all we have to do?

MR. BOSI: Yes, sir, you've satisfied the requirements.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Then there is a motion to adjourn --

COMMISSIONER HALAS: Second.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: -- and we are adjourned. Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*

There being no further business for the good of the County,  
the meeting was adjourned by order of the Chair at 11:17 a.m.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS/EX

OFFICIO GOVERNING BOARD(S) OF

SPECIAL DISTRICTS UNDER ITS CONTROL.

---

FRED COYLE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

DWIGHT E. BROCK, CLERK

These minutes approved by the Board on

\_\_\_\_\_, as presented \_\_\_\_\_

or as corrected \_\_\_\_\_.

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED ON BEHALF OF  
GREGORY COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. BY  
CHERIE' NOTTINGHAM.