

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING OF THE
COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Naples, Florida
December 1, 2011

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 9:00 a.m. in REGULAR SESSION in Building "F" of the Government Complex, East Naples, Florida, with the following members present:

Mark Strain, Chairman
Melissa Ahern
Phillip Brougham
Diane Ebert (Absent)
Karen Homiak
Barry Klein
Paul Midney
Brad Schiffer

ALSO PRESENT:

Heidi Ashton-Cicko, Assistant County Attorney
Nick Casalanguida, Growth Management Division/Planning & Regulation
Ray Bellows, Zoning Manager
Thomas Eastman, Real Property Director, CC School District

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good morning, everyone. Sorry about being one minute late. It's not the way we usually do things around here. Nick's always late, but this board isn't.

Everybody please rise for Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: As I normally start out, welcome to the December 1st meeting of the Collier County Planning Commission.

***With that, will the secretary please do the roll call.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Eastman?

MR. EASTMAN: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Schiffer?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'm here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Midney?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Ms. Ahern?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Strain?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Ms. Homiak is here.

Ms. Ebert is absent today.

Mr. Klein?

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Brougham?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Present.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, thank you.

***Addenda to the agenda. We just have one item on the agenda today, and it's the review of the master mobility plan. I think it's Phase II or whatever. Yeah, Phase II report.

Ray, is there anything else changing on the agenda?

MR. BELLOWS: I have no other changes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, thank you.

Our next meeting is December 15th. There's two issues on that agenda. Does anybody know if they're not going to be here on December 15th?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, looks like we'll have a quorum.

***Approval of minutes. We received them all electronically, the minutes for November 3rd, 2011. Is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ms. Homiak.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by Ms. Ahern.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

***BCC report and recaps, Ray? I don't think there was a meeting last time, was there?

MR. BELLOWS: That's correct, no meeting.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: ***Chairman's report, dispense with that.

***Consent agenda items, there are none.

***Advertised public hearings, there are none.

***We'll go straight into old business. First item up. Nick?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Sir?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: This is a rare occasion you attend our meetings, but that's okay.

First item up is a recommendation to accept the Master Mobility Plan Phase II Report and provide recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners.

We all received two or three weeks ago a rather thick binder of information, a good portion of which was an appendix for support, beginning of which was the summary and then various sections to back it up.

Nick, I don't know how you want to walk through this document, but I'll let you start out with your presentation and maybe you can guide us through it.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Very good, sir.

For the record, Nick Casalanguida, Deputy Administrator, Growth Management Division.

Tomorrow is my birthday, so I'm going to ask that you guys be kind to me today so I can wake up tomorrow and not have --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Boy, I wish we knew that in advance.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I know you do. Get out of the way in case somebody said anything.

I think, you know, before we get started, we're really fortunate that this plan kind of shaped up the way it did, because we really worked well with the community and the stakeholders. They've spent a lot of time with it. And I think the fact that there's not a lot of people here to object to the plan says a lot.

I don't think there's anything in this plan in the recommendations going forward that we're not going to have to do a lot more work to vet and bring to fruition if the Board -- this Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners feels it's important.

So I'll take you through the plan and a couple slides here, and then we'll get your comments and see where you'd like to go.

The project team members, I've introduced them several times. Obviously in bold, the general public and the stakeholder agencies. Again, I'll reiterate, they've been phenomenal.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: For the Planning Commission members, you have a little -- if your screen's not showing it, push the bottom button on that flashing thing on the right. That should bring the screen up that has the Power Point on it.

Sorry, Nick.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No problem.

So as I was saying, the general public and the stakeholders in bold on the slide says a lot. I think they've really participated and done quite a bit to put a good flavor on this plan.

The other folks, Collier County staff as well, Tindale-Oliver, Wilson-Miller/Stantec, Mulhere and Associates, AIM Engineering, White and Smith and Dr. Robert Cervero.

There's some controversy about the team in the past, but I've got to tell you, the folks that are on this team know Collier County. They know it well. They've worked on a lot of the plans that have been done in Collier County. They've seen the good, the bad and the ugly. And I think that they really put their best foot forward in developing this plan with county staff and the public.

The purpose of this is to review the draft report that we've sent to you, as well, I think Debbie has given you an addendum or a little sidebar of comments we've received and changes we've already made ahead of this.

But that aside, I think we'll go through the report. We have 21 policy recommendations and some examples of how they might apply. And I think that's really the bulk of what this report is going to discuss. I think obviously we want to go through the content with you to make sure that you don't have any issues in the first four chapters.

But those 21 policy recommendations where we start to move forward with things that may affect people in Collier County, and I think in a positive way, hopefully.

We'll answer questions in the report and discuss those recommendations with you.

So I think we just go through the first four sections. I don't know if you want to go page-by-page or just, you know, Chairman, you do a good job of taking us through usually, so --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I thought, Nick, what we'd probably do is take -- because it's a long report, take about five pages at a time. And a lot of it's redundant. Once you get past the summary pages, everything else is a backup of that, so maybe that will help expedite the process.

So with that, if that's okay with the other board members, the first page is really the -- it's titled, it's a colorful page, Master Mobility Plan Draft Report Executive Summary. And if we can get to that. It's in the early first part of the book, past the index.

If you guys have questions on the first part, holler, but I think most of the stuff starts with that.

By the way, for those of you, this is the first part here. That's the first section. So if you -- okay, do you want to work any changes to the discussion first, Nick, so we don't bring up issues that are already being -- I notice we got an 18-page memorandum about other things that have been raised. So how that fits into this, I think you guys need to kind of walk us through as we go forward.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So on the first five pages, do you have any changes that your team wants to make -- or points?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Do you have a copy of -- we weren't tabbed out by pages.

Deb, on the changes we've done, I don't have it by page so --

MS. ARMSTRONG: No, it's not by pages.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, what's easiest for you to tell us the changes that you're trying to implement so we can find them?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay. Well, do you want to do the track changes in the Word doc?

MS. ARMSTRONG: These three.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay, let's do that.

Give us a second and we'll show you what we've done. It's in strike-through/underlined, right?

There were no changes in the executive summary, I'm being told. The bulk of the report, the changes were following after that. So maybe if you guys have comments --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, let's just walk through the executive summary then.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Very good.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So Pages 1 through 5 of the executive summary, does anybody on the Planning Commission have any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick, on Page 4, under Conceptual Land Use Plan, the third line from the bottom -- or fourth line, it says, to help measure the influence of area-wide land use strategies on VMT and VHT, conceptual land use scenarios were developed based largely on input received from the public.

Now, how does -- what does that mean? Because it -- so a conceptual land use scenario by a citizen who does no land planning, may be anything from an accountant to a mathematician to a bricklayer, stands up and relays his concept of lands use scenarios that he believes for Collier County and that's how you react?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, I think we've taken a lot of comments from them, and obviously the professional staff that's worked on this has qualified and quantified their comments to make sure that they make sense.

But where you talk about -- you know, even the folks that participated, I think we've done a good job of educating them. You know, the comments about putting land uses together, that concept was pretty well identified. And they had a lot of comments about making sure some of these towns and developments that had a mix of uses. So I think that's what we're referencing, is that they supported those and made a lot of comments about complete developments.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Did you have any samples of those? Did they turn anything in, or is it just verbal?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think a lot of those were verbal discussions. I think they used a lot of the diagrams that we presented to them.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Further down the page it says: A conceptual wildlife crossings and habitat preservation plan.

I understand that wildlife crossings are part of the road system. I don't understand how a habitat preservation plan evolves out of a mobility plan. Can you explain that to me?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I can. The challenge that we've had with the agencies, especially Fish and Wildlife, DEP, even the District and the Basin have all talked about a unified concept going forward. If you're going to talk about mobility planning till build out, they've said, how do you incorporate that type of planning with the concepts of preservation?

If you do it in a vacuum, we're not going to support that. Matter of fact, if you do it and include it we're going to support your plan a lot more, because you're taking those things into consideration.

So I think that was the intent of making this a good portion of the project, was to take those comments into play that we have to look at this in a big picture with habitat conservation and preservation.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Do you have an advertisement that you use to advertise the public meetings for this master mobility plan?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I don't have them in front of me.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Do you know if it said in it that you're going to use it to establish conservation areas and habitat preservation plans? So that the stakeholders and the public who are reading it, especially those areas in Golden Gate Estates that are being affected by these plans, those residents knew that a mobility plan means a habitat preservation plan?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, I don't think it's to establish a habitat or conservation area over those properties, it's just to look at those --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, it says it's a conceptual habitat preservation plan.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: And to be used for planning purposes only. It's not to set them up, it's to say look, these are sensitive areas, both either as watersheds or habitat areas.

I mean, with your watershed management plan, and I know, Mr. Chairman, you were not here for that, and I know you provided a lot of feedback on that, but there was a large section of Golden Gate Estates where there was a watershed area that functioned both for habitat and watershed resources, and I think the residents of the Estates in some of the civic meetings we've had have been very open to that, they recognize that. Obviously taking into account there are existing land uses, there are landowners there, we have to work around that. But we didn't want to be naive to that I think in preparation of this plan.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: How did the watershed management plan, because I can't remember finding it in here, how did it address the VMT and VHT?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It didn't.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It didn't. Then that's because it isn't a mobility plan, right?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: What, the watershed plan?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right, it's not a mobility plan --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The mobility plan is not an environmental plan.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, but again, I want to reiterate, I know there's an overlap here, and I think there's been a lot of influence from the environmental side on the plan, because they did participate quite a bit.

But it's hard to envision Collier County at build-out in a road network without taking that into consideration. Some of the biggest objections from the NGOs and the official agencies have been, please tell us what you intend to do in the big picture in the long run.

And as much as I'd like to say I could be a soothsayer and project out, you know, 20, 30 years, we did the best we could and incorporated those concepts in there, you know, provide them a certain level of comfort that we weren't being naive to that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And Nick, I have no problem including, and in fact I have strongly emphasized that the environment needs to be addressed, but there are plans that address that. We have a CCME, we have elements of our Growth Management Plan, we have the Watershed Management Plan, we have a series of -- I mean, you could go through all kinds of studies in Collier County and find that there are plenty of environmental plans.

To take the mobility plan, advertise it as a mobility plan and then produce through that plan environmental plans I think is wrong and misleading to the public. I'm not saying those other plans aren't needed. But from my perspective in reading this, that is absolutely the wrong forum in which to have done that. It's a very misleading

forum.

For example, if my house had been included in one of the habitat preservation plan outlines that you have in this plan or the potential ROMA area, personally, I probably would have liked that, but I know that it would change the value of my home and the land that that home sits on.

But I wouldn't have known that I would have had to attend all these master mobility plan meetings to discuss an environmental issue that's affecting my home. I would never have seen that or foreseen that happening.

And I'm just trying to be very honest with the public that what you advertise is truth in advertising, what you're advertising is what you're doing. I'm very concerned that the evolution of these other plans out of a mobility plan that started out not even noting such things is not being truthful with the public.

So I'm going to have that theme throughout it. And a lot of my tabs are concerning that item. And I'll try to minimize my time on each one, but I want to make it clear from the beginning, since it came up in the beginning, that I didn't see this plan as what it's now evolved to.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, sir, in fairness, and not to disagree, when we first put this scope together and we applied for the grant, that was one of the bullet points.

So from day one we have outlined that we would consider environmental aspects and that we would have an environmental habitat and crossings preservation master plan.

What's evolved is actually downgraded a little bit. I think when this project started out it was our goal to have a network of roads. And working with the stakeholders we tamed it down and we used the word conceptual plans. So we wanted -- when we first started this project, we wanted to have a master plan that included one of the sub-plans, which was a habitat and wildlife preservation plan. And we downgraded to a conceptual plan for planning purposes, but it was in from day one.

So I -- just for the record, I want to make sure we're clear on that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Just the manner in which it was expressed in to the public, that's where my concern is.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Understood.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The last page is Page 5. I have a question between Objective 10 and Objective 17. How do those two work together?

Because in Objective 10 it's looking at an evaluation of an impact fee for a mobility fee. But in Objective 17 it seems like it's --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We're going to --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- looking at mitigation. Huh?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We're going to clean up the objectives when we get there. But I can elaborate a little bit.

One is a mobility fee. Typically, and we'll get into it much more detail as we get into that section, in your urban area we're talking about a mobility fee. The mobility fee allows you more flexibility of use. It's still a capacity replacement fee, but it looks at transit and bike ped. kind of movements as well.

In Objective 17 it's to say whether you're using an urban mobility fee that can still pay for roads outside of that area or the rural area or east of the urban area transportation impact fee. It's starting to target mitigation up front.

Because a component of our impact fee is mitigation. So if we had set aside that money -- now, right now when I collect impact fees, I put it in a different impact fee, district funds, and we use them for road project. If that portion of the impact fee that's calculated for mitigation was set aside, in other words, I could have a sub-account, then we could specifically use that money to pre-mitigate for projects in the future.

And I think that was a comment I think we received from some of the environmental groups. And we thought that's not a bad idea. Because then you are taking that fee that you're collecting, segregating it based on the sub-component and then being able to spend it later specifically for that sub-component.

So that's why we talked about that a little bit there.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: On Objective 3, incentivize neighborhoods serving retail and services uses in Golden Gate Estates.

I don't suppose you'd consider adding some language that says so long as they're not inconsistent with our Growth Management Plan?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Absolutely. Because they have to be.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I know, but that could be -- you know, I mean, I can see someone, some land use attorney standing up and saying even Objective 3 says we should do this, but forgetting that it's to be consistent with the GMP.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Our staff is taking that note down.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Objective 21, develop a process to formally update the MMP every five years. We have the EAR every -- well, it was seven years, now it looks like we're doing another one in 2014, so I think it's closer than that.

We have the AUIR. We have all other kinds of plans. Why do we need to add another plan to a staff burden for every five years? Why don't we just look at this through the EAR process as it occurs?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think you'll find that we've taken that -- that's some of the comments we received and we agree with you.

I think with the watershed management plans that you've heard, with the mobility plan and the fact that we do an EAR, all of these plan recommendations eventually transfer under the land development part of the Growth Management Plan, so it would be not inconsistent to say they will be evaluated as part of the EAR process every five to seven years as sub-elements that are incorporated by these plans.

So you're right, they shouldn't be done separately. But I think, you know, anybody that manages projects, if you don't measure it, you don't know how successful you are. So maybe evaluate it as part of the EAR, but measure periodically to see how we're doing, give ourselves a report card, are we being successful? And I think that's not unreasonable.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, it says develop a process to formally update.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I mean, far as you determining if you're successful or not, that's not -- I'm more concerned about if we have to go through and check all the language on this plan separately in addition to all the other plans that we currently do. You guys spend a lot of your time just rechecking everything that we previously did.

I'd rather see staff time be working more towards responding to the public than rewriting things.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think we've already -- that's one of the changes in the change sheets. That's why we're getting --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I haven't gone through those change sheets because I was hoping we'd do it today as we got through, but --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Very good, we will. But it is, we've discussed --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, these are some of the issues that I think we've talked a little bit about too, yeah.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The next grouping is this -- the end of the summary is only as I'm -- just wrap it up with Page 6 then would be the last piece of the summary page before we get into Section 1, which is project introduction and history.

Does anybody have any questions on Page 6?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I didn't get a Page 6.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You didn't get a Page 6?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: No, there isn't one.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: You're cheating.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Did you get a Page 6?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I had a question on Page 6. Here, this is Page 6, it's right here. It says Executive Summary. I'll be darned.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Yours is different than ours.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We snuck an extra one in just to see if you were paying attention.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well I was, because I have a series of questions from it that I'm not going to ask. If you took it out I don't need to ask the questions.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: What was on Page 6, Mark?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It was a -- actually, it told about the various stakeholders in participatory teams that

-- involved in this. There was 25 of them total. Thirteen of them were related to development, growth, business interests. Seven of them were some kind of agency, whether it was state, federal or local. Four of them were environmental and two were civic. So --

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: That's in the front section, on 1-8.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I've got it on Page 6, so sorry.

So we're using different documents.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, we're not using -- table of contents.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mine says Page 6. What page number does yours say?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Make sure I do not acknowledge the printer.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: One-eight.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: One-eight.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: One-eight, okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: One dash eight?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I've got an ES-6.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I don't have 1-8.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If you're going to speak, you're going to have to use the --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: She said it was in the standalone executive summary. So you're looking at a standalone copy. But list of --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You gave it to me.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That's our bad. But in the printed version it's in a different spot. It's in the table of contents.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, mine's in print, so --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yeah, so it's in 1-8 in your table of contents.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The next section is six pages. It goes from Section 1 to Section 2. So does anybody have any questions -- first of all, do you have any clarifications or needed corrections in Section 1, Nick?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We do. I'm on Page 1-1. I have nothing. So I'm going to scroll down on this. And I know it will be hard for you to see but at least I can track it and walk you through it.

At the bottom left of Page 1-2 we added -- I'll read it out into the record, I guess, if my eyes don't fail me.

The public involvement process brought forth several comments regarding how sea level rise would be addressed in the MMP. While sea level rise is a concern to all Florida coastal counties, it should be the subject of a separate detailed study. In response to comments received, the MMP now clearly indicates that no density increase is recommended for the coastal high hazard area identified in the future land use map, the FLUM.

That was a change we had based on comments in response to sea level rise.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody have a question on that change?

Paul?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Was there a density increase contemplated before this?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, not in the coastal high hazard area.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: So this is just reemphasizing what we already -- is already in our Growth Management Plan?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir. And I think that just some of the public were concerned that we were trying to encourage that. So we wanted to make sure we were clear.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I've got a suggested change to this paragraph. Leave the paragraph as it is where it is, scroll back down, but when you -- it needs to be moved to somewhere else when I tell you what it should say.

The public involvement process brought forth several comments regarding the environment that should be addressed in the -- that would be addressed in the MMP, while the environment and habitat conservation plans are a concern to all Florida communities.

All I'm suggesting is this is exactly an example of why I don't see this plan as being the catchall for all other plans. You even say it in here that it's better opportunities in a different plan to address sea level rise. Well, that's likewise what my argument was with the habitat conservation plan and the other environmental plans that were trying

to be dovetailed into this one.

So that just becomes a point I wanted to make. And whether you use that somewhere else, because throughout today I'm going to keep pointing out areas where the environmental issues should not have been brought in to the strength they're in this plan.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Understood.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I certainly think that the road -- the MMP could have referred to the fact that there are environmental plans that they are called a habitat conservation plan, called whatever you want, ROMA, called whatever, and those have to be taken into consideration when we actually apply the rules and objectives.

But this is a good example as to why another plan is more suitable for some specific criteria, this very paragraph you're trying to add, so --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Very good, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody have any questions on that section?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If not, I have one on Page 1-4. And it's the fourth bullet, same theme.

Opportunities to further protect. I think that is the wrong language. I think consider environmentally sensitive areas and wildlife in mobility planning is a better way to approach that last bullet.

Oh, you did it.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We made that change.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good.

You need to tell us the changes that you've made ahead of time so --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay. I'll go through and I'll note them and then maybe we can come back and I'll just scroll down. They're in strike-through/underlined. So I'm through Page 1-5 with no more changes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The next section is Section 2.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Let me ask a question, Mark, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Nick, back at 1-3 where you kind of give the history of planning development?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: How come the concept of activity centers is totally missing from this report, kind of?

I mean, this would be a good place to discuss it. But I'm sure back in -- when the activity centers in the Eighties was first presented, I mean, it was a major component, still is, of the Growth Management Plan.

How come it's not really --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We can certainly mention that. I think Jeff was interested in and brought up some plans that showed Golden Gate Estates subdivided down to the quarter acre lot with activity centers and commercial centers even back before that.

So I think it's a good point. I think we can note that, you know, on prior plans that that was an important aspect of the Growth Management Plan. I don't think that's an issue. It's good history. I think we're taking that comment down.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And even when we get into recommendations and stuff, it's kind of missing from this report, or I missed it from the report. I mean, I wouldn't mind discussing -- and I guess when we get into the areas that you define, the coastal area, we could discuss it, because that's --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You know, we touched on the activity centers. We don't really call them I guess activity centers, more destination centers. We mentioned in the Estates, as the Chairman brought up, having some areas consistent with the Growth Management Plan that you could have more commercial and industrial land uses with residential, kind of like activity centers.

I think the nomenclature might be a little different, but we do reference that that land use component of residential towards destination employment is extremely important towards mobility.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Correct. Yeah. Especially for transit and stuff. I mean, the intent was back in the Eighties that we would really put the density in these areas and that way people could live in one, work in another. And it's kind of happening but, I mean, it's --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Commissioner, that's the guts of that. I'll tell you what, I think Steve Tindale said to us when we first started this project, if you do not make your number one focus land use, you're going to do yourself a disservice. Because it's not about -- it's that land use component and the way they interact with each other that's the most critical component to planning and that mobility, the VHT, VMT reduction.

So I couldn't agree with you more, and it's definitely a key component of this plan.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So you're saying that when you use the word density centers or something, it's what we should interpret the old activity center? I don't think it's a good idea coming up with a new word if we have in our Growth Management Plan these centers of --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, I think an activity center, we can certainly look at the way we've documented the report. But when we talk about in Golden Gate Estates or in the future towns having the right mix of land use, we don't really call it an activity center, we just say it's important to have that industrial destination commercial retail within a close proximity to residential, so they can interact.

Because I think in a rural town, you know, in the RLSA they don't call them activity centers but balanced land use.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Right. In the new stuff I don't mind you calling it that. I mean, just, you know, point out as we go through this where you've shown how the current activity centers, how that concept is enhanced.

I mean, the paragraph you added, not adding density in the coastal area, kind of is against the concept of the activity centers.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, I can't by the Comp. Plan add density to the coastal area. And I wouldn't want to, I think, based on everything we know about coastal high hazard and the fact that you increase density too much along the coast we have obviously transportation issues.

Once we get out of that coastal high hazard area we certainly want to make sure that the appropriate density and land use mix goes on.

But we talk a lot about infill in the coastal urban area. Because we're getting to the point I think there's not a lot left. So we want to definitely plan the what's left, but redevelopment more importantly.

But once you cross that urban boundary, that's where two-thirds of our population is going to be at some point in time, roughly. We need to make sure that that focus on land use is appropriately set.

But to your comment, we're going to add the note about the activity centers. I think, you know, Jeff had done that research, and we'll make sure that we're not changing the nomenclature if there is any conflicts there.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And it would also give the impression we were thinking about it a decade earlier than this shows.

And then when we get into those, the different, you know, growth areas that you establish, let's talk about it again, okay? You can show me in there how we're redeveloping this.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay, very good.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: By the way, as we go through and point out certain things, how is it that you're going to relay our comments and concerns on to the Board of County Commissioners?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: If we agree with them, and so far it's been a very good relationship and discussion with all the stakeholders, we make the changes.

If we disagree or it's just more of a comment, we're going to annotate the plan and actually just show to the side, comment by Planning Commission, staff agreed, made change or disagreed and here's why, so the Board knows.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Will we know ahead of time which items you're going to disagree with, so that if we want to challenge your disagreement, we could possibly do so?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I will make it a point --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It's one-sided if it isn't that way.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right. Anything -- how about this in fairness: If there's anything we disagree on, I'll make sure we notify you ahead of time before we go to the BCC.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That would be helpful.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay, very good.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Section 2 is larger, so let's just go through five pages at a time. So we go through

2-1 through 2-5. At least that's the numbers my version shows.

Nick, do you have any --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I do.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We'll hit you first every time. Do you have any changes for those?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm going to try and get to a -- there we go, there's a size I can read.

Under Table 2-1, we have a margin of error of about 10 percent, so that we talk about build-out. A lot was talked about in terms of build-out population. And we tried to make it clearly expressed throughout the whole plan development and discussion with the public that the 2080 number you see in Table 2-1, we're going to be wrong. We're going to be wrong by, you know, plus or minus 10 percent. It could be more. You know, we're making certain assumptions. And the only reason we're making these assumptions is to test some of the hypotheses that we brought forward.

So I don't want to say it's irrelevant, because that's a really strong word. But I want to say that it doesn't matter as much to the concepts and the recommendations that you're going to get in the back of this report.

It's very important that, you know, when you put together a table -- I think some of the corrections we made as staff was we had to the hundredth, to the single integer a population projection at one point in time. And we said, we should almost round this to the thousand. I even see now 420 in 2000, and then 2035, 518,100. I almost want to say about 936,000 in 2080. Because a lot of discussion came out about that.

And then as you see on your viewer, it says the build-out data set, and I'm below that table, is based largely upon the work previously done by Tampa Bay Engineering as part of the Collier County Horizon Study Phase II in 2006, which was based on the county's Growth Management Department's urban build-out analysis. So we've kind of cleared that up a little bit.

But I really want to call your attention to Table 2-1 and just say please understand, we're going to be wrong. This is a planning tool and that's all it is. So don't stick to that number and say it's it.

On the next page, at the top left, we added as part of the MMP, the 2080 build-out dwelling unit and population estimates were allocated spatially, geographically in the RLSA, using the RLSA five-year review committee report. Potential locations for future towns and villages. The dwelling unit and population estimates for the area used in the report came from the Collier County Interactive Growth Model, not from the RLSA five-year review committee report. So clarification in that sense, because you had to make some assumptions to assess certain things.

I'll go through like the five pages and then we'll come back and get your comments.

Through 2-3, there's a page on 2-4 and another map there. So I'll stop there and see if you have any questions there.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Back to the first five pages from the Planning Commission. Anybody?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick, on Page 2-1, under existing and projected build-out population, the third line down says: As such, population and employment forecasts are critical.

That's going to set the basis for my trying to understand why you used some of the things you used that are the sources that are listed under the paragraph below Table 1.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Why didn't we just use BEBR?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, BEBR sets your growth rate and your existing population, but they don't go out to 2080. You don't have a BEBR --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, that's -- the language you added for the RLSA, what did the VanBuskirk people use for the population in the RLSA that you apparently counted on based on the last sentence here?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Jeff, you want to elaborate on that? Jeff was our --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I remember.

MR. PERRY: Good morning. For the record, Jeff Perry with Stantec.

The computer -- county's interactive growth model is based on a series of algorithms and formulas that look at existing land use concentrations that come from the Future Land Use Plan.

So the Future Land Use plan dictates certain densities, certain capacities in certain areas, and his model is

then loaded with those in the traffic analysis zones.

It then produces population, employment, school children and the like. That's the information that was given to us to incorporate into the travel demand model that we wanted to use for testing purposes.

During the last review of the Rural Lands Stewardship Area, there were some build-out forecasts or build-out scenarios developed largely by the landowners where they were able to tell us a little bit better where they thought they would keep their agricultural perpetually, where perhaps some areas were that were more likely to be developed as future towns and villages, and there was a series of maps developed that showed some of those scenarios.

One, you may recall, there was one -- the infamous centroid map that actually showed town dots that were construed as future towns. Those were actually the centers of the traffic analysis zones.

We used that map to spatially allocate the data that came from the interactive growth model. The interactive growth model we found sort of used -- it didn't have a whole lot of logic as to which TAZs he was putting land uses in in some areas, it just wasn't possible to put them in. It was in areas that he at the time was not aware that there were stewardship preservation areas or flow ways or things like that in zones that would not accommodate development. So a lot of that development was just spatially moved around to where it fit more in context with the work that had come out of the rural lands effort.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Jeff, I -- that was a nice expression of your thinking on it, but I still didn't get my answer.

What was the population basis that you guys relied on based on the paragraph that was added?

It says as part of the MMP in 2080 build-out, dwelling unit and population estimates were allocated. What did -- in the RLSA, using the RLSA five-year committee report. Okay. So what did CIGM use as the total population in that report? That was my only question.

MR. PERRY: Okay. Let's see if I can put my finger on it.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Mark, I have a question on that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And I guess whoever put the population. The coastal area is your little sub, you know, area, planning area is really huge. So, I mean, don't you think it would have been a good idea to break up the southern part of it, you know, the Marco Island area and all that, which has kind of a different kind of population, a different work force?

Because when you, you know, give data as to the increase in employment --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Commissioner, we didn't -- we didn't want to really break out the cities in that sense. I think we call them part of the coastal urban area. Because when we met with the MPO we talked about incorporating some of this information and then maybe joint planning with the cities with that respect in terms of what they could do. So we kind of lumped them in with the coastal urban area.

Now, there has been a discussion of -- and this is feedback from the community, nothing in Collier County is the same in terms of the population. Immokalee, Golden Gate Estates, urban area, they wanted separate districts. And we thought that, you know, that's a great idea. Because if we try and make this a blanket plan -- now, could we subdivide it even more because each part of the coastal urban area has its own identity as well, too?

I'm sure we could. I don't know if we start breaking it down into a sub-level like City of Naples, City of Marco, North Naples, that it wouldn't have caused more controversy than just calling it the coastal urban area.

So I think that's why we stopped at that level and didn't drill down even more.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. So, I mean, when the population -- it's just difficult when you give a number in such a broad area to figure out is it the whole area that's changing uniformly or certain areas of it. But that's what you did, so --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Do you want to come back with that number later and we can --

MR. PERRY: I just wanted to verify -- the CIGM population was 210,632 for the rural lands.

The data set that we ended up with was about 221,000. And that was based on differentials between traffic zones that were split between the Immokalee urban area and the rural lands.

Some -- unfortunately traffic zones don't pay too much attention to urban boundaries and things like that, so there were some traffic analysis zones where there was some population and development that were actually partially in the Immokalee urban area and partially in the rural area.

So the difference that we have is as a result of that. We added up certain traffic zones where the CIGM added

up a different set of values.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So by utilizing the 2080 build-out, you're saying that the density needed for the RLSA is only 221,000.

Now, if you divide that by 2.39 persons per household, you come out with a density on a number of houses per acre, far, far less than what the current RLSA five-year program is asking for. In fact, it's even less than what the current program is asking for without any changes made to it. Because currently the number of credits that you can create out there based on the 16,800 acres you originally said you needed as a maximum for the RLSA will give you a population of greater than 400,000.

So even at that population, you're still far off on this. So now why do we have an RLSA program going through requesting a threefold increase in the density out there when you can't use it based on the very master mobility plan you just finished with?

MR. PERRY: I'm sorry, I can't answer the question --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You're part of all those, Jeff.

MR. PERRY: What we used was the official data provided to the team as part of the --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, your official data just punched a hole in your RLSA request. So I just want you to know that, because this doesn't match up to that at all. I don't see how you're getting there.

Which also lends to the credibility of this plan. I mean, that's not the population that was projected for out there, it's much lower than the real population. It's much lower than what you all claim you need by the very -- by the mere fact you're asking for so many more acreage credits out there.

So I don't understand how we're getting to 221,000. It's far below what that area is going to take care of. And if this plan's real, why aren't we looking at real numbers?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You're saying -- so I want to be clear, Mr. Chairman, you're saying with the proposed RLSA changes this would go higher.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No, you're saying here this is incorporating the five-year review.

Then I'm asking you, if it is then why would you -- then why do you even need it? Why do you need the five-year review's increase?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Only for the -- only for the location map that was proposed. But we didn't incorporate the changes that the RLSA review was requesting or talking about, because it wasn't approved.

So some of those changes that you talked about with the density bonuses that would be in the RLSA review were not added in this.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So you used the build-out map showing 20 -- I think it's 23 new towns -- okay, we'll call them centroids as they -- what originally was towns. But you didn't put any population in those towns because they don't exist because the new map wasn't adopted because we're still going by the old plan.

MR. PERRY: No, the traffic analysis zone system that came out of the computer -- the county's interactive growth model spatially allocated all of the development, the 107,000 dwelling units and 220,000 population, spatially allocated them throughout the rural lands area into the individual TAZs.

When we compared that with the work that had come out of the rural lands five-year review where more effort had been put into -- subsequent effort had been put into where that development might take place, we reallocated the CIGM data into those areas that were more concentrated based on the rural lands review.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, but that means that --

MR. PERRY: We didn't change any of the numbers specifically other than just spatially reallocating them into different traffic zones.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, but vehicle miles traveled and vehicle hours traveled would seem to rely on a concentration of density and people.

MR. PERRY: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: By taking a more spread-out map for the RLSA that the five-year committee reviewed in that new towns or centroid map as you call it, and spreading the limited, sparser population of the original RLSA over that map, you've done just the opposite. You've created sparser population centers throughout there by using the right data from the one and the wrong data from another. I don't understand why you did that.

I'm not -- maybe I'm not following this plan, but it seems to me if you use the lower population and more points, you got just the reverse effect than what you're looking for.

MR. PERRY: When Dr. VanBuskirk went through and developed the CIGM, he did the best job with understanding with the size of the traffic zones where development might take place, and based on the population growth and the algorithms in his particular model.

He was not considering many of the, I'll call them restrictions in the rural lands where development would not likely take place. Areas like the habitat areas and the flow ways and areas -- in the Big Cypress, for instance, there were developments shown in areas and larger amounts of areas in the area of critical state concern, which we believe just would not be occurring. And the landowners in the five-year review gave us a hint as to where they thought the best places would be for preserving agricultural and where the likely places of future towns would be.

Now, all that was discussed during the rural lands five-year review. We felt that that spatial distribution of that same amount of development was better than what was coming out of the computer interactive growth model.

The fact that we changed anything, as Nick alluded to, is really irrelevant. Because what we were doing in the model was simply testing things that would give us a relative change if we started with 200,000 people spatially allocated or we started with 400,000 people spatially allocated. It didn't make any difference when we started adding bridges in Golden Gate Estates or moving things from point A to point B, because we were looking for the difference that the model produced between the one run and the second run.

So the actual allocation, the total amount of allocation out there is really irrelevant to the testing that we were doing. We weren't trying to build a highway network for 200,000 people or 400,000 people or 600,000 people. What we were trying to do is test what would happen if you move something from point A to point B.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Paul, did you have something you need to ask?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yeah, I was wanting to ask, could it be that the discrepancy between this projection and the higher numbers that Mark is talking about could be that you can allow a certain number of residences in a certain amount of population, but that doesn't mean that it's going to actually get built. Usually a lot less gets built than what is zoned for.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm glad you made that point.

One of the things we talked about was to be a little conservative with this. If we're going to error on a side, it's not to go higher. Because I think people take a lot of stock in these numbers. And you're right, you start putting a higher number out there. So while in -- with discussion with the Chairman, he made a point, he thinks that through the RLSA program there is bonuses that you can receive that haven't been clearly elaborated. I think we talked about that --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Think? I know there is. You know there is too.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay, we talked about that. But putting that in the RLSA review when it does happen to clarify that is not the job of the MMP.

So we didn't want to get into that debate in the MMP is how much can be in your RLSA. We took a, what I call a I wouldn't say conservative, but lower end of that thought process. Because once you put a high number -- and you're right, you can, I think every developer entitles more than he can build. There's not been one development in Collier County that's built out to the max that they've been entitled to.

So to Jeff's point, I'll reiterate it again, whether we show 900,000 or 1,200,000, we're testing off that number. I don't want to debate that number.

The Chairman's point is valid, I think that that's a discussion for the RLSA, because it will have to get cleaned up when the RLSA comes forward. But if you make it part of this, I think we're in a quagmire in terms of the population number.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I could use that as an example of something else, but then we'll get into another sidebar.

Did you have anything else you wanted to add, Paul?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: (Shakes head negatively.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Jeff, I disagree with your position, but that's not unusual, so --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It's not his birthday.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'll move on for the sake of trying to get through this today.

We're on the first five pages of this second section.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think you have some graphics here that are --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, on the Page 2-4.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay, let me get there.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The source on the bottom, the little footnote. Bottom.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You've got to go to the left. Right there -- no, next one down. That's 2-3.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: At least 2-3 in my book. I don't know what it is in yours.

Two twenty -- go back over, there it is.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That 2-5.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, it's 2-4 in mine. We're going to have fun today.

The language I want to talk about is on your Page 2-5, my Page 2-4.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Source, 2080 build-out employment figure based on previous planning efforts and refined as part of the MMP.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: What previous planning efforts, and how did you refine them?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Exactly what we just talked about, the CIGM, the build-out study that we've done. And how we refined them was exactly what Jeff said, we looked at some areas that were done by previous studies that said these don't make any sense.

Now, in some of the allocations, I'll go to the map and kind of show you, when we brought up these traffic analysis zones, Jeff, Tindale-Oliver, they've all walked up and said, God, we're showing some population over here -- I'm putting the cursor here, I'm just using an arbitrary location -- or some population over here. So somewhere in one of the previous studies they didn't clean these TAZs. It wasn't a lot, it could have been a traffic analysis zone in Picayune Strand State Forest that showed a population of 300 or 500, and we said that doesn't make any sense.

So I think to Jeff's credit, we kind of put a hold on everything and we said, Jeff, go through all these TAZs, and if there's anything that's in the middle of a swamp, if it's in the middle of a lake, because the TAZ wasn't cleaned up, and it wasn't a lot, please clarify that and clean it up. And he did.

So that refinement is going through those TAZs and saying whatever previous planning effort was done, even though we're not trying to get down to the micro level of population, we didn't want to, in our data analysis someone says, hey, we'd like to pull up your TAZ map, call out TAZ-200 is in the middle of Big Cypress State Forest and you're showing 400 people there. So that was the refinement that we're talking about in this as well.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Question, Mark.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Nick, how do you come up with the numbers for employment? What kind of process do you go through to --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: In traffic modeling, when you get to -- in retail centers, when you get to industrial parks or things like that, they convert them to square footage to employment, how many people will actually work there. They call it employment matching as well there. So that's where they get that from.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, thanks.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes, sir, Paul?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: On Page 2-5 in mine where it says 2007 population per available acre, I'm looking at Immokalee and I'm seeing areas that are orange that are totally uninhabited, they're just orange groves and tomato fields. I don't know --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Are you in Map 2-2? This is Map 2-2, but the bottom -- I think the Chairman has an unabridged --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Map 2-3 is what I'm looking at. That one. Up in the upper right-hand corner, the Immokalee area. There's a lot of orange areas that are totally uninhabited.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: In where, sir?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: In the Immokalee urban area.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I have my cursor. Is it on the western side or --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: For example, north of New Market Road there's a big sort of rhomboid -- right there.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: That's an orange grove, nobody lives there.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: And that goes all the way up to the county line and outside.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yeah.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: And I think the color calls it -- my eyes are going to fail me.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Two to five per acre.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Two to five people per acre in that area.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: And that's just an example.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: But there is some -- and because the traffic analysis zone is so big, there is population on the north side of New Market, correct.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Correct.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: So that's -- even though -- that's the problem. This population right here, sir, that as I call it New Market, it gets blended into this zone as a total.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Okay.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That's why it shows up that way.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Well, on the curve below Immokalee.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: There's nobody that lives down there. Keep going down. Past the Immokalee urban boundary. South.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Here?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: No, on 846 South. Just past the urban boundary. South.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Over here?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: No.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Tell my cursor to go to the east or --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Go to the left. Left, left. Down. Down. The curve of 846 there.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay. What Jeff is telling me is that this inset probably needs to be corrected to match this. Because I think what you did, you used --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Oh, yeah, that's right, they're different.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yep. So I think we'll -- good catch. We're going to check that inset compared to I think when we printed it. And I'm going to look down to the 2080 and see if that -- yes.

Here's what happened, sir. This inset in the next page is this, and it was duplicated here. So we need to take this inset and blow it up to here. But that's -- good catch. Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Page 2-6 through 2-10.

Nick, your changes first.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm going to go through it, sir.

These are the tables. I see no other changes. And I'm at --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Just through 2-10 for now.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm through 2-10 and there are no other changes for us. So if you want to provide any comments, we can.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Page 2-9, Table 3, 2-3.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I already talked to you about the RLSA numbers. The total persons per household, 2007.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Are you saying that what David Weeks uses as 2.39 has dropped to 2.71?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You mean increased?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: In persons per household total.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Persons per dwelling unit?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Per dwelling unit. Same. Okay, I'm assuming a dwelling unit is a household?

MR. PERRY: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, then maybe you can explain the difference then.

MR. PERRY: A household is an occupied dwelling unit. So that your persons per household is basically persons per family, according to the census bureau. It does not take into consideration any vacant dwellings or anything like that.

So a persons per dwelling unit rate would be a much lower rate, because it does take into consideration all dwelling units including those that have no people living in them. So you always end up with a persons per household rate that may be 2.25 or 2.7, something like that within -- or sometimes three in Golden Gate Estates or Immokalee even higher. But persons per dwelling unit, when you start averaging in all of the vacant units, goes down to 1.8 or 1.6 or something like that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, thank you.

Anybody else through 2-10? Yes, go ahead, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Just to be clear, on this next series of maps, the employees, that's where they will live per available acre; is that right?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: When you say next series of maps, the ones we've just looked at?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, the 2.2-8.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You're in the next section.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Actually, 2-7 too. It just says employees per available acre. That means that's where they will reside; is that right?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes. Not reside, that's where the employment centers are, not residential. That's where the trip match happens in those TAZs.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: The prior one, you use the term employer. Hold on a second.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Would that be relevant, employer here?

MR. PERRY: The number of employees.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That's typically -- the nomenclature is employees, but it's not that they reside in that, that's their destination TAZ.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Prior to that you used population and employment. But -- okay. So these are employ -- maybe employment might be --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: The nomenclature for transportation model is employees. That's the way they use it for transportation -- I mean, I understand what you're saying.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: That's fine then.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, Page 2-11 through 2-15.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: All right, let me see if I have any changes in those, based on our comments. And then we'll come back and go through yours.

I'm at 2-13 at the bottom right. And I'll read the last sentence, or the sentence above it. We corrected to say -- second sentence bottom right-hand corner says areas with lower median ages also experienced higher student generation rates, as there are areas with a greater proportion of school age children and families.

Then we added a sentence at the bottom that says: The ratio of school age residents per housing unit in Figure 2-3 is a reflection of the number of students generated per dwelling unit on an average by census block group. It does not reflect the overall student population within a particular area but rather the ratio of students to total housing units.

And that was based on comments.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, before you leave that, though, it's saying the student projections in Table 2-3?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Two-three.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm on 2-3 now and I'm trying to see where it talks about students.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Are we referencing the wrong table, folks?

It should be figure maybe? Yeah, I think we have figure and table wrong.

I'm sorry, I said Table, it's Figure 2-3.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Thank you, Debbie.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Nick, can you scroll back up? My page numbers aren't matching.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, his are going to be off, because he's added text.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Right. It's 2-12 in our book.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That's Figure 2-2 is on 2-12. On my 2-12. That's what happens when you make corrections ahead of time.

So that takes me through the first five pages I believe, sir. No other changes at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody from the Planning Commission?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick, let's start on Page 2-12. Table 2-7. The fine printing underneath, it talks about how the census was based upon. It says in the fifth line down, 2006 data are based on the 2000 student generation rate brought current to 2006 using building permit and 2006 student enrollment data developed for the 2006 Collier County school impact fee update.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: So I want to make sure I'm looking at -- which table now?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right there, that table, the fine print halfway through down the bottom. It seems to me they're doing the opposite of what we just talked about.

When I questioned the persons per household rate on the population and Jeff was saying that the vacant housing, when it's included, the persons per dwelling unit applies, and it's 1.71, that's a far different multiplier than 2.39. But it looks like they're calculating students on building permits? Building permits are vacant houses in a lot of cases, especially now. So how is that accurate for determining student generation rate, which then determines schools and where vehicle roads would go and how people will travel?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'll let them answer. But I think the problem with going with students was the challenge of we didn't have anything to back check it with at this period other than to bring it current with building permits.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But doesn't the school board -- I mean, the last time I had seen some statistics from them, they had pretty good demographics on students and where their bodies are.

Tom, you guys keep track of where your students are coming from and things like that?

MR. EASTMAN: For the current student population, we know exactly where each student is located, each address.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Then could you -- do you do that -- I mean, you have it in some kind of format so if someone wanted to see it they could see it?

Did you guys bother to use it for your analysis of the master mobility plan?

MR. TINDALE: Sure we did. The big key with the impact fees is that you have houses being permitted that are vacant, and they still pay impact fees. You can't charge an impact fee for the students per occupied household and then have people pull permits and 20 percent of the homes are vacant and charge impact fees and not reduce the number of students per home, because you'll generate too much revenue.

So we have to, from an impact fee purposes, use persons per total homes, not students per occupied household. And there's no conflict with what we're seeing here in terms of the impact fee data and the impact fee data knew the number of students per occupied home. And the impact fee data knew from the analysis where in the school board the students per total homes.

So this is just a reference being sure that everybody understands that we have to be sure we monitor students per occupied home and students for all homes. If not, we're going to have people pulling a lot of permits without students and we're going to generate way too much money because we don't have the students in homes that pull permits to pay impact fees. So this is just a clarification of what we've got, how we used it and where the data came from.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Tom, does this data to generate students match up to the way the school system uses it?

MR. EASTMAN: I believe the student generation rates are what we've agreed upon in our interlocal for concurrency, so it would match up.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And you'd know. Thank you.

On Page 2-13, part of that map, especially the part that I believe is showing east of Orange Tree, south of Immokalee Road and all the way out to 29, student age, residents per housing units, greater than .75. That's your highest statistical area for students?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Per housing unit.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's the most sparsely populated part of the county.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Per housing unit. That's the key. That housing unit is higher -- lower, I'm sorry. Lower.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, so school age residents per housing unit, when it says greater than .75, explain to me for the dark brown what that means.

I'll just reverse the question, since I don't want to assume I know what it means. Because you guys seem to have a different way of explaining it, why don't you explain it first.

MR. PERRY: It means that there's an average of three-quarters of a student in every housing unit in that particular area. Greater than three-quarters. So it could be two, one, one and a half, two, three, four children, school age children per housing unit within those dark brown areas.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So the dark brown areas that are in the agricultural area predominantly, which happen to be part of the areas that overlap into the City of Immokalee where the density is even higher, they don't have a different perception for this plan, but any houses in those areas are just going to have the most students.

MR. TINDALE: We've done this with the parks master plan, we've done this with the school master plan and there's a message that comes out in Collier County. The older community is along the water, there are fewer students and it's an older community in terms of the age and higher income. As you move out, the age drops and the persons per household goes up, which is dominated by students.

So this is very consistent with the parks master plan, the school analysis, and you can't plan for the same age group moving out into this area with the same students as you have along the waterfront. And this just documents that as you grow, not the rate of growth or the number that are there, the number of students per household is going to be greater per unit in these areas than the historical areas where we have the higher income and the lower age.

And this is just a graphic showing that fact, and it's being used for all the different elements in terms of planning and understanding that as you move out to the east you're going to have a younger group of people moving into the county and you're going to have more students per household. Not the number of households, but the makeup of the households.

THE COURT REPORTER: May I have your name, please?

MR. TINDALE: My name is Steve Tindale, with Tindale-Oliver and Associates.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Steve, what you just said absolutely contradicts the statement I had asked for the same response for in 2004 and 2005 in the approval of Ave Maria. In that project they used a persons per household that was far less than the coastal area, because they argued just the opposite of what you just said.

But now what you just said and what this map reflects is they were wrong in that calculation.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You're right. What we found is Ave Maria has a lot more children per household. I, you know, raised as a good Catholic, I guess -- that community is --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's what I said and I was told no.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You were right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm just trying to understand. This plan is bringing in a lot of differentials that seem to contrast with things historically we have followed. And I'm trying to understand how you got there.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I remember your comments back then.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, I do too.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You said, don't you think if it's a Catholic university town we expect the population to be higher? And I think the testimony back then was, no, it probably will not be. And in fact we found out it is higher. They do have more students per household in the Town of Ave Maria.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It's good information for use in the future. Thank you.

Anybody on Pages -- we'll go 2-16 to 2-20.

(No response.)

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I have no pages going through 2-20 and 2.21 in my book. So I'll take comments from the Commission.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: On 2-17. There it is, 2-18 on your pages. See that big dark square right in the

middle of the rural area?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think it's Orange Tree.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, that's what I needed to know.

On Page 2-20, I think my question may have been answered, so just give me -- okay, yeah, my question's answered on that one, so -- okay, go ahead, Paul.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: On 2-19, you may not know the answer to this, but I noticed that the CAT trips have been going down and the passenger trips per capita have also been going down since 2007. Do you know why?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I don't. But I can tell you that they're starting to tick back up. Their data goes to 2009. Stops there. We're back up to -- if this chart was to continue up, now that we've got 2010 and 2011 data, I think that's the recession that we just went through. We did see a drop. But we are now back up to those 2006-7 levels that are starting to increase as well too.

So it's definitely the recession hit the CAT system a little bit. You can tell not that much. But it's now trending back up again, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Two-twenty to 2-15?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick, do you have any?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'll go through that, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: 2-21 to 2-25?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I do. I'm on R-224, and the title at the top says Section 2.2, Land Use and Development Patterns.

Under the current land use, second paragraph, we put -- and I'm kind of highlighting my cursor here. It says -- it says the existing and approved land use map shows the majority of existing development is located within the CUA coastal urban area.

And then on the right-hand side, we talked about environmentally sensitive areas. On the first bullet point we say protected and environmentally sensitive lands include the nearly 825,000 acres of federal and state parks, preserves, and refuges, along with the NRPA sending lands and the rural fringe mixed use district and -- and then we go on to finish the sentence.

So that was a correction. I think we received that from the environmental groups.

We get into Map 2-7, no changes. Two-eight, we talked about the -- it shows the activity centers.

And map 2-9. And I have no changes through 2-28.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We're not even that far yet, we're only going up to 2-25 right now.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yeah, I think I jumped ahead on the graphics, but --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You're just anxious.

Anybody from the Planning Commission through 2-25?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick, on Page 2-23, which is probably your 2-24.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay. One of the maps?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No, it's not a map. It starts out Section 2.2.2, the one you made some changes on.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Got it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That one, the first change you made, the existing and approved. But it also, it says that the majority of existing development is located in CUA?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Coastal urban area, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: GG is the Estates. I understand Immokalee. Everglades City? How do you get the majority of existing development in Everglades City? It's like a hundred and, what, a couple hundred, few hundred people down there?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: When we talk about existing development, those are the development centers. And I think --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But it says the majority of existing development. Do you think Everglades City represents a majority of the existing development? And likewise with Ave Maria?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Then why do you have them in here?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think Ave Maria would be one. When you talk about development, they've developed a university. Probably as of note with the residents. But I understand your comment about Everglades City.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Man, Everglades City is a great place, but it's just not where you'd picture the majority of development to be.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'll let the Mayor know you wanted this taken out, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's fine. No problem with that at all.

Let's go on, 2-26 through 2-30.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm through 2-30, sir, and I have no changes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: On Page 2-26, which is your 2-27.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: This one of the maps, sir?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's it. Right there, 2-9. Go all the way to the bottom and let's go back and look at your fun footnotes again.

Right there. The green represents protected and environmentally sensitive lands.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. My -- I have -- my copy is different, so I'm not even going to get into it.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think that was one of the -- maybe the map changes.

MR. PERRY: That's to be consistent with the text.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's fine. It works better this way, so -- Page 2-31 through 2-35? Anybody?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick, do you have any?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm scrolling through, sir, and I don't see any changes yet.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, on Page --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Sir, we have a note here, and I want to make sure I didn't get ahead too far. Maybe I did. It's our 2-35, above figure 2-20. We put a note. The RLSA build-out population estimate from Collier County interactive growth model.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Page 2-35 through 2-40. Anybody have any questions?

(No response.)

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No changes from us, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody from the Planning Commission?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Could you back up to that Map 2-10, which was the road network. Go back down now.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Corrected.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I love the hard copy I have. I had a lot more questions.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think it was a correction you pointed out, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. We're on 2-40, is that it, through 2-45? Anybody?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, 2-45 to 2-50.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And then 2-50 to the balance of this section. Does anybody have any other comments or questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick, do you have any other corrections?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: On Map 2-18, you're coming to it.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, how about the map titled Solid Waste.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think there was one comment about an existing site. And I think this is it. It's park sites. It's 2-17. Let me get to that map, sir. Two-eighteen. I think we made that correction.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I see it.

Okay, that gets us through Section 2. Does anybody have any questions further on that?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And we have, really I think Section 3 -- yeah, because the Appendix, I don't see us going through that. And the grant page, page at a time. So let's take a break and we'll come back after break and see where we go.

So we'll take a break till 10:30, okay?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Thank you.

(A recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, everyone, take your seats. We'll try to move forward.

But before we do, I forgot in Sections 1 and 2 to express afterwards that when we finish with each section, I'll turn to the public. If they want to comment on that section at the end of our discussion of that section, they'd be more than welcome to. You don't need to register, I'll just ask by people to come up.

But also at the very end when we talk about the last section today, I'll ask for any general comments from the public as well. So we'll make sure we have as much input as those here may want to provide.

And Chuck, you're the one person standing still right now.

MR. MOHLKE: Chuck Mohlke, a Naples resident.

If it please this honorable Commission, I'd just like to make two observations about the general areas covered in Section 2.

One is I have a lasting fear/concern that as we develop these very badly needed planning instruments, that it's often the case that they show over time historically different outcomes, particularly as they're related to populations. Methods are employed that although conceptually similar are very often in their execution very different indeed.

And it concerns one when you go to listen to conversations among members of, for example, the Metropolitan Planning Organizations' advisory committees and they're talking about methodologies that are being employed that address the issue of plans for non-motorized transit in Collier County and in Lee County, that they have quarrels over validation of methodologies, concerns expressed about the integrity of this data over time. The way in which some of the studies are funded often comes in conflict with a desirable public purpose in having the best available population information estimates and projections as possible.

And I will seize on one point discussed earlier to give an example of my concern. The traffic analysis zones that are fundamental to the development of population information and have been used extensively in the material that you have before you in the master mobility plan are undergoing change over time. They are almost uniformly smaller, more compact, are, to use the language of redistricting, more contiguous than they often have been in the past. Very admirable objective.

But my concern is that as plans are developed and if they're robust plans that change over time, what guarantee do we have that these new configurations of the basic unit of population projection, the traffic analysis zone, are changed uniformly in all of these plans? That at some point in time periodically they're validated, periodically they are adjusted to reflect the recent findings of the 2010 census.

And you have a statement from but one person, me, that this activity is not going on presently, that there is not a coordinated attempt to look systematically at each one of these efforts to estimate and project populations over time that indicates that there's a good line of communications between the various agencies, all of whom use these to make what eventually ends up by becoming the real concern here, and that's rival claims on resources.

I think we ought to have this much money based upon the population estimates developed X number of years ago but which we have used for our planning purposes saying we need these resources in order to serve the public well. And then have others with limited resources being available making alternate claims that say well, my numbers are better than your numbers because they're more robust, they've been more recently validated, they don't rely on 2007 information, as this study does.

And I just ask the question for general purposes: At what point in time will what I hope will be a very robust system here be adjusted to have population reflect accurately the findings of the 2010 census?

Will then routinely, over the time between today and the time that you next look at a master mobility plan update, either an interim update or the basic update when this plan basically is reviewed at the same level you're reviewing it now. I'm very hopeful that this can take place.

I'll conclude my remarks this way. Mr. Chairman: You had asked earlier, why not use BEBR, the Bureau of Economic and Business Research population estimates. And there are often very good reasons for not doing that. But we do have after all through the county's Comprehensive Planning Department efforts to on a yearly basis make population estimates and projections. These will often end up mid-decade being very different than the projections that are relied on for planning purposes by the master mobility study, the transit study and a wide variety of other things that have to do with transportation related issues, pathways, greenways and sidewalk planning, for example.

And at some point in time other independent agencies, the district school board, the fire districts, a wide variety of other independent concerns that are not covered by the Comprehensive Plan of Collier County will have similar estimates of what their needs are based on population projections that they have developed.

At some point in time somebody is going to have to say how do we coordinate these efforts, how do we use that basic unit, the traffic analysis zone that has been updated and adjusted geographically to reflect current growth trends, are these reflected in the planning documents of other agencies?

Presently, I hope I'm wrong about this. I don't think that discussion is taking place. And perhaps one way to give it some specific reference, we are working with planning community districts in Collier County that were designed 30 years ago, and they have not been adjusted since that time. A combination of annexations, the creation of the New City of Marco Island and a number of other things have created what is left over, what survives, perhaps, from those old planning community districts, particularly in the urban area, that simply don't make any sense anymore. But we still use them. And the grounds are simple, that we in order to look carefully at trends over time, we have to keep uniformity in the system.

Well, it's desirable, but there's a way to make those adjustments and then use simultaneously both systems for a period of what, 36 to 48 months and then gradually move into the new system, knowing full well that it has been accommodated to reflect trends over time. I'm just hopeful that that will happen.

And that's the conclusion of my remarks, and I thank you for the opportunity to make them.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you, Chuck. Appreciate it.

Does anybody else want to speak from the public at this time?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We'll have more opportunity as we go through each section and at the end as well.

So with that, let's move to Section 3. It's a short section, so let's just take it all at once.

Nick, do you have any changes in Section 3?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, Commissioner, I'm going to go through real quick, just take a quick look. But while I'm doing that, I think the most important thing is to say that I think we raised the bar. There are a couple of comments here that were modified. And I'm on 3-6.

Under the public stakeholder meeting, number four, was held on November 21st, 2011, from 9:00 to 11:00 a.m. at the South Regional Library and was attended by 20 participants. I think we put some details in here.

Public stakeholder meeting number five was held on November 9th, 2011 from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. The exhibit hall was attended by seven participants. The purpose of these two meetings was to answer questions on the draft public report and gather feedback on the recommendations and questions and comments. So I think we're just making a note that we didn't have this information at the time of the report, and we put that in there now.

So those are the changes we have there.

And then said under this bullet point, Golden Gate Estates, Orange Tree. For instance, options that maximize the capacity should be emphasized in the area. Transfer of development rights should be used to reduce densities in targeted areas. And that was part of that public involvement.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody have any questions on Section 3?

(No response.)

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Let me go through the rest to make sure there's nothing else. One more comment. I know maybe I'm -- I want to stress this enough. But I've got to tell you, if this is the way we do business, it's

phenomenal in the sense you're getting public feedback. It's really, really good. The downside is it takes a lot more time to get things done. And I don't think that's a bad tradeoff. But we have definitely set the bar in public involvement with this project. So I want to make sure you're aware of that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Section 4 is a little bit longer, so let's take it about 10 pages at a time, if that's okay with you guys. It's more of a conceptual discussion.

So on the first 10 pages, which is Pages 4-1 through 4-10, Nick, do you have any changes?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm going to scroll through real quick, sir.

I'm on our Page 4-7. It's -- I'm on the right-hand side. And I think we put the word -- I'm going to try and find the beginning of the sentence here -- using 19 -- 190,000 square feet of potential neighborhood commercial at Golden Gate and Wilson Boulevard as a proxy, parentheses, 150,000 square feet recently approved plus the potential increase to additional 40,000 square feet. An additional 200,000 square feet of retail development was assumed for each neighborhood center. We put the word each in front of that so that we could talk about that. Again, to Commissioner Schiffer's comments about neighborhood center, activity center. So that change was made.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Before you leave that change, I'm trying to understand what you're saying there.

You use the -- using 190,000 square feet potential for the neighborhood center at Golden Gate and Wilson Boulevards as a proxy, what do you mean by as a proxy?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Assuming that that location worked and what was approved by the community, looking at this map -- and this is not the activity center map, but TDR map. Let me just see if I have an activity center map.

We said at the other locations where, say, Golden Gate and Everglades, right now you can't be that size, we used that as a proxy to kind of look at those areas, if they were treated the same way. If the community liked that one and that one worked, those other activity centers or neighborhood centers were brought up to that level. Or assumed. So we just said if that is a proxy, if that worked and that's what the community wanted, let's assume those at those other locations as well too.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: See, because when I read this the first time, my impression was that an additional 200,000 square feet of retail development was assumed for neighborhood centers located at the remaining three intersections. So if you allow five acres in each corner, the square footage, I didn't do the calculation or go back to the GMP to do it at the time, but my assumption was then that those three came up to about 200,000.

But what you're now saying is on each one you have predicted 200,000, right?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, we didn't predict them --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You proxied it, whatever you --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, how does that influence your mapping, your VHT and your VMT, if you are using the 200,000 as a basis for any calculation?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We're reducing? You mean increasing it?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You're reducing them, but you're reducing them based on that being done, right, as a proxy, more or less?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, I think --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I just want to make sure that this doesn't suggest that you're -- someone could use this as a basis to change the Golden Gate Area Master Plan by saying according to this plan it was needed this way.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It was tested this way. So it wasn't -- not to say it needed. That's a whole different discussion. You had said earlier, to make any of those changes you would need a Growth Management Plan. And we're going to put that in there.

But we tested it to see what would happen if we did that, if that first intersection was approved by the community and that worked really well, and if we tested the other areas, what would happen. Obviously you're going to get a VMT reduction, because you're going to have those centers there.

Not to suggest that, again, throughout this discussion we say that those changes have to be vetted by what the community wanted. We just show that those kind of changes benefit the VMT and VHT. You still have to take into the socioeconomic consideration with those.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Did you use any other non-GMP approved proxies in your analysis, or was it just that Golden Gate again got the benefit of being singled out for such treatment?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, we looked at what the densities in the rural village is and what the density transfers would do, and those aren't approved right now. But we tested those as well too. So yeah, we have looked at other areas as well, too.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Before this is -- before this goes to the Board, are we going to get a redline draft back?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We can.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And I think -- I would suggest we do. But I don't care if it's a colored version of all the flash, but a redline version of the text is all I would like to see.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Sir, if we make changes, and based on the changes we have here, would it be okay if we submitted it to the Planning Commission electronically so that you could review the redline easy or -- yeah, sure.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: See, I'm real slow today, but you're going the opposite direction.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, it's a problem. If it's okay with the Planning Commission, we'd be happy to send you an electronic copy. It's very easy to review that way. But if you want a hard copy --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Electronic's fine with me. Is that okay with everybody?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It's fine with me.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Happy to do that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, any other changes you have in Section 3?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Four.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Or whatever section. Four.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm through 4-11, sir, and I have no other changes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody have any questions in Section 4 through Page 10? I'm sorry, we have to go every 10 pages.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I do, Mark.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Nick, on the first page, these are the overview of conceptual plans. The -- I kind of thought the mobility plan was going to, you know, hopefully change some of the rules, but the first one you're saying is that, you know, to identify strategies that respond to the county's development plan.

I mean, shouldn't this be influencing the development plan or --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, I suppose you could use the word influence, or that guide the county development and economic goals. That's a good comment. I think we could look at that, that guide or influence.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Because I think the purpose of this is to use these concepts to, you know, reduce the vehicle miles, the vehicle hours, not just calculate what they will be if we develop -- as we're developing. Shouldn't we be changing that course if it makes sense with mobility?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yeah, comment behind me was both. But I agree. To, you know, to respond to an inference or guide the county's development and economic goals. I think that's a good point.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. And then another question is on Page 4-3, vertical mixed use. What did you mean by vertical mixed use? Retail on the ground floor, office in the mid-section, residential on top?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Vertical mixed use? Show me where, sir. I just want to make sure --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, yeah, it'd be on the lower right-hand side on 4-3. That may not be your number, I guess.

See the last paragraph: along with the benefits.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir, under reduce the VMT. Mixed use developments also have many economic and environmental developments, especially with concern to vertical mixed use.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And that's what you mean by that?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody else through Page 10?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I may have a couple. I'm trying to see if they're already answered.

That one has been. On Page 4-7, well, actually, it's Table 4-1, so I don't know what page that is on your -- there it is.

I just want you to know I strongly object to that table being included as part of this study. I don't believe that the areas that are being singled out in Golden Gate Estates for the TDR's or wildlife habitat corridors are appropriately annotated -- should be in this plan.

I'm not saying they're the wrong thing to do, I'm just saying it's the wrong plan to do it and notification to the public was far inadequate in comparison to the application that's being applied here.

Did you individually notify all those residents being affected like we did during the Golden Gate master plan study when things like this are happening in the neighborhoods? I know you didn't.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, sir. And I think we're very aware of that. And what we're recommending is -- and when we get to the recommendations, we'll talk about that. But I think what we're suggesting is those are areas that we have vetted with the civic association, that has been talked about through the watershed plans. Not the green at the bottom. But what we're recommending is that a committee made up of the residents of the Estates as well as some of the urban fringe and coastal area looks at that.

So we fully expect this to be a very detailed analysis, not by just county staff but by the residents that are there.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But Nick, the residents or whoever thinks this is needed needs to go to the Board and request a study be done specifically earmarked for this kind of activity. You don't throw it into this plan and have it put on a map on this plan, because it's almost a done deal.

If you're doing a due diligence on a piece of property that you're buying in that green or that orange area and you see this plan, I'd automatically be concerned about the piece of property I was buying and what it meant. And the fact that it was even bureaucratically in the process is scary. That's just not fair to the property owners out there.

Give it to them right. Do it through stakeholders meetings like you have everything else, and then that's the way to go. Or through the reappointment of the Golden Gate Area Master Plan committee and let it come up through that process. But not as a -- thrown in as the highjacking of this process. I don't believe it's correct.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Mr. Chairman, you're talking about a Catch 22. This is a way to introduce it. And if we introduce it and we say -- and we can say to the Board, if you say don't do it, comment received, we're done.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, well, I'm one person that's saying don't do it. Comment received. There it is.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: So sir, you would not want us to vet this with the community? Because we've got some positive feedback --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Not through this plan. If the community -- or the environmental community want this, they need to approach the Board like every time you need a new plan, not by in trying to put it on the map in this plan.

Everything that goes on this plan someone is going to use for a wrong purpose in the future. Seems to happen with every single plan we do. We don't know what they're going to use it for, we don't know what kind of defense they're going to make out of it, but they'll throw it up in the future saying see, it's on the plan, it was in the public, everybody knows this. And that's not the purpose of this mobility plan.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Mr. Chairman, I have the highest respect for you and I'm not trying to be argumentative, but what I want to say is that it's important that we note what we're asking for in the recommendation is we're asking to get with the community to look at this. Because through the watershed plans and then that green area to the south of the mobility plan, we've said this is something we should look at.

And all we're saying in this planning document is go out to the community and do exactly what you're saying. So I'm in a Catch 22. If I don't bring it up and say to the Board, tell us to go talk to the community, that's why I'm saying, I feel like I'm in a Catch 22 when you make that comment. Really, our intent is to meet with the civic association, meet with the residents and say, look, here's an opportunity, you want the Estates to be a certain way, there's a dual benefit both from the watershed plan and the mobility plan. A committee should be put forward from the people that are there, whether it's a Golden Gate Area Master Plan restudy, but take the time to look at it. Because we have received a lot of positive comments about this, and it's strictly voluntary.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. And I think like the paragraph you added that I pointed out earlier, you put it in a separate executive summary to the Board and say it's time this happened. This came about as our review from the public input on the master mobility plan.

But again, I think it's wrong to stick it in this plan, even as a visual reference, because someone is going to lock it in and get hurt by it, unintendedly.

And I'm not saying I'm against either one of those. In fact, probably good ideas, but it's not the ideas that belong in this plan.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Understood and noted, sir.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: I just have a question.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Isn't the -- this taking wildlife and the environment and sensitive lands, isn't that part of the requirement for the grant?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It is.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Isn't it required in the grant?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It was applied for in the grant, and that was one of the grant stipulations that we would -- we looking -- we have to comply with the grant. And that was one of the bullet points.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But it wasn't advertised as a conservation plan or a transfer of development rights plan, was it?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: How many people do you think actually read that grant document? How many people actually know how to find it on the internet? How many people in those orange areas or those green areas have pulled that document down from the internet and found it? I doubt if any of them have.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, the civic association representation has. I know they could --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm not -- I don't -- they're wrong then too. I don't think you can ignore people's individual property rights by drawing up plans, overlays on their properties without them being notified about it. I think it's just wrong, so --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Sir, I don't want to make it a circular discussion. I want to note your objection and definitely take that into consideration.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Pages 10 through 20?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I do.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: On 4-11, in there you're giving some techniques used to improve -- that's exactly right, to improve a product level of connectivity.

What does the first one do? When you say reduce intersect spacing, what do you mean by that -- intersection?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Let me read it in context, and that way I think it will help the audience and myself get up to speed. Let me see if there's a sentence that starts from the beginning.

Connectivity starts at the project level, where a mix of land uses should be able to interconnect with roads, transit and non-motorized options. When residents who want to shop at a neighborhood commercial center must get in their cars and travel outside the development on the arterial network, it wastes fuel, increases emissions and inconveniences the resident and the motoring public on the arterial.

Instead, having an intersection to the neighboring development, efforts to direct access to car or better yet by non-motorized travel, this reduces congestion, emissions, improving system operation, providing additional opportunities for exercise. Some of the techniques to use to improve project level connectivity are reducing intersection spacing, public safety, pedestrian and bicycle connections.

In an urban area, sometimes reducing that spacing helps out for that connectivity, because what you're saying is -- Radio Road, a couple of roads, if you can't cross that intersection, can't cross the road because spacing is a mile apart, then you've got to get in your car. But where you reduce it and you provide crosswalks and safe crossings, as long as it doesn't hamper that mobility for the vehicles and are timed properly, you allow that ability to cross that road without going a mile down, making a U-turn with a vehicle, or a half mile down to cross at a crosswalk, so --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah, I get it on the big scale, but somehow I pictured a smaller scale you're reducing. But, like for example, you have a distance between intersections like, you know, especially traffic lights. You're not thinking of reducing that, you're thinking of -- in other words, in a large development, don't have long

spaced crossovers on main streets.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think -- Mr. Tindale said inside the neighborhoods but also in your urban area, on your non-collectors and arterials, making sure you have crosswalks and safe intersections as well. But exactly his point, inside the neighborhoods as well, too, sir.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. And essentially at a pedestrian scale place these elements.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes. Development scale.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'm done, thanks.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Page 4-12. Right there. The second -- wait a minute. We're not on the same, but go down one page if you could, Nick.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: The graphic?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No, mine starts connectivity test number two.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir, right here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Number one, I'm sorry. Number one, the next one up. Keep going.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh, there it is. Okay, so where it's the second paragraph where it says following.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Following a run of the travel demand model, the results of the test network were compared with the baseline 2035 needs plan.

Now, when you did a run of the travel demand model, what does that mean? What did you use for the statistics that went into that run?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, we used the 2035 needs network as your tool to measure with by. That never changed.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, the statistics used to determine the Table 5 results, which is your vehicle miles traveled, and I'm considering again -- I'm back to population. What population basis did you use for that travel demand model?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: The one we outlined in the first chapter, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The one with the lower, more conservative populations?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I wouldn't say lower. I think it's lower -- to the point we could justify -- again, I've said it several times, you're in a Catch 22. If I start putting in too much population, I mean, I'm criticized for doing that as well, too. Almost I'm forcing the plan to show more results than I have. But --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Look at Table four -- look at your Table 4-2, Figure 4-2, next one. That's really the Ave Maria area.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That is Immokalee and --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Immokalee is kind of north of that. Looks like you cut off on the south side of Immokalee. And you have Farm Workers Village, maybe, but the bulk of that is the Ave Maria area.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Is this Ave Maria down here?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No, it's to the left. See the big -- right there.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That's it. Yes, that's the road, uh-uh.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think that's probably where a good part of the development would be that's in that area.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: How did you look at that development for your travel demand? Did you look at it as what they built there?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We looked at what's there. And we said if you connect --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Jeff is shaking his head no.

MR. PERRY: The forecast model that was used, as Nick indicated, is the 2035 roadway network. We applied the 2080 traffic analysis zone data that we talked about earlier. So that assumes a full build-out, whatever was in the county's records, the full build-out of the entire county was included in that forecast.

So the rural lands, the discussion we had earlier about having taken the interactive growth model projections

for build-out within each traffic zone, modifying those based on our understanding that came out of the rural lands review, that particular area plus every other change that was made in the land use forecast. But it was a 2080 land use forecast applied using the 2035 roadway model. We did not have a 2080 roadway model -- roadway network to use.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, but then what you did is you calculated somehow how the vehicle miles and the vehicle hours would be traveled, assuming by individuals within those vehicles.

MR. PERRY: Right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: How did you get the body count for individuals or the quantity count for the vehicles?

MR. PERRY: That's a statistic that comes out of the model. For instance, when you run the model, whether -- regardless of where the data sets come from, whether it's 2080 or 2035, 2007, which is the validation year, the model keeps track of every car and every person within the car and how much travel they make during the course of a day. So that is a VMT statistic. How long it took them to make those trips is a VHT statistic that comes out of the model.

And what we did was we ran the model to come up with a baseline condition as a starting point, tweaked the little roadway network within this particular map area to add some interconnecting collector roads that would connect some of these zones together that were not in the original model. We ran the model and looked at the difference.

That's why I said earlier, it makes no -- the issue of what's in the model to begin with is really irrelevant, because what we're looking at is the change between one run and the next run. They both have exactly the same land use forecast to them in this particular example, the same land use forecast.

All we did was added a few interconnecting roadways between some of the traffic zones and then reran the model and looked at the VMT and VHT to see if there was any change in the statistics that would say, okay, people were able to travel from one zone -- easier from one zone to the next zone, neighbor next door, and therefore there was less VMT, less travel. And it may have taken them longer or may have taken them shorter. Those are the statistics that actually come out of the model based on the two runs, and that's the comparison that's made.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So the only factor you're relying on is the consistency or the progress of the -- I guess the population or the number of vehicles that you predicted between one run and the other. Meaning if you have one run based on X and a second one based on X plus one, you're showing something because something's got to occur.

MR. PERRY: Right. In this example where we did not change any of the land use consent, in other words, there was no change made in the number of dwelling units, population, employment or anything like that, all we did was change the roadway network upon which the people travel. So the same 107,000 dwelling units in the rural lands boundary line plus the X number in Immokalee and every place else, those people changed their travel patterns, some of them did, changed their travel patterns because of a few little roadway interconnects that were made. People in zone one were able to go next door to zone two a lot faster and easier. And those statistics of how much they travel actually comes out at the end of the day in the model.

So we can actually easily compare by area or by countywide what the travel demand characteristics were. That's the purpose of the test, to test one condition versus another condition.

The fact that we started with 200,000 people or 500,000 people or a million people doesn't make any difference, because the same numbers are used in both examples. All we're doing is looking at the travel demand of that same number of people and employees.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you. Appreciate it.

Paul?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I don't know exactly where this is going to fit in, but right now in Immokalee a lot of the people that I know commute to the coastal area to do work in lawns, to work in hotels, to work in other blue kinds of blue collar jobs, industrial areas. And when I first started on this board there was a big push to get affordable housing spread more evenly through the county instead of having Immokalee be the low housing capital of the county.

I'm looking through here. Is there anything about spreading low income housing -- or I guess affordable housing is the preferred term now -- more evenly through the county so people don't have to commute so far in order to get to work?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Having available housing is important. And one issue with this plan, and I've

discussed it with several of the Board of County Commissioners, was we did a study last year that showed there was an abundance of housing available throughout the county. We did not bring it into this plan because it was controversial in the sense that -- well, because --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I agree, it is controversial --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It is controversial.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: -- and seen that.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: And the data that goes with that to say that, okay, we all know that if you don't have the proper blend of obviously employment and reasonable affordable housing, your plan's not going to work. You're going to have your lower income folks living far away, because that's where it's cheap, and they're going to have to commute a lot more.

So intuitively we know that. But we did not put this in this plan because it was one of those issues that we said was not outlined in the grant, unlike the conservation issue. It was brought up and discussed but we said now we're getting into a whole nother issue, so it's not included in here specifically as a component of it.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Just as an example, my son's been out of work like for a year and a half, and he just now, like a couple of months ago, found a job, but it's way over in the industrial part of Naples, so he drives like almost 100 miles a day, you know, just to go back and forth to work. And he drives in this old truck. He uses a lot of gas. And, you know, if the housing and the employment opportunities could be better distributed, you know, we'd really go a lot towards implementing the intent of this plan.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I would bet we reference it in here, but if we do not, we definitely need to put in that comment. Because that's an excellent point. Because today, Commissioners, a lot of talk about affordable housing not being needed, you know, get rid of the affordable housing committee, we can put it away right now, I'm not that young or that old, but I can tell you it's cyclical. I guarantee you we're going to be here 10 years from now, and if this thing kicks up again, we will have that same discussion about affordable housing in the urban area as we did five years ago. So I think if it's not noted clearly I think he raises a good point. We need to note that.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I think what we have now, it's true, right now there is housing and it's not that expensive. Of course a lot of people don't have money to purchase it. But we're in kind of an anomaly. This housing recession is not going to -- we certainly hope it's not going to continue for another 10 or 20 years, and probably it won't. So if we do good planning now, we may be able to avoid future problems.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Agreed. And noted, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Page -- I think we're on Page 20 through was it -- we left off on 20? Well, let's say 20 through 30. Anybody have any questions?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No?

Nick, Page 4-21, which I'm not sure what number it is on yours. But let's try to find it. It's the one that's protected natural areas.

Okay, go above that, the page just prior to that.

On this page it starts out on mine with a split section, which yours doesn't have. Let me match up.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Four-four.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: In your -- yeah, 4.4, starts talking in that one about halfway down -- no, it doesn't. It looks like -- go down further. Okay, hold it right there if you could.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Sure.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, right where your cursor just was. Right there. See where it says today many people enjoy living in Golden Gate Estates?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: At the times the roads were built, however, there was a negative impact, and it starts going on about how the roadways in Golden Gate Estates, the historic sloughs and overland sheetwater flows of water have been interrupted?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Over-drainage of wetlands has occurred, and the displacement of past wildlife corridors is evident.

I don't disagree with that.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But read the -- go down further, see where it says wild (sic) visitors and sportsmen were discovering coastal Collier County. It talks about -- huh?

THE COURT REPORTER: Wild visitors?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh, yeah, while visitors. Cherie's through all this. While, W-H-I-L-E. While visitors and sportsmen.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Cherie' had it right. We need to fix that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Were discovering coastal Collier County, settlers and residents were developing a growing expanse of productive agricultural lands. And it goes on to say what a great place it is for agricultural, and I think that's fine, too.

But agricultural does the same thing to flow ways and all the rest of the elements and drainage that you're claiming Golden Gate does, but in Golden Gate you point it out as a negative, and you don't bother doing the same thing in reference to the agricultural.

I think it's an unfair characterization of Golden Gate Estates. And I would rather this not portray Golden Gate Estates in a negative when it's doing no different than the agricultural is doing.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You know, it's funny you say that, because our surface water team that's putting together a business plan noted the same thing, one of the big issues is agriculture. So I think to be fair we note that -- we combine that comment and note that agricultural impacts it as well, too, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Why don't you just state the concerns you have about what Golden Gate's created but not come to the conclusions that you have without adding the same conclusions to agriculture.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Agree. I'm agreed.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We're going through Page 30, and let's go to the end. Anybody have any further questions on Section 4?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I have a change here, sir. I think it might come from some of the environmental groups. I'm in -- the two bullet points says primary zone and secondary zone, 4-25 in my book. And it's just under the map here, under Map 4-1 on the next page.

Under the primary zone we write: Those lands compromising (sic) primarily of non-urban and natural habitats, and we cross out sufficient size and then continuous/connected patterns that can fully support panther utilization for life cycle needs including breeding, resting, denning, stalking, crossed out "and feeding", and then add, and may act as landscape connections to buffers to adjacent land uses.

And then in the secondary zone we corrected or added those lands adjacent or contiguous with primary zone that are lower quality habitat and do not currently. That was added.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Before you go off those two bullets, can we question those now?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You can, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: In your primary zone. So in order to be a primary zone, because this is important, this came out in the RLSA study which is coming back to haunt us here soon, so we might as well understand what a primary zone is, those lands comprised primarily of non-urban and natural habitats that can fully support panther utilization for life cycle needs, including breeding, resting, denning, stalking, feeding. And then instead of the word or, you use the word and, and may act as landscape connectors to buffers or adjacent land uses.

So if you have a landscape connector or buffer to adjacent land uses but it can't support life cycle needs, including, nesting, denning or stalking or feeding, then it doesn't apply. It has to have both by the word and; is that correct?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That's correct, according to the way it's written, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Because that has a bearing on how we've looked at those connection points.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I mean, we've got one now with Lost Grove Mine. There's a piece to the north of Corkscrew Road that is considered to be primary. But under this definition I'm not sure it may be.

Ms., if you're going to be speaking you need to come up and use the mic., and you're more than welcome to. You know that, Nancy.

MS. PAYTON: Well, I was trying to tell them --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I know. But she's trying to write everything down you're saying, and you're distant, so --

MS. PAYTON: Nancy Payton, Florida Wildlife Federation.

Why can't we just use the definition from the Fish and Wildlife Service, rather than reinventing our own definition of primary and secondary? Because it references Fish and Wildlife Service has designated these two zones, why don't we just use their wording as to how they describe them.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Doesn't matter to me. But somebody went to a point to put it in here separately, so I was trying to resolve it.

MS. PAYTON: That may be. I think that was a suggestion of The Conservancy. And Nicole is shaking her head, Nicole Johnson from The Conservancy, that they suggest the definition from Fish and Wildlife Service, the official definition. She's shaking her head yes --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Do you have any problem with that?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, sir. We'll note that that's the official definition.

MS. PAYTON: So that is the official definition?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So this is the official definition.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, we'll note it --

MS. PAYTON: The amended. What's amended. In the two colors.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Tim?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, let's see if we can get to the bottom line here.

MR. DURHAM: Tim Durham with Stantec.

The original language that was in there was meant to be a little bit more for laymen, a little less technical. The Conservancy corrected it to match the definition that Fish and Wildlife has.

The problem you're noting, Mr. Strain, is exactly what I've had a long time. The definition and what's mapped doesn't always match.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's what I'm --

MR. DURHAM: It's a common problem.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's kind of why I wanted to bring it up, because we have it currently with one application that is coming back to us and we have it coming up in other studies that are going to come before us. So whatever definition we use, if everybody's in agreement with it, we certainly ought to know what it means.

And if that is the definition that the agency uses, is that correct?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: What I'm going to do, sir, is footnote that, and I will put a note that says as defined by the agencies. That way it's clear to everybody.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm fine with that. I just want to make sure it's consistent.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Very good.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Now, if you could -- anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If not, move forward with the rest of your points.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Couple other changes here to note. In the next paragraph, development activity, roadway widening and new road construction which is proposed within either of the primary or secondary zones or that may have an effect on panthers or panther habitat. That was added.

And then top paragraph here, habitat compensation must be provided for the direct impacts of the roadway footprint and associated water quality treatment areas, and minimization measures may be required regarding the indirect impacts for projects such as increased traffic and disturbance. Therefore, expenses of such compensation and minimization were added.

Lower, next paragraph, we added: And other federal and state listed species, so that we didn't leave that out. Those are the only changes there, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, we're going all the way to the end of this section, so if you have any other --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm scrolling through now. It appears I have none.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody have any questions on the rest of the section?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Are there anybody in the public that would like to discuss Section 3 or 4 at this

time?

Nicole?

MS. JOHNSON: Good morning. For the record, Nicole Johnson here on behalf of The Conservancy. And I do want to acknowledge and thank staff for incorporating many of the changes that we requested in Section 4. I think it's important to note that along with the definition from the Service about primary and secondary habitat there's also a map that specifically maps out where those zones are located, and that's part of Map 4-2, and I believe 4-1 also, perhaps.

One additional request that we had made was a, what we considered a correction to Map 4-2 in talking about wildlife linkages. If you look on the map just north of I-75 in the north Belle Meade area, there are a couple areas sectioned out as potential wildlife underpasses, but there are no roads there, and there are no roads planned to be there. And if all this mapping is based on the 2035 needs plan and there are no roads there, then it seems a bit presumptuous to assume that there would be a wildlife underpass needed in those areas. So we had requested that those be removed.

If in the future roads are planned there, then it would be appropriate to take a look at underpasses. But we saw that as premature to assume underpasses there.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick, do you have any --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm going to have Tim talk about that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Can you pinpoint us? I've just finally found the page and the maps, since mine isn't consistent with everybody else's.

MR. DURHAM: (Indicates). We're looking.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, thank you.

MR. DURHAM: If I may, I'll address that. Tim Durham with Stantec.

Mrs. Johnson and I exchanged voice mail messages and missed each other. I've been in the swamp buggy the last two days.

We have no problem with removing those. Those were originally on there kind of to inform people that if a road was to come through there it has major obstacles. The plan has evolved since then and they can be taken off. I don't believe we have any trouble doing that.

MS. JOHNSON: Great, thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nicole, a completely different subject. Just to point out, this map stops the primary panther habitat south of Corkscrew Road.

MS. JOHNSON: It actually, if you look on the insert, the primary does have a little bump north of Corkscrew Road, and that is the extent of the primary habitat. The remainder of the area north of Corkscrew Road is secondary habitat. It's occupied, but --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Just crosshatching, not the green and the crosshatching. Okay. Thank you. Good. You know, that was from our last conversation, or last meeting.

So -- okay, anybody else want to speak on these two?

Nancy, come on up.

MS. PAYTON: Nancy Payton, Florida Wildlife Federation.

An additional thought on the primary and secondary, maybe it could be footnoted. I notice there are footnotes for other references to studies and important information. Just footprint the appropriate document for primary and secondary. And I see --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think he was going to do that. I think he kind of said it, but --

MS. PAYTON: I thought it was just a reference to this, but we're asking for something a little more specific.

And I just briefly want to comment about my experiences participating in the master mobility plan process. And it was a very open process and very free for people to attend team meetings, which the public has not had that opportunity in the past.

It's a very good website. It's a simple website. And you don't have to search for that Department of Energy grant, it's right on the MMP website, right at the top of one of the pages. So there is a lot of information there. It's very easy to find.

We like what they did with the environment and wildlife, and that was one of the missions of the grant and the funding of the grant. And I think it's very important when you're dealing with the built infrastructure, you have to also take consideration of the green infrastructure. And that's a portion of this plan.

And trying to meld together -- mesh together the various plans that have been done in this county so they support and balance one another, rather than having these, this is a plan, this is a plan and this is a plan and they're not integrated at all. And I commend staff for trying to do their best to integrate the various plans so it truly is a comprehensive plan to give direction.

And I know there was some objections to including about northern Golden Gate Estates flow ways and habitat linkages. I think it's very important to have those in there for policy discussions, because they are issues for a variety of reasons, for flow ways, not only for flood control and water quality and related issues, but also fire protection.

And one of the major impediments to producing new roads in this county is habitat mobility and impacts to wildlife. So when you talk about a mobility, an increasing mobility, the environment is a very important factor in determining how you do that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you.

Okay, that's Section 4. We'll go on to five?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think we can do --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: By the way, Nick, I didn't see the -- and I have seen the grant application, I didn't see it in this packet. So --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'll get you a copy. Sir, it's on the website.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I've got it. I just wanted -- what's in this packet that staff produced is not the grant application, so --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay, sir. I'll take you back to the slide show, I think, because we've changed some of the objectives and recommendations to be a little more illustrative. Unless you wanted to go by --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I thought we were going to Section 5, master mobility plan recommendations. Is that --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I can do that, sir, if you'd like.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, no, if you've got other ways to -- I'm not trying to stop you. I'm just trying to understand. You want to do five through --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yeah, why don't we take comments and then maybe do the -- through the Power Point some of the recommendations and discuss them. So let me get it to page view.

Okay, and I'm in the first beginning.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody have any -- well, let's see, these recommendations are only 10 -- let's do first five pages. Anybody -- do you have any changes on the first five pages?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Minor. Under Objective 1 we use impact/mobility fee incentives here. We added that. And then here we crossed out documented in Section 6, just to be clear.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Mark?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We have a lot of changes. We could go through these things, but we can take comments as you go forward. Added mobility to the impact/mobility, so it would be clear.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Paul may have had a question about your first objective. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yeah, I think my point about the affordable housing, maybe it could be somehow injected into the idea about mixed use districts. Just sort of expand the definition to include a mix of housing types.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That's a good point, a balanced blend of housing.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yeah.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Because I think that would --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That's a good point --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: It's vague, it's not going to stir up any hornet's nests or anything, but, you know, at least --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Mr. Midney, I really appreciate you saying that because --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: At least, you know, it gets the idea out there. If you can somehow put it in that area.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: If you're happy with the words a balanced blend of housing to meet mobility and

housing needs, I think we can get something like that done. I agree, sir.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: No, I think that's too vague.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Too vague, okay. I'm open to suggestions then.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: It should have something in there about --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Full mixture of housing types and affordability?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yes.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay. A little bird just whispered that over my shoulder.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: A little wasp in there probably wouldn't hurt.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay. I'm okay with that.

We added another example. I'm going to probably zoom in a little bit just to make it a little clearer. There we go.

Another example would be retrofitting an existing project to interconnect to nearby nonresidential uses. An example, employment, shopping, recreation, education, thereby providing access for residences to these uses and reducing trips on the county's arterial network. This reduction in VMT can be calculated and a reduction in impact mobility fee can be granted based on these calculated reduced impacts.

A detailed analysis and public vetting of the potential incentives and related reductions in impact and mobility fees will occur as part of Phase 3.

Then Objective 2, we've made some other changes. Yeah, Debbie pointed out in the Power Point we kind of walk you through the changes. But I think it's -- let's go through that and then we can do the Power Point.

Objective 2, I think we need to spend a little more time on this. Recommend that the BCC appoint advisory board or task force to consider viable tools and programs to reduce density in sparsely developed portions of northern Golden Gate Estates eastern in order to reduce VMT.

Objective 2, geographic allocation. Potential areas of applicability include portions of Golden Gate Estates, Orange Tree and the rural fringe mixed use district receiving areas. There are a number of tools or programs which may be utilized to preserve land in eastern portions of Golden Gate Estates in order to reduce VMT. An additional benefit besides a reduction of VMT could be the potential preservation of ecologically sensitive lands and habitat. It is recommended that the BCC appoint an advisory board, and this is what we had talked about earlier, or task force consisting of property owners from affected areas and other stakeholders. Consider any of the following tools or programs.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I don't know if you want to read all that. Cherie's going to have sore fingers.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yeah, I think a lot of this is reformatting.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I certainly think it would be beneficial for this board to have had the potential of reading those before we vote on them today.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You know, the Power Point would -- if we vote off the Power Point and discuss off the Power Point, it might be, because I think the recommendations basically tell us do the next step. And as long as you agree that that's what it is, give you an opportunity to read this. And we can come back. When is the next Planning Commission?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The 15th.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Come back almost on a consent.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, we come back on consent, acknowledge the language meets what the intent of the Power Point was, I think that would work. I mean, I'd rather not -- you expect us to digest this writing here today?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: If we go through the Power Point I think it will clean it up a little bit.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Do you want us to finish our questions from that section before the Power Point or after the Power Point?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yeah, I think we can do that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Does anybody have any specifics in that -- I'm losing my voice. Good for everybody.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: God forbid.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Section 5, does anybody have any questions in Section 5 before the Power Point?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick, I have your Objective 1. It's using impact fees or a mobility fee based on reductions generated by optimal employment to population ratios. Wouldn't that mean that an area that doesn't have the optimal ratio would then theoretically pay more impact fees than mobility fees?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, you're setting a baseline, and you're saying if you do better than the baseline you could get a reduction. And what we talked about is doing it on the commercial end of it, not the residential end.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Did you say that in here?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We do. And that's in part of the Power Point.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Then I'll go on to my next question, which is on Page 5-3.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The Objective 3. Again, I'm more concerned on Objective 3 with what your intention is. Incentivize neighborhood-serving retail. Are you saying you want to add more commercial density to Golden Gate Estates that's not allowed by the current Golden Gate master plan or --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No. What we're saying is, is what's there now could be incentivized to go in early, or you could look at that as part of that and see if that warrants a Golden Gate Area Master Plan change. But not to do it without it. Your note earlier saying that it requires a master plan change is well noted.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Description/examples of potential strategies that could be used. You reference mixed use development. You're talking about Golden Gate Estates?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, you know, you're also talking about the rural fringe mixed use district, so I think --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I don't -- doesn't say it's not Golden Gate Estates. So my assumption would be you're trying to do that in Golden Gate Estates?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Maybe in our examples we can be more specific.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think so, because I think that's not what I've heard anybody out there express was ever needed.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No. And I think the question you brought up, and several of the other stakeholders had said, are you suggesting that we rezone the Estates to include multi-family mixed use? And that was never our intent. So I think we need to be clear on that.

I think the team's nodding their head that we'll do that as part of coming back.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, under A on the next page -- well, no, under A, my A, review minimum/maximum development requirements. Oh, boy, that's B under mine. So the one above -- oh, you already crossed it all out, so I'll wait till I get the revised language.

On Page 5-4, which is -- you've already changed some of that. B, right there, the first B. That one is incentivize the incorporation of transit infrastructure to support regional transit service, and TOD, which is transit oriented development, located at commercial nodes in Golden Gate Estates.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Existing commercial nodes, right?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir. Existing or approved in the future. Our goal is to say that right now you have a transit that travels through there. You've got to find a way to incorporate that infrastructure. And we do have bus stops. But as we talked about several times, they're inadequate, especially when you talk about -- so our concept is how do you make it so the bus can actually pull through a development? Have a connection into whatever that development is. Make it a good park-and-ride location. How do you make that all fit? Because it does lend to more of the use of that system, so --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. I think that's the last one I have. Let's see your -- anybody else have any questions before the Power Point?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, let's see your Power Point, Nick.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay, very good.

Okay, Objective 1, policy recommendation one: Use impact mobility fee incentives based on calculated reductions generated by optimal employment to population ratios and reduce commuter related trips both within specific mixed use developments and within larger sub-areas.

Fee discounts based on calculated VMT reduction for mix of uses, optimizing those ratios. Fee discounts --

and this is important -- on non-residential uses to ensure the construction of those VMT-reducing uses.

So if you've got a development, and Steve Tindale can do one, we can do one with staff, you can do a calculation of, say, if you put a right mix in, you already have that internal capture that happens, we can calculate that. So if someone says above the average, you're increasing that ratio, that's a policy decision as where that level is. But if you do better and you can show the way it's designed and connected optimizes that community, why not give you the impact fee incentive. But not in the residential. We'll do it when you put on the employment base side of it when you actually put that trip match in there and it's up and running and in place.

So that's that mobility fee or impact fee mobility incentive talking about.

Are there any questions on that, sir?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Not from me.

Anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No? Okay.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: So I think as a policy recommendation, do you think that's something we should carry forward? And then we'll obviously bring it back to you. But do you think it's a good idea?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Do you want us to vote on these policies one-by-one? I thought we were going to do it -- how do you see it happening?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think one-by-one. I think if there's one you want to take out as a board or leave in as a board -- and what we're saying is take this forward to the analysis, not implement it. There's no implementation in any of this what you're seeing today. Take it to the next step, do the analysis, bring it back and see if it makes sense.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: With the addition of the housing element that I had mentioned?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And you reference generated by optimal employment to population ratios. But yet when I questioned you on the employment statistics earlier you said that they were conservative. So which is it you're using here?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm sorry.

MR. TINDALE: Steve Tindale.

You're one of the few counties where we've got a major reduction of impact fees for people who qualify for affordable housing currently. It would be reinforced into that and mixed in with it, maybe enhanced a little bit more. But you're one of the I think very rare counties that we actually say that if you come in with the guidelines of affordable housing and income we have a reduced fee currently.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Uh-huh. So that should be mentioned, I think.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We can include it.

Mr. Chairman, you had a question or comment?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, earlier you had -- we talked about population, and you told me that you wanted to be conservative and use a conservative population statistic, and you did.

What did you use here? Because here it's saying optimal employment to population ratios. You're not going to get optimal employment using conservative population.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay. It's -- yeah, the birds are chiming in from the back.

Specific to that development is what we're saying. So when you come in with an application for a reduced fee, we're saying is when you test that development to that optimal ratio between employment and population, not a population number, but the development comes in like the Vineyards.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So it's the population that would be generated by the density that they're proposing to put in.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yeah. So if the Vineyards said I want to do 4,000 single family homes but I only want to do 10,000 square feet of commercial, that ratio doesn't work.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, I understand.

Anybody want to -- what's the board feel about this recommendation? Is there a recommendation to -- is there a recommendation for --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I recommend to recommend.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Recommend, okay.

Mr. Midney, Ms. Ahern.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: 7-1. Thank you, Nick. 7-0, I'm sorry.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: And we'll add that comment about housing. Very good. Okay.

Originally number two merged into an Objection 5 recommendation. Original number two, incentivize infill and redevelopment of coastal urban area to maximize the use of existing infrastructure and services.

This is where we get into the discussion about the TDR program and the Golden Gate Estates. So this is the one we're probably going to spend a little time talking about.

So our revised recommendation number two will read as this: Recommend that the BCC appoint an advisory board or task force to consider all viable tools and programs to reduce density in sparsely developed portions of northern Golden Gate Estates eastern in order to reduce VMT's. TDR program, targeted mitigation areas, voluntary seller acquisition programs, density relocation or lot combination tools are some of the things we talked about.

So I'll spend a minute on each one.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is this the only slide you have on this recommendation? So we see it all right here on one slide?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, there's a picture and it talks about where. That's the one you didn't like, so I'm not going to show it to you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's what I wanted to understand.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: So with the TDR program, exactly what it says, a transfer of development rights. If you said you're going to buy a vacant lot in the Estates and move that unit to a rural fringe area or another portion of the Estates, with targeted mitigation areas if we said look, in this area the value to purchase mitigation is higher, we'd say go buy these properties in these locations.

Voluntary seller acquisition programs, providing incentives for voluntary sellers to come in -- I'm sorry, incentives for the seller to sell to a mitigation bank, either through a tax credit or some other tool.

And density relocation or lot combination tools. We talked about combining the small lots in the Estates, the one and a quarter, providing incentives to do that so that maybe you reduce the density as well.

So again, the key point of this is probably to say look, this is going to be a hot topic. Folks in the urban area have said it's hot because their concern is you're going to build another high-rise along the coast with density from the Estates? No, that's not our intent. Where does that line stop? The urban Estates.

So our recommendation is to really take this to an advisory board or committee, let them vet it out with the watershed management plans, and what we're talking about here I think it's a good way to have a joint discussion about the merits of both. And I know your feelings, Mr. Chairman, so I'll open it up to questions or comments.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You're advising -- the recommendation would be for an advisory board or task force?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: By the time you put that together, you could easily be in a position to reappointment a new Golden Gate master plan study committee and do it all under that committee and kill two birds with one stone. So why would we want to separate it out when it's really a holistic approach to Golden Gate Estates, not just

piecemeal?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well -- and that was my answer anyway, but again -- no, it's okay.

There's been a lot of comments about the coastal folks participating in this, because they want to know where that density ends up. Not, say, coastal, the urban area, the one mile east of 951. Folks next to rural fringe mixed use district want to participate. They've all asked and said look, this transfer of development rights could be going to different areas, we want to participate as well too. So that may be in conflict with just a specific Golden Gate Area Master Plan committee.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So the entire county would be part of this and it wouldn't be as an advisory board or task force, they would have public meetings. But would they be required to vet their outcomes through the various levels of boards to get to the BCC?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. And I think your comment about the entire county, I think you've got to weight the committee to say, you know, I'm giving you an example, five members of the Estates, two members of the coastal urban area, one member here, and well represented but mostly represented by the folks that are directly impacted by this.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm just concerned, Nick. I mean, this is about Golden Gate Estates. But yes, I understand, because the TDR program is involved, it could affect others. But I could care less what the coastal community thinks about Golden Gate Estates. Golden Gate Estates is a standalone community and we need to understand what we need to protect our own property rights. I think we all try to protect everybody's.

But I don't want them telling me how I should run my life in Golden Gate Estates. I don't live like a coastal community does. It doesn't make any sense. So why would they want to get involved in Golden Gate Estates? I don't understand.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Because, sir, in my opinion, and I think I represent a lot of people when I say this, we're all communities combined and we all have a desire to make things work. And the way we interact between Golden Gate Estates, which provides the bedroom community to a lot of the employment centers to the east and the taxpayers to the west, how they fund improvements. So I think we're interrelated. And I think appointing a committee that in my opinion should be predominantly weighted by the folks that are predominantly impacted but has representation from other areas is important.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But I think if we do impact other areas it is important, but to tell -- but our area needs to be decided upon by us. I mean, I don't see -- I don't go into gated communities and tell them how to run their gated communities, and I don't think anybody should tell the residents in another community how to run their community. I think the communities need to run -- you move into a community because you like what you move into, and that should be the dominating factor in how this is handled.

And I'm concerned this is going to lead to something that takes control away from the residents of the very community that it's intended to serve.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think we need to note your concern and we need to put in some safeguards that don't allow that.

But remember, this isn't about taking away community control. In comments we've received, there might be some good things that come out of this for the Estates, people that own property in there, opportunities to keep that rural character. Because what we've -- some of the comments we've received is if we can lower the density in Golden Gate Estates, it will stay what we want it to be. You may not have that demand for the services that you're saying be an alternative. So we've gotten some good feedback on that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick, I like the ROMA and I like the preservation, and I like the idea of putting the Estates more sparsely populated. I like the idea of reducing, I think that's all good stuff. I'm just one, others may not, obviously, disagree. But I think that's a decision that mainly lies with the people who own those properties.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm open to suggestions from this Commission on how to do that.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Mark?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Question or comment.

What was your thinking, Nick, to merge Objective 2 into Objective 5? Objective 2 originally focused on the coastal urban area, and I don't see that referenced in the revision at all. I mean, I'm just trying to understand. And considering Mark's comments, it seems like coastal urban area, the way it was in the original objective, I mean, you

had something to say about it. You had an objective for the coastal urban area, and it's lost its identity here.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It's the original two is in five coming up. This is a new two.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: A new two?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes. Because we took the original two and it goes --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Now I understand.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It was very similar --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Just a question then about the revision, or a comment. Recommend that the BCC appoint an advisory board or task force to consider all viable tools. To me that says nothing. It doesn't speak to the -- what this task force or advisory board would do.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: To evaluate --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Well, I mean, what's their purpose, to consider? I mean, they could consider for four years and you never see a work product.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Agreed.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: So --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That's one of the reasons I'm glad you're on this commission, because you look at -- as we've worked through the floodplain committee you asked a lot of those same questions. I think we need to say to evaluate --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: You need to state some specific outcomes within a specific time frame; otherwise you've got another task force that sits and meets once every six months.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right. And I think we need to clean that up when we come back to say evaluate, you know, the comments below and come back within a defined time period with recommendation to the BCC, how they could be implemented.

If it's the commission's will that this policy go forward, we need to make that clear, we'll call it a smart objective, so that it defines what you said.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I'd be happier with more exacting wording.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Very good. We got that? Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nick, the only issue on here that affects outside the Estates is basically the TDR program. But wouldn't -- just like the Golden Gate master plan and the Immokalee master plan, if recommendations are made within those master plans that affect other parts of the county, such as the coastal area or anywhere else, as those plans have, people from other parts of the county don't sit on those community plans. I don't know, Immokalee was all Immokalee residents, I think. And I know the Golden Gate area was all Golden Gate area residents.

I'm still concerned that the committee could be hijacked for purposes not protective of the property owners who live within the area that it was designed to protect. So that's where my overall position's going to be on it, Nick.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Mr. Chairman, I'm not that fearful, based on what you said, if this board or this commission felt it should be made up of Golden Gate residents, and I'll tell you why. Because what we've learned through this master mobility plan in -- today in 2011, if you want to participate, you're going to get your voice in there.

So I'm okay either way. Because I think if you limit it to Golden Gate Estates residents, the folks that are interested, that have been talking to us from outside of Golden Gate are going to participate and provide comment. If you include them, I think either way you're going to get in front of the Board of County Commissioners or this agency and you're going to get feedback.

So I think the policy has merit. If you want to define who should be on there, I don't have an objection, because you will get public feedback either way.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody -- any further comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a recommendation from this board?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Just to clarify. Objective 2 is going to show up down the road? You said Objective 2 --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- is someplace else, okay.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, merged with five.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Well, I'll make a recommendation that we do urge recommendation of two with the input from this board that the parts that relate to Golden Gate Estates, the advisory board, be made up only of Golden Gate Estates people.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: And also, would you include my recommendation that they tighten up the language on the --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: -- purpose and objectives of the task force or advisory board?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by Mr. Brougham, made by Commissioner Midney.

Discussion?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: It's only including Golden Gate people. I mean, this plan is for the whole county and you're going to separate some --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No, this objective is not for the whole county, it's for -- this one says north Golden Gate Estates, eastern, in order to reduce VMTs.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Incentivize infill and redevelopment of coastal urban area.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nancy, do you have -- that's the one that's being taken out.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: That's taken out?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. So it's only -- take the words original number two and replace them where the word revised is and drop that first sentence, and that's what you end up with.

Nancy, did you have a comment?

MS. PAYTON: Could you phrase again, Golden Gate -- is it a resident, is it a property owner, is it a visitor?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: It could be either, either resident or property owner.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Just like it was for the master plan, I would assume.

MS. PAYTON: And just wanted to make the comment, when the RLSA was -- five-year review committee, it was the entire county. There was a representative from northern Golden Gate Estates, although he left very early. And I think it's wrong to only have Golden Gate Estates residents or property owners, because Golden Gate Estates sits in the middle of the county, it interacts with the rural fringe area, it interacts with the RLSA area, it interacts with the urban area.

We support Golden Gate Estates in some cases with our taxes, and therefore I think it's appropriate that there be representation from the entire county and all interests. Because Golden Gate Estates is not an isolated community, it interacts with the rest of the county.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you. You just made my case as to why it shouldn't be the way you say it should be. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: The reason that I made that motion was that I agree with Mr. Casalanguida that even though the committee might contain only residents and property owners, there will be input from the county as a whole.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Then why not break the whole county up into different sections and have their -- each one of them have their own advisory board?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We have that already. And that's why you had the Immokalee Master Plan, the Golden Gate Master Plan, that's why you have the RLSA. That's been done all over the county.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Where's the urban area advisory board? Where's the South Naples? Where's

--

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: That's kind of why you have us --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You've got your Estates Civic Association. You're trying to put a --

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: That's an advisory board appointed by the county?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think they have a -- much of an ear as anybody else in what happens in your area.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: This isn't the idea here. This is supposed to be all coordinated through the whole county and you're starting to separate it out now.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody else have any comment?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Question for Nick.

Nick, is sparsely developed portions, is that definable? I mean, is that --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We'll make that as Mr. Brougham pointed out, that we'll need to define this a little bit better so when it comes back it's got time frames, it's a smart recommendation.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, there's been -- any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: There's been a motion made and seconded. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 6-1.

Okay, what's your next one, Nick?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay. Policy 3, recommendation. Incentivize neighborhood-serving retail and service uses in Golden Gate Estates.

And this is where you brought up earlier, let's be clear, rural fringe mixed use district receiving areas and Orange Tree to reduce trip links for neighborhood-serving uses.

A discount on non-residential components of mixed use development.

Promote compact mixed use villages in the receiving areas using impact/mobility fee incentives upon analysis demonstrating the reduction in VMT.

Incentivize incorporation of trends in infrastructure, e.g., park-and-ride lots, transfer stations, et cetera, transportation-oriented development, and TOD.

TDR example moved to objective/recommendation 2, so that -- okay, that's four.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, anybody want to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I'll move that we recommend approval of this.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion made and seconded, Commissioner Ahern was the second, Commissioner Midney the first.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Policy recommendation four. Original language, incentivize development of self-sustaining towns and villages within the RLSA to provide for internal capture and use of alternative modes.

Received some comments and what we have here is review and revisit requirements that already exist for

self-sustaining towns and villages within the RLSA to provide for internal capture and use of alternative modes.

A couple of examples: Maximize allowable gross densities and reduce development footprint.

Optimize mixtures of uses within towns and villages by establishing and incentivizing jobs-to-housing ratios.

Locate town centers in proximity to arterial network.

Enhance connectivity through a local collector grid network.

Enhance building form/code requirements to encourage walking/biking within public spaces.

For the mixed use portion of that or the transit oriented development located near major transit facilities and within activity centers, impact fee incentives for development that provides transit facilities.

Reduce parking requirements through shared parking arrangements and multi-model parking credits.

And I think we stopped there.

To wrap it up, I think we said we already know we have rules for the RLSA and the RMUD. But I think we need to tighten up what we have there and maybe provide some incentives to look at the design. I think we've learned from projects like Ave Maria. I think when they moved their town center around, and we know that they lacked that transit connection, as much as we'd like, we need to put some language in these areas that encourage that more and incentivize that more, because we can do better. And I think that's the policy recommendation you have in front of you here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: A, Nick, maximize allowable gross densities and reduce development footprint. The gross densities for the RLSA are already set by the number of credits it takes to produce whatever you could produce on each acre. I think it's eight per acre and they're trying to go to 10.

And reduce development footprint, I believe they're trying to increase the town sizes and development footprints in the proposed revision. So how does this comport with what's being -- going to come forward?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'll ask for corrections, but I think we're trying to take -- not increase the net but increase the density per acre within that same net. So if you had 100 acres that could allow a density of 10,000 units and you said, well, you can put it out to the 100 acres, maximize it down to a smaller footprint, the more town center town core, more dense per unit within that town.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But how does that -- how does that fit with the new RLSA recommendations coming forward? It doesn't seem to. Because you've got an increase in standard stewardship credits, but you're also increasing substantially the number of acres you're going to be impacting. So you're not really concentrating densities, you're going to be reducing -- you're spreading them out more. I'm trying to understand how it all fits together.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We're not -- as part of the RLSA -- and the birds are welcome to chime in now -- but what I'm suggesting is if you've got a town with a net density, can you maximize that gross density, reduce the footprint? What can we do to incentivize and work with it to make it smaller in that net density?

You know, that's one of the good things of Ave Maria is that their town core with all those block housing, been there a couple times to look at the good and the bad. That's one of the good. What can we do to incentivize more of that type of community type maximum density around that town so that the footprint isn't spread out?

Now, when you start to get farther out in Ave Maria, you can see it goes back to that typical development footprint that you have in the urban area. So can we incentivize or maximize that to a smaller footprint? I think that's what we're looking at.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody have any other questions?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I think that it sort of is implied, the housing element that's in Objective 1, I don't know if we need to mention it again. It's probably implied.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think that's a good point.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You can't talk from the audience.

Nicole, did you have something you wanted to say?

MS. JOHNSON: For the record, Nicole Johnson with The Conservancy.

And it was The Conservancy that initially had concern about the original language because the RLSA right now you're required to have sustainable towns. And so we were concerned that we didn't want policies that were going to add additional incentives for something that you're already required to do through the GMP.

And we felt pretty comfortable with the revised language, but I still hear incentivize to make these

sustainable, incentivize to make these work. I think we need to say if there are problems in the make-up of the towns in the RLSA, it should be fixed. But I don't think we have to give them more to do that. If the towns are not sustainable when an SRA comes forward, then they should be denied, period.

So I think we have to be careful that we're not lumping more incentives onto this program that is very, very heavily incentivized already. So I guess that will be an outstanding concern as we move forward with additional policy language on this.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I agree. Could you go to the next slide so we could take a look at it a little bit.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Sure.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, anybody else have any comment, questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I'll move that we recommend approval of this.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll second.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I'm trying to think what the germs of the discussion are that we are modifying this.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I don't think we're modifying it, I think it's going forward like it is but we're going to be watchful of it to make sure it doesn't trip up anything that's already a given.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yeah, but then that's my recommendation.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's been seconded by Brad?

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

Nick, how many more slides do you have?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We're on five and I think we're up to 21, 20.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We're probably going to break for lunch then, because we won't get 21 slides done by lunchtime and we're probably going to be here a lot more than maybe one hour. So, rather than --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I apologize in advance. At 1:00 I have a conference call that will probably last about 20 minutes and I'll have one of these folks take over until I get back.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's fine, that works. We can walk through it. Is that okay with everybody?

Okay, let's break for lunch. We'll come back at 1:00, finish up.

(A luncheon recess was had.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, everybody, welcome back from the lunch break. Just prior to lunch, Nick said he couldn't be here, he's going to be late. So I saw Joe Schmitt in the building, and so Joe is going to continue with the master plan -- master mobility plan presentation today.

But Joe, it's really good seeing you again. We sure miss you around here.

MR. SCHMITT: Well, it's like I hadn't -- I just left, because this is the same --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I'm sorry, sir, you're going to have to come to the podium.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good to see you, Joe.

Okay, we left off on, well, Recommendation 5. Yeah, okay. Want to continue then, Jeff, from there?

MR. PERRY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, for the record Jeff Perry from Stantec.

Recommendation number five and the original recommendation number two both dealt with essentially the same concepts. So we've combined them together and are treating them as a new number five. These are the policy language statements that appeared in the document that you received.

This is the revised policy language. It's a little bit more specific, but it deals with urban areas in general, such as Immokalee and Collier coastal urban area. Sets out three different standards, if you will, or initiatives.

A, to encourage and further incentivize infill and redevelopment, B, to provide for internal capture, and C, to use alternative modes within localized mixed use developments.

I'll go through a few of the examples.

Impact fee discounts for VMT reducing design such as mixed use or transit oriented design. We've touched on this a little bit earlier, some of the other. This would be impact fee/and/or mobility fees.

Transportation concurrency management areas. We have existing TCMA's, and as I'll show you on the next slide, something called TCEAs, both of them dealing with concurrency. They deal with sort of exceptions or exemptions from the existing concurrency standards.

They're important because there are -- in certain instances there are areas where congestion ultimately will occur over time, there will be -- and there's no opportunity to expand roads any further. Much of our grid system within the urban areas is built out or will be built out, and there will be congestion occurring at certain times of day on some of those facilities.

The TCMA's use an averaging system, and the TCEAs are actually an exception for level of service specific standards. So it may be an opportunity or a need to use the TCMA or TCEAs and have those expanded as time goes. We're talking about obviously a number of years into the future.

Transitioning from road impact fees to mobility fees to allow flexibility in the use of those fees that are collected. Again, fees collected in some instances where there are really no roads to be built, and there are opportunities to use those for other capital infrastructure related to the transportation system.

Specific criteria for limited density bonus program.

Reduced parking/landscaping requirements to enhance interconnectivity for adjacent uses.

Consider designating additional areas targeted for future mixed-use and infill/redevelopment.

Reviewing minimum and maximum development requirements. Again, getting back to the balance of employment and population ratios within mixed use developments, making sure that we're providing those opportunities.

A lot of this is about removing barricades or removing things that might be in our code today that sort of preclude good planning efforts from moving forward. So those are the kinds of things we want to be able to do by revisiting some of those policies that are in place, enhancing them, adding new policy language or perhaps making specific exemptions across the board.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Questions from the Planning Commission on new Objective 5?

Paul?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I would like to make a recommendation that we approve these recommendations.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion made and seconded. We'll have some discussion, because I have questions on some of them first.

But first, does any of you all have any questions before -- okay. Can you go back to the very first page of this thing? Okay.

Could you take where on the third line it says within the urban areas, two, and then you have a semi colon. Could you move the A past the word and, drop the word and, and say to encourage, then A, period, further incentive. Because you want to encourage those three things. Because the way this reads you only want to encourage one, it looks like shall on the rest. And I think you really want to create incentives to encourage them, isn't that the purpose?

MR. PERRY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That I think would help clarify that objective.

Then if you move down to the next slide, impact fee discounts. Here you're asking for impact fee discounts but on the next slide -- oh, no, I'm sorry, the one there. I just saw it. Transition from road impact fees to mobility fees.

So you keep referring to impact fee discounts for VMT reducing design, but if you go from an impact fee to a

mobility fee, you really want to be careful, because you'd only have discounts for impact fees if they no longer exist, it doesn't apply.

MR. PERRY: Right. The term impact fee in item A really should be impact fee/mobility fee.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's where I was going, yeah.

MR. PERRY: If we move to a mobility fee in one or more of the urban areas or countywide or however the mobility fee, if it actually comes into practice, the idea is that there -- the same discount kind of characteristics are there. The mobility fee is based largely on the same kind of things that go into the impact fee calculation. And if there is a reduction in VMT that a mix of uses, a particular project is actually reducing traffic impacts because of their mix of use or something like that, whether there's paying a mobility fee or an impact fee, there should be a discount applied to it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think the same kind of impact fee/mobility fee applies as an example on the next page too.

Yeah, down on the bottom, impact fee incentive. So if you go through the objective, and probably the other ones where you start talking about impact fees/mobility fees, wherever one would apply as a substitute for the other, I think you better put the slashes in there otherwise it may get real hard to go back and -- I'm just experiencing something through the GMP now where the language is so strict it didn't have variables in it. You might make sure they're all in there, so -- now, with that said, does that -- anybody else -- Paul, do you accept that as a motion?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Oh, yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And the second do?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

Okay, on to number six.

MR. PERRY: Number six, I believe there are no changes from the version that is in your packet. It deals specifically with doing a better job of coordinating some of the planning efforts that are ongoing by different agencies and different groups.

The metropolitan planning organization does transit planning and long-range highway planning. There is frequently a disconnect between some of the things that comprehensive planning, zoning, long-range planning staff at the county are doing and what the MPO is then given to sort of use as their information going forward.

And we need to just make sure that we've got good solid connections between these different planning efforts that are ongoing so that if there's a nexus between them that they're both understanding what the implications are, changing land use, how it affects the existing transportation plan, how it might affect ongoing efforts to increase transit ridership, for instance, those kinds of things that should be just doing a better job of our planning practice.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is this the only slide with this recommendation?

MR. PERRY: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody have any questions on objective recommendation six?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Made by Mr. Midney, seconded by --

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ms. Homiak.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

MR. PERRY: On number seven, likewise there is -- the actual language is the same as in your agenda package. There are no changes being proposed at this moment.

It's dealing with enhancing the multi-modal infrastructure, developing standards that can be applied so that more specifically we're designing facilities for all modes. We have a tendency to think of highways as only being used by automobiles and trucks, when in fact they're frequently used by transit vehicles and cyclists and pedestrians that have to cross them or walk alongside of them. So we need to do a better job of finding ways to incorporate good design standards in many of our practices.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. One question, Jeff. The -- when you talk about designing roadway corridors with adequate cross sections for multi-modal facilities. It's easy to draw the diagram on a CAD file or something, but the problem comes in when you spread it out, takes up a lot more land.

At what level and what stage of implementation of these kinds of policies do we get into the feasibility of them financially?

I mean, I'd hate to see us accept an objective but then find out we're locked into a financial impact that is ridiculous. So is that something that can change at a further stage down the road? I mean, I know this is conceptual language.

MR. PERRY: Right. In many cases we're dealing with yet to be designed and built facilities. Oftentimes we're talking about here large scale planned developments where we have a lot of flexibility to implement good design standards for facilities. But on public facilities where you're going to be sharing roads, arterials and major collectors where you need to plan for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, oftentimes we're faced with constraints, physical constraints, economic constraints, buildings, right-of-way limitations, things like that. So we have to be able to have exceptions, if you will, to the criteria.

But when you're planning for new corridors, and we hope that in the future there may be opportunities to plan for new corridors or designs of new corridors, can we take into consideration all modes, the need for all modes.

Quite frankly, 50, 60 years from now we may be traveling quite differently than we are today. So the thought is we need to just sort of give some thought and understanding to all of the different modes being incorporated in the types of corridors that we're planning for.

And I think once you get to the point of designing regulations, things that might go in the Land Development Code in this case, as opposed to maybe a Growth Management Plan policy or statement, we're dealing perhaps with Land Development Code, we have cross section standards in there. And occasionally they have to be -- exemptions have to be made to those. But it's really more of a -- an understanding that transit vehicles have a right to the roadway and there may be certain design characteristics that need to be developed and implemented for transit vehicles that we don't have today. Certainly bicycle and pedestrian facilities need to be accommodated.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I understand all that. I just was curious about at what stage we address the cost of the additional right-of-way that would have to be created.

MR. PERRY: I think when you get to the point of designing or laying out the standards that would be developed by the county.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: This would not obligate us to plan every future road with these things if it was

feasibly unimpossible?

MR. PERRY: No, you'd have to -- a long range planning typically doesn't include a lot of very specific standards. What we're talking about here is having design standards incorporated into the process so that there is an optimum, if you will, desirable cross-section of roadways that are intended to accommodate all roads. And not all roads will be specifically designed to accommodate every single type of mode that there would be. But we do need to understand that there are multi-modes that have to be taken care of.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Any other question?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: It's certainly easier to do it up front than try to retrofit it after it's already done, put in a sidewalk or -- it's more expensive. So you're talking about saving money.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I agree. I just want to -- I want to make sure that if we came back in and say we wanted to do an expansion on 951, let's say Green and Golden Gate Boulevard, that we wouldn't be obligated then to make that piece consistent with all the intentions of this objective if this objective was accepted and adopted.

MR. PERRY: No, no. This objective is sort of a going forward kind of strategy. This would then follow, we would be looking at specific design standards, looking at the design standards that are currently incorporated into the county's manuals, the procedures that they use.

You may have heard the term context sensitive design. There are ways of designing facilities that accommodate different modes that don't necessarily always fit in the standard green book for FDOT projects or county projects. It's important to be able to have that kind of flexibility and to be able to put something, to adopt something, to adopt standards and guidelines that would take these things into consideration.

This in and of itself, this objective doesn't do any of that, it simply says we need to look at those kinds of things, and if they're appropriate, adopt them into our codes and use them.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Okay. Is there any comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If not, recommendation?

Paul?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Recommend approval.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Brad.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seven-zero.

Next one?

MR. PERRY: This one deals with implementing enhanced bicycle safety pedestrian improvements. There was one change in Item C. We added the term bicycle boulevards. It was at -- the suggestion was made at one of our public involvement meetings that certain -- dealing with cut-throughs and ways of allowing for direct passage of cyclists and pedestrians, there's -- the example was actually in Immokalee where there were streets that were largely pedestrian oriented, a lot of people walking on these streets, and that a bicycle boulevard would actually be an impedance that was put in in some way, bollards, if you will, or some sort of barricade mid-block that would prohibit vehicles from running the entire length of the roadway. They would have access to only half the street on either side of the barricade. Pedestrians and cyclists could traverse the entire length of the roadway, so that it was constrained to

vehicular traffic and more optimized for pedestrians and cyclists, eliminated cut-through traffic and those kinds of things.

We want to make sure when we do these kinds of things that we're not creating opportunities or creating increases in vehicle miles of travel. We're trying to reduce vehicle miles of travel. And as long as these roadways have access to arterial and collector roadways, there are certain instances where this might be appropriate. Other instances it might not be as appropriate and would be looked on as a case by case basis.

So that was one example listed specifically in item number C.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody have any questions? Paul?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No, I didn't look at you for a question, you want to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Oh, yes, I would like --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You're on a fly with motions this morning, might as well keep going.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: And I was thinking, oh, this is only going to take an hour, why should I come today.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm sorry about that. It's probably my fault.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I'm glad I did come. Yes, I move for approval.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded -- let's give Barry one. Okay, seconded by Barry.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Motion carries 7-0 -- oh, all opposed?

Nobody. Okay.

Jeff, we're on to nine then.

MR. PERRY: The number nine deals with interconnectivity and localized connectivity in ways that increased mobility by providing options for travel, don't necessarily require people to always go in the same direction, that they have more options than they did before.

We did some testing on bridge connections in Golden Gate Estates that had come out of a previous study with our model and it showed that there was in fact a benefit to doing that, to providing that increased level of interconnection.

This is also a topic that was discussed not too long ago in the EAR amendment hearing. You may recall dealing with interconnecting communities together. And what we're suggesting is that there is a value in reducing travel demand when there is greater connectivity between land uses, between communities, between neighborhoods. Even within the same neighborhoods or the same developments we've seen instances where residential development could not access the neighboring commercial development without getting out onto the highway to get down to it, even though it was part of the same planned development.

Those are the kind of things that we need to do a better job of trying to make sure that we do everything we can to optimize the interconnection between developments. This is primarily going to be dealing with future developments, although there are some retrofit opportunities the county may want to explore as well.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Any questions?

Phil?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Just a comment or a caution going back to the ERA (sic) based amendment meeting. And a note of caution is that we do not go forward with any requirements for adjacent communities, if you will, to interconnect. If there is an existing community, and I think Mark, you used the example

perhaps of a gated community, that -- and a new one's going to be built adjacent to that, that it's a requirement that they interconnect. Because I think that's, in my opinion, stepping over the bound here.

MR. PERRY: It wasn't my intent to get into it in this particular venue, but we've gone back and we've looked, and there are certain -- there are a -- I think there's probably at least six or eight instances in the Land Development Code today that reference the requirements or incentives or -- requirements basically to interconnect developments.

And that's something we'll be bringing back to the Planning Commission in detail to go through, dealing with that policy that's in the Growth Management Plan, showing you where those sections of the code are, and we'll deal with our recommendations at that point in time.

This doesn't -- obviously doesn't add anything today in terms of what, you know, what the current code is or what the current Growth Management Plan says. What we're suggesting here is that it is good planning for future towns and villages to provide for interconnection. The first one deals with future towns and villages, grid systems, networks and so forth. The bridges in Golden Gate. But also to provide opportunities for interconnecting, and encouraging in fact interconnection between developments.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think we can really summarize it much shorter than what you're answering. Just take the word provide and put encourage. And that covers it. Whatever you develop -- whatever comes out of the review of the -- because that's basically what you're saying the LDC already says. Why don't we just say encourage. Because provides like shall, it's strong. And encourage means that at the time a development comes in, if they want to provide, be given incentives to encourage that, then so be it. But it's not as mandatory.

And I think that's the concern we've had before.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I agree.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So that would resolve it. Anybody else have any -- I have one more, B.

You use examples of potential strategies. That's very definitive. Construct previously identified bridge connections in Golden Gate Estates. And I think that's too definitive. I would rather you not again use Golden Gate Estates as your model for things that are always wrong and how to make them always right. Because that may not be wrong in the eyes of the people that live there. And that may not be necessary for the taxpayers of Collier County to carry a burden of, what is there, 23 bridges at five million dollars plus a bridge. I don't know why the county would even want to jump into that.

So we ought to soften B up a little bit so that it's not so definitive, or remove it as one of your examples. You guys keep focusing on Golden Gate Estates. I understand why you do, it's a big subdivision. But in not all cases I think your focus is warranted as an example, so --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: And however you change it, could you take a look at being more definitive in previously identified. I think I know what you mean, previously identified in master mobility plan, but you don't say that.

MR. PERRY: The bridge study -- yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's what I'm worried about, Phil, is it's ambiguous. It's not a good example is what I'm trying to say. Do you need three examples? Maybe you could just leave two.

I just hate to see people coming in hanging their hats on this as more of an issue, when you can take it out and just not make an issue of it and let the objectives stand and be reacted to when you implement it. That would be simpler.

And Nick, I know you're anxiously waiting to get to the mic. again. But Joe actually summed the whole thing up for us and basically said that, you know, it's ridiculous, we don't need it, and go with the GMP, so --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Joe fell in the elevator shaft.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That timing was good, you've got to admit.

So now, what do you guys think the best way to react to B is? Are you going to -- is it needed? It's an example. So it doesn't mean it's locked in. But --

MR. PERRY: It's an example. It's a very specific -- as you said, it's a very specific example or strategy -- example, strategy. Example is probably not a good word, because at this point it's not an example, it's a specific strategy that we're recommending the county needs to pursue, because there is a value in implementing that plan.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Could you use consider constructing previously identified bridge connections in Golden Gate Estates?

MR. PERRY: Yeah. They understand that. It's the bridge study.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I know what it is. But could you say consider constructing? Because consider means it's open to a whole available bunch of alternatives that could be considered before it's implemented. And that's the only -- I want to make sure the door's always there to be opened, not shut.

Does that work?

MR. PERRY: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Any other comments on this one? If not, if there --

MR. PERRY: I changed the word --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Move to approve.

MR. PERRY: -- provide in number C to encourage.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right.

MR. PERRY: That was the other --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mr. Midney recommended approval, subject to the conditions we just talked about.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: (Indicating.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by Brad.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: 7-0.

Objective 10.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Evaluate the transition from a roads-based impact fee to a mobility fee to provide capital funding for multi-modal infrastructure. In A, transition from a road impact fee to a mobility fee provides flexibility to spend on capital for other modes. The impact to the impact fee is potentially one to three percent increase. It's typical but, you know, it could be less.

Explore establishing criteria to manage the modal distribution of fee revenues to emphasize different modes by geographic area, non-road modes in the coastal urban area. And that's 10 as it sits.

We discussed the mobility impact fee -- or the mobility fee in the urban area. And I think there were questions last time. I know Steve is a professional at this and has set this up. And my understanding of the mobility fee is that right now where we sat we primarily focused on roads. That's all it is, is a capacity lane replacement fee that you charge for new development.

What we're saying is in the urban area we have two transportation concurrency management areas. What we're saying, we're encouraging other forms of transportation: Bike, ped., but transit as well, too. So if you charge a mobility fee, it includes the impact fee but it gives you the flexibility to say as part of my impact fee I can now buy -- build a bus transfer station, I can build a multi-modal pathway between developments with that same dollar that before used to be -- had to be based on or expended on roads.

So that's what we're talking about for a mobility fee.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Melissa?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: So why would it go up?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Because you're taking into your cost -- the cost of the buses and the pathways as well too as a different component. Now, it's only a minor percentage.

Steve also pointed out that you can limit the expenditure of that impact fee up to a percentage point when you adopt it to be used for other purposes. So you could say, you know, for instance a typical single-family home right

now is about \$6,000. So, you know, a 10 percent jump would be \$600, a one percent jump, \$60. That additional dollars could be used to bring out pathway or that transit stop in the urban area.

So it's not a lot more money, but it gives you a lot more flexibility.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: So is the thought to go to mobility fee also the fact that if you incentivize by reducing the fee then you're not really losing anything?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You could consider that. I think that's a good point. You're obviously -- anytime you're going to send it to reduce your fee you're going to get an opportunity to do that.

But I think the biggest thing is that the urban area develops -- once we're done with the six-by-six grid, and we're getting close, we're left with I would say three or four overpasses, Immokalee, Collier, 951, 41, what do you start to do next?

With the mobility fee you can really do different things for transit and bike ped., as well as mobility. But it would be for the urban area. You're still looking at an impact fee east of 951.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Maybe you could reduce the impact fee.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You could reduce the impact fee.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I know it's a concept.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think we've done a lot of that. And I think other communities have done that. We're not new. We're not the first one going out there. It's been done through the State of Florida.

Steve, you want to take a minute and touch on it? How many have we done?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: He's responding to Nick, not to us.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I asked the question. About seven communities in Florida have done a mobility fee. So I think it's something we want to look at. And I think it needs to come back to the Board and does it make sense for urban Collier.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Phil?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Nick, just for clarity, a second bullet, I was thinking decrease there.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, it would be --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I'm being facetious.

You might want to consider minimal increase versus minimal impact, if in fact you're talking increase.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay, yes. Okay.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Wordsmithing, but that's --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Very good.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I've --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- got a couple.

Do you have any?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, I think it's a good point. I think it does put value on these other things, which helps developers maybe start building them themselves and back that value off. I think it's good.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Does the minimal impact overall fee amount -- right now we reduced our fees.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We have.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Was that done through a supplement to the impact fee study, or did they just arbitrarily say let's reduce our fees?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No. Your road impact fees have always either been done through indexing or studies. We've never arbitrarily reduced them.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So the new index fee reduced the impact fees not because the Board wanted them reduced but because the index fees required them to be reduced; is that true?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That's right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh, okay. Because that's a different political position. It wasn't done as a means to help business, it was done because it's required to do it because of the new indexing.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Not necessarily.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, that's what I'm trying to understand. Because it factors into how your

increase is looked at. Because if it's an increase based on a supplemental impact fee study and that one to three percent is reflective of that, that's different than an arbitrary up or down based on Board decisions.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right. It's based on the study. But our recent reductions -- I'll give you last year, we were in index years last year. And staff looked at it and said wow, we know our costs are down more. The Board could have held the line and said, you know, it's indexing, you're going to catch the ride on the way down, you're going to catch the ride on the way up.

But after talking to staff we said our costs have come down considerably, let's do a mini cost and credit update last year. We looked at a 32 percent reduction and 10 percent more going to utilities. The indexing would have took us down about 16 percent.

So the Board was aggressive and said do the cost and credit. In a year they could have indexed and said, you know, that's the way it goes, it's going down slow, it's going to go up slow, and we do indexing in middle years.

This year we're doing indexing, it's going to go down about seven percent for roads, and my costs are going up a little bit. So interestingly enough, you know, the Board's still going to probably adopt the indexing and cut the fees another six to seven percent, and next year we'll do a full study and they'll probably go up a little bit again.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If the Board didn't reduce the impact fees by double what this year's would be, what would have next year's indexing have been?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think the indexing would have been almost -- this year's would have been almost the same. Because it's based on a year-by-year analysis. So you've got an extra decrease by going at an aggressive cost and credit.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Are mobility fees restricted to future expenditures like impact fees are?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But they can be wider in a way that you expend them --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- as far as uses.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Do mobility fees still provide for the ability to do proportional sharing mitigation on projects of sizes that dictate it?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yeah, it wouldn't change that. Although House Bill 702, if I'm saying that right, we're having -- we're going to have some challenges. The proportionate share of --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Florida statutes at least used to say that their impact fees aren't the only cost to a contribution to the road network. They're costs going forward but maybe not costs going backwards.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: With your Question 21 in the DRI you're supposed to be cost neutral, so you do proportionate share analysis where your impact fees are creditable.

But if you owe more because you've done an analysis that says look, your impact fees in this specific area don't cover your needs, you pay more, but you get the credit for the impact fee.

What the new legislation says is it's a pay and go type environment. The debate now is what is that proportionate share and how is it calculated and where does it go? That's going to be our challenge as a community how to figure that out.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So the mobility fee though won't impact the ability to proportionate share?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good.

That's all the questions I have. Does anybody else have any?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a motion, Mr. Midney?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Yes, I would like to move for approval.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Barry wants this one.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Barry?

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, motion made by Paul, seconded by Barry.

All those in favor, signify by saying say aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.
We're on Number 11.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Continue to improve traffic operations by maintaining appropriate signal timing plans, including pedestrian movements, and through the use of ITMS, Intelligent Transportation Management System, ITMS --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a recommendation on this one from anybody on the Planning Commission?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I move that we approve.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Made by Mr. Midney, seconded by Melissa.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

Nick, some of these are too obvious to --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I know.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- beat up. So unless somebody has a question, we can move through them with that premise in mind.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Very good.

Policy Objective recommendation 12. Coordinate with FDOT and Collier County regarding commuter-based services and/or infrastructure to reduce delay for vehicles carrying multiple persons during peak travel demand and emergency vehicles.

A: Coordinate regarding feasibility and benefit of implementing a carpool/high occupancy vehicle lanes in targeted areas along I-75 during peak travel demand.

And this is probably the more important one: Coordinate interchange activity centers with park-and-ride or transfer facilities to provide access points for commuter transit services.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Any discussion by anybody?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a recommendation?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Approval.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Recommendation by Mr. Midney, seconded by Mr. Schiffer.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

We're on to 13.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Plan for the incorporation of alternative modes or connection to nearby multi-modal infrastructure or facilities, trails, park-and-ride during the design of new and expanded roadways/corridors. Plan to identify new or expanded multi-modal corridors, plan for connection of multi-modal corridors to nearby infrastructure to create a network, coordinate multi-modal corridor designs with environmental preservation objectives --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You know, on some of these, unless we have questions, we probably don't have to all read them, because for the record they're on the screen. So I'm sure we can survive with that. Does that work?

Okay, are there any questions on number 13? Is there --

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Recommend approval.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mr. Midney recommended approval. Seconded by --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- Mr. Brougham.

Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

One thing I wanted to mention, Nick, on some of these objectives, and especially the examples, the A's, B's and C's, a lot of that stuff seems intuitively obvious. And it was stuff I thought you guys were doing all along. But now you're just kind of codifying it.

So I don't -- it's hard to object to it because who can object to making transportation better in some of these ways that don't impinge on property rights or people's right to travel, but --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You would think so.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah. I was just a little surprised that some of these seem awfully expected, compared to having to put them now in writing. But --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Citizen input as well drove some of these. They wanted to make sure that they were defined and not just arbitrarily looked over and said yeah, you're doing it already, reinforce it, so --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And maybe the funders of the grant want to see it, so --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh, there you go. I forgot about that.

Okay, 14.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay, right now we have transportation demand strategies as part of your

transportation concurrent management areas.

Just a quick thing is how do you get employers to start doing alternatives? I'll give you examples. Martin Marietta used to, instead of rebuilding some of the roads used to say, well, we're going to start our workforce at 6:00 and let them out at 3:00, you know, we're going to let our employees work home one day a week. And as the technology increases, what if an employer said I can shut down on Fridays. I cannot be open, I don't work four 10's, can I get a break on my impact fee if I'm closed for a day and I can prove that? Those are all possibilities that we can look at for employer-based incentives to eliminate some of those trips.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Recommend approval.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: (Indicating.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mr. Midney.

Now, discussion. Nick, as of the part of this process, if you were going to give someone or institute an incentive so someone can have a credit against impact fees or whatever, how do you monitor whether or not -- sure, they put language in there that says we're going to let our employees work from home. Okay, you qualify for incentives.

How do you know that actually happened? How do you audit this to make sure you're getting the bang for the buck that you gave them an incentive for?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You'd have to do some random audits. And right now with technology in California -- I know California is one of those -- it's a different country sometimes, but the technology is built into the computers that actually tells if a person's working from home. There's an audit that goes back and says all the data entry and back and forth happened on a certain day. So they're proving to the communities that they're doing that.

So you'd have to find out the ways. And also, if you did an audit and you didn't do it, you pay the impact fee, you just lost that benefit.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I think that as we implement language for these, that would be an important consideration as to how it's going to be monitored, because there's a lot of things that people say they're going to do they never get watched so they never end up doing them, so --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Again, one of the key ones was the employer who says I will run my business from 6:00 to 3:00 and I can afford to do that. And if it means a little bit of a break, if you're ever open past 3:00 or you're not open at 6:00, you lost that benefit. Because they're in light industrial manufacturing and they say, that works for us.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: How do you incentivize existing?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think the same way. I think if they can prove they can transfer to something like that, the impact fee runs with the land, you might be able to give them a credit on their property. That might be harder than -- in existing but, you know, sure, opportunities to do that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, there's been a motion, it's been seconded. We had discussion.

All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

We're on to 15.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Let's see. Original 15, I think this is a discussion about working with the regulatory agencies, and a comment came back that we should already be doing it.

A lot of this came from the regulatory agencies. They don't think that we're doing it enough, so --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, but it's kind of like the comment I just made about those other items being --

we thought you were doing them already, this is just another feel good one, so --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, one part is can we get the agencies to provide incentives if we do the right thing. And that's what the new 16 kind of -- 15 and 16 talks about together. And I think we've combined it.

What if we talked to the agencies and said we're doing the right thing, can you give us some incentives on your end, fast-track, you know, reviews, you know, quicker reviews, things like that that we could do with that.

So we're going to work on that. Because I think the agencies want it, the community wants it, and we are doing part of it already.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, seconded by Melissa. Made by Mr. Midney, motion to approve.

Is there discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay, 17. I think we talked about this earlier in plan review. Use the mitigation cost component of the county's current roadway impact fee to fund specific mitigation strategies.

I think you're going to have a speaker on this one.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: What does that take away from? Where are you currently using those monies at random?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You're not. You're still mitigating for your road projects at the time you do the project. But for instance, sometimes I don't get to a project till the fifth year and I've been collecting the fees all along. But in the first year I get five percent of the project or 20 percent of the project over five years. I could start buying that mitigation early with that component of the fee. And when I get to the fifth year I'll always (sic) have that mitigation already in place.

Benefit would be is you're already buying the properties and protecting it early. You've built up that credit with the agencies. I think that is okay. But I think The Conservancy and other folks are concerned about the HCP. I'll let them speak for that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. But when you said -- when you're talking about creating an HCP, or when you talk about what we already have in conservation lands that are -- could be considered qualified mitigation, such as Starnes and Caracara I think it's called now, and I think Pepper Ranch had a portion of it. Are we still proceeding with getting the mitigation locked in for those so we --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We've still got to pay for it, though. We get discounts but we have to pay for it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh, because it's inter-department?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir. It's Conservation Collier funds and we have to reimburse them for that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Nicole, did you have something you want to throw in? Add?

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. For the record, Nicole Johnson here on behalf of The Conservancy.

The Conservancy is very concerned in general about a county-wide multi-species HCP. It isn't the concept of an HCP that's necessarily bad or good, but each individual HCP can be either very beneficial to species or not work quite so well. So we're concerned about the county pursuing an HCP.

But in the context of the master mobility plan, we just don't see a nexus for an HCP as being part of it. I

mean, an HCP really is the result of obtaining coverage under the Endangered Species Act for harm to listed species. And how that translates to the goal of reducing VMT's, I just don't see it.

There is an Eastern Collier County HCP that's being pursued privately by the landowners. That's going forward. So I think we're dealing with these mitigation efforts in other avenues, and The Conservancy just doesn't believe that it's necessary and really fits in with the master mobility plan.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Boy, I didn't think you'd agree with me on that, but that's great.

Nick, that's a good point, why do you need A and B? Why don't you just leave the objective as a sentence?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, I think other stakeholders who aren't here right now wanted to see an HCP. And I think the agencies have told us, get your act together and come up with a big picture conservation management plan. So we're getting that.

But, you know, my comment would be if you're going to say they shouldn't be in here, then the rest of the environmental section shouldn't be in here, because this is definitely a component of it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Didn't I already say that?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yeah, you did.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. That's my opinion, at least. I know the Board will weigh in on it in the end.

But if you -- we don't even know if the HCP is the right mechanism for Collier County's environmentally -- in lands.

The suggestion that you did by adding the paragraph, I would repeatedly use as an example, is that this needs to be relegated to another study altogether, not demanded in this one. Because you don't know it's the right -- I don't think we know it's the right thing to demand. There may be other strategies that work better for Collier County than HCP's or different ones for different species.

I'm not -- so I would certainly agree with Nicole. I don't myself think you need to put examples in this recommendation. It stands on its own. Let it develop as it would. And as the recommendation goes forward and we acknowledge that we need to have mitigation strategies, let those come out of the implementation language so we have more time to think about it and hear the pros and cons of HCP's.

But right now I don't see that as a needed recommendation mobility plan. At least that's my opinion. So I'll -- depending on the motion, that's how I'm going to weigh in on it.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Very good.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody else have any comments?

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: I motion that we reject this -- we accept the objective but reject the description A and B.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a second?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'll second the motion.

So the motion's been made to use the introductory sentence to the objective and leave A and B out of it.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, all those in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

Are if we're on 19?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: 18.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: 18, I'm sorry.

Well, this is a pretty no-brainer. Nicole, you object to this one?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Made by Melissa.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by Ms. Homiak.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

Let's go to 20 --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: 19.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: 19. God, you're always -- I'm looking at this one to predict the next one. You're always changing on me, so --

Now, this is different than the A, B and C and D you have in our booklet.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think we've -- based on comments we've refined it a little bit.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think we ought to walk through them just to make sure we understand them.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Sure. I think it's more geared towards county services and infrastructure collocating certain things, along with development. You know, you see some of the developments right now; the mixed use centers will include a satellite office for the clerk for things like that. How can we include things like that. Locations to provide those things.

So collocating key public services in strategic places I think makes a lot of sense so that people don't have to drive as far. That's one of the key things. Make sure there's no more of that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody have any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I have one or two comments.

Okay, Nick, when you say identify and plan for long-range needs of key public uses, to what extent is that limited? Is it any public uses? And by specific examples there is the known need for a future site for a landfill. We know the landfills take 10, 15 years to permit. We know we have a certain life expectancy of our current landfill. So something needs to be looked ahead. Is this saying that's the kind of thing we need to be looking at?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It's a little broader than that. I mean, yes. And the answer is we're looking at maybe transfer stations if the landfill is not there. It's any service that the government provides to you for public services, but it's geared towards a lot of things. Can we strategically locate a voting center, a license renewal center, a transfer station or we talked about the landfill right now just got re-permitted for a much longer life span. But what if there was a location in Eastern Collier where garbage was collected, sorted and then redelivered to the landfill and re -- like these recycling centers. Locating those key locations where it makes strategic sense reduces that trip length. So that's what we're looking at here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No, I agree with it, I just want to make sure I understood the magnitude of it. Because that could come into play in new land planning coming forward in the county in all aspects. If we have a regional need of something in an area that's coming in for some changes, maybe they need to consider putting a landfill location on it and things like that.

Okay, anybody else have any comments?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Melissa beat Paul to this. Motion to approve.
Second?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: (Indicating.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: By Brad.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We're doing this already. I think it's come up in a lot of public comments about e-government. We're switching a lot to electronic permitting. So I think anything else that we can push government to do electronically --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's a great idea.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: -- it's -- you know, that's trips that don't have to come to our building.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Melissa again.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Second by Brad again.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: And then what we talked about, instead of five years, review the outcomes and measure every five years and as necessary update the LDC's or other regulatory instruments.

So get away from that mandatory five year review and do it as part of the EAR. But measure how we've done every five years to see if we're heading in the right direction.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: What encompasses your -- on how to measure? I mean, so how much staff time, people? Is it a separate process? Because if you're going to do it at the EAR, you'd have to measuring your objectives to see if you've met them at that time. So if you do it every five years, you're going to do it every seven years in the EAR. So do you really need to do it five and then two more later?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No. I think you could save that as part of the EAR.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I mean, I think that just saves staff time.

Go ahead, Karen?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: But most of the transportation plans are updated basically every five years.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Your long-range transportation plan is every five years through the MPO process, that's right.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: All right. And this is mentioned throughout here, the LRTP and the TAZ's --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: -- which are going to change too. They're going to be looked at again shortly.

So even within this time that you're making policy, they're going to be different. But you're not going to use the modeling. The modeling's going to be the 2035 LRTP --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: -- numbers, right? Even though the policies -- so the policies will be written with that information and those numbers right now.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think our goal is -- you know, I think what we envision is every five years we do a staff report and say how many communities have we interconnected, have we brought e-government services up. It's almost to measure and say these are the 20 recommendations that we've brought forward. What have we accomplished in five years? Have we turned on e-government? Yes. That's a good measure. We've now -- we've reduced permitting by 50 percent. How many collocations have we done? We've done 10. We've collocated government 10 times.

So we can -- based on the recommendation you see, we can kind of do a report card, review the outcomes. Have we done a good job? Have things been better after five years? I think that was the goal. And then if they're not, when we do the EAR-based amendments we can look to tweak the language.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But along with Karen's line of thinking, if you're going to use this as a tool to understand what changes you may need in your performance, or your objectives, maybe instead of tying it to every five years you tie it to every -- two years prior to every EAR, you could do it. That way you could use the statistics you developed from that review to correct any deficiencies in the EAR. With that -- or do you feel -- because if the five year cycle gets off cycle from the EAR, you'd be producing results after you've done the EAR and you may not benefit from it then. Is that another way to look at it?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Commissioner Homiak was talking about modeling the 2035 LRTP, the TAZ's and the vehicle miles traveled. It's almost impossible to determine from the modeling what came out of this.

You know, you could still say you've done certain things, but I wouldn't know how to quantify it in the model necessarily. Like, you know, e-permitting, how would I measure that drop? That would be hard to do.

I think what the Chairman is saying is go into that EAR-based review. I'm okay with that, that makes sense. I still want to come back with a report card. I think that's our goal. And maybe if we did it two years before the EAR and then use that to drive some of the EAR recommendations, that works.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Something's still bothering me here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Listening to the last five minutes of comments, do you view the master mobility plan as a one-time effort?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, I think -- well, yes and no. Yes, once the plan's adopted it's done. I don't think we're going to redo a mobility plan, it's done.

The renewal and review of these outcomes after technology changes or things change, I think you have to look at all the time. But I think you've done, and the mobility plan has shown, that you can get reductions by doing the right things. I think you have to test those repeatedly, but I don't think you have to redo the whole plan all over again.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Well, I certainly endorse measuring your progress towards the plan. But what's bothering me conceptually is to do a plan of any sort and then not replan based upon results --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: -- if I'm communicating my point.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, you are.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I mean, because some of the premises and assumptions, et cetera, that you put into any plan are for certain going to change, which can drive you in to different recommendations, et cetera,

et cetera, et cetera.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: And would everything necessarily surface in the EAR amendments? If you know what I'm saying.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I do. And your great point is your analogy is your Growth Management Plan. It's a plan for the county. But you don't redo it. Once you've done it now you tweak it as you go. So I think that's the point you're all trying to make. I think I'm hearing it in different pieces.

So your master mobility plan is a subset of your Growth Management Plan. All of these recommendations are going to fall into that, or the LDC. And yes, you need to revisit them just like you do your GMP. But every five years or seven years we don't rewrite our GMP, we just say how have we done.

You know, so I think it just becomes you've done it, evaluate and you write. We expected to go 10 degrees northeast --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: It didn't turn out that way so we're going to --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Exactly. But not redo the whole plan again.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Okay. What I was uncomfortable is thinking that well, we did it and we're never going to measure progress, we're never going to make a change in our assumptions, so forth, so I think I understand.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Was there any -- I'm concerned that if this is as it's written, you'd have to do it every five years, but that may not coincide with the EAR when you would benefit most from being able to make the changes that you'd learn from your review.

Is there a better way to word that if that's the better way to go?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think we'll reword it to tie it with the EAR. I that's the appropriate way of -- talking to Mike -- I don't know if he's still here. He left -- we did discuss this.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And we killed two birds with one review.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We killed two birds with one review. We just -- we'll just make that a specific subset of the EAR is look at mobility more and more. And we do, we have a transportation element, so --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, I think with that caveat, that would clean that up.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Does anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Motion to approve with that caveat.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Melissa, motion to approve as recommended.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: (Indicating.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Brad.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: This was supposed --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: This is the last one.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: -- to be a slide recommending a raise, but that didn't get up there.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: For Debbie?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, for Debbie.

I really want to thank -- if the public's watching and we don't have them in the room, but the people that participated, it's an amazing effort that you've done and I think it shows that there's not a lot of controversy. And the hard work is truly in the next phase. And for the Planning Commission taking their time.

We'll be back in two weeks to make sure we've captured your thoughts and come back with it on a consent.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. We've not quite wrapped up yet, though, so I want to make sure: Anybody from the public wish to speak, come on up and speak now.

MS. JOHNSON: I promise, it's the last time.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's okay.

MS. JOHNSON: Nicole Johnson from The Conservancy.

And I have been jumping up when I had questions and comments, so I wasn't able to make my general comment, which I think is very important, to thank staff and the consultants, the team, for really addressing all of the stakeholders' concerns, certainly The Conservancy's concerns. I think we were one of the most vocal in the beginning with concerns about the scope and the outcomes and the process of the master mobility plan.

And staff and the rest of the team has been very good about answering our questions, incorporating many, many of our comments. So I know that I jumped up today where we did still have some questions and issues, and I wanted the team to know we very much appreciate their efforts.

The hard work is going to be in the next phase of really nailing down the details and the policy, but we're pleased with the product as of today and we appreciate everyone's efforts. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you.

Anybody else?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Mark?

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Okay, Brad?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I have a question on section six, the last one.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, I was going to get to those too. So that's fine, let's just move on to those next then. I hadn't -- that's what I said to Nick, we're not quite done yet, but I'll make sure any questions we have the appendix or six are answered.

Go ahead, Brad.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Wishful thinking.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Nick, the grant, does it fund anything past Phase II?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think a little bit of Phase III, which is the policy language. And I'm going to be honest with you, I think we're optimistic with six months. I think we're already a month and a half behind to get to the Board in January. Elections are in August. So I think we'll trod along in Phase III. And realistically, it's probably going to take us another -- I would say the end of calendar year '12.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And Phase III will be the language to change the GMP to --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Or LDC.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Or LDC.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: And I think like the one that requires a committee, that may be like a 12 to 18-month project. It will take longer.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: All right, thank you.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, I think one thing I'd like to ask from the Planning Commission, if individually we have any points that we want to make to Nick -- and I'm doing that more of a self-serving objective of mine. I do. And so I don't want to deprive you any of that as well. I normally wouldn't step out of turn on that stuff. So -- and it's not something to vote on, but I want to get on record a couple of objections I have overall so they're not misconstrued. But I don't know if the -- and I'm going to offer that opportunity to any of you first.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'm fine.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, I have three things that concern me.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Please.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Your use of the population statistics. The fact that they are not synchronized with the same statistics we use for capital improvements in the AUIR is concerning. Because that's a document that dictates for years in advance, like the solid waste, for example, how we expend money.

Using a more conservative approach on some of the population statistics, especially in the RLSA, which I think is going to far outweigh the urban area in population in years to come, but that doesn't show it in this plan. But I think that conservative approach hurts the reliability of this master mobility plan.

The second thing is the environmental aspects of it. I don't disagree with the environmental needs. I disagree that this plan is implementing those or trying to utilize those as a program. Because I don't believe it's been advertised that way. I do know that based on testimony today, the stakeholders who are -- and the property owners who are most effected were not notified.

Now, in Golden Gate Estates when we did the master plan, when we effected a neighborhood like that, there were mailers sent out to every neighborhood about changes. That didn't happen here. So those stakeholders didn't know to come out and fill a room like they did when we had the master plan going on. People out there are involved. And I think they had to right to know that before the plan even introduced a new program.

Then my last one is that figure 4.1 showing the location of the potential ROMA and the preservation. And anything that goes forward I personally would strongly object to that plan being used.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So those are my three standing objections. What you do with them is up to you, but I'm just letting you know, and for the record, I don't agree with those points. However that comes out and tumbles out in final language of which I may or may not be a part, I don't know, so --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: If I could just respond to a couple of them --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Sure.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: -- for the record as well.

On population, Mr. Mohlke spent a little time talking about the dysfunction between population totals and when they're used to drive monetary decisions on funding and who gets what, when they used to drive needs.

I think we did a real good job in this plan, when you're talking to The Conservancy, the stakeholders. None of the population -- if you looked at the recommendations, they were not driven by population at all. So that was important.

When we got to the recommendation section, if we had said in this area because of population X, Y, Z we need to do this, I want to reiterate again on the record, throw 300,000 people more in this plan and the recommendations wouldn't have changed. Take 300,000 people out and the recommendations wouldn't have changed. So we didn't make it a metric in the sense -- we just used it as a test base.

And I think, so people know, I think we were damned either way, if we go in high or low. We chose to go low because I think sometimes people hold the higher number to be more dangerous than the lower number.

As far as notification in the Estates, I think I've talked to a lot of the folks that live out there, and I think they were more comfortable when they heard the committee recommendations. They said okay, we will get a chance to participate at that level, and we will make those decisions then.

So I think they're not here today because they realize there's no language in there that says do it. It says look at I.

But I do recognize your concerns, because if your property was on there you may get a little flag that goes up. Thank you, I really appreciate the comments.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I think that wraps up our meeting today.

And I thank you all. Your group did a great job. I mean, I think we're here to chew it up. And between what you did, it was no -- that's not saying you didn't do a good job, I think you did a nice job, a great job in putting in well documentation.

And Debbie, I don't know why you didn't want to stand up here and argue these points today, but you could have done a great job at that. He's got the gift of gab, doesn't he?

Okay, with that, is there a -- I think that wraps up any public comment. I think we've already asked that.


Motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: By Melissa.
Seconded by Barry. We are adjourned.

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by order of the Chair at 2:03 p.m.

COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION



MARK STRAIN, Chairman

These minutes approved by the board on 1-12 as presented or as corrected .

Transcript prepared on behalf of Gregory Reporting Service, Inc.,
by Cherie' R. Nottingham.