

TRANSCRIPT OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
EAR MEETING OF
THE COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Naples, Florida
December 7, 2010

LET IT BE REMEMBERED, that the Collier County Planning Commission, in and for the County of Collier, having conducted business herein, met on this date at 8:30 a.m. in SPECIAL SESSION in Building "F" of the Government Complex, East Naples, Florida, with the following members present:

Mark Strain, Chairman
Melissa Ahern
Donna Reed-Caron (Absent)
Diane Ebert
Karen Homiak
Barry Klein
Paul Midney
Bob Murray (Absent)
Brad Schiffer

ALSO PRESENT:

Heidi Ashton-Cicko, Assistant County Attorney
Thomas Eastman, Real Property Director, CC School District
Mike Bosi, Comprehensive Planning Manager

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the December 7th meeting of the Collier County Planning Commission.

This meeting is to review the adoption documents for the Evaluation and Appraisal Report, otherwise known as the EAR.

If you'll all please rise for Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, before I ask the secretary to do roll call, let it be known that Mr. Murray and Ms. Caron had called in. They've got issues today, they couldn't make it, so it will be excused absences.

With that, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Eastman?

MR. EASTMAN: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Ms. Ahern?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Schiffer?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'm here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Midney?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Strain?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Ms. Homiak is here.

Ms. Ebert?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: And Mr. Klein?

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. ***Approval of the agenda.

Mike, I don't see anything. It's your agenda. I don't know if you want to change anything. You have any changes to the agenda?

MR. BOSI: No, this is just a tentative agenda that was suggested by staff at the discretion of the Planning Commission. We will go in whatever direction the Planning Commission would seem appropriate for today, but none as presented.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Just so I'm clear, as we go through the document today, do you want a separate motion on each one of the issues raised in the agenda, A through S, or do you want them as one collective motion?

MR. BOSI: One collective motion would suffice.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. What if we have individual concerns about any particular piece of the document, do we vote no on the whole document then, or just -- how do you want to handle that?

MR. BOSI: Well, if you have a policy that is being suggested, or an objective that is being suggested for a modification and the majority -- the majority of the Planning Commission is not in favor of recommending that, we would remove that policy or objective, but we would also provide text within the BCC adoption document that the policy had been suggested but it was removed at the direction of the majority of the Planning Commission.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. But what if it isn't a majority of the planning -- for example, I have some issues. I have one issue in transportation that I'm going to be pretty strong on.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If I don't want that issue -- as far as I'm concerned, I would vote no on it. How do I single out my vote so that -- without having to vote no on the whole document? And it's not -- I wouldn't be in the majority, I'd probably be in the minority.

MR. BOSI: In the section related to the new projects related to the Everglades and I-75 interchange, that particular project or any example of any policies like that where we have a dissent amongst the Planning Commission, what we will do is we will try to encapsulate what the dissent was and put that in the document to the Board of County Commissioners that a minority voice on the Planning Commission felt that it was inappropriate for the numbers of reasons that are expounded upon.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: This is strictly the specificity. It's not supposed to be in this document and it ties our

hands in the future.

So anyway, now that I know how to proceed, it's -- at this point it's all yours, Mike.

MR. BOSI: Thank you, Chair, fellow Planning Commissioners. Good morning. My name is Mike Bosi, with the Comprehensive Planning Department. I'll try to speak slow, deliberate and methodically for Cherie's benefit.

Today we are -- as the Chair had mentioned, we are here for the adoption hearing for the EAR or the Evaluation and Appraisal Report, which is applied to the Growth Management Plan.

The Growth Management Plan in Collier County is a collection of elements that are made up of individual goals, objectives to accomplish those goals and policies to further those objectives which accomplish those individual goals.

Florida Statute 163.3191 requires that each local jurisdiction in the state perform the EAR on a regular basis, on a seven-year basis. Last year was performed in 2004 from Collier County, so we're here back in the seven-year window.

The adoption hearing for the Board of County Commissioners is set for the 31st of January, 2011.

The EAR, as mentioned, evaluates the performance of the elements of the GMP, the successes, tries to identify the successes, tries to identify the shortcomings and provides opportunities for the local plan to respond to changes within federal, state and regional planning requirements and modifications, but also conditions on the ground that we see that have been expressed through the numerous planning studies that have been performed, the numerous dialogues that local government has had with the community, the issues that are raised on a regular basis with the Planning Commission, the issues that are raised on a regular basis with the EAC and the Board of County Commissioners and the other advisory boards, trying to bring those issues to light and see how and where appropriate they would fit within the Growth Management Plan.

It's a two-part process. And this is really an important point at the beginning of our hearing today. And we're at the tail end of the first part. And this tail end -- or the first part is when we make the evaluation of the elements within our Growth Management Plan of the goals, the objectives, the policies, and we raise our hands and say here's this policy, that policy, this objective, here's the areas we think we need to have modifications. We don't try to find what the specific modification is, but we recognize that we can maybe do a little bit better, or the policy needs to be strengthened or a policy needs to be added. Or, in particular, in one instance where an entire new element needs to be suggested, which was suggested by the Planning Commission, and rightfully so, at the August meetings for a mobility public transit element.

Those are the type of opportunities, those are the type of issues that the EAR is designed to accomplish, to find those potential holes, to find those potential weaknesses within our Growth Management Plan and address them through modification.

But that 18 months -- once the Board of County Commissioners would adopt this EAR, transmit it to the Department of Community Affairs, within the 60 days for them to evaluate whether we've met the mark and the requirements of the statutes, we'll have 18 months from that time to process and adopt, to transmit and then adopt the EAR-based amendment.

So what that means is all these policies and objectives in these areas we say we're going to modify our Growth Management Plan for, we're going to have 18 months to -- for staff to take the initial crack at the language that was provided for within this assessment. And then we'll come to a transmittal hearing with the EAC and then the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission will review the proposed languages, the proposed modifications, make some evaluations, give us some further additional direction upon the language that we had proposed. We'll transmit that to the Department of Community Affairs. It will come back again and we'll have an adoption hearing.

So that 18-month process will have -- the Planning Commission will have two additional opportunities to confirm and assure that the language that we're being suggested from the policies that we are saying that we need to modify, that we'll have two additional opportunities -- not only the Planning Commission, but the general public as well will have that opportunity to have their voice heard and put forth whatever issue that they see appropriate related to those individual policies.

Just for the benefit of some of the newer Planning Commissions (sic) real quick, this process started in 2009, back in August. We had a meeting with the Regional Planning Commission (sic) and the Department of Community Affairs, gave a general overview of what they're looking for within the process.

And one of the things that we heard from the Department of Community Affairs representative was House

Bill 697, I think everybody has been pretty familiar and versed with 697. But what it means -- what that piece of legislation said was we're going to try to do a better job of connecting land use planning and energy efficiency and greenhouse gas emissions related to climate change and all those issues that are associated with the utilization of energy and the mobility of individuals within the county.

September we had an interlocal meeting with the various cities and adjoining regional governments and state agencies over on Horseshoe Drive. And then from that period we established a letter of understanding from the major issues with the Department of Community Affairs, and that was December of 2009.

In the early part of this year, January, February and March, we held three public participation meetings where we invited the general public to come and asked them just to tell us what was it that they saw that was issues, what was it that they saw within their daily lives, within how they experience and how they interact with the built environment, what is it that they see as problematic and what is it they see that they would like to see more of.

From those issues we tried to identify the major concerns from the individual public, put that in the document, and we put that in the document in the first chapter of this book to give the advisory boards and the Board of County Commissioners an understanding of here was the sense of the issues that were raised by the general public.

From that assessment, from those three public meetings, we went by on an individual basis, element by element, objective by objective, policy by policy, and evaluated whether the policy, whether the objectives were meeting their mark.

Staff made their assessment and then we had our individual workshops.

On August 11th of 2010, we had a workshop with the EAC. Had some comments, had some issues, had some direction from the EAC.

Then we came back on August 25th, and 27th, a two-day meeting where we spent at great length with the Planning Commission going through each individual policy and objective one by one to assess where the changes needed to be.

From that meeting with the Planning Commission, we consolidated the EAR books, indicated the additional areas, the additional direction that was provided by the Planning Commission, sent that book to the Department of Community Affairs in the state reviewing agencies, the Department of Transportation, the Water Management District, the various state reviewing agencies that look at any Growth Management Plan amendments that Collier County would propose.

We received our letter of comments from the Department of Community Affairs and the other state agencies in mid-October.

What I wanted to do before we get into the substantive issue of each element by element was kind of walk through what that letter said from the Department of Community Affairs so we can address it up front and you will also be able to iterate where some of these issues have been highlighted within the body of the document.

But overall, my assessment of that letter -- and if you read that letter -- if you read the letter and what it says on a macro level, it basically says that our Growth Management Plan, the assessment that we made in the direction that was provided by the Planning Commission at the August workshops was a pretty qualitative evaluation of our Growth Management Plan. And our Growth Management Plan is attending to the areas that the state wants us to attend to.

If you look through the letter, they're looking for -- a majority of their comments are they would like to see more data analysis provided for the major issues. And what we have done within this book is, for instance, on -- if you look at the letter, which is at the very first part of your --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mike, before you get into the specifics of the letter, I mean, if there's any procedural questions, I would like to get them out of the way now, if anybody has any. I have two.

You mentioned that we will be going into a transmittal and adoption as a result of the EAR down the road, maybe 18 months. It's pretty useful to have a workshop before you guys put the writing in stone in the form of a transmittal. Once it's in transmittal, it's locked in in a sense that it's there, if we disagree with it, it's too late, it's already there anyway.

Can we have a workshop prior to the transmittal? Can that somehow fit into the schedule?

MR. BOSI: We haven't put together the PMP, the project management plan, for the specifics of the amendment cycle. Based upon the direction that's provided by the Planning Commission, we most certainly will have -- before we schedule our transmittal hearings, a couple months before, we will -- we'll incorporate with -- into the

process a workshop specifically with the Planning Commission so we can get a comfort -- the Planning Commission can get a comfort level with the draft language that's going to be proposed so you can have a stronger hand within that shaping of that transmittal language.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think that would be important.

And also, you had gotten a rather detailed letter at the workshop from Jim Flanigan, and he has reinserted it more or less for discussion today.

But several of his points lead to the conclusion that -- I would think, that a workshop would be highly beneficial before staff allocates and puts things in more firmer writing. And I think that would help solve some of the concerns he had expressed as well.

MR. BOSI: And I was -- towards the end of this -- my opening remarks I was going to make a comment related to the work and the effort and the time that Mr. Flanigan had spent. And you're correct, and that will address those points.

And one of the points that I wanted to make, and I will, I'll talk about that a little bit later towards the end of my conclusions, but Mr. Flanigan did suggest a very good improvement to the initial part of the EAR. And this was the first EAR that I was -- I handled. So there was some shortcomings in my performance, and I look forward to being able to improve upon that.

But one of the best suggestions that was within that letter was before we arrive upon those major issues with the Board of County Commissioners and the Department of Community Affairs, we should have had that, we should have had a public workshop. We should have had a little -- as Mark, your suggestion, we should very had a workshop before the start of the process.

And I look forward to incorporating, making some modifications towards how I'm going to leave that road map for that next year. And I know it's six and a half years away, but it's a good suggestion. And I'm going to start incorporating that within to the document and to the anticipation of how we're going to handle (sic). So yeah, we will incorporate that workshop before the transmittal hearings.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, my second procedural question, is the need for a transmittal for the EAR an option? Because we did a workshop. I don't -- did we do it -- we didn't -- there's been no transmittal.

MR. BOSI: There is no -- the EAR process does not contain a transmittal, an official transmittal. It's -- there's that courtesy review that I had mentioned, the letter that we were talking about that we received from DCA. That's only a suggestion. You don't have to take advantage of it. Most local governments do because they would like to make sure that they're on the right path following the EAR steps. But the statutes do not require a transmittal for the EAR process, they only require an adoption hearing.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So we didn't want to make sure we're on the right path?

MR. BOSI: We did. We had the workshop.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm just teasing. We had a workshop, but we didn't have the transmittal.

MR. BOSI: No, we didn't have the transmittal because there's not a transmittal. We had the workshop. The workshop -- instead of calling it a transmittal, we called it a workshop. And then we sent the document up to DCA. The same procedure we would have had if it was officially that transmittal.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, the only difference is during a workshop we're not allowed to take official action. On transmittal we could have.

MR. BOSI: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. BOSI: Yes, so that is the distinction. And it's based upon the statutes and how the process is dictated to work.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Those are the only questions I had at this time. Thank you Mike. Anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, thanks.

By the way, there's at least two members -- Melissa, were you here during the workshop in August?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: (Nods head affirmatively.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, but Diane and Barry were not here. So this will probably be more informative to you guys than anything else. It won't bring back good memories, because you weren't here.

Okay, Mike.

MR. BOSI: And for the DCA comments, just real quick, the first issue that they said is in the identification of the major issues were pertinent -- were important, the potential socioeconomic and environmental impact of the issues. And they were looking for the social impact of the intergovernmental coordination and urban development pattern.

And the first time -- I was taken back a little bit by that comment. Because it was the first time that I was ever asked to in the Florida planning environment to really -- to expose or expand upon the social implications of our Growth Management Plan policies. We think that we've tried to make those connections, specifically within the urban development patterns, specifically within the climate change writeup sections to try to make those individual connections towards land use policy and what potential social effects that it can have within our built environment, and how our community interacts with itself.

The second questions really -- the second question talks about further data analysis: Further data analysis for climate change, further data analysis for the urban development patterns, for the water resource protection, intergovernment coordination and the Rural Land Stewardship Area.

The first four, the intergovernment coordination, the water resource protection, urban development pattern, climate change, each one of those sections, the sections that you're provided in your books, have been augmented to address these points further beyond what was provided during your workshop books.

The last issue, the Rural Land Stewardship Area Overlay, one of the things that they were asking for is they felt that we didn't articulate enough the work that was done by the five-year review committee.

And I agree, we didn't do it. We didn't do a well enough job within the workshop addition. We've augmented in what -- and the intention is, volume one and volume two of the five-year review and then the directions that were provided ultimately by the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners will be transmitted as part of this EAR with -- as part of the EAR as our assessment of the Rural Land Stewardship Area.

We as staff felt that that 23-month process was an adequate review of the effectiveness of that document. And we thought it was not -- there wouldn't be a benefit to take those steps over again. So we're going to utilize that review and those assessments as our assessment of the Rural Land Stewardship Overlay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But Mike, in your assessment, the documents you send them, will you be sending the CCPC's version of the rewrite of that section? If you recall, we did a detailed rewrite of where we disagreed in the various paragraphs from the committee's perception. In fact, Brad focused on one of the tables, and we had a lot of stuff that we actually suggested as a better way to go or a way I think we perceived it to go.

It was all draft. I know it never proceeded into any final approvals to the Board of County Commissioners. But will they be getting that document to show where we were at that time?

MR. BOSI: And I'll have to go back and review, but the Phase I and the Phase II report, and I think it's the Phase II report that talks about it, and it has -- includes the minutes of each individual -- of the meetings and the directions that were provided.

And what was provided to the Board of County Commissioners, and if I remember correctly, what was provided to the Board of County Commissioners was the direction that was provided by the Planning Commission within those five meetings that you had before it was presented to the Board of County Commissioners.

And remember, these -- those draft or proposed amendments are just that. Those aren't the amendments -- those -- the language that's contained and the specificity that's contained is not going to be what we're obligated to adopt when we do go through the RLSA amendment process.

Another point that I do want to make out is we cull out that it's not Collier County government's intention to include the RLSA amendments as part of the EAR-based amendments.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, I know that. But see, if you send up one set of documents that portrays a certain position without sending up all the other processes that went through, just as theirs is only part of the process, then I think you might be showing an unfair portrayal of what occurred here.

The fact that it has not gone forward and gotten further approvals, it was very controversial. I mean, there's a tripling of the acreage involved and a lot of other things that were -- and the panther primary and secondary zones, all those issues that were deferred to the panther study that was going on and other issues that occurred, we've never reconvened on those issues since then. But I think there was a good record that -- there was a lot of controversy. This Phase I and Phase II is just not accepted hands-down and said okay, this is great, go on. And I wouldn't want to leave

that impression with DCA is what I'm concerned about.

MR. BOSI: And what I will do is I'll go back through that record and I will try to either identify it or compile it from review of the tape the specific areas of issues of concerns that was raised by the Planning Commission during those -- I think it was five individual meetings that you had regarding the RLSA potential amendment -- to give a further understanding to the Department of Community Affairs that these amendments that had been identified by the review committee are not and have not been officially endorsed by Collier County government, that they are just that, tentative proposed amendments to the RLSA overlay that still need to be vetted through staff, still need to be vetted through the Planning Commission and still need final approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, just so it is portrayed fairly. Thank you.

MR. BOSI: The third issue that was raised by the Department of Community Affairs was population growth and changes in land area. And that was a rather simple fix. And we just utilized the BEBR population numbers to 2025 and assured that those anticipated populations could be accommodated by all the individual public facilities that would be required to serve it.

Relevant changes in growth management laws, that individual section of your EAR book have been updated. We had only gone through 2006. The Department of Community Affairs and rightfully so said it needed to be through comprehensively 2009. All the legislative changes, we went through that and we made sure that we've attended to all those individual changes.

Point number five was how successful have we been in identifying alternative water supply projects. We've augmented our water resource protection area to address that and address the 10-year water supply plan that was just recently approved by the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners.

On point six, there were eight points that were raised by the department. Point six was the valuation of any past reductions in land density associated with the coastal high hazard area.

David Weeks had addressed that within a few paragraphs within the Future Land Use Element, describing how the coastal high hazard density reduction has been implemented and what effects it had had on property rights.

And then seven and eight really deal with transportation and transportation concurrency management. Those issues have been addressed within the transportation element, but also within 2.5 of your EAR book, which basically is an assessment of the different methodologies of concurrency management implemented by the various cities within Collier County, Naples, City of Marco and Everglades City.

And Mike Green will be able to expand upon that a little bit, if you'd like further explanation.

The other two state agencies that really made pertinent comments were the Water Management District and the Department of Transportation.

The transportation element, if you review the transportation element, you'll see that the areas of concern that have been expressed by the Department of Transportation are the areas that staff and the Planning Commission have already indicated that modifications are needed.

And on the Water Management District, as we go through -- they had issues related to water quality, flood protection, natural systems, water supply and ecosystem restoration. Those areas are at or are being adequately addressed from staff's perspective and have been attended to within particularly the coastal high -- or the CCME element of the Growth Management Plan.

And the last letter that I really wanted to talk about was the letter that Chairman Strain had mentioned. It was from Mr. Flanigan. It was submitted at the August workshops.

And what -- it's a 10-page letter and it's an assessment of the overall process of the EAR, where improvements that could be made. And also talks about individual perspective of the various issues and where we think that improvements can be.

If you would look through the letter and make evaluations of the issues that are raised, and some of the -- some of those issues are, you know, need for effective and measure of job growth element. And that's related to the economic element of our Growth Management Plan.

Reevaluation of the population centers. Engaged in the community, politicizing growth management, unilateral decision-making. A little bit of process, a little bit of policy. And that's what a lot of these issues that are raised have been raised within the public section. It's just a furthering of voice of some of the I think macro concerns. And some of these issues are related -- directly attributed to the Growth Management Plan, and some of these issues are the practical application of how we interact with government and our citizenry, but how we provide services and

how we pragmatically deliver the type of services that government provide.

One of the issues that was raised by Mr. Flanigan, which I think has a room for debate was, you know, a disconnect between transportation and growth management. I think that Collier County tries to be as efficient and effective in terms of communicating with the general public, but there's always room for improvement. There's always areas that we can improve upon.

But per the Growth Management Plan, I think that those interconnections between land use and transportation, I think Collier County government has tried to take a number of steps to make a tighter connection.

And one of the things that I mentioned within the workshop, and it's really -- it's the effort that we're trying to accomplish within the individual elements, and it's something that I know Chairman Strain has always -- is looking for, and it's related to our modeling efforts. It's tying and strengthening the ties between the individual elements.

And one of the things that I've spoken to Mark about was, you know, incorporating, wouldn't it be nice if we would have a land use modeling, transportation modeling, water management plan, bringing all the resources to be able to kind of work in concert in a little better agreement.

And what we're trying to do within this effort within the EAR is making sure or trying to make these individual elements of our Growth Management Plan a little bit more dependent upon each other and interactive with each other.

And if you look through the various elements, you see how they intertwine and how they interrelate. But there's still opportunities and there's always opportunities for improvement within those. And I think that's one of the major efforts that we have tried to accomplish, and I know the Planning Commission has tried to stress is strengthening those ties between those elements and how they relate towards each other.

You know, other issues: Private water and sewer in the Estates, rural standards versus standards, the master mobility plan and some of the concerns associated with those, those are issues I think that are pertinent. I think those are issues that we have addressed within the EAR, we've addressed during the workshop and we will continue to address as we go through the transmittal process.

One of the things I had mentioned, the next EAR round. At the beginning we'll probably have a little bit different approach, a little bit more public meetings at the beginning. But one of the things, and some of these issues we've talked about, you know, private water, rural standards versus urban standards. You know, there's that effort that I was the project manager on was, you know, the Phase II of the Horizon Study where we spent 24 months talking transportation, public utilities, parks and rec. In a general sense what the direction and what the purview of the public was related to these issues.

We have spent, Collier County government, a tremendous amount of time, effort and resources of trying to identify not only the issues, but the individual desires of the community. And it's a difficult task. It's a difficult task because everyone has their own perspective upon what's appropriate.

And when you deal with planning, especially -- and I like to joke with the professionals within the engineering side of the shop. You know, they've got constants, they have absolutes, they have knowns, they have things that you can hang your hat on. Because two plus two always equals four. But the distance between a residential structure and a commercial structure is -- there's not a specific, there's not an absolute on that. There's an individual preference. There's good thinking, there's appropriateness within that evaluation, but a lot of times it comes down to a personal level.

So what we've tried to do is to take those individual perspectives and find how they best fit with the overall goals that our Growth Management Plan is trying to accomplish.

And another thing that we have to always try to understand or remember and never forget is all of our plans are intended to help improve the sustainability of our community. And a lot of times what's sustainable is not always the most enjoyable. And it means that sometimes there's things that have to be done that aren't always -- and it's like the conversation I had with my daughter last night about doing homework. Sometimes, you know, the things that we need to be done aren't always the most fun, and aren't always, you know, embraced by everyone. But that has to always be at least in the backdrop of our mind as we're going forward. And I think that's what we've done within this effort within this EAR evaluation is we've tried to make our Growth Management Plan and our policies that promote a more sustainable built environment.

And I think we definitely -- we're making -- we continue to make strides. But that journey or that process never really completes itself.

And that really kind of concludes those individual perspectives that provide -- I will say that a misstep by myself, I did not include this letter within the public -- the chapter one, the public comments. It will be included within the public comments that go to the Board of County Commissioners and eventually is transmitted to the Department of Community Affairs. Because we do want to recognize the hard work and the effort and the good ideas that are suggested by the letter submitted by Mr. Flanigan.

With that, that's really the overview that I had planned for the EAR today.

Any specific questions that the Planning Commission may have regarding the comments?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, let's start with your introduction comments. Anybody have any questions with his introduction comments?

Mr. Midney?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yeah, you talked about the letter from Mr. Eubanks from South Florida Water Management District. And on Page 2 of his letter he talks about a project that I'm not familiar with. He mentions the Lake Trafford critical restoration project, which I'm assuming is the dredging and the Picayune Strand restoration project, which we all know what that is. But what is the Lake Trafford watershed management plan?

MR. BOSI: I would probably def -- I'm not familiar with that. I would maybe defer to Mr. Mac Hatcher, who is coordinating the basin studies.

MR. HATCHER: Mac Hatcher, Stormwater and Environmental Planning.

The Lake Trafford Watershed Management Plan is a proposed Big Cypress Basin project, which is scheduled for a couple of years out. It has not been initiated yet.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: What does it encompass?

MR. HATCHER: It will encompass a watershed management plan for the Lake Trafford Basin.

We're, you know, doing broader watershed planning within the county. This will be a very detailed and basin specific plan.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Now basin, that usually assumes waters that drain into Lake Trafford. I'm assuming that would also include the Camp Keais/Lake Trafford Strand system overlay which is part of the Immokalee Master Plan; is that not true?

MR. HATCHER: That I don't believe has been decided yet. I mean, they have not even initiated this project yet. So what they define -- the Camp Keais basin is downstream of Lake Trafford. The problems that were identified --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Excuse me, it flows into Lake Trafford.

MR. HATCHER: That's not widely accepted. Yeah. The south end of Lake Trafford is -- or Lake Trafford is accepted to spill over the south end at an elevation of 19 feet.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Right, I agree with that.

MR. HATCHER: And the Camp Keais area south of Immokalee Road is less than 19 feet. So it takes unusual stormwater conditions to cause water to flow north into Lake Trafford.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: No, it flows west into Lake Trafford. The slough runs east to west -- or west to east.

MR. HATCHER: Well, we're talking I guess semantics then. Because I think of Camp Keais Strand as the wetlands that extend from Lake Trafford south.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Well, I'm talking about the overlay.

MR. HATCHER: And you're talking about Corkscrew -- what overlay?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: The one in the Immokalee Master Plan.

MR. HATCHER: The area of the Immokalee Master Plan would include a large area that drains into Lake Trafford. The drainage break runs through the City of Immokalee, and the Immokalee Master Plan included areas that drain into the State Road 29, Barron River Canal, as well as Lake Trafford. And that segment would probably not be included in the Lake Trafford --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I don't want to get too deep into this. I was just -- I just saw this reference to this watershed management plan that I hadn't heard of before and I just wanted a little clarification. Thank you.

MR. HATCHER: Well, it's a future project.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody else have any discussion concerning the introduction?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mike, I hate to go back and shake the tree again, but I want to follow up on some issues that Jim Flanigan brought up.

And the first one that we talked about earlier this morning was the need for the workshop prior to transmittal, and we actually go into the GMP amendments. I notice Jim's here now. He wasn't here to hear that discussion, but I think that was concurred upon by you and so we will probably move forward in that direction.

I believe that helps some of the procedural elements that Jim has brought out. And they're good elements to point out.

Some of the other things that he mentioned: Need for effective and measurable job growth element. Putting an element in is rather extensive, but putting policy in or using a policy to define the job growth or lack of job growth from seven-year to seven-year period of the EAR may not be an unreasonable nor a negative comment, a negative tool. It might be very positive to know what we've done growth-wise. Are we keeping unemployment down or are we causing more unemployment to occur, based on our economic information.

Is that something that could be looked at for an inclusion at some point down the road?

MR. BOSI: We could explore, during our economic -- it would be the economic element that would be the appropriate policy. We could suggest developing a potential policy to the department that we will coordinate with the Economic Development Council to assist Collier County within, you know, the monitoring on a regular basis, yearly, or whatever the most pertinent case would be, of employment figures and the changes within employment figures.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I just think maybe there's an appropriate party that we could communicate with, whether it be the EDC or a state board or some measurable unit that tells us what our employment rate is and helps us see where we're going every EAR.

I'm not sure that would be a bad -- and Jim, I notice -- you can come up and speak. And anybody in the audience that wishes to speak on an item, just raise your hand or something, we'll call you. We're going to do this rather informally. It's hard to fill out a request on things you don't even know we're going to be talking about, so --

MR. FLANIGAN: Good morning. Jim Flanigan here.

The real thought behind that was to create a means where development actually creates the jobs for the housing and the residential aspects within the development, and having some kind of accountability to creating the jobs for the people you're bringing into the county. That's really what that process and thought came from.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you, Jim.

I'm going to hit on about four or five of your topics here, so you may want to sit handy in case the clarification is needed.

Reevaluation and/or reconsideration of planned eastern populations. I think especially if the RLSA goes forward in an expanded mode, our population statistics we currently are using are going to be probably out the door.

The population projections by some, one of which I did, would show an excess of population in the Eastern Lands over what we have in the urban area. And I know we're not even prepared for that, and I would imagine the comment that Jim's making eludes to the fact we need to be better prepared for what we're doing out there.

MR. BOSI: And I would say that, you know, remember, we did the build-out study, East of 951 study, we had a staff assessment in 2005, we updated with the CIGM in 2009. We've had another iteration of what that build-out number would be in 2010 with the updates. So we've ran three different population potential strategies above what the BEBR numbers provide us.

So I think Collier County government has been very active trying to get a better handle upon what the population demands that our regulations will provide, and what that -- and all of the obligations that that provides.

And the master mobility plan, which was also mentioned within that letter, is another iteration of those -- that land use modeling, those population projections.

So Mr. Flanigan is absolutely correct, we have to continue to try to evaluate and get a better handle of those population, those demands that -- and the regulatory allowances that are provided for and what the populations will be expressed.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Did your population statistics currently, your projections currently look at the RLSA under the plan that's adopted and in effect today? Did they also look at the one that's being proposed where it triples the acreage for home sites?

MR. BOSI: That has not been incorporated, at least within the Collier interactive growth model. Because it hasn't -- there's still tentative -- that would be a discussion that we could have with the Board of County

Commissioners if we would try to incorporate those amendments. But that process would take -- that would take some time and some consideration.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I understand this can't be done today, but wouldn't we want to know the quantity of people moving in that area and the general impacts -- I understand you can't do specifics -- before something's adopted so we know if we're heading down the wrong path? I mean, that's the support argument that we talked about, that I believe this board as a majority had as a concern jump into some of the higher numbers they were talking about.

MR. BOSI: Well, one of the components of when we go through those RLSA amendments and the data analysis that the county's going to have to perform, one of the additional actions that could be incorporated would be run -- those what if scenarios that the Collier interactive growth model was proposed specifically for. If these modifications aren't provided, what is the net effect in terms of the population difference compared to what is being provided -- what's being projected now by the growth model compared to what would be provided/projected by the growth model with those regulatory changes, with the increases that were suggested by the Chair.

That could be a component that we could ask the board, based upon the direction the Planning Commission gave us within the EAR process, this is a step that we think we need to take during this amendment process.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, any such backup material to make a decision a better decision I think would be warranted. I can't imagine that not being supported.

Go ahead, Mr. Flanigan.

MR. FLANIGAN: Yeah, I do have a concern with the comprehensive approach and the populations there. And we're getting into those decisions right now.

The I-75 interchange is being focused on Everglades Boulevard as an interchange location, and that doesn't take into account the projected populations at build-out. And if that is going to be the last interchange on I-75 on Alligator Alley, then somebody's got to take a look and project those populations and how that's going to access I-75, both in cost to the taxpayer and cost of development and to the populations and impacts of those eastern lands on Golden Gate Estates, the rest of the county and practical egress out of the eastern lands onto I-75.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And that's one of the issues that we'll be bringing up when we discuss the transportation section.

One of the interesting issues are that we have -- we actually have three locations where that interchange could go. And it might be better to make sure we've picked the best location before we lock one in. And I think that's a concern I'll express when we get into transportation.

Two of Jim's comments were concerning connecting the disconnect between transportation and growth management and then cautioning against the master mobility plan as a parable (sic) Growth Management Plan.

It's interesting, because for a long time I know we've discussed the multitude of plans out there. The plans are great, they keep the experts employed with taxpayers' dollars, they keep employees and staff employed with taxpayers' dollars, and every department does their own plan and they keep generating more work to have their plan fine tuned.

But I just sitting here wrote down a few of the plans we've got hanging around out there. We have an MPO, Metropolitan Planning Organization, which has the LRPT, the long-range transportation plan. We have -- that's one plan in the work. We have another plan called the mobility plan that we got a federal grant for that a whole bunch of people are working on. That's another plan in the works. We have the Growth Management Plan that your department works on. We have the VanBuskirk plan, which I think is under your department as another sub-plan. Under the GMP we have the rural land stewardship area, we have the Golden Gate Area Master Plan and we have the Immokalee Area Master Plan, all sub-plans of the GMP. And then we have the panther studies going on for the RLSA which are another formal plan, because they delineate what is primary and secondary. Mac's working on a watershed plan. Mr. Wiley's working on a flood plan. Federal Government's working on a FEMA plan. South Florida is working on their own plan with Big Cypress and various basin specific plans.

It just makes common sense to have one plan which incorporates all these ideas. And I'm not sure how much coordination -- I know that everybody will claim they're well coordinated. But at times -- an example exactly is what Jim's looking at right now, there's a big push for an interchange at I-75 in the Estates. The Estates desperately needs an eastern interchange, I heartily agree with that, it's got to get done. But we have three choices right off the bat on where they could go. Where is the best place for that interchange, and how much of the population of the RLSA will use the easternmost interchange.

If you have 450,000 people in the RLSA and you have towns like Big Cypress and Ave Maria and all the other stuff going, is it wise to put the interchange through platted areas that have 700 lots or more before you get to the interchange, or is it wise to put it somewhere where it's not so congested?

I don't know the answer to that right now, because I don't know what the best plan is. But it certainly warrants looking at. And I think that's part of what Jim's trying to say in some of his issues, that before we jump into any one plan, let's make sure we're best coordinated with them all.

MR. BOSI: Understood. And take this for however you want to receive it, but that is the intent of the master mobility plan. The master mobility plan is -- the overall project for that takes the land use modeling from the CIGM, incorporates it with the LR -- and that land use modeling has been incorporated in the LRTP to try to populate -- to try to anticipate what those populations are and identify the travel areas.

And also the Rural Land Stewardship Area with those individual towns and villages that were proposed, potentially proposed by the property owners, that's been incorporated.

One of the components of the master mobility plan is trying to bring the environmental layers within that GIS to that process. It's got limitations, I agree. There's only so far that it can go. But it's a step in that direction. And I think what we need to do as a general purpose county government, as community -- or as growth management is vet and provide a little bit more exposure of the master mobility plan to the community and to the Planning Commission, which I know we have coming up in the future. So you get a much better understanding of all the resources and all the data that's been incorporated within to this plan to try to coordinate, as you suggested, in a little bit better of an effort.

And I think until you get to see those specifics, you're still going to have those reservations. But that's the intent, that was the original idea behind the master mobility plan was to try to bring a number of these modeling efforts and bring them a little bit closer into agreement.

Just a side note, the -- one of the reasons why I got into the profession of city planning, I read a book, it was called "The Foundation". It's a series by a science fiction writer, Isaac Asimov. And he -- in the future what he was able to do was bring a modeling effort that incorporates all engineering, it incorporates land use planning, transportation planning, economic principles, and it tries to predict the overall course of human behavior so we can make better decisions.

That's the end aspiration. We've got to start. And the master mobility plan is another step within this process to try to bring a coordination, to try to bring a more robust modeling effort so we can make the most informed decisions and we can try to get the best handle upon that probability. Because there is always a probability that that future holds. It's the probability, but try to get the best agreement towards what that probability's going to be.

And I think when we provide a little bit more of the specifics of the master mobility plan to the Planning Commission, you'll see that that was at least the intent that general purpose county government was trying to go with that effort.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So all these plans are really an effort to control human behavior.

Mike, I'm just kidding.

MR. BOSI: That's what --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I thought it was an interesting statement you made.

MR. BOSI: That's what planning is.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I don't doubt it a bit.

MR. BOSI: That's what planning is.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I wonder to whose favor.

Go ahead.

MR. FLANIGAN: If I might, on a master mobility plan, the focus and the drive behind that is reducing vehicle miles traveled and reducing greenhouse gasses. And it's more of a transportation approach more than anything else. My concern is it's another parallel plan and it's not taking into effect a comprehensive approach that incorporates watershed, conservation lands and a compre -- I'm looking for a comprehensive planning approach with no single aspect leading and driving decisions and planning altogether like transportation is at this point.

If you go into the transportation element, the focus is now that the road system is going to drive the population. That's one of the concerns -- the objectives. And I think that's turning it 180 degrees based on the FLUE maps.

And if you're looking at populations of this county to be close to a million by the time this is built out, and the bell curve actually has most of that population going in the next 20 years, 25 years, then our -- you know, the population from 2035 on to 2080 in build-out, all those decisions really need to be made now. Here's where the population's going to come waving in at us. And our plan needs to be focused within that next 25 years.

I don't see those populations and those road systems on the LRTP for 2035. You look at the LRTP as it was just recently issued, and there are no road systems beyond DeSoto. You've got Oil Well Road, you've got Immokalee Road, and there are no collector roads or arterials within the RLSA.

And if we have a population coming to the RLSA, no matter whether it's 250,000 or 400,000, there has to be some understanding of what's going to happen out there, even on a conceptual basis.

I understand that most of the roads going east and west are going to service those areas, like Vanderbilt Beach Road, but there are some considerations that need to be taken into account on the impacts of the other communities that that population's going to serve. We can't -- you know, frankly I'm concerned that we're going to have a bunch of highways running through Golden Gate Estates. And as I've, you know, been a promoter of, the rural community of Golden Gate Estates needs to be preserved. And transportation needs to kind of take its opportunities to go around and circumvent the -- circumnavigate the Estates, rather than going through it. Ultimately that's the concerns I have.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And Jim, you know, there's one other point I want to make on your letter. But I very much appreciate the detail that you went into. It's rare that someone that is not involved in the government side as much as people on these boards are, for example, or staff understands the issues as well as you do and the letters that you've provided.

So if anything else, as we go forward this will be used as a theme that we all will at least talk about.

I can't believe I left my -- I'm sorry, I had it on vibrate, but it didn't, so --

But anyway, I'm looking at your document as a theme that I'll keep with me as we move into the workshops and elements in the future and just holding it up against those issues that we bring up.

There is one combined other element I'd like to talk about, issue I'd like to talk about that Jim brought up. And it hits home, because when I was chairman of the Golden Gate Area Master Plan Committee, which has almost been 10 years, at that time it was a real concern in Golden Gate Estates that we maintain the ruralized character of the Estates.

And there were two items here that Jim pointed out and another one he just mentioned. One is maintain private water and sewer in the Estates and the other is the create rural development standards. And then the third would be the transportation system.

The Estates has been under attack in almost all that regard. And we worked for many years trying to maintain a rural community out there. We certainly like some of the benefits. But running corridors through the Estates and adding utilities at the huge cost to offset -- it just doesn't seem to have a rate of return that's even beneficial to anybody.

And then the standards we find that are used in the urban area really don't all apply equally in the rural area. Like the, what's that, Dover-Kohl study we did. It was great for the urban area. He told all these great things we've incorporated into the GMP, as though it should be applied across the board in Collier County. To be honest with you, it doesn't work everywhere. Certainly doesn't work further out. I don't think Immokalee's benefiting too much from it, and the Estates certainly won't.

So I think we need to be careful on how much we apply in a broad brush. There are different -- this community now is different. And instead of being focused on just the urbanized area, as we move further out, the standards need to be changed. And that seems to ring true through what Jim has commented on here as well. So it's a good theme to consider as we move forward.

MR. BOSI: And I agree and I understand. And there has been action by this general purpose county government of just that.

You remember two years ago we modified the level of service for EMS in our response times and we lowered the response times for the rural area of the county just because of the cost that would be incurred by trying to have an eight-minute response when you have a low density environment.

So we have taken steps within our levels of service to recognize that what's appropriate within the urbanized area is not always appropriate within the rural area.

And I think that what I'm hearing, not only within the letter from the voice of the community but also the

Planning Commission, is we need to further explore where those opportunities or where those differences need to be applied.

MR. FLANIGAN: And don't get me wrong, I'm not criticizing, I'm looking to try and improve. And, you know, when you take the Growth Management Plan and then you go into a practical application -- let's take the septic systems out in the Estates. In 2004 the county stopped taking septic waste and processing septic waste at the county wastewater treatment plant. And there is no plan to bring that back on line. And that was something that was based on precedence, and there was -- it was supposed to be a temporary ceasing of that so that they could adjust the plant. And at this point septic waste gets shipped to Charlotte County and Miami.

And frankly, I think if we're going to provide a county that's going to have a legitimate source or disposal site for septic waste, I think we need to incorporate that as part of the rural standard and as part of the infrastructure within the county, you know, to obligate our county to put a facility there to allow its contractors to have a legal dumping site within the county.

That's my -- these are the practical applications that the policies and the -- you know, the goals don't really show. And there's a couple of those kind of things that the policies that are in place for the service area, but they're not comprehensive on the county. And that's another one I'm bringing through.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Jim, what I hope you would do is this EAR is basically a concept presentation of just thoughts about policies. It really is more like a bubble plan, if you were to want to relay it something of another -- like planning or something.

When we get into the amendment process that interprets what's happening here today and what has occurred in the public process, that's when the real nuts and bolts start to apply. That's where these very specific details need to come in for discussion.

And before you came in, we specifically asked Mike if we could have a workshop prior to staff hard-lining their issues for transmittal. Because I think that would address a lot of the concerns where the public input may not have been interpreted as it should have been or categorized as it should have been. A workshop will give us a latitude in a relaxed or informal way to analyze those and see what the public feels about where their comments were made. And then by the time Mike puts it into amendment or transmittal, it's hardened in a fashion that had some more input from the public as to how it should be done.

So I look forward to that. And I think your letter will be something I'll keep handy and we can work with as we go forward.

MR. FLANIGAN: Very good.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you.

MR. FLANIGAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And if no one else has any questions, what I'd like to do then, Mike, if it's okay with you is start moving through the multitude of tabs you have here.

We have a section that -- of the document in front of us that lays out the elements of the GMP tab by tab.

But prior to that we have a series of tabs that are more or less backup information that's being supplied to support the EAR assessment.

So what I'll do is I'll try to just move through the tabs. We've seen them all before, they were here in our workshop. This reflects supposedly our workshop comments.

And what I did myself was go through it, and areas that the workshop comments seem to not be taken -- had questions on them, I tabbed those for bringing up again today.

I don't know what you all did, but why don't we just start moving through it. And let's take the first three tabs and go all the way through where it says chapter one, public participation. Basically it's background.

Does anybody have any information about the way that's being presented or questioned?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The next three tabs take us through where -- the one that says existing anticipated development. That is chapter two, population growth and annexation, and then existing anticipated development.

Are there any issues from the Planning Commission from those areas?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mike, I have one. And it really is under the last tab I just mentioned, the existing versus anticipated development. And you've got a map there on Page 28. It's titled Undeveloped Land in Corkscrew

Planning Community.

When you analyzed the undeveloped acres and the land use and the institutional and all that for that area, the tab says anticipated. Where would I see the -- since that is the RLSA, how did you anticipate the population there?

MR. BOSI: We didn't try to anticipate where that population was going. What this section does, it tries -- it identifies where the population is, what is the acreages of undeveloped land within each of the individual planning communities, and tries what -- what's the underlying zoning and what's the underlying future land use designation, and can they -- would that land be able to accommodate any future growth in population.

And what we've done, by -- to give -- in the individual planning communities was try and give a little bit more detailed description of where the population could potentially go. But we didn't try to model where the population was going to go, we just wanted to show in totality with the culmination of all the planning communities that there was enough acreages based upon our development pattern and the consumption of land that our current population has consumed, if we take our build-out number that's provided to us and we ran that out, or in this case we ran it out to 2025, our planning horizon, we have more than enough acreages to accommodate that population that we projected towards the horizon year.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, but I think one reason this one caught my eye is I was looking at these maps, and when it said undeveloped acres and then the land use, in my mind it was kind of what you just said, that the potential there then was -- for this land was sitting there barren and it could be developed.

But I looked at the yellow on here and that looks like Corkscrew Swamp Sanctuary, and it's labeled Undeveloped Institutional. It's as though you're saying that that could be developed. It can't, if that's the Corkscrew Swamp Sanctuary. That's a preserve.

MR. BOSI: It's a preserve, it's institutional. It's got an institutional designation. It's not developed, it's institutional. If you pull the first layer back, you understand that it's a conservation area that's not going to receive development. But I guess the labeling, the strict GIS label from how it was allocated labels it as institutional. It doesn't have square footage upon it, it's undeveloped. We know that it's not going to be developed. And the intent wasn't from staff to say it's going to be developed, we just -- this is the classification of that land.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So we don't know how much developable acreage is in relationship to the potential to accommodate future growth in this area, we just know how much the undeveloped acres are, but we don't know if those undeveloped acres can be utilized for accommodating future growth.

MR. BOSI: For any one particular acre, I don't know if it's appropriate for a development to go there. This is just a macro general assessment.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It just changes the value of the documents, from my understanding.

Okay, Jim?

MR. FLANIGAN: And that's kind of where I was going too, because if you have watershed and conservation lands within each of these maps -- that's one of my questions. The translation is a translation of what is today based on the .415 I think it was acres per capita and translated to the inventory, essentially. But what takes that inventory down is the conservation lands and the lands that can't be developed.

In other words, there's lakes and rivers and watersheds here that can't be developed or have to be mitigated, right? And does that come out of the equation here to give us developable land? Is that deleted from that equation, yes or no? No?

MR. BOSI: It's not deleted, it's a component. It won't ever receive development, but it adds to the equation. It adds to our utilization as a county of how much open space compared to our population that we have.

This isn't a land use modeling plan. This section here is to identify our planning communities, what has been developed within those individual planning communities, and what's available for development. In a very generic sense.

But the generic assessment is we have enough acreages within our various planning communities to accept the population that we anticipate by 2025, not what is going to be at any one location at all.

MR. FLANIGAN: Well, I guess I was looking for it the other way around. I was looking to see what land is actually available and how does that project to the population when you come --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And I think that's the issue. You've taken productive land -- and by the way, Corkscrew Swamp Sanctuary, the flow ways, the SSA's, they're all productive land, they're just productive naturally; they're not productive through a development process that creates a product we use in like a building.

That may be the disconnect in trying to understand these maps. And I'm not sure how to cure that, but I think that's a clarity that needs to be known. If you had an item on here that showed preservation lands or something of that nature and then had another one that shows undeveloped institutional, I think that would make us realize that in this entire area there may not be any really institutional, as the word seems to imply, to a lot of people who may be doing the planning.

There's a lot of preservation, which is really good, but where's the room for institutional? Where's the community center in the Corkscrew planning community that would house some government facilities? It's not there yet.

I think that's kind of what I think the disconnect is, so -- at least that's where I've seen it.

MR. FLANIGAN: And on those maps, I would just make one suggestion going forward. You know, if the south blocks are going to be a restoration area, then the northern part of that Fakapalm planning community might be connected to the Corkscrew planning community to incorporate the RLSA, and that would be a more effective way of looking at the planning community as a whole.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, those are suggestions that Mike I'm sure will take a look at. Thank you, Jim. That takes us through those tabs. If there's none others, we'll move on to the next.

The next -- before we get into the GMP elements themselves, let's just go through the next two tabs, the vacant -- now, this says vacant and dependable lands. I'm not sure that tab is properly labeled. I think you meant vacant and developable land, right?

MR. BOSI: I believe so.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, okay.

And then the next tab would be statutory changes. If there's any questions from the Planning Commission on those?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I do.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead, Mr. Midney.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I found a new term, a rural area of critical economic concern. Is that a new -- something new I never heard of before. Is that something that the --

MR. BOSI: No, Immokalee is designated as a RACEC area, a rural area of critical economic concern. And with that -- and it's administrated by the office of OTAD, tourism and economic development. It implements a program --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: And what is an agricultural enclave? I never heard of that before.

MR. BOSI: Agricultural enclaves are suggested from the Department of Community Affairs within your Future Land Use Map where you have areas of agricultural that are surrounded by -- that are surrounded or bordered by developed areas but wanted to be maintained by the individual community as agricultural going forward.

So to alleviate the development pressures that are inevitably going to come to it, they designated it as an agricultural enclave; therefore it increases the threshold for any change into that area, meaning you have to go through the Growth Management Plan process to make that transaction -- it's sort of like -- it's almost a specific future land use category within the future land use element, as we have industrial, as we have commercial, as we have our urban residential, as we have our -- it would be kind of a parallel to a conservation designation, but really specifically geared to promote agricultural activity. And those are the type of land uses associated with it.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: That's interesting, because agriculture is so important to Immokalee. Would this have to be implemented by the whole county commission or would it be the population of Immokalee that decided that, you know, we wanted to maintain our agricultural land?

MR. BOSI: It would be something that would be obviously started -- it could be started in the Immokalee community. And I think it has been. And it would have to be approved by the Board of County Commissioners.

But think about the Rural Land Stewardship Area and that five-year review. In the Rural Land Stewardship Area, and the task of that overlay is supposed to attend to, it's got two primary tenets -- well, three primary tenets; property rights of course is -- has to be attended to.

But it's got to serve environmental protection and agricultural protection. Those two are hard to be able to -- they don't always fit together. They don't always fit together. And there has to be a balance between the two. That RLSA area in the potential amendment trying to promote -- give agriculture a little bit higher of a standard within those protections is one of the intents of the RLSA area.

And if you look at those SSA's that have been created, most of them have at least allowed strip down to still allow passive agricultural activity, grazing, those type of activities.

So that's the strategy I think that we've incorporated without designated specific areas of agricultural enclaves. The SSA's almost act as a default area of agricultural enclave.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Thank you.

And then one more question. Extremely low income persons is recognized as another income group whose housing needs might need to be addressed by accessory dwelling units.

Is that something that Collier County has looked at at all?

MR. BOSI: To the extent -- I know that category has been examined within our housing element. And that question, we can get to it now or I can bring Michele up or we could -- you know, during our discussion of the housing element Michele can describe about the various categories that we've looked at and how we're suggesting to move forward related to those various categories.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I think that's extremely important. Because this is the marginalized group in Immokalee that usually now is using -- they're not eligible for a lot of the government help and they're housed in migrant camps which are usually the worst housing of all. And I'd like to see it addressed some way; I don't know how.

MR. BOSI: Well, and I think you'll hear within Michele's comments and her assessment was that was really her area where she said this is that unprotected kind of classification or grouping that our housing element really has to be geared to protect and attend to. So I think you'll hear that within the presentation.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Mike, there are some -- and Paul's near one of the pages I had a question on. It's on Page 12 and 13, for example. This is just an example, number 167 and 168. There are changes in Florida statutes. In one of your columns says addressed where, how. And then amendment needed by element.

Those issues that show amendment needed by element, does that mean we're going to see an element changed when we come in for the amendment hearings that follow this EAR?

Look at number 168: Creates new section preventing local from requiring for a permit or other approval vegetation, maintenance and tree pruning or trimming within an established electric transmission or distribution line right-of-way.

Our response was: GMP is silent to procedures within transmission and distribution rights-of-way.

I mean, what are we -- do we intend to do anything then or --

MR. BOSI: And we have to -- and that's one of the things that we've tried to identify with the Department of Community Affairs is how we -- how they expect us as a local government to comply with these requirements of land use planning around a electrical distribution station.

We don't have a power-generating substation within this county. They're all distribution lines. And the distribution lines follow the land use pattern; the land use pattern doesn't follow the distribution lines. And the value that that effort would provide the county is questionable at best in a sense that we have no power generated stations, that the lines almost by default fall where our development patterns emerge.

So we have to have further discussion with the department of -- and the department was silent to that issue within the review of our EAR. And we have to get clarification as to how much and what action we can do related to the issue.

So it will be something that we will have to talk about during the amendment process. I just don't know if it will result in an individual policy.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, my only question was, and number 168 is the example I used. It doesn't talk about power generation sites, it talks about distribution line right-of-way, which I would think may be the utility easements that run along our road lines. I don't -- I mean, I just didn't know if we had to change the GMP because the statute is now law, or we can just leave our comment that says we're silent on it. It doesn't seem to adhere to the law, if that's the case.

I don't necessarily agree with that one, because I don't know what it entails. But I didn't know what your plans were, and that's what I was trying to find out. Because there's quite a few. I've tabbed about six or seven different points like that where your answer wasn't yes, we're going to adhere to the law, it's just kind of like, eh, we didn't do that.

MR. BOSI: Well, and we didn't do it. Our GMP is silent to it, and we're not sure if the benefit -- we're not sure if requesting the benefiting of the action -- and we questioned whether the Department of Community Affairs intends to mandate that we do address this within our Growth Management Plan.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And I understand. And in fact, to be honest with you, I question the benefit of most of what our legislature does.

Anyway, on the last page of the thing, of the tab, it says 2.5 assessment of methodology or concurrency management. Your analysis talks about the only municipality that performs a separate transportation system concurrency review is the City of Naples and Marco Island. We do Everglades City's?

MR. GREENE: Michael Greene, Transportation Planning.

Honestly, it's been such a long time since there's been any new development that required concurrency review in Everglades City, I don't know if we do it or Everglades City does it themselves. The only thing that I do know for sure is that Everglades City has separate maintenance responsibilities.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The second line says all. And all is pretty encompassing. All other jurisdictions within Collier County fall under the county's methodology.

So if they don't, we ought to find that out and include their reference in paragraph. And if they do, you're good to go.

That moves us into the typical elements. It's close to break time, so we're going to run through all the elements when we get back from break. Why don't we come back at five after 10:00 and resume the meeting, okay?

(Recess.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Everyone, if you'll take your seats, we'll resume the meeting from our break.

And we left off moving into the actual tabs that addressed each element. I just ask that we hit those one at a time and see if there's any questions.

The first one is county-wide assessment, the CIE. Does anybody have any questions in the CIE writeup?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Corby, if you've got anything, just jump in.

MR. SCHMIDT: I would do that, but with the CIE, there's nothing to really add. The comments that came back through the Department of Community Affairs from the Department of Transportation are certainly agreeable to add detailed level of service standards explanations.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, the next tab is the county-wide assessment for transportation. Does anybody have any issues on the transportation section?

By the way, if members of the public do, either wander up to one of mics or raise your hand and one way or the other I'll make sure we try to see you and hear you.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Mark, I have.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead, Mr. Schiffer.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Hold on, let me find it.

In -- one of the issues we had is you had a new 4.9 that looked a lot like 4.6. So I think what you've done is what we discussed at the meeting, moved everything in the 4.6.

So does that mean 4.9 in our prior book has been removed?

MR. BOSI: Correct. There will be no new policy, it's just an expansion of the existing 4.6 policy.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. That's it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's it.

Anybody else in transportation?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mike, I have Page 9, your Policy 6.5. You're recommending that the -- you changed this to now take out the former projects that were in 6.5 and include new projects. And the specificity of those projects concerns me, especially as things could change.

The first one, I-75 and Everglades interchange, I don't think the studies have been done to show this is the best location. There are at least three locations out in that area that could be considered. So if this ends up being the best location, we badly need an interchange, that's great. But I don't think we ought to put one in here and lock ourselves into a commitment in the GMP when there's other potentials. And the studies haven't been done for any of them at this point. So I have a real concern about that.

The second one is the grade separation at Randall and Immokalee. I think all three of them -- the third one would be the U.S. 41 and SR951 grade separation. And then the Randall/Immokalee grade separation.

The Randall and Immokalee grade separation is based on Randall continuing out and connecting up to Big Cypress and Ave Maria.

What is interesting is we're now working on Oil Well Road, and if it's completed, all four or six lanes, we're going to have a major rework, because the Big Cypress plan, if it were to be adopted, shows Oil Well dead-ending and teeing into our future extension of Randall.

Now, that's great for Big Cypress for everybody to pull into their town and have to stop to get to Ave Maria, but I'm not sure that may be not fought or contested by maybe Ave Maria.

So the whole idea of the Randall/Immokalee grade separated overpass is contingent upon a future drawn-out segment of Randall Boulevard going -- and maybe straight-lining all the way out to Ave Maria, or at least in a continuous fashion without having a T intersection and Oil Well being the T.

Those are issues that have got to be resolved over time. And I think it would be unfair to highlight any of them in the GMP as a priority before we know if that priority is that realistic, just like the interchange.

So I'd strongly suggest we don't get into these specifics and we leave language in that we always have in regards to, you know, trying to do the best transportation corridor system we can based on the needs at the time.

So I'm concerned about Policy 6.5's change. Not that we're taking out what was already done and completed, but that we want to add more. And I'm not sure how you want to respond to that, but that's the issue I have with the transportation.

MR. BOSI: During the workshops that you had raised similar issues, we had put that to the vote of the Planning Commission, and the majority of the Planning Commission had suggested to leave it in. Is that still the -- and I think that it would be appropriate to call that question again. Because right now the recommendation that we had had from that workshop was to leave that level of specificity, leave these future projects in.

One thing that I would remind the Planning Commission, this is just a proposed. Whatever the amendment would be, the specificity of the language, whether we say I-75 in Everglades interchange or if we say the general area of that area will be determined and will be crafted during the workshop, the transmittal and the adoption hearings that will be part of the EAR-based amendments.

So with that understanding, the Planning Commission, would you still recommend that this policy that identifies these future projects be brought forward as part of the EAR-based amendment process but maybe add a clarification that the level of specificity will be determined during the EAR-based amendment process that we provide?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But we've strived for the 10 years or nine years, whatever it is I've been on this board, to lessen the specificity in the GMP. Because it's always been staff's contention that this is not the document you want the specificity in, that you want it in the supporting documents.

This doesn't even make sense. And especially with the array of questions that revolve around some of these supposedly needed issues, if we can do it better, which I hope we can, why would we want to be stuck with something that binds us and something that may not be the best. And it's too premature to know that right now.

Jim, did you want to comment before we --

MR. FLANIGAN: Well, I have -- yeah, I agree with that as well. But I also say that a lot of the I-75 effort is being driven under the auspices of an emergency egress system needed now.

And I was going to ask about having an additional element or additional policy in here to provide temporary means of egress in advance of any full-blown transportation project as a matter of emergency management.

And, you know, I look at I-75 and Everglades interchange as a project, but I also see that the water district now has an egress onto I-75 to service their construction project, and I'm concerned that that egress is not capable of carrying a population out of a wildfire situation or an evacuation situation out of the Estates when it could be done with little money and great effort and only immediate direction.

So I'd look for a temporary egress aspect of these transportation elements relative to emergency management.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And Mike, to follow up on that, though, I believe -- a while back I went over to see Nick and he wasn't in, because I was told he was at an inspection with Norm to look at the completed temporary emergency accesses that have been made, put on Everglades Boulevard to I-75.

So I thought that had already been accomplished, or may have been. Mike, are you aware of that?

MR. GREENE: Again, Michael Greene, Transportation Planning.

The on and off ramps that have been constructed at Everglades and I-75 are projects specific for the Picayune rehydration project. There are gated, and there has been documentation in place through the right-of-way permit that the conditions state that it is only for project access, not for emergency access. And that when the project is over, I believe in a seven-year time period, they will be removed and that area will be restored to the way it was before they went in.

Now, everybody expects that if there were an evacuation demanded in the Golden Gate Estates area, that they would be opened up and people would be allowed to use them, but that is not part of the conditions of the permit.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: In the Golden Gate Area Master Plan I thought we had actually put language in there seeking to have that (sic) emergency exits put there, opened in a manner that they're gated and they'd be open for emergencies. So now that they're there, they can't be used for that?

MR. GREENE: I'm not saying that they can't be, I'm just saying that that's not part of the application or the right-of-way permit that those were put in under.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Why don't we look at modifying that permit to -- and Mike, if you look at the -- I think it's the Golden -- when we get to it, maybe I've tabbed it, the Golden Gate Area Master Plan language, we had three priorities in our language that involved road systems. One of which was an emergency access on I-75 to Everglades Boulevard.

If that access that's in now is considered to be used at all, why don't we ply to have that become the emergency access to at least give us some relief if there's any immediate need before anything else gets permitted?

MR. BOSI: Well, for the appropriateness of this hearing, what would be suggested would be a policy that would state that Collier County would work with the Department of Transportation to ensure that all temporary access points on I-75 will be made available for emergency egress or ingress based upon a situation, something like that.

That would be -- for this, for what we're doing today, that type of a policy would probably help us in that negotiation, because it's not -- that permit's not Collier County government sought that permit, that's South Florida Water Management District through the Department of Transportation.

Now, if we have a policy within our GMP, our transportation element that specifically addresses that -- and I think you may have already indicated that we do have it within the Golden Gate Area Master Plan. But if we suggested an additional policy that talks about utilizing all temporary access ramps as temporary evacuation routes or something to that effect, you know, explore that possibility, that might be an additional policy that may be suggested from the Planning Commission regarding the issue.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, sure would seem to be practical, especially if they're even partially built. Why don't we just --

MR. GREENE: They are complete and operational.

Prior to their construction, there was a gated dirt emergency access at I-75 and Everglades. When the fires were down there and they were evacuating the area, somebody tried to take a motor home through it and got stuck, and everybody else got backed up behind it and prevented the rest of the evacuation.

MR. FLANIGAN: And if --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm not going to comment on that.

MR. FLANIGAN: And if I may, that emergency egress or temporary -- and I wouldn't call it a temporary egress, I would call it an emergency egress and have it as a policy.

But with that goes all the interlocal agreements between Florida Highway -- I mean FDOT, the Florida Highway Patrol, the Sheriff's Office, Emergency Management, Fire and Forestry and the Collier County Sheriff's Office. I mean, it's not just the one policy that opens the door, it's a policy that would incorporate those aspects.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, let me read Policy 731 from the Golden Gate Area Master Plan. And I'll just read the last line. It says: Shall begin establishing one or more of the following routes for emergency evacuation purposes. A, an I-75 interchange at Everglades Boulevard. B, improved emergency access from Everglades Boulevard to I-75. And then C, a bridge on 23rd.

But that is why that should have been -- I mean, it should have been already accomplished based on this fact that this policy has been in place since '02.

And if that's already there -- I notice Dan Summers is here. Why don't we get it open to the public for emergencies. I mean, if there's -- and Dan, if you've got something, you can provide us with input, it would be great.

MR. SUMMERS: Good morning. For the record, Dan Summers, Director of the Bureau of Emergency Services and Emergency Management.

I can't speak to your specific policy, but let's talk operations just for a minute, if I may.

Number one, we're aware on the north side of that gravel access area, we know that that is one potential access, as well as the new paved access that's on the -- basically we'll call it the south side access.

Two things that I think are important. And I don't plan to be a transportation expert, but one of the major drawbacks in that is the absence of a deceleration lane and the absence of an acceleration lane.

Having said that, that with having access to both of those and we do have an emergency situation, it's very much within our operational planning over there to put law enforcement, lights and those type of things, if we have to make that emergency egress in any direction there.

So let me just tell you that while I can't speak to the policy issues that you're working on right now, operationally if we need it I'll use it. And I'll make those items occur working with fire, forestry and those type of things.

If it is an emergency, we're not -- we are paying attention also to the gravel side. I will review that as we get into spring fire season from tactical planning arrangements with the forestry folks. We'll review all of that.

But knowing that, we will do everything right to protect life and property. However, we're very sensitive to federal highway guidance and the absence of acceleration and deceleration lanes there. So we -- if we have to get into manual traffic control to provide access or egress to that area, operationally we're very capable of doing that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, thank you.

And I think, Mike, it would be -- if we -- I'll get the opinions on the rest of the board here too, but let me try to summarize.

I think if the policy were to focus on the utilization of any temporary facilities that are available to become emergency access points when needed by Collier County, and for that effort to be completed through whatever agencies you need to move through, I think that would be a more effective way to approach this policy, rather than get into specifics on all these items that we may not know if they're the best specific at this time.

So with that, I'd like to get everybody else to weigh in on it. Do you agree or disagree?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Let me just --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: One question. Is the reason they eliminated it from the description so that they don't have to build it to a higher standard? I mean, I do know that if they needed to get people out of it, that they could close a lane down and just flow everybody in the decel lane -- or the lane coming in would become the lane on 75.

But is that why it's written that way, so that they build a lesser intersection?

MR. GREENE: The interchange that's constructed is the bare minimum for construction access. It's for very, very low speeds and very low volume.

MR. BOSI: And remember, that -- those temporary, those aren't recognized in the least bit by -- those specifics aren't recognized at all within this policy. This -- we're talking about an operational side. And the first conversation we started to have about this was Policy 6.5 as it's proposed.

What I've heard from the Chair was potentially replace this 6.5 as is suggested and replace it with a policy that says that we'll explore the utilization of all temporary ramps for emergency egress or ingress.

What staff is going to seek from the Planning Commission, do we want to keep 6.5 as it's proposed today? Well, I know we have the Chair who says that he would like to see it modified. If it is the Planning Commission's desire to leave this in, would you like another policy that says that Collier County government will explore all possible means to utilize existing facilities for emergency egress related to those construction entrances?

And I think from a staff's -- we represent towards what the Planning Commission as a majority and also representing what the minority assent may be to the board so we have a full description of this issue.

And I wasn't sure if we're talking about eliminating 6.5 with the modification as we suggested, leaving 6.5 and adding an additional policy, or what the desire of the Planning Commission would be.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, let's start with 6.5 then, as far as the Planning Commission goes. The specificity here is a concern. So from my perspective, that isn't needed.

Melissa?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I have a question.

I think one of the issues, when we discussed the specificity, was the opportunity for grant funding. If it's not this specific and goes more general to the area, how does that apply to the grant?

MR. BOSI: I would have to defer to Mike. Mike Greene is the individual who has brought millions of dollars in terms of grants to this county, so he knows a little bit more of the specificity of that.

MR. GREENE: When we apply for grant funding, we have to show that we're consistent with our Growth Management Plan, our Capital Improvement Element specifically and also our long-range transportation plan.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: So if you revise this to take out the particular area at Everglades and just kind of generalize, so it's clear that you're seeking an interchange at I-75, just not establishing exactly where, will that still help you?

MR. GREENE: I believe we could work on revised language that maintains needed improvements in these areas without saying specifically, example, I-75 and Everglades. Because even with the interchange justification report, it is still in the area of, and it's one of three locations that's still potential.

The reason I-75 and Everglades itself has been shown on maps and used for discussions is because we are required to be consistent with our long-range transportation plan, and for modeling efforts we have to use items that are in place that we can model.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And for what -- for the benefit of some, at the time Big Cypress was being promoted they actually have maps showing that they were going to participate and support and promote at probably a great savings to taxpayers another location just east and away from Golden Gate Estates that would not disrupt hundreds of home sites in Golden Gate Estates.

So if that were viable in a reasonable time frame and it was at a huge savings to taxpayers and it didn't have any negative impacts to the extent others might, why wouldn't we want to be able to explore that too? And that's my only concern.

So I think Mike, your suggestion is, is that we keep a policy that says we will seek an interchange, an easternmost interchange at I-75, something to that effect, and that we will try to encourage grade separated overpasses in areas that warrant those, that may give you the same emphasis you need but not provide the specificity that takes out a lot of other good opportunities we may have.

MR. BOSI: It would be at the discretion or direction of the Planning Commission to modify this suggestion to say that we're going to identify the general area of these improvements that are needed within the policy, and you'll have the opportunity to comment on the language during the amendment process.

But let the board know that we're going to keep this policy but that the specifics of the language will not be as project or as site specific as it's suggested here, but more in a generalized area.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. And I think the explanation, though, is that because we want to make sure the best opportunity we avail ourselves is the best opportunity, not just one that hasn't been fully vetted out compared to others that may be better.

MR. GREENE: Absolutely. And also the language I would suggest that we add is pending the outcome of future planning studies.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Jim, before we -- do you have anything else you want to say?

MR. FLANIGAN: No, that's kind of where I was going.

But I still want to focus on the egress, as an emergency egress and not a temporary solution. I think that's a --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That would be a separate decision.

Anybody else? Brad?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah.

Mike, how come you're not trying to incorporate the language into the policy yet? You're still carrying the old policy in the book. Wouldn't it be a strike-through and underline at this point?

MR. BOSI: No, we're not changing anything. We're just -- remember, we're raising our hand, this policy is going to be changed. We're not saying what it is or -- I guess in this book we're providing the existing policy to show how it reads today.

Our analysis is this policy has been accomplished, we're going to -- we're proposing to include three potential new projects. And what we're going to say now is three potential new projects, we're going to identify the general area of where improvements would be identified, but not specifically.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But my point is we did that at the workshop and had that exact -- this same conversation. So -- but, I mean, the reason -- because we do have strike-through and underlined on other policies. I'm just wondering why you haven't done it on this one yet.

MR. GREENE: At this phase in the process I could have just simply said that this policy is out of date and needs to be revised and not shown any proposed replacements. That could have waited for the next piece of this when we actually get into tooling the language that will be adopted.

I thought it was more appropriate to bring some of these issues up early on so that we have more time to vet through the public process.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But what you really have is what we had at the workshop. And then we're here --

MR. BOSI: This is really the confirmation of -- the workshop said that this policy was going to be changed. And we're saying yes, this policy is going to be changed. We're not trying to say this is how we're going to wordsmith the policy to be changed. This is one of those areas where we gave more specificity towards where we're going to be going with the direction of the policy change. And maybe that has caused that little kind of a disconnect.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It caused deja vu, that's all.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, no matter what we want to call it, what's this board's continuing position on this?

Melissa, are you inclined to keep the specificity or make it a little bit broader like Mike has suggested?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I think if we can not be so specific but still have the availability to get the grant funding, that was the part of the reason for having it in here, I think that would be fine.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Brad?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'm for non-specific.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Paul?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: The same.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I expressed myself.

Karen?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: I agree with Melissa. As long as it stays in here somehow for additional funding availability.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Diane?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Non-specific.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Barry?

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, I think you've got direction, Mike.

The second item was the idea of adding a policy that would encourage staff to work with other agencies to utilize any emergency accesses, any accesses for emergency purposes for Collier County as such emergency would be declared.

Does anybody seem to have an objection to that?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Just a question on that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Could somebody explain the difference between those two intersections? I mean, if you're building essentially decel lanes and accel lanes, you're essentially building an intersection, if it's going to be used for emergency.

Is there any difference between an emergency intersection and a final public use intersection?

MR. GREENE: Yes, there's actually significant cost differences and radiuses that have to be designed to. With the true emergency only access, as Dan said, you don't necessarily design in acceleration and deceleration lanes.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Right.

MR. GREENE: Your radiuses are much tighter, it's a slower speed, and they compensate for the lack of design issues with operational issues.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, I support that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Melissa?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Does that then become the responsibility of transportation to maintain?

MR. GREENE: It depends on the agreement that we reach. Currently the gravel emergency access that was in place is contained within FHWA limited access right-of-way, and it is not part of the maintenance agreement that Collier County has.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, Mike, I think that's the consensus of the board for direction.

MR. BOSI: So we will add an additional policy to 6.5 -- to group objective six related to -- as we discussed about the utilization of all temporary facilities for emergency access.

And the specifics of that will be provided to you during our next phase of the process.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, with that we'll move on to some of the other elements.

Sanitary -- Jim?

MR. FLANIGAN: If I can come back to Policy 3.3?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Transportation?

MR. FLANIGAN: Yes, transportation.

It calls for arterial and collector roads to be of no less cross-section than six lanes of traffic.

And my concern is when you get into a rural situation and you're looking at villages and towns that are supposed to have recapture and limited mobility between the villages and towns, you know, the self-sustaining community concept, six lanes to me is an urban cross-section and an urban design. And is that appropriate in a rural --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Before you go too far, read down. See where it says Planning Commission comment from the 25th? That comment now will be incorporated into the amendments for some kind of new language that will probably -- and that was done I think to address specifically the issue you just brought up.

MR. FLANIGAN: Okay. Very good then.

MR. GREENE: If I may add something to this item also.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes.

MR. GREENE: The language could be revised a little bit so that we identify a corridor width and not necessarily specifically six lanes. Because as we move into the future, we don't know how we're going to be traveling, and we do need to identify and acquire these corridors for mobility in general. Could be bus, rapid transit, could be light rail, could be pedestrian features.

So more the intent here is to have enough width in right-of-way so that we can put in the facility that we do need in the future. Even if we put in a four-lane divided rural section, usually it has swales and it will take up the same width as an urban six-lane road.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I think the way we worded it, it opens the door for you guys to come back with an amendment that addresses the needs in the best way you feel that it can be, and we can debate it at that time as far as specifics go.

MR. BOSI: I was going to suggest, this will provide a good opportunity during that workshop before you even get to that transmittal as to, you know, the specifics of what you would like to see, and then we can find agreement with that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Next item is the sanitary sewer, countywide assessment.

Does anybody have any issues on that?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And let's just do the water one at the same time. Sewer/water. Anybody have any -- Corby, you do?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Upon my return -- for the record, Corby Schmidt.

Just to note that staff had previously overlooked a small detail in the mapping for both the sanitary sewer and the potable water sub-elements.

Other provisions in the Growth Management Plan adjust the boundaries of the Rural Fringe Mixed Use District, and as those boundaries are adjusted, so adjusted are the boundaries of the sewer and water districts. And those have not kept pace with adjustments, recent adjustments to the Rural Fringe Mixed Use District.

And just a note that those maps -- at least the SS-1 main map for sanitary sewer, and the WT, I believe it is, 1 for wastewater treatment for -- I'm sorry, for potable water, those two maps at least, and perhaps the sub-mapping

would need amendment based on those border or boundary changes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody have any other comments or questions from the sanitary sewer and water?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If not, let's go to drainage, the issues in the drainage section.

Paul?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yeah. I'm going to put something up on the visualizer.

In the drainage section, when you go to the levels of service attained by basins, and go to the urban Immokalee basin, you'll see that we're at a level of service C, which is --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Can you give us a policy number that we can turn to?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Sure. It's under objective two.

MR. BOSI: Policy 2.1.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yes, that's it. The second page.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Page 4.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Exactly, Page 4.

And you see urban Immokalee basin is level of service C. That's despite the fact that Immokalee has very little drainage infrastructure compared to all the other areas of the county that are flatter and have so many different canals and drainage structure, infrastructures there.

And I'd just like to point out that a lot of it is because Immokalee is on a ridge and it sort of slides down into this wetland area. But this is going to come up in the CCME.

What we have in Immokalee is a free infrastructure here of an area where the drainage naturally occurs. And in objective two and five it talks about the county shall maintain adoptive drainage levels of service standards for basins and subbasins. And the maintenance of the drainage level of service identified will be implemented through the watershed management planning process and the CCME.

And in five also, objective five, it talks about protecting the functions of natural drainage features and natural groundwater aquifer recharge areas.

This is going to get into the CCME where we talk about the natural resource value of this Lake Trafford overlay.

And I just want to point out here that it also relates to the drainage element. Because Immokalee is relatively well drained compared to other parts of the county because we have this natural feature here, and we want to maintain as much protection as possible.

As you can see in the map, the overlay encompasses almost all the wetlands that are within the urban area. So it's very compactly drawn. There's very little wetlands that are not part of this slough which, as I was speaking earlier, kind of flows into Lake Trafford from east to west.

And there's going to be the watershed study that's going to be coming out that's also going to be talking about protecting this area. But we'll get more into that when we get into the CCME. But I just wanted to point out that it also relates to the drainage element.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. And are there any specifics on the drainage element that you think have to be addressed now different than what would be on amendment at this time?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. With that we'll move on to solid waste. Are there any issues with solid waste?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Natural groundwater, which is NGWAR. Any issues on that one, the next tab?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The one after that is housing, which Michele I know has a discussion for us and passed out some additional information.

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you, Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you, Corby.

MS. MOSCA: Good morning. For the record, Michele Mosca, Comprehensive Planning staff.

As the Chairman stated, I did pass out the affordable housing inventory. It was a board directed activity. The BCC will hear that particular item on December 14th. So that information is part of an inquiry from the workshops. I've provided that to you folks for your review and for your records.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It looks interesting. Especially what you've come up with. It seems to follow what some of the concerns have been for quite some time but not categorized. That will provide a lot of interesting reading, thank you.

MS. MOSCA: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Melissa?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: There's several items in here referring to City of Naples and that dates need to be established. How are we determining what those dates are going to be?

MS. MOSCA: As part of the amendment process, staff will work with the City of Naples to establish those dates, and we'll bring those back to you as part of the amendment cycle.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anything else, Melissa?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I think that's it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, anybody else? Paul, did you have any housing issues you wanted to bring up?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: No. I'm trying to digest this. I'm kind of having a hard time. I thought that District 5 in Immokalee had most of the low income housing, but it seems like we only have 18 percent, and that's kind of surprising to me.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, I noticed that too. But it also in a lot of ways shows that one of the concerns that Commissioner Fiala had seems to ring true, they've got a lot more -- a lot greater share of affordable housing than some of the other areas do.

MS. MOSCA: And without going into great detail, because we haven't presented it to the board for their review and approval, you will find that because of the variables we looked at zero recurring debt. We also looked at a \$300 reoccurring debt. And based on that, there are so many different scenarios that you could come up with with the inventory for the affordable mortgage rates. And that was based on two and four persons only in the households.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Would it be that Immokalee -- because it seems like we have so much of it, which is not necessarily a bad thing. But are we talking in Immokalee about only the very, very low income?

MS. MOSCA: Well, and again, going through this at a later date, it -- Immokalee does have those three categories: The very low 50 percent, the low, which is 80, and then 120 percent for the moderate. So you do see the full spectrum within Immokalee. I think based on the overall review and the variables, we do see less of the 50 percent range throughout the county, including Immokalee, for affordability for both two and four-person households.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It will be interesting reading. Thank you.

Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: The points that I had brought up before about --

MS. MOSCA: The extremely low?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yeah. What is that? What is the county going to do about that, if anything?

MS. MOSCA: Unfortunately Mr. Ramsey's not available right now, but I know that during the 2004 Evaluation and Appraisal Report, we discussed the possibility of guest homes, both in the Estates and elsewhere, and that was turned down by the Board of County Commissioners.

What the Board of County Commissioners did approve was the density by right in Immokalee only, which likely would reduce the cost of developing affordable housing. So perhaps in the future, if that's the direction of the board, perhaps we look at garage apartments or we take a look again at guesthouses.

We have to consider though the impacts, infrastructure and so forth, and increased density within the county to make sure that we can in fact support those additional units.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Margie?

MS. STUDENT-STIRLING: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. Marjorie Student-Stirling. I'm volunteer legal counsel for Habitat for Humanity of Collier County, Incorporated.

And just a couple points on Policy 1.4. And I've talked with staff a little bit about this and the proposed change to remove the language seek to. We'd like the opportunity to work with staff on perhaps further refinements to

this provision before it comes to you in the form of an EAR amendment.

But keeping in mind that the EAR sets the tone for the following amendments and trying to be proactive, I wanted to let you know we do have some concerns.

On its face it looks great. But we are concerned about when you go into an as applied mode, that this does not create a situation that would severely limit or even keep affordable housing out of the county, given development patterns, historic development patterns and also the historic land costs associated with it.

And again, I've talked a little bit with Michele and we're willing between now and when you bring an amendment back to work with staff on, you know, putting some further refinements to the amendment.

And one other procedural matter, we believe that the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee should have a chance to look at the proposed EAR as it relates to the housing element, and also possibly the study that Michele eluded to. Because in their ordinance as part of their functions, powers and duties, they do need to look at goals, objectives and policies that relate to the housing element. And I believe the language of the ordinance is other directives and so on.

And as to the study that Michele just eluded to, we have been made recently aware of it and have it and I think we'd like to reserve any comments on that to when it's heard by the Board of County Commissioners. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, thank you, Margie.

And Michele and Mike, I'm assuming that any changes will be coming out through the amendment process for further digestion and debate.

MS. MOSCA: That's correct.

Okay, anybody --

MS. ASTON-CICKO: Mr. Chair, I just wanted to make it clear what I believe Margie was saying, and that is what they're opposing is the change that the Planning Commission recommended. They don't want the language shall seek to distribute affordable housing equitably removed and replaced with avoid the concentration of affordable housing units only in specific areas of the jurisdiction. Because they're concerned if they come forward with applications for Habitat in East Naples that they might get denied in the future.

MS. STUDENT-STIRLING: And we'd just --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is that what you were --

MS. STUDENT-STIRLING: We'd like an opportunity to work with staff on that Policy 1.4 because of the concerns about the historic development pattern and cost of land.

And so the effect of it, while on its face it looks wonderful, and we'd love to be throughout the county, but where we can craft something that doesn't totally foreclose or severely limit us. And also give us an opportunity to go into other parts of the county.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you, Margie.

And as you know, an EAR is a prelude to an amendment process that has a lot of -- and we even included this time a workshop. So I think there's going to be more than ample opportunity to debate every issue that's brought in to the EAR process.

Okay, next item up is the recreation and open space element. Anybody have any issues with that?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, the one after that is the CCME. Does anybody have any issues with the CCME?

Paul?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: On Page 30 and 32. On Page 32, that was the meeting that I missed, and there's a note here on the bottom of the page, the Collier County Planning Commission suggests that specific native vegetation requirements for Lake Trafford/Camp Keais Strand system be clarified.

And has anything occurred on that, or any recommendations?

MS. MOSCA: I think the decision has been made to defer this particular item until the Immokalee Area Master Plan comes through. Specifically I'm not aware of the exact language that's being proposed. Either Michael perhaps or Carolina Valera may address that. Thank you.

MS. VALERA: Carolina Valera, Principal Planner with Comprehensive section.

Yes, and we will bring it to you as part of the adoption portion of the Immokalee Area Master Plan. Staff has

looked into that. We have looked at your recommendation or, you know, the sum of the comments in regards to native preservation, 90 percent, versus 25 versus 40 percent, 60 percent. And we have come up with some language and we will bring it to you as part of the adoption hearing of the Immokalee Area Master Plan.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: In the meeting that I wasn't there, there was mention that you might bring it to the CRA to discuss that. And I have a friend who goes to all those meetings and he said it hasn't come before them yet.

MS. VALERA: I wasn't aware that we were going to take it to the CRA meetings, but --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I thought it was going back to the stakeholders in some way.

MR. BOSI: The discussion has been with Penny in terms of the proposed language. Whether she has disseminated that informa -- I'm not sure when she intended to discuss the issue with her CRA board. But the tentative way that we're going to address preservation standards within there has been discussed with the CRA.

MS. VALERA: And they are -- we just received the draft of the revised language just yesterday night. So I -- we'll have to double check I guess with Penny to see if she's going to bring the revised plan to the CRA committee.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: And the other thing was whether the Camp Keais Strand should be designated as a NRPA or not. And this relates to the drainage element. It also relates to Immokalee Master Plan and to the CCME. It seems like it should be, because it is a major flow way and a high functioning natural system. But I don't know what point that would be addressed.

MS. VALERA: Again, as I said, we will bring some language to you as part of the adoption hearing. We have had some conversations. And we have -- also to keep in mind that this is within the urban area. It is not part of the RLSA, the rural fringe. It is part of the urban area. Urban preservation is 25 percent.

Of course that wouldn't make sense for Lake Trafford/Camp Keais Overlay, because we want to retain as much as we can. So we were thinking that maybe the preservation requirements of the neutral lands will make more sense instead of -- which is 60 percent instead of the 25 percent, which is what the preservation requirements are for the urban area.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Well, looking at the map that's still in front of us, the whole overlay is wetlands. Forty percent seems very low. Would you say that you could develop 60 percent of that wetland area?

MS. VALERA: Those that do have some development allowances, you know, uses within those lands that are unique for the urban area and, you know, not like the rural fringe. So the property rights, you know, you do have allowed uses within some of the RT uses that -- the recreational tourist areas we chart different from the rural fringe.

And so as you're saying, you're correct. We also believe -- of course we haven't adopted this and we will bring it to you, but 25 percent seems very low. We need to preserve as much as we can. So we're thinking more of a 60 percent, keeping in mind that all those uses that are allowed within that overlay.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Well, two things come to mind. First of all, in terms of how a NRPA is defined. It's defined -- one of the main ways of defining it is it's a major flow way, which this is.

And the other thing is that when you talk about setting up a watershed management plan, your priority has to be on the areas that are most susceptible to development. And since this is an urban area, that should be addressed just because it's going to be under such great development pressure.

And looking at the fact that Immokalee, only about 28 percent of the land is developed, there's a lot of vacant land that's available, it's not really necessary to develop this wetland area. I think those should all be taken into account.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And if I'm not mistaken, the recommendation from this board last time was to suggest specific vegetation requirements for that area.

MS. VALERA: Correct.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Now, the weight of those requirements, whether they're 25, 60, 80 and all the other terminology to go with it will be the debatable issues coming out when we produce the amendments --

MS. VALERA: Correct.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- at which time then we can weigh in on whether or not they're strong enough.

MS. VALERA: Yes. And we have heard you and yes, we have discussed and we will bring you that language so we can talk about them as part of the adoption hearing of the Immokalee Area Master Plan and, you know, have public input in regards to those and lengthy probably conversation about it.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But to defend -- to protect Paul's position, the fact we have this note in here from the Planning Commission and the other groups, it isn't going to go away.

MS. VALERA: Correct. No, it's --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It's for sure coming back. And there's going to be a lot further refinement.

MS. VALERA: And we already have proposed language which will be part of your packet of the adoption hearings of the Immokalee Area Master Plan. We are not going to wait until the EAR-based adoption hearings, we will do it before.

MR. BOSI: That's the clarification. These other ones you're going to have to wait until we -- until the EAR-based process. This one we'll address within the Immokalee Area Master Plan, the specifics of it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Chuck, did you have something you wanted to add?

MR. MOHLKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If it pleases this honorable committee, my name is Chuck Mohlke, and I appear here as a citizen with an interest in regard to the conservation and coastal management element, particularly those listed under number 12 in your packet.

This concerns particularly Objective 12.1 and other related matters that have to do with natural storm events, notably but not exclusively hurricanes or tropical tornadoes, and the issues that lie around this central theme, some of which are blatant issues that frequently don't emerge in a discussion like this. And I'd like to, Mr. Chairman, if I may, make three points.

First, it seems to me that it would be logical during the EAR process that the municipalities, all of them hurricane vulnerable, have in regard to future plans for evacuation a transportation issue and the displacement of persons whose housing may be damaged extensively during a major storm event. It would be I think desirable to in future discussions at least give consideration to revisiting memorandums of understanding, interlocal agreements and all manner of other issues that have to do in some instances with land use overlays and so on that can be at least assessed as to whether or not there would be appropriately mentioned in any future plan revision issues which are related to what we have learned, particularly from Hurricane Wilma.

Second, there are in the urban area, particularly adjacent to the incorporated municipalities, enclaves that are technically within the county but are treated for the most part as if they were incorporated as a part of a municipality. And all you'd have to do is look under the overview assessment that Mr. Bosi discussed with you.

And on the second page is a map of the urban area that identifies where these overlays are. And I'm not going to be tedious or technical about this and go into great detail about what map two in that section refers to. But all one has to do is to look at these overlay areas. If transporting yourself and your private automobile into the area south of Pine Ridge, north of Creech between U.S. 41 and Goodlette Road there's a heavy aggregation of rental housing, much of it rather elderly, within a half a mile of the Gulf in some instances, that is especially vulnerable in these areas. And although it was not directly impacted to the degree that other areas were by Hurricane Wilma in the future, it will be.

And to have something in these issues that are related to evacuation, displacement of individuals, the repair of damaged commercial units and residences would I think at least be appropriate to be mentioned in the assessment so that it can be properly incorporated into any future land use amendments.

Because number three, the changes in the digital Flood Insurance Rate Map, which were brought to the attention of Collier County residents in the third week in August of this year, starting on the 16th and going through the 20th of August, there will inevitably be serious impacts, both in the urban area and extensively in the area of the Estates never thought to have been a subject for concern based upon FEMA and other federal regulators, and now increasingly state regulators and hopefully regulators in Collier County of how we're going to accommodate to the requirements of that new mapping which is going to inevitably have very serious impacts on future land use, particularly when the area is damaged.

And as a personal anecdote, in the past I've had occasion to be involved directly in some of these major events, particularly a no-named storm in 1993. And if somebody doesn't believe that the impacts of these events cannot be serious after the event, one should have tried to stand at the intersection of the bridge on Collier Avenue that is the northern boundary of Everglades City and watched the receding waters and the impact that they have, which has a great deal to do with FEMA's concerns here. If you stood just correctly, it would knock you down.

Now, I know you only have me saying this, but those are the concerns that are rarely incorporated in here. And I would think that you would pay special attention to the fact that in municipal plans, one notably in Everglades

City, it is a requirement by DCA, a requirement that the county's hurricane evacuation plan be incorporated directly and specifically, not by reference, but in detail in that small community's comprehensive plan. And if they go through the EAR process, no doubt that will have to be addressed, based upon what's happened in recent weather events.

And I would just ask that some special attention be given to this because A, Wilma, B, of the enclave areas that are essentially unaddressed in issues like that by of the municipalities. And thirdly, the implications of the DFIRM mapping and what that will have to do on future land uses and the ability to even utilize some lands that realistically won't be able to obtain flood insurance without significant cost and may have some regulatory scheme developed in the future once the DFIRM maps are firmly in place and have gone through the public hearing and public comment process.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you.

And Mike, there's quite a few good points. And in particular, the idea of our hurricane shelters and their adequacy, especially with the FEMA maps, the transportation, mobility planning, the growth in the RLSA and all the rest of it. A few years back, I can't remember how long ago now, but it's been a while, when we assessed -- we talked about hurricane shelters before, I had called over to the school system to try to find out if their schools were truly hurricane shelters, as defined by Florida statute. And that means certain wind loads and characteristics that I found out -- I was told by the individual -- it's been so long I can't remember who now -- that they didn't build to those standards, they're just schools.

Now, that may not be true, that may be changed or things may have been different, but why don't we get an assessment of each one of these facilities that you passed out on this risk shelter chart you gave us today and see if Barron Collier is built to the right wind loads to really be a hurricane shelter in the category that it's in. Why don't we see if they've got the emergency facilities and products that are required to be a shelter in the definition of Florida statute. Because if we're sending people to these facilities and they're not adequate, are we doing them any good?

MR. BOSI: Well, I wouldn't argue that that would be an appropriate action. I guess would you suggest a policy that would be implemented that on a regular basis all potential and designated hurricane shelters be evaluated for appropriateness in terms of structure integrity?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, no, here's what I'm concerned about. We have some schools that have been around a long time. The current standards for wind loads are greatly changed from when those schools were built. And my question to the individual I talked about years ago was did they build them to the new standards?

Well, no, we didn't, we built them to the standards at the time.

Okay. Well, that may not be a hurricane shelter then. And I'm concerned that we're going to direct people to a school with a -- usually it's bigger gymnasiums and stuff where the standards that were used to build that facility are not the standards we consider hurricane shelters today. Or if they're supposed to have emergency backup or if they're supposed to have water supplies. I don't know what is entailed, but I suggest -- it would be nice to know that we -- if we're saying that Barron Collier is a hurricane shelter, or Veterans Community Park where they have another flag on here there's supposed to be a shelter, if that's a shelter that is built to the standards that shelter's supposed to be built to.

MS. MOSCA: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to speak for Dan Summers. I spoke with his staff the other day. Dan's here.

But the shelters are actually storm dependent. And he probably can address that more. So the type of storm would be dependent upon which shelters were opened.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Then maybe we can find out from Dan how many hurricane shelters -- how many of these buildings are really hurricane shelters. If there's -- I know there's a definition in Florida statute, because developments are required in some aspects to provide hurricane shelters. And I was involved at one point with a development that had that requirement. It was in the CHHA. To do that kind of requirement would have been horrendous. So I'm curious as to how these others qualify.

MR. SUMMERS: Mr. Chairman, Dad Summers for -- Director of the Bureau of Emergency Services and Emergency Management.

You and Mr. Mohlke bring some very big questions. Can I just give you a little bit of framework and background before I get into the specifics?

First of all, understand that we do have what I would refer to as a triage process, based on certain shelters that we use based on -- that are somewhat storm dependent.

And while it is very important, and I'll come back to this, that we also talk about hurricane hardening and resources and shelters and capability, all the things that you've mentioned, there's one very important factor here that always is overlooked in these, and that is exactly -- that's behavior. That's evacuation compliance and behavior, and how far the public is really willing to go for certain level of shelters.

So there's -- while we have some science here associated with building code, we have some estimates associated with evacuee behavior. And we certainly want to get these folks away from the coast line in the event that we have storm surge vulnerability. And we know from lots of behavior analyses that we don't have folks traveling very far in the evacuation process.

So understand that while we address bricks and mortar, we also have to understand some of the behavioral science associated with good evacuation.

And to that point we have, as you have noticed in every hurricane evacuation of any consequence that I've recommended to the board, I too have promoted a voluntary precautionary evacuation to bring census down well before the formal evacuation takes place. And that's been very successful for us in Southwest Florida.

But just a couple of points that -- first of all, you mentioned about the hardening of the buildings, et cetera. The State of Florida does manage a technical data report that they do on all the shelter facilities. We don't have the financial resources to go in and do engineering and architectural assessments on the buildings. However, in the last -- since I've been here in 2003, there's been tremendous cooperation from Collier district schools to build as close to if not including all of those standards in recent construction.

And the one that comes to mind that I can validate is Palmetto Ridge where we do have large sheltering capacity and we use that as our special needs shelter, and the State of Florida funded a large generator for that building to accommodate special needs populations at that location.

There are millions of dollars that I could spend in hardening and additional power supplies that I just don't have. In a lot of cases I try to rent. Some of those cases I try to do small temporary backup power arrangements in those.

But in terms of some of the full-fledged hardening, the financial resources are not there or any of the burdens associated with that hardening we've just not been able to acquire.

So I have a good number of shelters that I feel very confident in in that one to three or one to four category range.

You also have to understand, there's one other point here that Mr. Mohlke brings up in terms of the DFIRM and storm surge mapping. And storm surge and hurricane category now have been disconnected by the National Hurricane Center.

So you can have different storm surge predictions based on the trajectory of the storm rather than basing the storm surge on a particular category.

Now, we have the capability pre-landfall to evaluate that storm surge, 48 hours in advance, 24 hours in advance working with the Hurricane Center and try to make our sheltering arrangements accordingly.

And there's some new study data that the Regional Planning Council's working on. However, we have -- first glance at that particular data, we find that woefully incomplete and a number of confusions in some of those model runs.

So I will tell you that one, we're on top of the shelter capability and the shelter limitations. We don't pretend to have 35,000 shelter spaces, as recommend -- 30 to 40,000 in some of these cases that are recommended. However, we have -- previous storm events have not put us over a shelter population much of about 8,000.

That notwithstanding, we look closely at some of the development issues, and where we find an opportunity for hurricane mitigation credits through a DRI, we do attempt to work on that. However, the market has been such that we've not been able recently to do anything with hardening or hardened structures or new structures. Typically our urgent need are things like supplies and other portable generators. So just to give you the framework of that, that we're paying very close attention to that.

Also, although fortunately we've not had significant DRI review activity, if we go into formal assessments, as Mr. Mohlke has recommended, I'm just not tooled up to have the staff or to review a formal assessment between say a DRI and other hurricane evacuation impacts. I don't have the tools or the resources or personnel to look at that, and I'm not sure that many of my counterparts are doing that in the emergency management community on a formal level.

So I just want to tell you that we're very much engaged in all that. We look at that every day of the year as

part of our planning process. But these shelter facilities in terms of a reassessment, we have some of that technical data that it's probably no more than three years old and we haven't had any construction of new schools in that period.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The -- have you seen this risk shelter diagram given to us today?

MR. SUMMERS: I did. And part of that -- Michele put that together at staff's request.

And I will tell you that one of the things, that -- those are our primary candidate shelters. We wanted you to be aware of all of the potentials that we had.

And in all hazards environment, whether it's flood, tornado, wildfire or hurricane, each storm, the characteristics of that storm, the trajectory, the anticipated storm surge, we go through a decision-making process as to which one of those we will use, whether it's all of them or in some cases we've filled them in certain orders.

Because Barron Collier, as an example, is not typically a shelter we would use if we anticipate an overwhelming storm surge. That has some vulnerability. However, if we have an exiting storm where we're not anticipating water and it is Category 1 or 2, that becomes an eligible shelter. So while you see a paten list of shelters, understand that as the characteristics of the storm or the hazard are reviewed by us, it is that process that we go about pulling those shelters from that candidate list.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So you have enough information so that if a Category 4 was coming through Collier County, you would know which shelters could withstand that and provide ample comfort to the amount of population that would be needed to go to that shelter from this list, for example?

MR. SUMMERS: Our best estimate, yes, sir. I mean, nothing is a certain based on -- we are very conservative in all of the posturing that we do with the shelter and the storm's trajectory.

Let me also mention one other thing to you, sir, and you brought up a good point about sheltering in gymnasiums. While we look at the building as a whole for hurricane hardening, there are two other options that are very much within our planning process for sheltering.

While we might be pre-storm or post-storm, depending on the wind speed, the gymnasium may be okay to use. However, good sense and wind load engineering will tell you why I put that many people in one open space. And very quickly, we might want to move individuals into interior hallways and classrooms. What we call taking a tornadic posture for three, four, five hours during the storm until the high intensity storm winds move on. So we don't put folks in open spaces or large wind load spaces during that critical period.

All of our storms to date have in most cases allowed us to do that based on storm information, but the backup plan for that is to bring them into a tornadic type posture for a couple hours into your hallways and classrooms, and I think that adds an additional level of safety in that process.

So we're not using the large spanned areas totally throughout the sheltering process. Maybe pre and post, but not during the peak part of landfall.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. And in conjunction with the hurricane issue, I remember reading in the prior part of the CIR (sic), I think it was transportation, they're going to do an assessment of the standards that we maintain on our hurricane evacuation routes too. So add that to the standards you're now looking at and categorizing shelters. We've got both the exits, categorize them by transportation and the shelters by how they rate.

MR. BOSI: And it's Policy 5.8 of the transportation. It was recommended that on an annual basis we do that and evaluate those links.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think there's even a Florida statute that requires no approvals if you have a hurricane evacuation route operating below the adopted level of service.

So by doing what you're doing, you're creating the level of service, maintaining it and then if it fails, anything that has access to that road may have a -- if it's more than one percent, more than diminimous impact, you may have a problem getting approved. So --

MR. SUMMERS: Mr. Chairman, that's a very good point. May I elaborate on that --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Sure.

MR. SUMMERS: -- just for a second and tell you that I really have -- I as a practitioner have some challenges. And I will tell you what they are. Number one is that not everyone leaves to evacuate at the exact same moment. So I don't have a good behavior analysis recommendation for the transportation planners as to when that road segment meets capacity. And I've always told folks, number one, that's why I do a precautionary voluntary evacuation, is hope that some of the folks will leave early and that will bring some of your trip count down.

The other component of that is that everyone makes -- we know from behavioral analysis everyone makes

that decision to leave at different times. So I have a hard time in that science.

I support that concept wholeheartedly, but we have to go back to other estimates and other tools and those kind of things, again because of the challenges around an individual's behavior.

The other part of that is that there is some new study data that the Regional Planning Council released and drafted to us about a week or so ago. And I will tell you that one of the things that is very disheartening is that a lot of the roads that were under construction in 2008 and where they were at capacity was the basis for the new study. Now our roads are complete, I-75 three-lane north and southbound being completed. So we have not gone through yet and analyzed nor accepted some of the transportation components out of that regional evacuation study yet. Again, because I think it wound up being about 18 months old and there's a lot that has changed since then.

So understand that some of those products are out there, but they are still going through our review at this point, and bring some caution to you as to saying that's the latest and greatest estimates.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you very much, Dad.

Melissa, then Brad.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I'm wondering if the different colors shown on this chart denote a different risk level or what that represents. Like each school had -- or each location has a -- or is color coded.

MR. SUMMERS: No, ma'am, I don't think that was intended. That was just intended to give you a -- that's a good point. I think it was just intended to give you an approximate location.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Brad?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: My question, Dan, when the -- you know, we have different evacuation zones, and you do things on streets too. If the shelter is in an evacuation zone, is it evacuated?

MR. SUMMERS: No, it's not. And it depends -- well, it depends exactly on what we anticipate with the storm surge modeling at that particular point.

If the zone -- let's go back to the Airport Pulling Road, Barron Collier. I am not so good, nor is the Hurricane Center, to tell you that east or west of Airport Pulling is a defined line for storm surge. So again, it would be dependent, if I'm expecting storm surge and Barron Collier is within 300 feet, unless I know there's significant changes in finish floor elevation, most likely I would not use it. And I have not done that.

However, if we survive that and the building remains intact and I need it for a service center or a secondary shelter post-event, then obviously I have the option of using that.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, thanks.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Dan, thank you very much. Appreciate your information.

We're on the CCME. Does anybody else have any other questions on the CCME?

(No response.)

MS. MOSCA: Mr. Chairman, I have a few, if the other members are not --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead.

MS. MOSCA: On Objective 3.1, just a point of clarification. The Planning Commission recommendation from the workshop was to retain the text as written. I believe the intent was to retain the text as written except to allow the reference to the establishing of the monitoring network. And that's on Page 16.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I would concur with that. Does anybody else have any issue with it?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: She's going to modify the monitoring aspects of that.

MS. MOSCA: Right.

And then I spoke with Nicole Ryan yesterday regarding Policy 6.3.3. And that's on Page 34 of your packet.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That was the only issue I was going to bring up to you too, so --

MS. MOSCA: Okay. I just wanted to restate The Conservancy's position, that they would like the text to be retained as written.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, but she goes farther. And I want to get your input on this. At the August 27th CCPC meeting, Michele Mosca indicated based upon inquiry as to why the policy would be deleted, that staff was no longer recommending deletion, that the policy would remain.

Since that was said -- so you're not -- now you're reversing that, or did you not say that at the meeting?

MS. MOSCA: Well, my understanding from Gary McAlpin is that they were okay with retaining the text as written. Initially coming from their group they had said to remove the policy.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So then why are you still recommending it be deleted?

MS. MOSCA: It's just a historical portion of the document. So what we can do is post CCPC, this particular hearing, we can say staff is in agreement and we'll go ahead and retain that policy as written.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So then when we come back for the amendment cycle, we won't be seeing this one being changed.

MS. MOSCA: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. I think that's consistent with what the Planning Commission's notes are from written before and what you had said, so that works.

And next? Anything else?

MS. MOSCA: I don't have anything else, thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, that wraps up the CCME. We'll move on to the intergovernmental coordination element, the ICE.

Does anybody have any issues in the ICE?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I see Chuck moving up to the microphone, so --

MR. MOHLKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chuck Mohlke again with a comment on, if I may, the interlocal agreements.

Sometimes in these comments we are often too critical of a missing detail or an unobserved event in the past. But for those of us, and we're small in number, who were involved in the recent efforts to incorporate a school concurrency element into the comprehensive plan, I would suggest that it represents a very comprehensive model of the way in which intergovernmental units should cooperate with one another and the development of that new element to the plan. And the very detailed interlocal agreement that helps implement the features of the plan is deserving at some point in time maybe of recognition for a process that unfolded in a very systematic, careful, planful (sic) way and ended up with a new feature of the plan that will complement nicely such things as the Future Land Use Element, the development of very detailed population estimates so as to better accommodate future school populations, will have an impact certainly on the transportation element, particularly when issues that are related to when a road will be built and how it will accommodate the need to provide for future students at every grade level in Collier County.

And I just thought perhaps it would be appropriate to mention an example of how intergovernmental coordination and cooperation worked well in recent years, and if we can use it and some of the things that we've learned from transportation planning in the past, maybe the consideration in the future of overlays where there are issues regarding adjacencies to municipalities or adjacencies to federally and state regulated lands, that we can learn something from that very steady, careful and well orchestrated process that led to the school concurrency element. And thank you for the opportunity to make these remarks.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you, Chuck.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Question, Chuck?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Brad?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Chuck? Back here, Brad.

Since we brought the school district in, do you think we should bring in the fire districts too?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ooh, you want to step into that?

MR. MOHLKE: Well, I'd be glad to in just -- in one limited way.

Because the independent district accountability act of 1989, amended in 1997, in no instance that I'm aware of acknowledged the fact that independent districts that play an important role in the community need to be a part of the comprehensive planning process, and they're not. About the only time that they get even mentioned in implementing documents like the Land Development Code is when issues of collocation come up. How can these new important essential services be accommodated in terms of land use. And how can they be accommodated in close coordination with other users of land that provide essential services; sheriff substations, for example, the constitutional officers are only loosely related to the comprehensive planning process. Very loosely related.

And if there is a way that some enlightened legislator could champion the motion that 163 and all the

adjacent occupants, particularly 189, 190, and those other statutes that affect the independent districts could call for the kind of coordination that was so well illustrated by the adoption of new provisions to put school concurrency into comprehensive Growth Management Plans, that would be a beginning.

Because right now we don't really have a mechanism except as we call upon people of goodwill to reach across the table and shake hands and say let's work together. Other than that, we have a long and unhappy history of lack of cooperation and coordination. And hopefully that will be changed in the future.

But if you can encourage putting independent districts, as the school district once was, totally absent from mention in the comprehensive plan, except in some ways related to transportation, hurricane evacuation and other matters, I think it would be a great contribution legislatively, at least in Southwest Florida.

Is that responsive?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It's good, thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you, Chuck.

It's interesting to see different perspectives. I remember the school board episode as being one of the worst ones that I experienced. The browbeating, the intimidation, the demands that were put upon the county and the county process that it had to deal with, I didn't see it as a good solution. I saw it as a very difficult process. I remembered explicitly. And I remember meeting with Michele numerous times.

And I appreciate Chuck's perspective on it, but I see it a little differently. So maybe the outcome was beneficial. I'm not sure whose -- what side of the taxpayers won on that one yet, though.

So with that said, there's no other things on the intergovernmental issue, let's move on to the future land use.

Jim, is this an intergovernmental?

MR. FLANIGAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. FLANIGAN: I just want to bring up the point that the watershed management plan covers a whole myriad of governmental agencies that need to be involved between Corps of Engineers and Water Management District. And I don't know if there's any policy within these intergovernmental coordination elements that calls them to come to the table and cooperate. So that's just the point I want to make.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you.

Mac, when you finish for example your watershed plan, are you going to have to submit it to the agencies for sign-off and concurrence, or how does that work?

MR. HATCHER: Mac Hatcher, Stormwater and Environmental Planning.

We're not required to submit to the agencies for sign-off. We do have representatives from the Water Management District, DEP, EPA, City of Naples, City of Marco participating in the process. We have planned presentations to the Big Cypress Basin board, the City of Naples. So it's I guess cooperation amongst staff primarily at this point.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So if you produce a watershed management plan, that will generally have impact with certain regulations on a county ordinance basis. And we adopt it and we decide to go forward with whatever impacts it may have regulatory-wise for our efforts, would the South Florida Water Management District be obligated to adhere to our concerns in regards to watershed management, or are they still going to go on their merry way and we have a plan that's maybe not directly in alignment with theirs?

MR. HATCHER: From a permitting standpoint, I believe they'd be obligated to go with our regulations.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Even where they conflict with ours?

MR. HATCHER: If our regulations were more stringent than theirs, they would be obligated to go with us. We could not expect them to adopt a less stringent standard if we did.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So the coordination basically is whoever's interpretation is, is of the strictest provision.

MR. HATCHER: I believe that's correct.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So that's not much coordination.

MR. HATCHER: It's certainly not full coordination.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No. Now, it's a good comment, it's a good thought. Is there a way that coordination can be improved through this element of the GMP?

MR. BOSI: I mean, we can suggest a policy towards where we establish a formal mechanism of cooperation

between Collier County and the Water Management District, if that's --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I mean, it's already there, they actually review -- we actually give them the review of water management planning right now, I think. We defer most of it to them anyway.

I'm just wondering in the watershed management process, why aren't we seeking more coordination in regards to this kind of an issue? It would be terrible to have a -- go through all this effort after years and have this plan established only to have South Florida say well, we still like our interpretation better so we're going to go by ours. And I wonder why we wouldn't have gone there in the first place.

MR. BOSI: I guess I, not being part of the meetings and discussions between Mac and the staff of South Florida Water Management District, I'm not sure if that's not already going on as it exists today.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think it's a good heads up. If you get this plan done, and it doesn't seem to be supported, you've got problems.

MR. HATCHER: Yeah. I mean, we've always intentioned to bring to the attention -- or bring to the attention of the commissioners any areas that might be contrary to state or federal policies. It just seems a little presumptuous of us to expect the state and federal agencies to --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Adhere to our standards.

MR. HATCHER: Right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And I didn't -- I would agree with you. I was just curious as to how far that's been thought out with them in regards to their signing off on it except saying that this meets our minimum standards. Instead we're going to meet our standards and if it doesn't meet theirs, they're still going to abide by theirs. That's interesting.

MR. HATCHER: It's more up to us to meet their standards than them to meet ours.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you, I think it's a point well made.

Anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Let's move on to the Future Land Use Element.

As far as lunch goes, everyone, I'm not sure how much longer we have. We could wrap it up in an hour, hour and a half or we could take lunch and come back and wrap it up after lunch.

What do you guys -- what's the preference of the board? So I know when to give Cherie' a break.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: If we're going to be an hour and a half, I'd rather have lunch.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, it could be. I just don't know how long we're going to -- you know, we've got speakers and people are going to be addressing things. So it's hard to say how long we're going to take on each one.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Let's take a break now.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, well, we'll -- oh, you want -- Barry's looking for lunch or a break?

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Lunch.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So what we'll do is about 11:45 we'll break for an hour for lunch and we'll finish up after lunch. So let's just go on for another 15 minutes.

David? Oh, you're here because of any issues with the FLUE. Or did you have an opening statement you want to make?

MR. WEEKS: Actually, for the record, I'm David Weeks of the Comprehensive Planning Section.

And I do have three items I would like to discuss briefly. The first two are comments from the FDOT regarding recommended changes to the density rating system and the Future Land Use Element.

One of the proposed changes is to eliminate the traffic congestion area boundary and the associated density reduction factor of one dwelling unit per acre and replace it with a coastal high hazard area density reduction factor of one unit per acre.

The effect is to take the boundary and move it seaward, which means that that density reduction factor applies to fewer properties or, conversely, allows higher density on a greater number of properties now.

And staff is in evaluation and determined that approximately 480 acres would now be eligible for a density increase by shifting the boundary as proposed. That translates into approximately 6,500 trips additional. And that's based upon a rule of thumb of six trips per day for multi-family, 10 per day for single-family, and assuming a 50/50 split between dwelling unit types.

Now, that I would say is at or near the maximum impact. I purposely discounted properties that those zoned

agricultural and that's our typical up-zoning, occurs from agriculture. They're developed with substantial buildings, developed with schools, with churches, other types of institutional development.

I don't think it's reasonable to assume that all 480 acres will first of all come forward for rezoning to residential. Secondly I don't believe it's reasonable to assume that all of those properties that do come forward would ask for a density increase that would result from this change. That is, if the property's eligible for three units per acre, they may not pursue a density higher than that.

But that would be the maximum impact, approximately 6,500 trips, 806 dwelling units.

The second comment from FDOT had to do with the change to the residential infill density bonus.

And I want to stress first of all that the change that is being proposed does not increase the density in and of itself. The residential infill density bonus is for three dwelling units per acre today, and with our proposed change it will still be three units per acre. The change is to how the density is derived.

You might recall, many of you, that back in 2002 when we adopted the rural fringe, the Growth Management Plan Amendments, we modified this density bonus provision to now require that the first of the three dwelling units in that bonus be obtained through a TDR credit, transfer of development rights credit, from the rural fringe area. It was intended to help make that TDR program successful, to force it to be used in the urbanized area.

Actually, the -- about the only effect that that has happened is that this density bonus is no longer used. People avoid it. It's been used I believe once since 2002.

Staff proposes that that requirement be removed. Our rationale is that it is not fulfilling its objective of helping the TDR program be successful. And because it existed previously ever since 1989 up to 2002, it was deemed an appropriate density bonus then and we still think it is today without that TDR requirement.

It's difficult to quantify what the impact will be, because the actual density bonus does not change. But staff would expect the bonus to be used more than it is with the TDR requirement.

The maximum impact, that is assuming 100 percent utilization of this density bonus, could result in about 2,800 dwelling units or about 2,300 trips. And if you go to what I think is closer to but probably still too high of a reasonable figure, it would be 714 dwelling units at about 5,700 trips.

And just as with the traffic congestion area bonus, this is applicable throughout the coastal urban area, so it's not necessarily concentrated in one particular area. It goes from near the Lee County line all the way down to the vicinity of Collier Boulevard and U.S. 41.

And my third -- unless there's comments or questions on those two.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I have one.

If we change this density to make it easier for someone to utilize them, which this would do it, I think you're even acknowledging they would be used more, what are we saying in regards to the requirement of compatibility? I mean, we have an odd -- I shouldn't say an odd way, we have a complex way of assessing compatibility. And it's done sometimes by buffers, the heights of trees, the number of trees, the -- whether there's a wall, the distance for the parking lots and things like that. And we look at quantity, how much the density is on a parcel next to another parcel.

By clearing out this methodology to either reduce or increase your density and by eliminating the TDR requirements and even going from a traffic reduction to a CHA and moving that line further west, are we causing any obligations to award density if it is proven to be incompatible?

MR. WEEKS: I don't think it anyway. Because the density bonuses are not entitlements, they're discretionary. And the rezoning criteria in the Land Development Code includes compatibility, includes infrastructure impacts and so forth. So those same rezoning considerations that apply today will apply tomorrow if this density bonus changes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So the density bonuses are still always optional.

MR. WEEKS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, thank you.

MR. WEEKS: The third point I just wanted to touch on is pertaining to the planning horizon issue. And we have a future land use map with a planning horizon of I think 2016. It's out of date. It needs to be moved out. We have the RLSA program with a 2025 time horizon. We have transportation maps under the MPO that are out to 2030 and soon will be out to 2035. We have inconsistent time horizons; we've identified that as an issue here.

And we've also, in the most recent round of GMP amendments, we adopted a policy that says during this EAR we will identify this issue and rectify it during the EAR-based amendments.

I just wanted to point out that we don't know yet what that planning horizon is going to be that we're going to choose to make the dates align. It sounds simple, just pick a date and apply that date across the board. But the impacts it has upon the various planning programs that the county has may be significant. We need data and analysis to support whatever planning horizon we choose. So if we pick 2025 or 2030, or whatever it may be, we have to make sure we have different infrastructure components planned out that far, transportation, water, wastewater, et cetera.

And one issue in particular has come up recently and was discussed in a different context earlier and that was the interchange future, possible interchange, in the vicinity of I-75 and Everglades Boulevard.

Well, such an interchange is identified in the 2035 transportation maps under the MPO, but it is not identified in the Growth Management Plan transportation maps. And that would need to occur at some point in time before that interchange at whatever chosen location could go forward.

I just wanted to touch on the fact that there are -- it's going to be a task to come up with the date and the supporting data and analysis, but it is something we must do and we will do.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. And David, are you going to be here after we finish the FLUE? Do you have other reasons to be in the room?

MR. WEEKS: I can stick around.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, no, no, we can try to finish the FLUE before lunch if you're intending to leave for the rest of the day. Or if you're going to be here anyway, we'll just try to -- we'll break at an earlier time and come back to you.

MR. WEEKS: I would prefer not to stick around.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Then we'll try to finish up the FLUE, if we can do so quickly.

Chuck, did you have something you want to add before we get into our questions?

MR. MOHLKE: I did. Mr. Chairman, thank you. Again, Chuck Mohlke.

Not enough can be said about David Weeks' institutional memory and his contribution of probably approaching 30 years to improving our understanding of land use issues --

MR. WEEKS: I'm not that old, Chuck.

MR. MOHLKE: -- in Collier County.

Disclaimer noted.

There is another element, Mr. Chairman, that you and I have talked about from time to time that bears directly on Mr. Weeks' third point here. Not only do we have these inconsistencies in terms of Future Land Use Maps and the timing of them, but we have one of those rare instances, we won't have it again until the years 2030 and '31, in which there is a coincident in time, the census, the EAR, the transportation development plan and a wide variety of other regularly scheduled reviews of land uses and mapping and population concerns.

There is beginning to be an ability on the part of all the affected jurisdictions to harmonize their population estimates with what we will soon find the census will tell us as to whether or not there are inconsistencies between our earlier estimates and today.

But there is another element of this which is land use related that I'd just like to mention now and not expect Mr. Weeks to comment on except as he thinks is appropriate.

To be blunt about it, we have land use mapping issues which are grossly out of date. For example, the planning community districts drawn in 1982 based upon the census of that time, and thought to be of great importance because of the way in which it harmonized with the newly created Metropolitan Planning Organization or MPO.

You have throughout the early parts of the EAR documents that you have in front of you, particularly under the first item assessments, that use for purposes of historic rendering of what's happened since the last EAR in respect to residential growth, commercial growth and a variety of other things.

These boundaries have changed significantly in terms of the way in which areas adjacent to the municipalities have changed. And many of them represent issues in which important essential municipal services metastasize into the unincorporated area and cover all the issues that are related to potential future land use.

But nowhere that I'm aware of, and I stand to be corrected, is there really a coherent form of coordination and cooperation between municipalities and county government -- it could perhaps happen with the EAR process at the municipalities this next year -- in which they could be treated as a unified entity and not as an accent of annexation and a variety of other things.

We're creating, in these enclaves that I spoke about before, pockets that are going to have to be addressed by somebody sometime that are related to law enforcement, housing issues, hurricane evacuation, transportation, the list could go on.

I would urge that somewhere, Mr. Chairman, there be addressed the issue of should we look at wholesale major revisions in the community development districts and the planning process in terms of how we gather data, how we report data and how those users of data come before you when they petition this committee and the board for map amendments, future land uses and a wide variety of other things. Because we now have great disproportionality in the way in which this information is handled and the way information gathered from the Property Appraiser, other constitutional officers and other agencies, some of them local, some of them not, and the way in which these differing points of the view that are essentially population driven, but not always, they're not compatible. They need to be made compatible. And Mr. Weeks knows a great deal about this.

And just as a closing comment, some of this will become apparent to the Board of County Commissioners and others who have to change district boundary lines next year in terms of the reapportionment and redistricting process.

And brand new population information will be made widely available, which will differ profoundly, let me assure you, profoundly, with the estimates which are now available based upon which we develop planning instruments and accommodate to future needs.

And I would hope that this modest comment made here could be incorporated in some manner in the future use of census information and the coordination of these activities with our other units of local government. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you.

With the Planning Commission's permission, I would like to finish up the FLUE before we break for lunch. Is that okay?

And Cherie', would that work for you?

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Hopefully we'll move forward.

David, Chuck's comments. I think one of the most blatant issues that came up is this idea of affordable housing and how by district by district it was evaluated, and it didn't seem to fit reality.

Now you guys have come back and done it by another methodology. Sometimes you can look at it area by area. Like East Naples isn't one commission district, it's actually three. So your planning communities that we have also don't follow any other lines. We have commission districts, we have planning committee districts, we have different levels of districts.

Is there an opportunity to realign planning districts to give us a better evaluation? Is something -- is what Chuck said an idea that may work? And I'm not sure the EAR is the right answer for that, but I'd like to get your input or response.

MR. WEEKS: A couple of things. One, staff has been resistant to changing the boundaries to the planning communities previously because we like the ability to have historical data. If you leave the boundaries the same, then as you gather data over time you always have a consistent apples to apples comparison. East Naples is East Naples, North Naples is North Naples and so forth.

But I cannot disagree with Chuck that as the county has developed more and more and more, you do have to scratch your head and say well, why do we have the central Naples planning community at that location? We may find that it might be appropriate to have fewer planning communities, or maybe the opposite, have more planning communities.

We're to tie it in with the EAR. There is a place. I don't have the Future Land Use Element with me, but it's under objective four. There is a policy that refers to collecting and reporting data by certain geographies, by communities and whatever terminologies. And we've historically done that primarily by planning community, and then we've also by population data, commercial inventory, industrial inventory and so forth.

Planning communities, county-wide, unincorporated, the municipalities, that policy under objective four would be the appropriate place, if you so desire, to add a comment that the county consider changing its planning community boundaries.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I wouldn't take that far of a leap. I would suggest that we make sure the

policy allows you to evaluate the effectiveness of the planning communities at every EAR opportunity. I mean, that gives you every seven years you can go back and say okay, is this planning community the most effective the way it's done now. And the effectiveness could be weighed on historical content, it could be weighed on political boundaries or whatever. Or even the census as it comes out.

I think that would give you some flexibility for right now. And if we notice that my goodness, we're really remiss in the way we've not addressed these boundaries before, we can tighten that one up next time.

But I think right now we ought to just take the exploratory approach and say are we as effective, based on the information we have, by leaving it the way it is. And I think if you were to write that ability to explore that into a policy and consistent with the -- concurrent with the EAR process, I think that would be a good way to approach it, to take a look at it. It wouldn't hurt to take a look at it. I think it's a very good comment.

Does anybody have any objection to that?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: No.

COMMISSIONER HORNIK: No.

MR. WEEKS: Mr. Chairman, if I understand what you're suggesting is to add an EAR comment that we --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Evaluate the planning communities that we currently have to see if they're aligned in the best fashion based on current information.

MR. WEEKS: I think that's good.

And as Chuck has pointed out, this is a good time, because we're going to have the release of census data, starting with certain population data next year and then over the year or two after that additional data from the Census Bureau. And that's the ideal time, if we're going to make changes, when we get a fresh set of census data.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good. Thank you, Chuck, that was a good suggestion.

Okay, we're back on the FLUE, David's finished his comments.

Anybody else have any comments on the FLUE?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I have one, and it's for David and Mike both.

You're reducing the density in the coastal high hazard area by -- or you will by the suggested language. How are you balancing out the affordability? And I don't mean just affordable housing. When you lower density, you increase per unit costs.

We're almost saying that we're going to make the coastal area of Collier County an exclusivity for people who can afford more.

Have you thought about how that discourages the demographics of the area based on economics or income?

MR. WEEKS: I have not specifically evaluated that, Mr. Chairman. I was coming at this from a perspective of the way this has been since 1989 when we adopted this plan. The coastal high hazard area has allowed for higher densities, but at the same time it's the area where we want to discourage high densities from developing.

It's always been a balancing act. Because there is the legitimate concern of not putting population and structures, property, in harm's way within the coastal high hazard area, but at the same time recognizing that we historically have had quite a need for affordable housing.

And the way it's been dealt with initially, go back to the '89 plan, there was actually a limitation on the number of affordable units through the density bonus for affordable housing that could be developed within the coastal high hazard area, and then over time that was amended to be removed to simply open the door to an unlimited number.

I'm suggesting that we eliminate that opportunity for the bonus, that we impose a cap of four units per acre without the exception of affordable housing. And coming at it from a -- shifting the balance to the safety concern.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: How often has someone taken advantage of putting an affordable housing in the coastal high hazard area?

MR. WEEKS: Very limited. It's limited.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The only reason, it seems like we're really going to really have -- you talk about enclaves or isolated factors, we're going to create an enclave of exclusivity for those that can afford the lower densities along the most preferred area of the county, which is the coast, to those that can't, which will force everybody who can't further inland.

I'm not sure if that's setting the right tone in regards to how we look at equality of everybody's ability,

whether -- no matter what their income is, to benefit from an asset like our shoreline, or being close to the coast.

We don't have the adequate number of beach accesses now, we don't have an adequate number of parking, boat slips, anything, unless you've got a lot of money. And I'm not sure that's the right thing we should be doing in this county. I'm not sure this -- I'm not sure that this is going to not simply encourage that even more, which I see as a bad thing. I'm sure the people living on the coast don't see it that way, but --

MR. WEEKS: I just wanted to point out, I don't have quantification, as I was discussing earlier about other matters, but the coastal high hazard area, it's significantly built out. The opportunity for rezonings for affordable housing densities or not is rather limited. Essentially it is west of U.S. 41, it does jog around some, but west of 41 from the Lee County line coming down to approximately Golden Gate Parkway. And then it jogs east over more or less to Airport Road and then down to 41 east.

And if you look at the map and you look at the zoning of the land as well as what's actually developed -- because the zoning I think is equally as important as what is actually developed. Because if the zoning is in place, someone has to make the decision that that's what they believe is appropriate for their land.

My point is that the opportunity for the rezoning to implement this affordable housing density is limited.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: What would it hurt to leave it in then? If that rare occasion comes along that another cross-section of the community can benefit from a place closer to the beach, what's wrong with it? I mean, people who have a lot of money got to evacuate just like people who don't. And if it's not going to have that much of an impact on the overall density, what are we worried about? Why paint that picture that we want to have that more exclusive area? I'm not sure that's a good thing to do.

MR. WEEKS: That's the good counterpoint.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Mark?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: On that point too, and I agree with you, is David, the building codes and all the regulations are protecting the people in those areas. I mean, granted, they'll have to evacuate, but a structure built properly should survive. So there's no danger there being in that area, other than the inconvenience of evacuating.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And I think the position I'm taking is that fine, go to the reduction in the coastal high hazard area under standard density, eliminate the traffic congestion like you're suggesting, but don't eliminate the ability for a density bonus in the CHHA. That leaves the diversity we might somehow happen. Even though it might be very rare and limited, at least it's not completely slamming the door.

And that's -- Brad seems -- Melissa.

Paul, are you against less expensive housing?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

Barry, Diane, Karen anybody?

COMMISSIONER HORNIK: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, I think the consensus -- that's the general consensus, so --

MR. WEEKS: Mr. Chairman, could I ask for clarification? Because they're actually by -- I'm reading through on Page 13 of the Future Land Use Element. And it's the last paragraph -- second to the last paragraph on the page.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. That's where I have my note, how do we balance the income levels, so -- what was your point?

MR. WEEKS: My comment is that I'm looking at the last line on that -- or starting on the next to last line, after the semicolon. And revise the conversion of commercial bonus to prohibit its application within the coastal high hazard area.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. WEEKS: I may have been misspeaking earlier to talk about the affordable housing.

I'm looking for the language that refers -- but I think you're correct, I just want to make certain -- about what exactly I propose, that it would place an absolute cap at four units per acre. Which means no bonuses, affordable housing or otherwise.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, that's what I thought you were intending. If I was wrong that -- that's fine. I'm just suggesting, and it's something that you could pursue afterwards, but I think this board is saying generally the

reduction in the CHHA is okay, but don't eliminate the affordable housing density bonus.

MR. WEEKS: Could I break this into a couple of different areas then? Maybe leave the affordable housing as the only bonus that would be applicable.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah.

MR. WEEKS: I believe there's only two bonuses right now applicable in the coastal high hazard area. Most of the others explicitly state that they're not applicable there. Or as part of this amendment we're proposing that where there's a reference now to a bonus not applying in the traffic congestion area, that instead that change to say this bonus would not be applied -- applicable to the coastal high hazard area. So I think the only two are affordable housing and conversion of commercial bonus.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But you're removing that by the last line of that paragraph you referred to.

MR. WEEKS: Right. So what I'm asking then, would the Commission find it acceptable to remove the conversion of commercial bonus but not remove the affordable housing density bonus.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think that's what we acknowledged.

MR. WEEKS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I don't think any -- I mean, myself, I didn't have a question about your commercial. The conversion of commercial bonus without requiring it to be affordable, doesn't help anybody except make more higher price units somebody can profit from in a very limited exclusive area.

MR. WEEKS: Right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think all I'm trying to suggest is if there's a possibility, and you're saying that it could be even very rare, if indeed at all, if we don't have to be so exclusive and can provide some affordable housing, we can do it.

I don't think it will ever happen, but at least it's a chance.

Okay, anybody else have any other questions on the FLUE before we let David run?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, we'll break for an hour for lunch. Let's come back at 1:00 and we will then resume by picking up the Golden Gate Area Master Plan comments at that point.

(Luncheon recess.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, thank you, Mike.

Welcome back everyone from our very, very cold lunch. Where we normally sit was not pleasant today.

So with that in mind, we'll move into where we left off, which was the Golden Gate Area Master Plan portion. Let's just proceed like we always have.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Corby.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Does anybody have any questions about the Golden Gate Area Master Plan?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And Corby, you have an introduction you want to start out with?

MR. SCHMIDT: Just quickly, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Sure.

MR. SCHMIDT: A number of entries from previous meetings or workshops where direction was taken or recommendations were given have been changed based on latest recommendations or direction from you in that these items be put off until the Golden Gate area restudy can look at them comprehensively. I believe there's more than 20 changes like that in here that covers almost all of the items that had been discussed previously.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. And I believe the community -- and it's the preference of the community, at least the members that I spoke to, and Jim Flanigan was here, I don't know if he's coming back for this or not. We're looking forward to the time we can have that reassessment done as we --

MR. EBY: There he is.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: There he is.

We're talking about you, buddy.

One policy, though, I'd like to ask you about, and it's Policy 6.2.4. That policy is not currently in the Golden Gate Area Master Plan. And I'm a little concerned about it. And I know this is one that is referred to as being deferred until taken up by the comprehensive master plan, but let me explain to you my concern. And I guess it's because of past actions that we've experienced in Golden Gate Estates from the transportation end of things.

It says: The county shall apply the standards and criteria of the access management policy as adopted by resolution and as may be amended to ensure the protection of the arterial and collector systems' capacity and integrity.

All of the policies that we seem to have are homogenous, they want to apply across the county. And it's kind of like the discussion we had earlier that we have urban areas and now we have extensive rural areas and the same standards don't necessarily apply.

There's a concern that the same issue rises here. Transportation's idea of six-laning massive corridors just about everywhere may not be the best application for roads going through Golden Gate Estates. In fact, our current GMP talks about roads of rural character and will have tree-lined and canopies and things like that. Well, you can't do that with a six-lane road.

So I'm concerned that Policy 6.2.4 will lead to unintended consequences because of its generic application when it -- to say it's adopted because of the urban area or for corridors that are known. All of a sudden that same application's trying to be applied to the rural characteristics of a community like Golden Gate Estates, and I'm very concerned about that in that policy.

And with that being said, whatever you do for the amendment writeup, I will be looking at that myself in that regard.

That's the only thing I have to say on all the Golden Gate Area Master Plan because all of the substantive items you've labeled to be discussed by the committee in the future when that's formed. So I think with that said, we're probably in good shape.

MR. SCHMIDT: All right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead, Mr. Schiffer.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And there's one thing, and it's 6.3. You're recommending removing these two things. And before they go away, one thing that the Estates does have is the grid system, which is, some people would argue, a very efficient way to let traffic flow because it doesn't collect it.

Wouldn't this be a good place for us to note that they should complete the grid and essentially the bridges and make the grid an actual grid?

Because in planning there's two ways you can do it: You can put together a tributary system or the old city grid, which does allow people to wander and pick their path.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I believe that's already in one of these policies. We talk about bridge connections. I don't remember which --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I don't see it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: This isn't the whole master plan here, it's only excerpts from it, so --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But we do make note where -- and I think it's in 6.2 or somewhere that they could increase the linkages with the local road system, which I guess were the bridges.

In other words, if you want to achieve that, the -- and that's the problem with the emergency access, all the times are long because the people have to leave the grid or go around the grid, which is the worst case.

MR. SCHMIDT: Make sure that staff looks closely at 6.3 and its under policies. Because I believe in the longer version -- a previous version that did leave out those to be unchanged. That language is amended. And perhaps if additional cross-referencing or mention may assist with that idea, we'll look at that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It's 6.2.2. 6.2.2 on Page 19 starts to refer to it. And they did a special study in Collier County for the east of 951 bridge study. And that bridge study prioritized the bridge lengths and they acknowledged where they needed to be to I think meet what you're just now saying, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, you know, I'm saying the whole grid, not -- some of these things you see it referenced, it's in certain areas to increase the travel time, but --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I would just like to add, you know, if they can improve the grid system then you have less need for these big wide roads that have to knock down neighborhoods.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. I think that's what was acknowledged by the community, and that's why the east of 951 bridge study became what it was and then they prioritized the bridges as soon as the funding's available. And they probably put in 20 years worth of bridges because of the funding. So I think we're way ahead of the game right now in trying what we needed to do.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay.

MR. BOSI: Correct. And that was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, but it was as funding

becomes available. And as we know, that situation still has been somewhat of a shifting proposition in terms of when those funds will become available.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But you know, at the same time, if Nick took all the money he's spending on obtaining right-of-way he doesn't need, he could put a lot of bridges in, but that's another side bar.

Jim, did you have something you want to add?

MR. FLANIGAN: Yeah. I think you were referring to the bridge study.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right.

MR. FLANIGAN: And I think in terms of financing, I think the recent LRTP shows the bridges not going in until 2021 or something on that order. So funding not being available has a lot of effect on what the Growth Management Plan can functionally do.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: I think there --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Karen?

COMMISSIONER HORNIK: -- were about eight or so bridges in the LRTP and two are cost feasible, so they would be --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.

COMMISSIONER HORNIK: I'm sorry. There were probably about eight bridges I think in the LRTP, and two of them were cost feasible. So the rest will have to wait. They'll be coming shortly, I guess.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Mark, let me --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Jim, can I ask you a question? This is Brad. No, it is hard, because you don't know. It's the ceiling talking to you.

How many bridges do you think -- I mean, to complete the grid, how many bridges would it take?

MR. FLANIGAN: Originally I think -- oh, I don't know about that. But there were 12 bridges in the bridge study to get connectivity around the Estates.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And those are really the speed of travel distance, I think.

MR. FLANIGAN: That's actually to take disconnects out of the dead-ends. Because at some point you had to go down 16th Street all the way to get -- and you couldn't get to Everglades or the boulevard and somewhere. There were disconnects that locked different areas from getting out. There was only one way in and one way out. That's what the bridge was --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Right. But that doesn't complete the grid. Like I'm -- because I think like the best potential is if you did put all your tributary and stuff on the perimeter and you completed the grid, you would have the best transportation. Or at least some planners would say that.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Probably less expensive than making huge new roads, right?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Probably.

MR. FLANIGAN: Well, the grid system really is a series of huge new roads. Every -- you know, we're talking about six lanes on most of the new --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: No.

MR. FLANIGAN: -- roads. Is that what you're talking about?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No, no, he's talking about maintaining the two-lane roads we have now but just putting more bridges in so that the traffic can flow without having to have the six-lane roads.

MR. FLANIGAN: Yeah. And that should have some effect on the whole --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: You would just filter to the edge.

MR. FLANIGAN: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And then from there you pick up tributaries.

All right, thanks.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But I think the bridges already studied provide more oppor -- more -- can't be in place by the time the next EAR comes around; is that a fair statement?

MR. BOSI: That is a fair statement.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So by the time the next EAR comes around, we can reassess it. And if we're able to do more bridges than we think, we could update the grid at that point, add more to it until we get it all completed to a point that's acceptable.

MR. BOSI: Exactly. And remember, the primary consideration for where those locations of where the bridges were, the first consultation was with the first responders in trying to see how -- where the most effective places in terms of reaching those areas that are cut off or bisected by the canals.

And as a side note, and it relates to the point that was just raised, at \$4 million estimated per bridge, the amount of system relief that is provided compared to, you know, seven and a half million dollars per new road mile is considerable. And so it is a much more cost effective and logical strategy to provide increased mobility.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So as the manager of our comprehensive planning, you disagree with Nick Casalanguida that we don't -- so he doesn't need to put all those roads in and tear up Golden Gate Estates. I'm glad you said that.

How's your neck?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Talk about putting words in somebody's mouth, right?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: One quick thing.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And Mike, all of these bridges would be almost identical, because they're in identical positions. So somehow I've got to believe that you could put together a really good competitive prefab, let the sponsor put his name on the side of a bridge and clean it up. That would be the greatest place to live if all that grid was completed out there.

MR. BOSI: But that is an alternative revenue funding source that I'm sure that transportation will definitely explore.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick's watching the show. He's calling to complain to me right now. I can see it.

Well, Nick, I'm not going to answer you. Boy, oh boy.

Okay. Well, anything else on Golden Gate Area Master Plan?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, let's move to the Immokalee Area Master Plan, which really isn't the Immokalee Area Master Plan, it's just a couple sheets telling us it's coming.

Anybody have any comments, questions or issues on that -- on those statements in our packet?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: When?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: When?

MR. BOSI: And I will let Ms. Valera, who is the project manager for the Immokalee Area Master Plan, respond.

MS. VALERA: Carolina Valera, Principal Planner, Comprehensive Planning Section.

It's coming. We have scheduled the EAC hearing for January the 5th, so hopefully we will come to you sometime in February.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: And will it be going through the CRA first?

MS. VALERA: I will confirm with Penny and I will let you know.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. We have the economic element next, which has been revised per our last discussion.

Any issues on the economic element with anybody?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mike?

MR. BOSI: There was that one policy we discussed at the very beginning, a potential policy where we monitored the unemployment rate on an annual basis, and we'll explore the development of a policy to do just that so we can have a better understanding whether -- and the specifics of it we can get into at the time, but I just wanted to make sure that that was something that the Planning Commission thought was appropriate to add to an additional policy within the economic element.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I certainly think knowing the standing of our unemployment base and the amount of employment we've increased by statistical numbers, if those are available it would be helpful. We could monitor them on a regular basis. Everybody else?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And you're looking -- your policy Objective 3, it looks like it could fit somewhere there, Mike.

I have one question. Policy 3.1. The terminology in 3.1 is a little not as flexible as I think we've tried to make the rest of it. The county will support efforts by the EDC to formulate a five-year economic development plan.

In the rest of it the references were more generic. So I'm wondering if we want to commit Collier County to having to support something they haven't even seen yet.

MR. BOSI: You're referring to Policy 3.1?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes.

MR. BOSI: Collier County will support efforts to form an economic development plan to assist local org -- so the question is do we want to -- because it's kind of -- is the concern the economic development plan is too specific?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I want to make sure we're not binding our -- well, first of all, is that the only agency in Collier County that would formulate a five-year economic development plan for us?

MR. BOSI: To my knowledge, yes. Maybe the -- yes, as far as I would know.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: By naming them in this policy and saying that we will support a plan formulated by them, does that require us to fund them to formulate that plan? And what control over the way the plan is formulated do we have if they're not an agency of Collier County?

So what it gets back to is more of a generic reference rather than an agency specific that we can't control.

MR. BOSI: As it exists today, the policy -- you know, as I read it, will support an effort to formulate an economic development plan.

The language that was proposed was proposed by the EDC. And what I hear is maybe that's too specific in going -- in back to the reference to an economic development plan within a general sense is more appropriate for a policy within the Growth Management Plan.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. If we will support the effort to produce an economic development plan for Collier County. And I don't know if we need to name the entity. It may obligate us to an argument that hey, you named us, therefore we have to be funded by it. I'm not saying we shouldn't fund them, I'm just saying we need to make sure our options always remain open and we don't lock ourselves in.

MR. BOSI: Based upon that, then the existing policy, Collier County will support efforts to formulate an economic development plan to assist local organizations in fostering the expansion and diversification of the county's economic base. That should serve to -- as appropriate without a need for modification?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Sounds to me like it does. I didn't even look at that page. Right, that does. Why would we need to change it?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Agree.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Everybody okay with that?

MR. BOSI: No change.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No change, yeah.

And the next item up is the public schools facility element. I didn't know what PSFE stood for there for a minute. Public schools facilities element. Just a couple of pages.

Does anybody have any comments on the policies and recommendations in that section of our quest here before us today?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Then that ends the typical sections of our GMPP, and we get into the specialty major issues of which there are what, five or six items mentioned.

And I know that DCA commented on some of these as well. Staff responded. So let's see if we have any questions on tab by tab.

The water resource protection plan. Does anybody have any questions on the comments under that tab?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And Mike, can you tell us the value of having these included in the EAR? Since they aren't specific recommendations to policy issues within the document, what weight do they carry and where does it lead us in regards to amendments?

MR. BOSI: These are the major issues that were agreed upon, and the way that the EAR is intended to work. These major issues received extra attention as we went through the individual elements. And the elements were weighed against how we were measuring our success for water resource protection.

The individual -- the concurrency management issue, the affordable housing issue, climate change, we weighed those issues and our assessment of those issues against our objectives and our policies to see where maybe improvements needed to be made within our policies to further these major issues.

So really, they're the support documentation for a lot of the changes that are being suggested within chapter two, which is the individual element.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So the assumption we should have made in reading these is that whatever flags that were in here that needed to be highlighted, you've already addressed them in the language that we just went over through the various elements.

MR. BOSI: Yes. We -- the areas that we said that needed changes, a lot of them were motivated by the issue of water management, the issue of concurrency management, the issue of climate change, the issue of affordable housing and all the eight major issues that we've agreed upon.

So they really are support documentation for the actions that are being taken within chapter two.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So now that we're looking at it under that premise, does anybody have any questions under the water resource backup documentation?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: How about the Rural Fringe Mixed Use District documentation?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The next one would be the rural lands documentation. Does anyone have any issues with the rural lands documentation?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The next one is climate change and energy sufficiency -- efficiency. Anybody have any issues there?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Again, it's all backup to what we already went through, so I'm not sure what relevance it's going to carry it individually.

The affordable housing information supply.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mike, the affordable housing information that was distributed to us today, will that also be used as backup to the affordable housing element that you -- I mean backup data you have?

MR. BOSI: That -- we expect the Board of County Commissioners will direct us. We're going to ask them to utilize the affordable housing market rate study that we are going to discuss on the 14th to provide supplemental information to understand their availability of affordable housing as it exists today as support documentation.

So the intention from staff is to ask the Board of County Commissioners for us to include the affordable housing study as part of the backup information contained within this EAR.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody have any issues on the housing?

Melissa?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: We discussed at the last evaluation reducing it from 1,000 to 850. Is that going to be revised here as well?

MR. BOSI: Not with -- this is the support documentation that's going to provide the justification for that reduction.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Okay.

MR. BOSI: And that housing study that was provided today really does provide a lot of data and analysis as to why we think it's appropriate to go from that 1,000 to 850, because the bearing that the market is providing right now within those thresholds for affordability.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you.

The concurrency management backup material. Does anybody have any issues with that?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm assuming that coincides with the AUIR?

MR. BOSI: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, we have the urban development patterns tab, second to the last one. Any issues with that?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Just a question.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead, Mr. Schiffer.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Mike, the way you stretched the map on Page 1, is that to delineate the sprawl concerns you have?

MR. BOSI: Subconsciously, maybe. But what I heard in discussion this morning from the Planning Commission was that growing recognition, or that recognition from the Planning Commission that within the appropriate urbanized area, higher densities, because of the advantages and the issues of social equity and because of issues related to transportation problems when we have to provide or bus in our employees from far reaches of the county, that there are appropriate areas within the urbanized area where higher densities do make sense. But no, it wasn't an overt attempt.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I hope you realize that was a joke. That was a pretty serious answer.

MR. BOSI: Yeah, I did.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The last item that we have in our backup package is intergovernmental coordination. And are there any questions on that section?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That takes us through the entire adoption book for the EAR. Again, the EAR is a concept document in which we will build amendments to the Growth Management Plan for further review in a very detailed manner down the road, probably a year or more from now.

So with that in mind, Mike, I think the next item is a motion from this board; is that correct?

MR. BOSI: Correct, Chair. What staff is seeking is a motion from the Planning Commission for recommendation of approval as modified as today, as discussed within the individual policies, the additional policies that we described to adopt, and then to transmit to the Department of Community Affairs.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Before we ask a motion, just so there's no other comments, does anybody in the audience wish to comment before we propose a motion?

Margaret's been sitting back there all day and not said a word.

Okay, with that, is there a motion from this board?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Actually, the motion -- excuse me, we're making a motion to just -- because all this really did today was add the comments that everybody made, and ours being the last. We're not going to forward it; aren't you going to now go -- well, what is the process for you from here?

MR. BOSI: We now -- the site modifications that we're directed from the Planning Commission today will be incorporated into this book, and the book will be presented as it is today with those modifications to the Board of County Commissioners for adoption and then transmittal to the Department of Community Affairs. And they'll make an evaluation as to whether we have hit all the statutory requirements within this document.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So the rewording that you're going to propose will be done and then go to the Commission and we won't see it? What am I missing here?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, okay, there's some confusion. There's three steps -- four steps that are going to go through yet.

This EAR is a concept document about ideas that we don't feel -- or everybody, including the public may not feel has been adequately addressed in the current language. Those concepts now get recommended by us today to go to the Board of County Commissioners.

They go to the board for adoption as official concepts. Meaning we've got to look at this, and we've got to look at this when we come back to do the amendment process, which takes those concepts and puts it in really hard-line language where we can sink our teeth into every word that they put into that paragraph.

Now, that process we've agreed will have a workshop, then a transmittal, and then an adoption. So this is still purely conceptual. It just kind of sets the stage for things that we want to talk about further. And we're not obligated to accept any of them as time goes on. And in fact, when the specific language comes out, if it's in the wrong direction or we decide by then that it's inappropriate, it can be washed out of the system at that point.

Is that a fair statement, Mike?

MR. BOSI: It's a good representation of the process.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So this is basically a housekeeping matter required by the state before we can go to the next stage, which is more detailed.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So essentially a motion that we -- and I'll try it, okay? That this be a motion that we recommend approval of the concepts -- that these concepts are representative of what the Planning Commission wants for the EAR. Is that good enough, or do you --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: For adoption, and then recommending for transmittal as well.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, for adoption and transmittal as well.

MR. BOSI: Adoption and transmittal to the Department of Community Affairs.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. Does that -- okay, so a motion has been made to recommend adoption of this EAR in its form as described, and transmittal to the Department of Community Affairs.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by Diane.

Okay, is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

And that takes care of the EAR.

MR. BOSI: And excuse me, I'm sorry, Chair, before we end, I just wanted to extend my personal thanks to all the effort and energy that each one of the members -- I know this is outside of your normal course and a little bit different of an animal and arena that you're used to operating within. But it's very important.

And the attention that was paid to this document and to the process is appreciated by staff and I know the rest of the viewing public.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, Mike, from my perspective, you have been the best manager of that department that I've worked with in the 30 years I've been in Collier County. So congratulations to you, you've made the process less painful for us.

Every item that we've asked for as far as cooperation goes you've gone to the extent to try to cooperate in every manner whatsoever. So I'm very pleased working with you on this, and it's been a pleasure from my perspective and I'm sure the rest of the board shares that.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, and let me add one thing. The brevity of your answers compared to others is extremely appreciated.

MR. BOSI: Acknowledged. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And the accuracy of the answers too might not be bad.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, with that, we've had a motion, we've vetted, we've passed it. Now we're at the point we can adjourn. Is there a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Motion.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Melissa. Seconded by?

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: (Indicating.)

COMMISSIONER HORNIK: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Barry raised his hand.

All in favor?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.
We're out of here. Thank you, Mike.

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by order of the Chair at 1:28 p.m.

COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION



MARK STRAIN, Chairman

These minutes approved by the board on 1-6-11 as presented or as corrected .