

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Second.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Motion by Commissioner Henning to approve, second by Commissioner Coletta.

All in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER HILLER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Aye.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Aye.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Any opposed, by like sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: It passes unanimously.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Good job, Beth.

MR. YILMAZ: Thank you.

MR. OCHS: Thank you, Commissioners.

That takes us to Item --

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Great speech.

Item #10E

RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ACCEPT THE WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN (WMP) AND DIRECT THE COUNTY MANAGER OR DESIGNEE TO IMPLEMENT WMP INITIATIVES UTILIZING EXISTING STAFF AND BUDGET – MOTION TO APPROVE W/MODIFICATIONS TO STAFF’S RECOMMENDATIONS AND DIRECTING THE CHAIRMAN TO WRITE A LETTER TO THE GOVERNOR FOR ADDITIONAL SUPPORT – APPROVED

MR. OCHS: Yes, if they all went that well.

10E is a recommendation for the Board of County Commissioners to accept the Watershed Management Plan and direct

the County Manager or designee to implement the WMP initiatives utilizing existing staff and existing budget.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: How many speakers do we have?

MR. MITCHELL: Sir, we have five speakers.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. How many people in the audience are opposed to the staff's recommendation on this item?

MS. HUSHON: I have an addition.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Motion to approve.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Commissioners, one clarification.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Wait a minute. We have a motion. I've got to act on the motion first. Motion to approve by Commissioner Coletta.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: I can't second it until I hear what additions they're talking about.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: I withdraw my motion.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. The motion's withdrawn.

Go ahead, Nick.

Commissioner Henning, did you get anything, or do you want anything here?

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Yeah, I do. I want a whole bunch.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. Save it till the end, all right.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: All right.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Am I going to start, Commissioner?

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Go ahead.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay. First of all, thank you. Plan's been a long time coming. There's been a lot of people involved in the plan, and I'd like to report that it was under-budget, although not on time. It was a long, drawn-out process, and it had to go on for quite a while. We actually returned a little bit of money out of the project.

There are four pillars in Collier County, as you know; utility, water/sewer; your land use; your transportation; and what I call your

natural resources, water. And it's becoming more important on a daily basis, and especially in the long term.

I don't know if any of you are familiar with the water wars that happened in Hillsborough County, Tampa, where the city's municipalities and the unincorporated areas fought for water resources. As you know, right now the City of Naples draws from the same aquifer as the Golden Gate residents do in Golden Gate Estates.

So I think protection of natural resources, especially water, is critical. And some of the components of the plan, I think, bring that up to speed or bring that to the highlight.

I'll take you through a quick presentation. The purpose of the plan: protect water resources, meet our GMP goals, help meet the regulatory requirements, both state and federal, and it gives us a blueprint for restoration.

Key components of the plan, Commissioners. No fiscal impacts in this phase, and today you're not approving any regulatory standards. And we have two things I want to make sure you're very clear on. It's obviously subject to available funds. Anything you see in here will come back to this board for appropriation at the appropriate phase.

And staff and the applicant, and even working with the Planning Commission, we made it clear that most of what we're going to present to you will be cost neutral. Anything that's not, we'll make it clear, if it's regulatory, that it will impact someone somewhere.

But our goal with the LIDs and regulatory things that we're going to present will be cost neutral.

Conclusions: excessive freshwater discharge to the bays and estuaries. Your pollutant loads, such as nitrogen, phosphorus, copper are concerned; inadequate are primary and secondary canals, and we'll get into that in a little bit in the presentation; and your aquifer impacts and reduced recharge.

When we talk about water wars, we talk about two things. One is the discharge freshwater into Naples Bay. That's been a primary

concern. The table in front of you shows, on the left side, the season. As you can see, what I would call this line over here represents zero, and this is excessive water that's going into Naples Bay during the wet seasons. And even in Rookery Bay during the wet season they have a deficit.

When you get to the dry season, you are discharging still excessive water into Naples Bay, and the deficit is there. So part of that water discussion with the city's going to be, you keep putting in water into Naples Bay, what are you going to do about it, and that's an issue we're taking on with the BCB, the district, and the county.

Planned water diversions. We know that if we can divert water down to the estuaries to Henderson Creek, through that area, we'll get more freshwater where it's needed, and we'll take water out of Naples Bay. And these are some of the diversions we talked about, one through the City Gate area, just west of your landfill, tying back into Henderson Creek, and then something in the North Belle Meade area.

Total basins with water-quality impairment: nine have dissolved oxygen; four fecal coliform, four iron; three nutrient; one, copper and mercury in the Florida Gulf.

Interesting note, what I found out recently was we were an exporter of materials from Naples Bay when I talk about -- I want to say -- oysters, and now we can't do that anymore. Someone had told me the history was, we're one of the top exporters. Because of the contamination, you can no longer do that. I thought that was an interesting thing to bring up.

We recently had what I call a stress test. They talk about in Europe stress-testing the banks. Well, what we have in the summer months in Florida is what I would call isolated rain. But that recent rainstorm we had a while back was rain everywhere. We were inundated throughout Collier County into Lee County.

And I want to point out something that we all knew that was very interesting. When I take the highlighter right here, the Corkscrew

headwaters into the Golden Gate Canal in Corkscrew and the Cypress Canal, this is all red; whereas, you see green in other areas. And we talk about model results show limited conveyance capacity in numerous canal segments, but what this shows is the red was out of bank.

So we know that water coming from the headwaters flow down into Naples Bay, that this red area right here is where we have a backup. And we've met with the district, and they've made improvements to increase the headwater flow north, and Lee County has made improvements to send more water down this area right here as well.

So we know that diversion to Henderson Creek is important. We know that rehydrating this area's important, and this stress test confirmed what we knew already.

Third point is the aquifer recharge. We talked about -- I mentioned the water wars. These are the lower Tamiami aquifer and the surficial aquifer, and the red is, obviously, a bad sign; the agricultural drawdowns and the well drawdowns in the upper aquifer, and then in the lower Tamiami.

So we're starting to see the early signs of that drawdown. And our goal as part of the Watershed Management Plan is to divert water back into those areas and keep it there where we can.

So, again, nothing in this plan is going to be brought forward other than coming back to the board, so we want to be clear about that.

My clarification was on your Item 4 of the recommendation. It talks about evaluating the effectiveness of a fee-based stormwater utility to create incentives to improve water-quality treatment and recharge. Structures of the fees would not increase the total revenues but reward users with effective treatment systems.

This initiative would require an initial fee-rate study that would be funded by grant or from existing stormwater fronts.

My recommendation and change to that to you, Commissioners,

we do a cursory review first before we spend a lot of time and money on that, then come back to you and explain to you what other districts, communities in Florida are doing, and then just give you an update before we proceed too much in depth with that. I think you'll find that concerning if we move forward with a stormwater utility too quickly. So that's the change I'm recommending.

This was voted unanimously by your EAC and your Planning Commission. The presentation continues with the conclusions, and I have Mac and the consultant here to take you through the rest individually or to answer questions with the team that's here.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Let's have the public speakers.

MR. MITCHELL: The first speaker is Tim Nance. No?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: The next one is Nancy Payton, and she'll be followed by Brad Cornell.

MS. PAYTON: Good morning. Nancy Payton with the Florida Wildlife Federation to represent the propose -- or to support the proposal that's before you today.

We're particularly interested in two aspects of it. One is the proposal, the recommendations to protect and enhance wetland systems in eastern/northern Golden Gate Estates -- it's referred as flowways in the proposal -- and also, a TDR program to be explored to further protect habitat and wetlands in Northern Golden Gate Estates.

Also, it briefly was discussed by Nick, North Belle Meade. We're particularly interested in that one; rehydrating wetlands, rehabbing wetlands. That was part of the whole North Belle Meade Overlay. It ties in with the Natural Resource Protection Area Program. There's some mitigation efforts that are taking place in that area, and there's a way to mesh several different programs in achieving that rehydration and also improvement of wildlife habitat. It not only benefits North Belle Meade, it benefits South Belle Meade,

it benefits Rookery Bay, and it benefits Naples Bay. So it is a program in North Belle Meade that has significant implications for the rest of the county.

So I urge you to move this plan forward into the next phases to further evaluate the recommendations in the projects that appear in the Watershed Management Plan.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Thank you.

MR. MITCHELL: Following Mr. Cornell will be Nicole Johnson.

MR. CORNELL: Good morning, Commissioners. I'm Brad Cornell, and I'm here on behalf of Collier County Audubon Society and Audubon of Florida.

And we're also here to support this plan and move it forward. I have three succinct points I want to make though, about it. One is that I share Nancy's interest in the rehydration and protection of wetlands in North Golden Gate Estates, North Belle Meade, South Belle Meade, and some of these other restoration projects.

I do want to point out that there's a good connection between this and the Master Mobility Plan that you're going to also be looking at in the near future, particularly in North Golden Gate Estates, the TDR program. There are other ways we can protect wetlands and public interests, flood protection, and resource values: lot trading, land acquisition, cooperation and collaboration with the South Florida Water Management District and the Big Cypress Basin perhaps using land trust, et cetera.

Second point, it's really important to do the implementation phase. Moving this forward as Phase 1 is good, and we support that; that's why I'm here. But you've got to implement it. And, you know, I think everybody's tired of studies that sit on shelves. So clearly that's in the public interest, and we urge you to take the next step after this acceptance.

And, thirdly, I just want to underscore the importance of a proactive program like this where you're planning to do watershed benefits for your own public and how important it is to do this ourselves. We should not be deferring resource protection to the state and federal government. We should be -- we know what the watershed requirements are, the wetland protection needs are, and water supply and flood protection needs are in our county. We shouldn't be deferring those. So it's our responsibility, and so I support your moving forward on this on that basis, too.

Thank you.

MR. MITCHELL: Nicole Johnson will be followed by Judy Hushon.

MS. JOHNSON: Good morning. For the record, Nicole Johnson here on behalf of the Conservancy of Southwest Florida.

And in a couple days of lots of heated debate, many important issues that you've been discussing, I think it's really important for all of us to take a look at this Watershed Management Plan, because it's been a long time in coming. It was due '93, and then in 2000, and it wasn't until 2006 that the county really got serious about moving forward with this.

In 2010, which was the due date, the Conservancy was one of the organizations that requested a bit of an additional extension because we felt that the plan wasn't quite there yet, and it was most important to get it right. And I have to say that that additional extension has paid off.

We had a lot of concerns, comments, suggestions about the Watershed Management Plan, and Mac and the staff and the consulting team have been really tremendous in working with us and incorporating our suggestions, explaining why they couldn't incorporate suggestions in other cases. So we're very, very pleased with the document. We're pleased with how the team has worked through this, and we do ask that you move it forward.

But this really is only a plan. It's a guidance document, and its implementation is going to be where the community truly sees the benefits. Staff has identified a series of recommendations that are, we believe, sensitive to budgetary constraints that the county is under, and they've indicated that the majority of work will be done in-house as funding permits; therefore, in order to keep the plan from simply languishing on the shelf, we ask that you move forward with these recommendations with staff doing what they can this year with funds permitting, and we ask that the initiatives be considered during the upcoming budgetary cycles.

It's important to keep in mind that any policies or programs that you pursue now as part of this process will result in water-quality improvement. And as the cost of addressing water quality will continue to increase in the future, any work done now which contributes to improvements, be it LIDs, fertilizer ordinance, TDR program, protection of the wetlands in the North Golden Gate area, it's going to result in less cost in the future associated with water-quality treatment. This problem isn't going to go away. We need to start seriously addressing it now.

One suggestion that we would make regarding the fertilizer ordinance is that, as you'll recall during the fertilizer ordinance process several months ago, you had directed staff to prepare an ordinance with more stringent, more protective standards than the state model ordinance. Then at your July meeting you received a letter from the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services saying that they needed to further review new statutory language to see if you could go beyond that model ordinance.

We have had communication with Department of Ag, and they indicate that to resolve that issue they may actually need to go in and introduce legislation to clarify the statute.

So with this in mind, I think it's implicit in the recommendation, but you may want to specify that staff monitor what happens during

the legislative session and then bring back a more stringent ordinance as appropriate.

Thank you.

MR. MITCHELL: Judith, yes.

MS. HUSHON: Judith Hushon, Chair of the EAC.

We heard this for many weeks, many months, and we've very familiar with what's in it. We like what's in it, and we hope the county does move forward.

When the staff document came out that was the implementation and kind of the guidance for implementing the document, there were a few things that were missing from it, and I would like to request that you consider adding these at this time.

All good plans need to be reviewed on a regular basis. This needs a review in five years. We are going to have new data, new monitoring data. We're doing things in engineering, we're going to move canals, put in basins, whatever. We need to relook at our numbers in five years. Relooking at those numbers is not a big deal. It's not going to be as big a deal as this deal was, because we know how to do it now. We just need to look at them again.

Also, we need to include in future reviews a look at a one-inch sea level rise, and then maybe a two and a three only because this will affect our groundwater, and our -- we need to see what that impact is, because we drink our groundwater. And so any influx of saltwater -- saltwater intrusion into our drinking water aquifers would be serious, and we would be very -- it would be very expensive for us, and we would have to start putting money ahead for those expenses.

So I'm just saying we need to know what's coming, and the only way to know what's coming is to study it. So I'm asking that that be included in the next round of study.

Also, we need guidelines for managing anthropogenic copper in stormwater ponds right now. Nobody knows exactly how to go about it. They're kind of going about it in ten different ways. I would like

the county to come back with some guidance, some standard guidance documents.

The EAC intends to consider whether land development actions in the future are designated as resource protection lands, as seen on Figure 1-41. That's because these are the lands that this study has shown are those lands that need to be protected, to protect our water resource.

COMMISSIONER HILLER: Do we have a copy of that? Can we put that on the overhead?

MS. HUSHON: Somebody -- you have a copy. You have a copy. It's in the executive summary, 1-41.

COMMISSIONER HILLER: We should have it on the overhead for everyone to see.

MS. HUSHON: Sure, sorry.

Also, our canals are maxed out. That was something our -- this study showed us, our canal system as it exists today.

In the future we should be requiring that no more water leave a development site than was when it was virgin. In other words, you need to manage your water on your site and not pour it off onto the next site, onto the next site, and out into the gulf.

So we should be looking at having that as part of our goal for the future as well. And these are points that I think should be in the staff guidance, added to the staff guidance.

So thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Thank you.

MR. MITCHELL: Sir, that was your last speaker.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Coletta?

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Yes, thank you.

Nick?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: I know the answer, but I just

need to have it on the record. One of the concerns that we have out in the Golden Gate Estates area, of course, isn't so much retention of the water in the land -- which is important. I mean, people know that it's important, but it's not the biggest issue -- it's the conveyance of water away from the residential area. Will this plan in any way hinder that present conveyance of water?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, sir. No, that's not the intent of this plan.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Because one of the fears is that -- it's been mentioned many times and it's been category -- proven to be untrue is the fact that there's been plans afoot to be able to make Golden Gate Estates the water-storage area for the county. So this plan will in no way impair the flow of water? It will not add to the flooding risk?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, no, not the flooding risk, sir. As I pointed out in one of the prior slides, right now that Golden Gate Main and the Cypress Canal are already overflowing. So one of the --

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: No, I know that. But, I mean, will this plan in any way increase that risk?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, sir, that's not the intent of this plan, to increase flooding to the residents.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: And will it be stated in there as we go forward, too, when we get it back as far as that, that it is not that intention? It would be great to have it stated in plain words so that everybody can go to it and refer to it and know that there's no harm that's going to come to them from this plan.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes. And anything we bring -- anything we do, sir, has to come back to this board, so we'll clearly look at that, that benefit.

One of the goals of the plan is to rehydrate certain areas in the Estates but not raise the water table so it will affect existing septic systems or flood anybody. That's definitely not what we want to do as

part of that.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Thank you, Nick.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. Commissioner Hiller.

COMMISSIONER HILLER: Yeah. I like the comments that Judy just made, and I think they really should be incorporated. I also like the point that Nicole made, and that is that we should clearly have a timeline for what we are doing. And, in fact, I think we should, with everything brought forward, have a timeline, because oftentimes we just vote without saying, you know, when it's going to come back and, you know, what the plan is for the next step beyond that.

So have you established a timeline for any of this?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No. Interestingly enough, the discussion is that Mac is an army of one. And along with the additional staff, when you look at these recommendations --

COMMISSIONER HILLER: Yeah, but he's a great army of one.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: He is.

COMMISSIONER HILLER: So it's okay. We can count on him.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: And so I think our goal, Commissioners, and we've talked about it internally, is that we're limited in staff. So to look at the recommendations and then prioritize them internally, what can we consult out, what will be tied to the Surface Water Business Plan that you're going to hear next. And third component, you know -- and I'll bring it up. It's the bear in the room that nobody wants to talk about. But we're a donor county to the district, a donor county to the basin.

And I mean no disrespect to Clarence and the basin board members or the district board members, but I've been knocking on their door the past 12 months and saying, I'd like to look at the financing, why we keep giving in funds to the district.

The recent water report that was provided, the legislator talked

about the east coast water supply. Well, we are a west coast, and we provide a lot of funds to the east coast.

So we're going to be asking a lot from the district and the basin. And they've said to us, the executive director, Melissa Meeker, said, bring me a plan, show me what you want to do, show me how it benefits the district and the basin, and I'll encourage our staff to fund some of that. So we're going to be pushing for that to be a major funding source for some of these initiatives.

COMMISSIONER HILLER: Well, I think you bring up a very good point, and I know that you've been working on this for quite some time. The basin board is a new board now.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HILLER: And I think there are people on that board who are very reasonable. And maybe it would be worthy of a workshop to meet with that new board and tell them, hey, you know, we've got concerns about the redistribution of wealth, if you will and, you know, we want to be treated fairly.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think it's something I left off their fiscal-year budget with -- at their budget meeting that I would be inquiring going into '13, and I would love this board to put forward some motion or direction for us to inquire about that financing and distribution of funds. I think that's a great idea.

COMMISSIONER HILLER: I think we have to have a dialogue about it. It is the county's money.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: To some of Judith's recommendations -- I didn't catch them all. But we talked about the sea-level rise. That's not funded as part of this project, and that's a pretty extensive study. So I don't know if I could commit to that. Obviously, the review annually is limited to the staff we have.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Review after five years.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right. But provide a metric every year as to where we are. We could obviously give a board report as to

the recommendations where we've come in 12 months. And that's not a hard thing to do.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: I think the intent of the recommendation was to assure that the plan itself would receive a review --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: -- at the five-year mark to determine if it's really accomplishing the goals that we intend it to accomplish. So that shouldn't be an overwhelming burden.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, sir. And with the mobility plan that just was heard at the Planning Commission, their recommendation, which made sense, was to tie to the EAR review that happens every five to seven years. So staff is holistically looking at both the Growth Management Plan, which this drives, as well as other projects.

So if you want to tie it to that EAR review, I'm perfectly happy putting that on the record that we do an update to the plan or do a review of it with the EAR.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: I like the holistic concept, because all these things feed into a common plan.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: So I think it's -- that would be a good idea if you were to do that.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Very good.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. Commissioner Fiala?

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Yes, thank you.

I would like to make a motion, please, to approve this agenda item with all of the stipulations here, plus I would like to add that -- we had some really great points from our speakers. Plus I would like to add that we don't defer it to other governmental agencies, as Brad Cornell said, but keep it within, and as Nicole said, move forward with staff, not outsourcing. So they're one in the same things, but also to have a timeline or time frame so that it gives us a map to follow.

Also, to monitor legislation so that if legislation moves forward in the right direction, that we can then address, at some point in time, bring back to the County Commission maybe the more-stringent fertilizer legislation.

And then I like the idea from Judy Hushon, that said review in five years. I think that's good. But like you said also, review with the EAR.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: And so I think that's a good deal. Manage water on site for each new development. That's excellent. I think we do that in most cases, but if we need to expand that, I think that that would -- that would be important. And then, of course, with the sea level, as you mentioned right now, we don't have the money, but maybe we can monitor it from -- you know, from time to time, because that is going to be coming up in the future --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We will.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: -- and it's important to do that. So that is my motion.

COMMISSIONER HILLER: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. Motion by Commissioner Fiala, second by Commissioner Hiller to review -- to approve with the modifications to the staff recommendations as enumerated.

Okay. Commissioner Henning?

COMMISSIONER HENNING: We want to make the biggest impact to watershed management. Interconnection in Golden Gate to Henderson Creek would be a big impact.

Commissioner Coyle knows that the historical watershed for Naples Bay was much, much smaller, and it's because of the changes outside the city to where we're dumping more water in there. If we can get it down to Henderson Creek, that should be really our goal.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It is, sir.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: And how can we -- how can we

get everybody on board to -- I mean, we have to work with the basin.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Some of the funding will come there, and that was part of your remarks is a letter from the board to establish those connections?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Encourage that some of these projects are funded in partnership with the basin and the district.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Can that be a part of your motion?

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Sure, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: If you don't mind if I just support that. One of the -- you've already said that you would entertain -- or you would love to have a motion that would encourage you to approach the basin about getting some funding for some of these projects.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: And the district, sir.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: The entire district.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: And so I would vote for a motion that would include those kinds of things.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Very good.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Do we need to have that as a separate motion, or can we include it in this?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Include it in that is fine.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Great, great. I will absolutely do that. Thank you for that.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: And the second accepts that change?

COMMISSIONER HILLER: Yeah, definitely.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay. Let me just expand that very quickly.

Big Cypress Basin has plans to do that, to distribute that water into a more appropriate surficial water flow. The problem is that it's going very, very slowly.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: And if we can encourage them to allocate some funds and priority to getting that done, that will accomplish the goals of all of our districts.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: And so that, of course, is implied in the motion, which suggests that you approach the district about additional funding and higher priorities for some of the projects we'd like to see finished.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We are taxed two ways, sir, as you know. We are taxed as a basin tax and a district tax. So approaching both entities is important.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Commissioner Henning?

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Yeah. Can we copy the governor on this?

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Sure.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: I'm sure he's aware of the dynamics of Naples Bay, wouldn't you think?

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Yeah. Why don't you instruct me to send a letter to him on behalf of the entire Board, not just from me, but on behalf of the Board to encourage some emphasis on priorities and funding for the Water Management District in Collier County.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Perfect.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: We'll provide copies to our legislative delegation also.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Excellent.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Okay.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Very good.

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

COMMISSIONER HILLER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FIALA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Aye.

COMMISSIONER COLETTA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HENNING: Aye.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Any opposed, by like sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COYLE: It passes unanimously.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Appreciate your support,
Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN COYLE: Thank you, Nick. Good job.

Item #10F

**RECOMMENDATION TO ACCEPT A PROJECT
MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A SURFACE
WATER MANAGEMENT BUSINESS PLAN THAT WILL BE
THE GUIDING DOCUMENT FOR THE FUTURE COUNTY
SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND DIRECT
THE COUNTY MANAGER OR DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE
PLAN – MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROJECT PLAN WITH
DEVELOPMENT OF A TIMELINE, REVIEW BY THE EAC AND
TO INTEGRATE LDC ACTIVITIES INTO THE PROCESS –
APPROVED**

MR. OCHS: Commissioners, that takes us to Item 10F, which is a recommendation to accept a project management plan for development of a Surface Water Management Business Plan, which would be the guiding document for the future County Surface Water Management Program, and direct the County Manager or designee to execute the plan.

Mr. Kurtz will present.