

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING OF THE
COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Naples, Florida, September 28, 2012

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:

CHAIRMAN: Melissa Ahern
William Vonier
Brad Schiffer
Karen Homiak
Diane Ebert
Barry Klein
Phillip Brougham

ABSENT: Mark Strain
Paul Midney

ALSO PRESENT:

Mike Bosi, Comprehensive Planning Manager
Corby Schmitt, Comprehensive Planning
Jeff Klatzkow, County Attorney
Heidi Ashton-Cicko, County Attorney's Office

PROCEEDINGS

MR. BOSI: You have a live mike.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the September 28th meeting of the Collier County Planning Commission for the AUIR.

If everyone would rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Before we get into the AUIR this morning, David Weeks is going to review a little bit of history on the Hussey settlement review that's going to be upcoming.

MR. GADDY: Madam Chair?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Yes.

MR. GADDY: Could I make a short public comment?

MR. KLATZKOW: You'll need a roll call, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: She's here now. Let her do the roll call.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: You want to go ahead and do the roll call.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Sure. Mr. Eastman is absent.

Mr. Vonier?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Present.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Schiffer?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'm here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Midney is absent.

Ms. Ahern?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Strain is absent.

Ms. Homiak is here.

Ms. Ebert?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Klein?

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: And Mr. Brougham?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Present.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Thank you.

MR. GADDY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

My name is Peter Gaddy. I'm here on my own behalf and on behalf of the Golden Gate Estates Area Civic Association.

I came here this morning because I'd like to express our thanks for the many years of service of Mr. Strain and Mr. Schiffer on this commission.

This is the most important commission in the county outside of the Board of County Commissioners. And I think you'll all agree that Mr. Strain and Mr. Schiffer are two of the most knowledgeable and experienced individuals that have ever served on the Planning Commission.

And I want to thank them, and I hope that the events of the last week have not embittered them and that they will come back to serve again.

And I would ask this board to pass a resolution recognizing their service.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: So moved.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I'll second. I second it.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Motion by Barry, second by Diane.

All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I think I'll abstain, or maybe vote to upgrade it to a plaque. But, Peter, thank you very much.

MR. GADDY: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay, David.

MR. WEEKS: Good morning, Commissioners. For the record, David Weeks of the comprehensive planning section for Collier County.

Commissioners, on Tuesday of this week the Board of County Commissioners considered a lawsuit settlement, a Bert Harris claim brought against the county and others, by the -- what I'll refer to collectively as the Husseys.

At that meeting, ultimately, the board directed that this matter be sent to the Planning Commission for public vetting.

The settlement is complicated. It's complex. It's large in magnitude. And for that reason, I've provided materials to you today relevant to that settlement so you could have an abundance of time to begin reviewing this matter.

The date has not yet been set for when this will become -- come before you. But, again, I wanted to give you plenty of time to start the review.

In effect, it is a complex Growth Management Plan amendment. The whole issue pertains to the designation of the Hussey property, which is located within the North Belle Meade area.

And, by the way, the packet that I provided to you includes this map and any others that I might put on the visualizer this morning.

This is the Hussey property. You can see it's located in North Belle Meade. It's on the north side of I-75, east of Collier Boulevard, also east of the county's landfill. The site comprises about 966 acres. The entire site is designated rural fringe mixed-use district sending land and, as such, that means its land uses are very restricted.

The Husseys -- well, let me give you some background first. Let me start with another map. This is the Future Land Use Map from 1999. This pre-dates the rural fringe creation. The sending lands, the receiving lands, the TDR program, none of that existed. You see a lot of white on the map, or white with some green speckling pattern; all of that white is the agricultural rural designation. And those -- with rare exception those properties were zoned agricultural. They allowed your typical agricultural uses, just like you would find in the "A" zoning district today.

Agricultural uses, excavation, churches, childcare centers, and social fraternal organizations, so on and so on. Those types of uses -- some of them were allowed, by conditional use, but at any rate, that's how the properties were designated, including the Hussey property.

When the rural fringe amendments were adopted in 2002, which was a result of a final order from the governor and cabinet of the State of Florida in 1999, the county had adopted some plan amendments in 1997; ultimately led to a final order by the governor and cabinet saying, Collier County, you're not doing a good enough job to protect your natural resources to curtail urban, to protect prime agricultural lands, et cetera.

To address that -- and the final order went on to say, you've got three years to do an assessment of these rural lands and to come up with new regulations that adequately address these issues.

The county divided up the rural area into two sections, the rural fringe area and what we call the eastern lands or rural lands.

Citizen advisory committees were appointed, they had numerous meetings, a lot of publicity, ultimately concluded with the adoption of what we call the rural fringe GMP amendments. That's where we established the sending, receiving, neutral lands within the Rural Fringe Area and also where we established the Rural Land Stewardship Area surrounding the Immokalee area.

And as I said earlier, the Husseys' property got designated as sending lands, severely restricted in its land uses, including no longer allowed to do excavation.

The Husseys had participated in those rural fringe GMP amendment hearings, they protested their -- the designation being proposed as sending, and they took the position that their land had significant value for

excavation purposes that exceeded any compensation that would be provided through the TDR program.

And there's legal history that goes on, but we ultimately end up with, today, a proposed settlement agreement. Over time that settlement agreement no longer involved just the Husseys' property there in the North Belle Meade area, but came to include a second property which is located on the east side of Immokalee Road, north of Golden Gate Estates. Some of you might be familiar with it because it has a conditional use on the property for excavation. It's about 2,500-plus acres.

All of it is designated receiving lands, so it has, virtually, the same land uses, if not the same, as it had prior to the whole creation of the rural fringe GMP amendments 10 years ago.

The Husseys have a part ownership in that northerly property, which is owned by State Road 84 -- State Road 846 Land Trust.

Now getting to the settlement agreement itself. In a very broad way, the proposal in the settlement agreement is to do a partial swap in designations, take a portion of the Hussey lands and change its designation from sending to receiving and, therefore, allow receiving lands uses, including excavation, and take a portion of the SR846 Land Trust property, change its designation, a portion of it, from receiving to sending.

The idea was -- some effort to try to maintain a balance of what we have today as far as acreages of designations, of amount of lands that would be protected, and the amount of density and TDR credits that could be generated and so forth. There is not a balance. But it's not too far off, I'll say.

I think that's as far as I want to go. I don't want to get into a lot of detail with this. Certainly, the purpose today is only to give you an introduction to this, not to get into any deliberations or discussions of the contents of the agreement or the merits of it. That's for a later day when this is going to come back for a full vetting before this body.

Some of this -- most what I've said, I believe, as far as introductory comments, are included in the cover memo on the packet you have. And, then again, there's a variety of documents. There's the executive summary that went to the board on Tuesday, there's the proposed settlement agreement itself, there's a staff analysis and summary of that agreement, and a variety of maps, including the two or three that I've provided to you here today. One exception, the 1999 Future Land Use Map is not in your packets.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: If I may? I have a question.

David, this is Phil Brougham, no matter -- irrespective of where I'm sitting. The visualizer didn't work over there.

Is there -- is this the extent of the materials that the commission is going to be provided, what we received today, or is there more information, data, exhibits to be provided?

MR. WEEKS: You actually have more than was provided to the commissioners on Tuesday.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: So this is the extent of our homework?

MR. WEEKS: For now. It's possible -- I suspect that as we prepare for your actual public meeting to discuss this, that staff may prepare some additional exhibits and/or analysis to provide to you. But this is the majority of it, certainly.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay.

MR. WEEKS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. We're going to move on to the AUIR.

Peter is the only person that's registered, so if anyone at any point wants to speak, please come up to the podium, and then we will acknowledge you at the end of each category.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Melissa?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'd like to interrupt. Yeah, some of these terminals are down, so could KD, I know you're listening to us in the backroom, report that we do need somebody to do a little tech work up on the dais.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Did that get it?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Sounds like Phil and Bill have a problem.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Mine's still down.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'm just butting in.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Mike?

MR. BOSI: Good morning, Planning Commissioners. Mike Bosi, comprehensive planning manager and interim director of planning and zoning at the Growth Management Division.

Today we're here to discuss the 2012 Annual Update and Inventory Report as well as the Capital Improvement Element Annual Update. For the past five years I've been the project manager for this particular document.

This year we're continuing the transition that we started last year. Corby Schmidt has taken a lead role, and he's doing a terrific job. But I'm going to provide an overview of the AUIR, what it does, what it doesn't do, some of the key points that we can focus on moving forward, and then we'll go by the individual infrastructure provided to service providers for their capital improvement schedule and the program that they have put forward.

I put together a short presentation. I would say for the Planning Commission, if you have any questions on any of the slides, please feel free to stop me. It won't disrupt the flow of the presentation in the least bit.

Annual Update and Inventory Report, and that will be the long version. You'll hear AUIR a number of times today. That's basically what it stands for. And it's the annual one-year snapshot of time in the projected needs and the required improvements from all the infrastructure and service-providing departments and divisions based upon the projected population increases against the BCC adopted level of service. It should be noted that this snapshot changes as the change in the demand equations evolve.

What does all that mean? It means that we expect in the next five years to receive a certain amount of population. That certain amount of population has to have services and infrastructures provided to it. The county has adopted levels of service standards. The amount of any one particular of that service, whether it be numbers of law enforcement officers, number of jail spaces available, the road miles that are available.

All those are tied to levels of services. So when population is added to this county, we have to maintain that level of service, and that's what this Annual Update and Inventory Report does. That's what the Capital Improvement Element Annual Update does. It makes sure that the quality of place, the infrastructure that our businesses and our residents depend upon and have grown accustomed is maintained.

And as a sidenote, we have, over the past two, three, four years, and rightfully so, we've had a lot of concentration, a lot of focus upon the issue of economic development because of the reality and the need within this county.

This is the other part of the equation. We talk about, you know, attracting businesses for new opportunities for our residents to gain employment.

And this is the other side of the equation. This is the development of the infrastructures that provide this county the competitive advantages that makes it more attractive to residents and businesses to be able to locate here and do business.

So this is an important part of that conversation that we've been having for the past couple years of how do we make ourselves more competitive, how do we attract more businesses, how do we grow our job base.

And this is, like I said, done on an annual basis and based upon the fluctuation of the demands that we expect.

What's included in the AUIR? There's -- the concurrency facilities, these are the ones that development has to satisfy before we can gain a final development order, whether that be plat or whether that be an SDP. There has to be capacity; there has to be concurrency for any one of these components. Those are roads, drainage, potable water, wastewater, solid waste, parks and recreation, and schools.

The ones in red are the ones that are now optional. The state has provided each local government the ability to make their own decision whether they want to maintain these types of requirements. The Board of County -- the Board of County Commissioners has always -- has always defended our concurrency management system and said we want to maintain these levels of service, because I think it ties back to sense of place, that competitive advantage that we want to maintain to make sure that Collier is an attractive

location for not only residents, but also for businesses.

And then we have our Category B facilities, jails, law enforcement, libraries, EMS, government buildings, and the two dependent fire districts, which are Ochopee and Isle of Capri.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Michael, if I might ask a question --

MR. BOSI: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: -- regarding level of service standard. What is the process, if any, in the county whereas changes can be made to the length, width, and depth, my words, of level-of-service standards?

I mean, on the surface, some of the calculations look very simplistic, you know, the number of population times the number of acres, for example, gives you the level-of-service standards. And it's -- to me it's a very shallow measure, so -- is there a process to -- can we revisit those?

MR. BOSI: And I'm glad you asked that question, Commissioner Brougham, because this is the process. And one of the things at the end of this PowerPoint, I'll say, one of the recommendations that we seek from the Planning Commission on this annual basis is whether the Planning Commission feels that the level of service that we have is appropriate. And that is -- that ties into some of the informational demand data that we provide for the various components, the parks, the EMS, the libraries, the type of utilization that is being demanded upon those services.

Those help formulate your opinions and your determination as to whether there has to be an adjustment. A good example is, on regional parks, the acreages for regional parks. At one point in time it was over two acres, you know, per thousand per capita. We have subsequently, through -- and it was initiated through recommendations from this Planning Commission that the Board of County Commissioners realized that the abundance of state and federal lands really does make this a unique community. Sixty-seven percent of our land is covered by conservation, state and federal lands, and because of that they recognize that maybe the need for regional parks is not as great as we once had determined. And based upon that, they've lowered that level of service.

The same thing for jails, the same thing for the number of sheriff's officers per thousand, based upon those conversations with the SO office.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: So we'll get an opportunity, if there are any further questions or suggestions as we go through each department, that we can --

MR. BOSI: And one of the recommendations I -- we'll ask is if there is a component that you believe that the level of service needs an adjustment, whether it be up or down --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Thanks.

MR. BOSI: -- to make that, and we will carry that forward to the Board of County Commissioners in representation of the Planning Commission's opinion.

And Commissioner Brougham had pointed out the simplistic equation, and my next slide will get into that. But part of that equation, one of the primary factors within that is population. And there's always a question of how do we determine population. And it's something that is out of our hands in the sense that we pick -- we choose what level of population projections from the University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research, the BEBR department, that does the population projections for state, for -- and it does for all the counties in the jurisdictions. There's very few that have developed their own population methodology.

The Board of County Commissioners, in 2008, went through -- went through an analysis. We used to have a methodology of population where our population was a combination of BEBR high and BEBR -- and BEBR in our permanent population with a percentage ratio. It was pretty confusing based upon that -- based upon the complication within formulating those population levels, as well as the slowdown in our population growth, the Board of County Commissioners decided upon the BEBR median population projections with an additional factor.

As you know, we are -- we are a seasonal community, not as much as we once used to be, but we still have that seasonal influx that everyone recognizes. And we have our permanent population, but then we have our peak season population.

And the second bullet point talks about our seasonal population, and that's 20 percent above our

permanent population. And the question is why would you -- why would you program your capital improvement, your infrastructure to a level above your permanent population?

Well, we know between December and March and April, there's a fluctuation. There is an increase within the demands upon our systems. And if our systems aren't adequately addressed and contemplated to be able to handle additional demand, there can be issues in terms of availability and issues of providing those services.

So based upon that, we've recognized those increases in demand, and we decided upon that 20 percent. And we've done numerous studies that have determined that at any one point in time in March or in February you may have a 33 percent increase within our population, but we don't want to -- we do not want to build our infrastructure to that top hundredth or that top 10 or that top hour of demand. That is fiscally unattainable. The excess in infrastructure you would have for the nonseasonal months, I don't -- would not justify that level of capital expansion.

So 20 percent is below that high mean, but it's a number the Planning Commission in the past, and also the board -- and more importantly, the Board of County Commissioners, has determined is what is appropriate to find that medium between our highest demand of our seasonal population and our peak-season population.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Question. Madam Chair, can I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. When you look at the data here, you're showing 2010 as an estimate. How did the census come out compared to what we've been estimating and projecting?

MR. BOSI: The census we set -- the census was lower than what -- in previous years moving forward. When the 2010 census came out in about the end of 2010, 2011, it was a resetting. It really said the population that we had expected, the estimates that we had were above the reality of the residents that we had on the ground.

So based upon that, the 2010 census, really, we set our population or recalibrated our population moving forward. And what that did -- and I'll talk about it a little bit later -- is what it did is it provided us more time before most infrastructure-providing departments will have to build that next facility.

We were expecting -- in 2007, 2008, 2009, we were building to an expected demand that never materialized, and that 2010 census really confirmed that.

But because -- the nature of capital improvement programming, the time frame associated with it, you can't just put on the brakes abruptly. And because of that, most of these -- most of your components of the AUIR will not have an improvement.

Roads and drainage are the two areas where there's actual capital being spent. All of the other divisions right now are saying, we are planning, we are taking adequate steps to make sure that next improvement, when it is needed, will be the most effective and efficient in terms of its placement and its overall service provision.

But those are not being provided for within this first five years. They're in the outer years. And as we continue to look at our population rates, which I will talk with in a second, we make those adjustments as to whether we need to continue to push them out, leave them stagnant, or if we see an increase in demand. We will pull them closer because we see the gap between what we have available and what we're required to provide becomes a little bit closer. But that's the advantage of why we do this on a yearly basis.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And let me -- so the numbers in 2010, do they reflect the census? When you said you recalibrated, did you replace all of our projections, in essence, with the census numbers?

MR. BOSI: The projections from 2010 were influenced most greatly within this year's projections from the BEBR. Last year's were influenced as well, but the 2010 have been -- have been fully integrated within their projections for this year.

The slide that I -- I think it's Page 4 of your executive summary, that shows what -- the year and what we were projecting, those aren't -- those haven't been influenced. Those are what, historically, we would have.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: My question's really -- the simple question is, is the 2010 numbers here the census? Let me try that.

MR. BOSI: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, perfect.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Which number? Excuse me, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: The 2000 -- they call it an estimated 2010, but, essentially, that's census 2010.

MR. BOSI: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: On Page 4's table?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, I'm in the appendix.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Well -- and I'll mention, you can see in 2010 we are projecting 333, and then it ticked down a little bit after the census.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Quite a bit.

MR. BOSI: Absolutely. How much -- and relevant to our discussion in this slide is how much do we build? For the majority of it, it is a rather simplistic equation. It's our new population multiplied against our level-of-service standard, and that's what our Capital Improvement Program is. That's what drives the amount of any one facility.

An example is the library. If we were projecting for this -- for a five-year period 333,536 people, and our level of service was .33 square feet for every person that lives within this county, the multiplication would be 33,536 times .33, and that results in the amount of additional square footage that we need to provide to maintain the level of service that this county has deemed as appropriate.

Of course, those three -- the 33,536, those new people that we add to the system have been associated with dwelling units that have been added to this system at one point in time that have impact fees, and those impact fees help pay for the expansion of our capital system.

So the expansion of our capital system related to growth is not placed solely on the shoulders of our existing residents, but the new residents have a share; they have skin in the game, so to speak, to pay for those new improvements.

Now, they're not always at 100 percent, and there's a number of reasons why. Maybe a community does not want to have those impact fees at 100 percent, but that's a policy debate. But this county has always lived by the mantra that new growth will pay for the new facility, and that's why the impact fees are -- and that's why the relationship between impact fees and the Capital Improvement Program exist.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Can I ask another question?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I guess this is more or less a follow-on to my previous question.

If you could go back to that library -- the previous slide which illustrates the library, and let's just take, for example, the population you know for whatever reason, you know, jumped up tremendously, and that dictated that we need to plan on and, in fact, carry through and build another library.

So funds are acquired somehow, some way, and we build another library building. And so we have a building sitting there that satisfies the level-of-service standard that may be unmanned and may be empty of books because, as I understand it, those components of cost, operating costs, if you will, are not included or recognized anywhere in this particular exercise.

MR. BOSI: You're correct. The books are, the books are. The materials are included. Staffing, operational expenses are not part of the AUIR/CIE. That is a part of the capital budgeting program of the Board of County Commissioners. I believe those type of -- those type of programs are extensively reviewed by the Productivity Committee that deals with those financial matters.

The Planning Commission, as the role -- as the land-use agency for Collier County, the focus of this effort is for the planning for that new growth. And I understand it's only part of the equation, so the Planning Commission doesn't have a lot of opportunity to weigh in on that operational -- the budgeting and the question you had asked about -- prior to this week about replacement of older obsolete facilities.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Right.

MR. BOSI: Those are part of a separate process.

I think the county manager has initiated an asset management program, and the long-range

prospective is to bring those together with our capital improvement programming to be able to give you a little bit more of a snapshot of the full revenue picture as well as the planning considerations.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: One more note. Just to adjust my questions along those lines -- and I'll use parks this time as an example, because I'm very familiar with parks' facilities. According to this AUIR, we have more than adequate parks' facilities. We're meeting and exceeding our level-of-service standard; however, there are certain amenities within our park system that are 10 and 15 years old that, quite frankly, are falling apart. I mean, they're falling down.

And I respect what you say that there's another process that's being constructed and evolved and so forth and so on that will begin to address that. But to me, it doesn't make a lot of sense if we were to become -- or if we were to fall below our parks' level-of-service standard to go out and actively acquire more parks' acreage or build a new facility when we can't keep up with the maintenance of existing facilities.

And if I look in the roads and the transportation section of this AUIR -- and I stand to be corrected -- but I see capital improvement projects in there. Repaving an existing roadway to me is, hey, the existing roadway is falling apart. We've got to go in there and repave it.

To me that's not a lot different than the East Naples -- what do you call them, the roller board parks and so forth that are made out of wood and falling down, you know, aren't addressed as would paving the road.

MR. BOSI: And you're correct. And in transportation, and because they show -- their noncapital -- their noncapital programs as the resurfacing and the other programs of expenditures within transportation program that's underneath your capital improvements, that really sets a template, and that's why the county manager has us moving in that direction to try to provide that full picture for all of the facilities. We just haven't gotten there yet.

But the intention is to bring that type of information with -- into this component, because it is currently, right now, a separate process. And you're right, the separate process -- looking at two halves doesn't give you the whole.

And the one reason I will say the -- that there has to be an understanding is when you have growth that comes in, as you would say, and if you're paying for new improvements when you've got -- when you have -- for parks, would be a good example. If you've got some facilities that need to be replaced, the reason why you still have to continue to build those parks is because of the levels of service and because of the requirements within your impact fees. Those impact fees are demanding that they can only be spent to provide for the new facilities associated with that new population.

So that's why that segmentation and that's why you have something that would seem counterintuitive. Why would you be building new facilities when you've got older facilities that need to be replaced? Trying to bring that full picture as part of that asset-management program which is -- the intention is to bring that as one document to the Planning Commission, to the Board of County Commissioners. But you're 100 percent right, Commissioner Brougham.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Mike, one thing, just to be clear, is impact fees will buy -- and, again, the new library, the new parks. The added tax base is what's going to pay for the operation of it.

MR. BOSI: Absolutely. It helps --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It's not an equation that isn't balanced.

MR. BOSI: You're absolutely right. There is a -- those new individuals not only have the -- have the responsibility for the impact fees, but they do contribute to the tax base and sales tax and all the other revenue funds that we have associated with it.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: From that day forth. So that's where --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: If budgeted.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well -- but they'll be taxed. They'll be due that. I mean, if the people aren't budgeting, you know, the repairs and the staffing, that's a problem that isn't in this room, you know.

MR. BOSI: And you're right, but eventually it will -- that -- at least the obsolete and the facilities that do need replacement, the intention is to bring that picture in as well. Even though we're not going to ask,

and the financial scrutiny is not one of the primary focus of the Planning Commission, but just to provide also the level of detail that the Planning Commission is accustomed to being provided.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Mike, when do you think that will happen? Do you think it will be by next year's AUIR?

MR. BOSI: We were hoping to bring a little bit more of it into this year's AUIR. It's just the coordination between all -- the OMB, the various departments, their individual planners, comprehensive planning, who coordinates it all, it just -- it wasn't -- it wasn't advanced enough to bring it in so we can present a good product to the Planning Commission.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BOSI: Also, other reasons for the AUIR, it establishes a rational nexus between the utilization of impact fees for both categories. I think we just spoke about how that relationship works, and it's also an approximation of the revenue projected over the capital period to determine the county's ability to construct the adopted levels of service, and that's -- it's an important part of the overall BCC budgeting process.

Whose idea was this? Sections 6.02 of the LDC requires the county to provide that public facilities and services meet or exceed the standards established in this CIE required by sections of the Florida Statutes, and that's the premise. Growth is going to pay for growth. We're going to maintain the sense of place that Collier County, its residents, its visitors, and its businesses have grown accustomed, and we're not going to allow the new populations that come in upset that balance.

So the program and the strategy is to provide for and maintain that levels of service. It was established in 1994, and it's -- really, one of the things that I did in 2008 was a level-of-service comparison, and I think it goes to one of your original questions, Commissioner Brougham, and it was trying to make the determination, how do we stand? How does the county stand against various other communities?

We were on par, if not maybe a little bit higher for the most part, but within the range of similar type of counties, the Sarasota County, Manatee County, those type of similar populations. But one aspect that we provide that I have not been able to determine that any other of the counties or jurisdictions that I -- that I've studied is, we talk about libraries' levels of service, we talk about jails, law enforcement, the fire district, government buildings in a public vetting as what the public feels and the Planning Commission, the Board of County Commissioners feels is appropriate.

I've yet to find a county that has that type of a discussion in terms of those type of amenities and what the community feels as important.

So we take on a little bit more responsibility. We go above and beyond what is required, but I think that's just by nature of how the county wants to make sure that what we're providing is what the community is expecting and what the community is demanding.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Mike, are those other counties also funded only by impact fees?

MR. BOSI: No. One of the things that we did find is one of the greatest -- and not hampering towards our capital improvement programming is that that penny -- the percentage for capital improvement programming. Lee County's a good example. They have other sales tax. A percentage of it goes -- is dedicated to capital improvement programming. And what that does, it helps growth really, truly pay for growth in a sense -- in a sense that you have your impact fees that make up a portion of the total cost of providing that new facility, that new infrastructure.

But there's a gap. There's always a gap between how much impact fees are collected and the final cost or price tag for that new bridge or that new road, the new library, whatever the facility may be.

If you have that -- if you have that percentage sales tax or another dedicated funding source outside of your general revenue tax base, it helps close the gap in the hole, and it really does alleviate the burden from your existing property tax -- property tax base, but it's more tied to your sales activity.

That's a much larger policy debate that I think the Board of County Commissioners has had in the past and will continue to have as we -- as we look forward, look at the price that we have associated with the cost of providing the infrastructures to the levels of service and whether we feel that that, at one point in time, is an appropriate step that we take.

That will be from the purview of not only the recommendation from the Planning Commission but, ultimately, the decision that the Board of County Commissioners will make based upon the recommendation

that we provide from the various bodies but also the discussions that they have with the community.

As I said, AUIR is the blueprint for concurrency. It's also the preparatory document for the Capital Improvement Element of the Growth Management Plan. Statutorily, no longer is that required to be done and sent to the state. We continue to -- we continue to update it annually because we want to maintain the levels of service. We provide it to the state DOT -- or FDOT as courtesy copies, but it's really -- has really become an internal decision and an internal document that we at the county have much more control of than we had just two years ago.

As I said, our population numbers, one of the things that -- in the past couple years that we have been, not struggling with, but very close attention has been paid to is what is the level of growth that we're going to expect in these five-year periods.

2007 was kind of the -- starting the tailing off of our population expansion that we had at the first part of this -- of the prior decade. And you saw almost a 20 percent increase we had projected for our five-year period. And you could imagine the AUIR, the capital improvement programs that we were taking at that time, the number of improvements that we were showing.

As each subsequent year went by and as the impacts of the recession, of the economic downturn were materialized upon our growth rates, you see it. You see the effect that it's had. And what does that mean? For the past four years we're now projecting under 2 percent on an annual basis where, in 2007, it was three times that amount at almost 4 percent annually.

It would indicate -- I mean, we start -- now start having a statistically significant sample that four years starts to determine a pattern. And the pattern would be that our growth rates have changed from what they were, and they are now at a -- you know, below a 2 percent.

And what I would say is, if you look at that compared to the first part of 2000 to 2007, it seems like, you know, we're not growing at all. But from an individual who grew up within the Midwest in -- and seen places have an annual reduction within your population, there's many jurisdictions, there's many counties that would love to have a 1 to 2 percent annual growth rate.

And if you think of that type of predictability, if it does maintain, that allows for a continuing expansion of our property tax base, but it doesn't place an overburdensome onerous in terms of getting these infrastructures in place as soon as we can possibly get. It allows for a more predictable and, I think, a more organized and mannered way for providing these infrastructures.

We will continue to monitor that as we move forward. And as we see spikes, whether it be up or down, the program and when those infrastructure improvements are going to be required will be reflected as such.

What are we asking the Planning Commission to do today? One, accept and approve the attached document as the 2012 Annual Update and Inventory Report on public facilities, give the BCC direction by separate motion and vote on each of the Category A and B facilities relative to the projects and revenue sources as set forth, and also for inclusion within our annual update to our CIE.

So for each -- after roads, we're going to ask you to make a recommendation upon those roads to the Board of County Commissioners.

For utilities -- for each of the utilities, for stormwater, for potable water, for solid waste, each one we're going to ask you for an individual recommendation. For the Category B facilities, in the same manner.

Also I provide a recommendation that the school district CIB -- CIP be included in the annual update by reference. It's one of those facilities. It's part of our concurrency management system. It's part of our growth management. We have a public schools facility element. But the actual work plan, the programming, the budgeting, is the responsibility of the school district that's in concert with the coordination and the data sharing that we provide to the school district, but that is a process outside of general purpose county government, but the relationship we have is defined and established within the Growth Management Plan in the Public Schools Facility Element.

And just to provide you one heads-up -- and it's a mistake on my part, and I shoulder the blame for it. The -- at Page 1 of your staff report, it indicates that the school working group -- every month the county, the jurisdictions, your Naples, Marco Island, Everglades City will meet, talk about the issues for planning and the various improvement process. At that meeting it was contemplated that the school district may have a

recommendation to no longer maintain the concurrency management system, but through discussion with their -- with their management and administration, and I believe the school board -- the determination is the school district would like to keep concurrency management at that time.

So the recommendation -- and we're going to ask the Planning Commission to also make a recommendation upon whether the -- whether the county should maintain school concurrency.

Just to give you a backdrop, the Board of County Commissioners, when this came up last year at the AUIR/CIE hearing, had said, we defer to the school district. It's really -- because they administer the concurrency management system, they apply it. It's really their decision.

So what -- the decision that the school district is going to make is what they're going to echo. The school district wants to maintain school concurrency, and we're going to ask the Planning Commission to provide that perspective.

And just to give you a brief overview, it's similar to roads and potable water. A development that's coming in, not at the PUD stage, not at -- not at the rezoning stage, but when they would come in for a DO, an SDP, a Site Development Plan, or a plat, the capacity within the school system is evaluated as to whether that program could move forward.

So it's quite -- it's just as similar, and the process works just as similar as road concurrency or concurrency for public utilities. And it's an important part, I believe, of the coordination effort, and the school district at this time would like to maintain it.

Another of the bullet points that we ask of the Planning Commission is as you're reviewing the individual divisions and departments, if you believe an alternative level of service should be recommended, please do so. If you think that we have too much or too little of one commodity and you think that we need to provide more or less of it based upon some of the demand factors that are contained within it or what other considerations that you may believe is relevant, we ask that the Planning Commission -- and this is that opportunity, this is that one opportunity that the Planning Commission has to be able to weigh in on the levels of service.

We have made a number of adjustments downward based upon those recommendations, and those are tied to law enforcement, tied to jails, tied to parks based upon how the Planning Commission has provided recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners.

Third, forward the GMP schedule -- CIE schedule update to the BCC with a recommendation to adopt.

And, finally, to provide the BCC with a recommendation regarding maintaining school concurrency, as I discussed.

That is the end of the presentation, the overview.

Any questions that you may have related to any of the topics that we had before we get to the individual divisions and departments?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Anyone?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah, I do, over here.

Bill, you can go first.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Mike, as we talked by phone this week, being the first time it was -- I was interested in your table -- your BEBR table that you showed. And for 2012, that 328,339 population number doesn't appear anywhere else in this report under population, and that threw me to begin with as we talked.

So as we go through this for each section, I'm going to be very interested in the specifics of how the number was arrived at based on what I think is your peak number, which was found at the end of the book, not at the beginning of the book.

MR. BOSI: Correct. And, most certainly, for newcomers to this document, it can be confusing in terms of that mannerism. Because the 328- is our permanent population for 2012.

The populations that we're going to be focusing upon, that's our starting point. But the majority of our service providers, their infrastructure is based upon peak-season population. So it's that number with a 20 percent increase, and then that compared against what -- the projections with that 20 percent increase.

So each component will have how we derive what population figures we utilize to drive that

equation. And to make it even more complicated for you, the drainage component, the transportation component and, to some extent, the public utilities component utilize this population, but it's not the sole driver. Their equations for demand is a little bit more -- is a little more elaborate, not as simplistic as some of the other components, and they will -- I'm sure that they will be able to provide a little bit more insight towards how that is.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Well, I was interested in being able to, mathematically, take the population number and adjust it by something for each of these specific areas.

MR. BOSI: Well -- and that's the -- that's what the graphs after -- and we'll get -- a good example is on Page 71 of your book is community -- community and regional parks.

And as you can see, it says "facility type" at the very top of the page, facility type, community and regional parkland. Let me put this on the visualizer.

As you can see under level of service, it says 1.2 acres per thousand and in parens it says "community." And then underneath the unit cost it says "community parks." It says, utilizing the peak season population for unincorporated area of Collier County.

So that's telling you the population subset that we are going to utilize is unincorporated Collier County, excluding the populations of the municipalities, but also with that 20 percent increase.

And then on the following page, or not the -- but Page 73, those -- that provides your mathematical equations as to how the total number that is going to be applied to that equation is determined.

So for 2012, that -- the unincorporated population with the 20 percent increase is 352,048 people. And for each component of the AUIR, there is kind of that Rosetta stone at the very beginning of the document that says, this is the population that's assigned to this geographic -- or to this individual infrastructure provider and that corresponds to the graphs that had -- the numbers that are associated with those populations.

And as we go through each one, we'll make sure that we point out the population that's utilized and how that was derived.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: That's an interesting comparison, because on Page 72 it shows the unincorporated peak population as 382,310, not 352,048.

MR. BOSI: That 382,310, if you look at the last year of the five-year program, the 2016/2017, that is the total population that we will have to satisfy at the end of the five-year program.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Okay.

MR. BOSI: The starting point is the 352-. And that starting point of 352- is our permanent population times 20 percent, and that's how we get the starting point, and then the end point is the 382,310.

It can be very -- it's confusing, but it -- really, it's -- that top of each summary page will tell you the population numbers that are utilized, and then that graph kind of explains the math of how we've arrived there.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Anyone else?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah.

Mike, just go over what relationship if we change a level of service has to impact fees.

MR. BOSI: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Changing a level of service in the AUIR, how does that affect the impact fees?

MR. BOSI: If the level of service is changed below -- if the recommendation is to change the level of service below -- let's utilize community parks as a good example. If we've got 1.8 acres per thousand and we lower our level of service below the 1. -- the 1.2, if that's expressed in our impact fees -- if our impact fees are being charged at X number of acres for community parks and that translates to 1.2 acres per thousand, if we lower that, then we have to lower what -- we have to lower that amount within our impact fees as well. We can't charge our impact fees above what we've adopted as our level of service.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So the point taken that, yes, we can play with the level of service here, but the ramification of it and the impact fees we have to be very careful.

MR. BOSI: Yes, most certainly. And Amy Patterson is our impact fee manager. She will be able to get into a little bit more of an explanation other than the clumsy one that I just gave you. But she can give --

and you're right, Brad, there is -- there are implications.

And one of the things -- you'll hear that we just need to lower our impact fees, you know, to attract more businesses. The problem with that is, though, it places a higher burden upon the cost of that new growth upon our existing residents.

So that's why it's a delicate policy decision that the Board of County Commissioners has to make when they're deciding what is the impact fee level that they have to -- that they -- that they want to set. Because it's not just one consideration, Brad, as you've, you know, accurately pointed out. There's other implications and considerations that, most certainly, have to be made.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Anyone else?

Mike, are you-all set?

MR. BOSI: Yes. If the commission's ready to go into individual sections --

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Is there any rhyme or reason for the list on our agenda versus the book?

MR. BOSI: The agenda -- and that's another -- the agenda that -- the program of who we were going to see first was reflective of last year. I hadn't had the conversation with EMS or emergency management whether the fire chiefs needed to go first.

I would say push those back to behind -- right behind the EMS version, because Dan Summers may be able to provide -- if you have any questions. I know the program, but if you have any specific questions, we can address it at that time.

I would suggest starting off with roads and then going down from there.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: I think I figured that one out, since they're standing.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: They're lurking.

MR. BOSI: And with that, I will turn that over to the roads experts.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, one thing in the past is it was always good to shed the staff that's in the audience to make sure we get rid of everybody. They can go back to work as fast as possible.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Well, if we have to sit here, they should too. I'm teasing.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, not a good use of taxpayers' money watching us, I don't think.

MR. JARVI: Good morning, Commissioners. Reed Jarvi, transportation planning manager here to talk about the roads portion. Nick, my humble assistant and three bosses up, is here to pick up the ball when I fumble it.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: This is your first one, right, Reed?

MR. JARVI: First on this end, yes.

So we're going to go through the page-by-page. If you have questions or comments, I'll attempt to address them.

This is your revenue. This is the work program expected revenue over five years. And we'll go through some other slides, but this is just an overview of the department, the road and bridge revenue. It's, as you can see, divided up with a projection of impact fees, gas taxes. There's a transfer in that's a small amount. And general revenue -- excuse me -- General Fund, as Mike talked about earlier, which is mainly for some maintenance aspects, and then grants which help with the impact fees for capital improvements.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I have a question.

MR. JARVI: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: What is the gas tax per gallon the county gets and the state?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We'll get that to you. I'm not sure.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: You're not sure and yet we have these figures here?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, I can tell you the revenue stream. I can't tell you the exact percentage. We get a month -- for the record, Nick Casalanguida.

I get a monthly report on my collections, but to break it down, that's one of those details I just don't have off the top of my head.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay. But we do get a certain percent -- I mean, we get so many cents

per gallon for the county --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: -- and so much for the state.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That's right.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay. And you will get that to us.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Absolutely. We get about -- it's been about -- steady at about 18.3 million dollars, and it fluctuates 18.2, 18.5. It's been -- you would think it would have gone up, historically, but it's actually gone down, and now it's just kind of bumping along a certain bottom, even with the increased population. And I think that's a function of miles per gallon, I mean, with people trying to drive less and the economy, obviously. But we're not seeing that as a growing revenue.

But I'll get you details on -- and the breakdown on each one.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay, thank you.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You're welcome.

MR. JARVI: And the next page is pretty much a graphical -- excuse me -- graphical representation just what we talked about. You can see that the pie chart is last year's five-year plan, and the -- on the left and this year's five-year plan on the right. And you can see that changes a little bit. But it's roughly the same as it was on a percentage basis.

And the bar chart on the bottom shows the four aspects over the last few years, just a different representation of what we just showed.

Questions?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Just -- I have one quick one. On Page 4, down at the bottom you give some schedules.

So, essentially, what you're saying is it takes seven years if it's -- everything's not done sequentially there, right? In other words, you can start buying right-of-way while you're designing, stuff like that, right?

MR. JARVI: Yes, sir. We've typically program right-of-way design and construction as separate items.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: My Page 4 is blank. Where are you?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: On Page 5, I'm sorry.

MR. JARVI: It was at the bottom of the first page I had up.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It must have been a reflection -- it was the reflection I was looking at.

MR. JARVI: No. The numbers in those -- the small Table 1, 2, and 3 design, those are how many months those individual activities take.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay.

MR. JARVI: Typically.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: On average.

MR. JARVI: On average.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. But it's still, like, five years if you --

MR. JARVI: It's seven -- six, seven years.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It's seven, yeah.

MR. JARVI: You know, if we started today on a project in 2012, sometime 2018, 2019, 2020 you'd be driving on the roads, seven -- six, seven, eight years from now.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So in this five-year review, all we would see is the start of, essentially, buying right-of-way, correct? Would that be the first step or no?

MR. JARVI: We'll actually get to that in a later slide that talks about various projects, and there's some that we were buying right-of-way for, some are in design.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: You stopped. I thought your presentation was over. Run it to the finish line, and then we'll ask questions.

MR. JARVI: Okay. This slide -- for those of you who have been on the Planning Commission for a while, have probably seen this pretty much the last several years, but it talks about how we take our counts.

Unlike -- to address the population issue right off the bat, we don't directly use population for the transportation aspects. We use traffic counts, and we have several counters, 150-odd, '60-odd counters around the county, plus there's some state ones.

And we take, in general, quarterly counts at these count stations. Some of them farther out east are semiannually and annually. But generally it's quarter counts, and that's what we do. And we factor them to the peak-hour counts, which we'll get to in a bit.

Our level of service is based on what we typically call in the transportation profession the 250th highest hour. This was a policy decision, 2000 or 2001, to basically not take into account the highest two months of the season, February and March, from a traffic count perspective.

This is -- Mike talked about earlier, we don't want to design the roads to the highest seasonal population, just like the other facilities, but more to the general population that lives here. So that's how we do it. We take the -- what's called -- what we call the highest -- 250th highest hour.

And then the third point there basically talks about the assets -- asset management that Mike talked about briefly that, you know, as -- we put in a bunch of lane miles since 2000 -- I think it says 250 lane miles -- we have -- we've maintained those miles and the ones we've had, but what we're going to be -- what we're seeing in the future, as the construction seems to slow down, the maintenance is going to be more and more of an issue and maintaining -- the paving the roads and fixing the cracked sidewalks and, you know, repainting things and, you know, new signal design hardware and things of that sort. So those are going to be the issues we're seeing in the future.

It's not -- it's becoming an issue, but it's -- it will become a serious issue in the near term. And we'll be putting more information out, I think, next year you said, Mike, as this goes.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We're doing it now. It's not part of this project.

MR. JARVI: It would be more information to you. But we're going through the process now. John Vliet and his group in the maintenance side are really looking into this.

Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Questions. I'm sorry.

And we talked about this with Mike but, historically, how did transportation come to include the maintenance aspect of facilities whereas the other departments don't have that benefit? I mean, what event occurred that allowed that to happen?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, I think -- for the record, Nick Casalanguida.

The bullet point was put in there when Norman and I were getting to the point of winding down the program and going into more of a preservation mode. Every department, whether it's utility or parks, does some sort of asset-management program to their level, and we're all trying to -- the county manager's been trying to make that an agency-wide standard. That's the initiative you've been seeing about us purchasing a contract vendor to go through and do an analysis and build the hierarchy and taxonomy. The same for all of us, who are all working at the same level playing field, but we've been doing it since day one.

What -- the transition, we kind of bring it to the Planning Commission's attention and to the board, is to say, at the time we're in the highest growth program where we had a capital program that was almost a billion dollars over five years, it wasn't that big of a deal to talk about asset management, because we're basically ripping up everything that was old and replacing it with brand new.

With the arterials, the life cycle's about seven to nine years before you get into that. You look at some of Airport Road and Vanderbilt, they're already looking in certain areas like they need some work to be done, and Livingston.

So we've been trying to just make sure that people are aware as they're looking at this program that asset management is going to become a bigger portion of the pie over time.

And, you know, when you throw the discussion into the AUIR, it obviously invites questions. Does it really belong in there? One could argue that we probably want to transition and start talking about how our assets have done.

I can assure you I've got binders of reports that we've looked at everything we have that's critical. We've looked at storm water; we've looked at bridges; we've looked at roads. So nothing is going to fall down. If we hadn't gotten a couple bridge products out, I'd be a little concerned. But they're all out the door

and under construction right now.

So, critically, we're covered. Level of service is probably a discussion we're going to have -- probably the board will tell this commission to look at, because I -- for me to do my pro formas out in 15, 20 years, you need to set a level of service for asset management, and we haven't done that yet. And I think Mike alluded to it as I was walking in.

That's an AUIR-type function; what is the level of service you want your assets to be at? And until we do that, I can't give you quantifiable numbers.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: And I appreciate Mike's response earlier that it's not within the purview here, you know, to deal with financial management and budgeting and that type of thing.

But I'll bring it back from my own perspective to level-of-service standard and the -- not only the acquisition of the asset, but the maintenance, the serviceability of the asset.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I mean, that's what I'm concerned about, that we're somewhat myopic in some of the other departments here in just looking or focusing on and approving and recommending asset creation and not maintenance, and that continues to bother me. I just -- but I see -- in a case of transportation, I see --

COMMISSIONER EBERT: It's huge.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: -- evidence and programming of maintenance.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Those other folks in the back of the room -- and I can tell you, they're probably jumping out of their seat as you say that -- they are definitely doing the same thing we are. Some are funded better than others.

And if you look at -- we all have our restrictions on funding. I've got gas tax, impact fees, and I can't use impact fees for maintenance. Public utilities has, obviously, the fees they collect and other sources of revenue. But some departments are better. And I wish we could blend the money, but we can't legally. They're all restricted-use funds. They're going to be ahead of us.

I would say, if we were talking in a workshop environment, Dr. Yilmaz and I have talked about, we're kind of ahead of them a little bit right now in the sense that we've kind of done some certain things ahead of them. They're going to surpass us as time goes on because they're funded better than we are.

But we've all covered our worst-first stuff. Nothing -- as Leo pointed out when we did the budget the last two years, cut your budgets, you know. I have to make the balanced budget, but tell me nothing's going to break, and we've all said, "Nothing's going to break."

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I mean, enough said.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I have a question, too, Nick.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Roads are very important to me. I moved here when Immokalee Road was one each way, and for 10 years they worked -- the county still needs plenty of roads. And I really like the three-lane each way like Livingston, because --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: -- I noticed here that the bridges and culverts you say are at their 50-year life cycle. I'm sure that they've all been inspected.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Can you kind of go into that right now as to what you're doing? I notice there is a lot of maintenance and, you know, new bituminous has been put down on many of the roads, and it's nice to see. Logan, down a little bit further, rather than the bumpy ride, and Oaks was all done. It looks very nice, and I was very pleased with this maintenance that was done, because they both needed it badly.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Similar to roads, stormwater -- Jerry and I just wrapped up our discussion. We had a capital project review a couple days ago. Three hours; it was excellent. I wish you folks could have listened to what we're doing.

But all the weirs and control structures -- and he'll get into that a little later -- we've got them covered. We know which ones are problems. Golden Gate City's an \$18 million issue. I just discussed it

with the commissioner from that district. As LASIP winds down, we'll get into refurbishing those.

Bridges, probably a third of our bridges are over 50 years old. If they're not structurally a problem, they're functionally obsolete. They don't have enough headwater clearance from high water lines. They're just not built to standards that are today -- so we've got three bridge projects that have just been out the door right now. The two on Golden Gate Boulevard are being replaced as we speak, the one on State Road 29, and the board just approved the White one. And the White one was -- we were getting really worried because the cross-stands have broken, so the beams were functioning independently. They were no longer tied together as weight-bearing beams.

But anything that I think is critical, Jay's assured me that he's got them under control. So what he's doing now, he does what's called a cursory inspection first. Just has the FDOT inspectors go out and do the visuals. Anything that strikes a visual alarm, we do a work order, we take it to the board, and then we go into a deeper inspection. They may say it looks bad, but it's actually strong. So don't worry about it, or they may say, look at these pictures. Bottom chunks of the bridge are falling off. You need to get to this right away.

So I'm comfortable in telling this commission, and as well when we get to the board, all the worst-first stuff is being covered, and we're funded to cover that.

The hangover is still coming. And as the economy picks up, I think we're going to focus more on that. So hopefully that allays any fears you have on that type of infrastructure.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay.

MR. JARVI: This slide, Page 8, shows just some statistics and observations of the traffic counts compared to last year. As you can see, and certainly could imagine, some are up and some are down and some are about the same.

And, you know, these fluctuate year to year, have forever. And sometimes we can understand it if -- you know, Vanderbilt Road was under construction a few years ago out east, and Immokalee Road had a lot of traffic on it, now Vanderbilt's open and traffic shifts back, you know, we can see those, but sometimes it's just, you know, where people are going and where they're from. So there's not necessarily a rhyme or reason that we can do unless there's a construction issue.

And Page 9 -- excuse me. Page 9 -- I'm sorry. I'll get it down yet -- basically has the same -- it's a graphic representation of what Page 8 was in tabular form. It just shows the higher growth corridors in -- and the lower growth corridors from a year-to-year comparison. It doesn't -- it's not a trend analysis. It's just a year-to-year comparison.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: And, Reed, you only have one under construction now?

MR. JARVI: The construction is -- Collier Boulevard/Davis Boulevard is under construction.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay.

MR. JARVI: And then -- is Oil Well done?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Oil Well's done.

MR. JARVI: Oil Well's done. That's the only other one.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay. Oil Well's done, so --

MR. JARVI: That's recently finished, Oil Well.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: So this is the only project you have right now that is under construction? That doesn't mean --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes, the only major capital.

MR. JARVI: Yeah, major.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Reed, just a curious question. Why would DeSoto pick up like it did down there?

MR. JARVI: It's real hard on the farther-out roads, DeSoto and some -- Everglades, because the traffic is so small, so you'd have, like, 150 peak-hour trips, and you gain 20, which is not a lot, but that's a big percentage wise. So the outer ones fluctuate a lot.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: A birthday party could throw it all off?

MR. JARVI: Probably a couple birthday parties, but yes.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Two homes could do it.

MR. JARVI: When you're on Airport Road that has a capacity of, say, 3,000 --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. Got it, got it.

MR. JARVI: This slide shows -- as we were talking about the programming, this is the five-year CIE, and it shows -- and I apologize, I have to go from memory because I can't quite see it. But you'll see that there is R's --

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Would you like glasses?

MR. JARVI: It's just real small way over there. Anyway.

But you'll see in the top there, that's our capital program that we're looking at doing over the next five years. And you'll see the -- next to the dollar amounts there's a letter, and R is right-of-way and D is design and C is construction, and if you have the page open in the bottom left side, there's the legend that tells you what each of these stand for. But you can see that we do program them on a five-year basis.

You have Golden Gate Boulevard being programmed, that there's right-of-way -- right-of-way being bought, designs coming up, and construction for the Golden Gate/Wilson intersection and to -- past the bridges, which is approximately a mile east.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I'm going to jump in just a little bit, give you a little more detail on what we're doing and why.

Really, only three capital projects that are coming up that are probably relevant. The rest are subprojects and still going through the motion.

951 and 41 is -- we're extremely aggressive on that right now. That's the big intersection down by Fiddler's Creek and 41. We've got close to \$10 million between state grants, \$8 million contributed from developers that are banked, another 4 million that was just committed by a different developer. So that's coming up right now and going to be in construction next year, and that's a big one.

Notice that a lot of the projects we're doing, we're only doing them because there's grants involved, they're developer commitments; otherwise, they wouldn't be there.

Your other project, which is Collier Boulevard, Golden Gate to Green, again, has six to 7 million dollars of TRIP money, transportation regional incentive program grants. That's scheduled to go next year as well, too. So those are the two big focus projects.

Golden Gate intersection, which is also there, it says Golden Gate Boulevard/Wilson to east DeSoto intersection, it's all going to depend on how far we can go based on money. Our goal is to try and go at least a mile to the east, maybe two to one of the bridges we've just done, and that's in your outer year.

When you look at that in '15 -- it may get pushed to '16, depending on revenue that we get coming in.

Those are the three big capital projects that we have left. And we're trying to space them out accordingly. The rest of those are right-of-way acquisitions. Some of those committed by agreement to keep moving. And then below the line, your bridge improvements that, Commissioner Ebert, you talked about, we put about -- almost \$5 million each year -- if you look in '14, '15, '16 into the bridge program, because we know how important that is.

The rest of those are intersection safety capacity enhancements where, in the urban area, we talked with the board -- am I talking too fast?

We talked with the board about, in the urban area, what do we do once we six-lane everything, and it's basically go back and start making these tweaks, Valewood, Whippoorwill, Vanderbilt, and we're going to start just, kind of, minor modifications, and those are all projects that are going to range between, I would say, 1.5 million to 5 million, not 30, 60, 70 million-dollar capital projects that we're used to, but definitely enhancements that you'll see.

That's where the program's going. I don't anticipate that to change over the next two or three years. I don't -- even though permits are up year over year with our impact fee collections being down, based on reductions in fees and advanced COA payments, I -- you know, the next two or three years, doing the AUIR, this is what you're going to see, very, kind of, scant program, focused on asset management.

Any questions on that page that you'd like me to answer?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Nick, what is Marco Island/Asset Management? It's a consistent amount of money for the next five years.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It's a commitment. It's two things wrapped up. We, by agreement, give

Marco Island a million dollars a year, and that's the commitment we've made to Marco. The rest of that is asset management in the sense that we're allocating a certain amount of money.

Because you've got a real condensed page. So if I was to expand this, part of that money is to manage the asset management. In other words, hire the folks to do the surveys, compile it and manage the data. We put that in as part of ours as well, too.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Okay, thanks.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Nick, what is the transit enhancement operations -- slash operations?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It is our funding that we do as part of the General Fund that goes back to transit operations. We've committed about \$1.8 million a year to funding transit out of gas tax and General Fund, the 313 fund.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: But the proposed terminal is not in there?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: No, sir, because it's already let and encumbered in a prior year. So there's no future dollars to that project. It's already encumbered. That's something that was done in '11 and '12. So it wouldn't show up in this five-year plan going forward.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Anyone else?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Any other questions on the capital?

MR. JARVI: This '11 is just the -- it's more of a five-year delineation of the revenue sources we talked about earlier. If you have any questions, we can address those. But it's a summary, five-year summary versus the five-year -- five-year summary by years versus the whole five years.

The next -- I'm just going to put up the first sheet, but it's -- this is what I -- this is the meat of the AUIR from a traffic perspective. And this.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Eye chart.

MR. JARVI: And at best you need, like, double or maybe even triple glasses to see this. But half the problem is we do it on 11 by 17, and it's almost readable on 11 by 17, and then it's shrunk down, so -- but we do this electronically usually.

This is a delineation of the various road segments that we have around the county, and we have count stations in there and limits of the segments and their level of service and number of lanes and, et cetera. And you get to -- to the middle part and it talks about what the counts are and the trip bank, that I'm sure you've all heard about before, we get to total trips, and compare that to their level of service and find out it's within standard or not within standards or how much is left remaining capacity.

And we use this as a programming. As you see -- you know, I didn't do this last programming, but I'm working on the next year's and the future ones. And, you know, as a road segment gets close to capacity, we're starting to look at moving that up into the priority list, and as dollars become available, then we'd do the balancing, which one works. And you can see through all these. And I'd be happy to address any specific questions you have or -- and if you're just looking at this now, you're probably not going to be able to see it well enough. But we can get it to you electronically if that helps, because you look at it and scroll and pan around easier.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Just a quick question. I know we talked about it a little bit last year. How are you guys handling all of the projects that have gotten extensions from the state?

MR. JARVI: From, like, a PUD standpoint?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: (Nods head.)

MR. JARVI: From -- a PUD doesn't go on here. This is -- we look at the -- to get on this list, you would have to do a concurrency check, which would be an SDP or a plat or something of that sort, or the few projects that are actually vested from a zoning DRI perspective would be on this sheet. And -- nows those have been extended, too.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: SDPs?

MR. JARVI: But they'd be on there until they're abandoned or built, in which case they would then move into the background traffic for our purposes.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Do you need a little more elaboration?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: No, that's fine.

MR. JARVI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Reed?

MR. JARVI: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: From just looking at this, it would look like the level of service is pretty good. There are only a few bad spots, according to this chart, these charts.

MR. JARVI: Yes, sir. And, primarily, you know, quite frankly, we are growing, and we build a lot of roads and we had Nick's boss, you know, Six-Lane Norman, doing all the six-lane roads, and we built them and then, you know, the population has stopped or slowed.

And so we're basically -- we've caught up in the large extent, so that's the level of -- the projections are showing us in general. We don't have a lot of problems short term.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Reed, there's one on Page -- let me see -- 14 that is also in dark line -- Oil Well to DeSoto/Camp Keais. Why is that one darkened out?

MR. JARVI: Oh, we -- the ones that are darkened, in general, are ones that we had as one long segment, and we've divided them into separate segments.

We keep the main one in there just as kind of a placeholder and -- because Oil Well, as you've known, typically, is now more through Orangetree, Immokalee to Everglades and Everglades to DeSoto.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: So you've just broken it down?

MR. JARVI: We've broken it down. And there's another one I just -- we did this year is Tamiami Trail which is, I think, on '13, east of 951. It was a long segment from 951 to County Road 92, San Marco, and we've broken it into three segments, because there is upcoming planned construction there.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay, okay, very good. So not all those segments need to be finished now, so you've just kind of broke it out and are doing just the ones that need to be done?

MR. JARVI: When there's a difference in lanage, we try to do that for sure. Because for Oil Well, you know, between Immokalee and Everglades, it's four lanes. Well, east of Everglades it's two lanes till you get over to Oil Grave Road, is it?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Strand Road.

MR. JARVI: Strand. And then it goes to six lanes. So if we kept them the same, it would be real confusing on what is your level of service volumes and what are your volumes, because you just can't do that, because it's four to two to six.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay.

MR. JARVI: We just tried to make them into the logical areas.

I think for your purposes, in my opinion, these are the most important, these next two graphics. This is a table, and the next one after that is a graphic of basically the same thing. And it shows what Commissioner Vonier said that, in general, we're okay from a level of service -- meeting our level-of-service standards. We have some problem areas that we're looking at coming up in general.

We are addressing them. For instance, the one yellow is the portion of Davis Boulevard between Santa Barbara and Radio Road. And at the time we prepared that, it wasn't under construction. I think it's under construction or about to go under construction.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: About to go under construction.

MR. JARVI: So it's being solved, but it is a -- at least at the time this was prepared, there was a problem.

And then also we're looking at these -- we had areas we are looking at that are future problems, you know, maybe not quite today. Golden Gate Boulevard within -- is within standards by 100 trips -- no, 30-some trips. Well, it's within standards but, obviously, that's not going to be far before it's a problem, so that's -- you know, that's the areas we're looking at.

Any questions on this?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: No. I do know, though, that Santa Barbara and Radio Road this morning had an accident on it. They were reporting it, and I was driving in, so I know that's a problem area.

Also, when you -- you're working on -- are you working on the Collier Boulevard between Green and Vanderbilt Beach? Are you doing anything there?

MR. JARVI: The north part?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Uh-huh.

MR. JARVI: Yeah, that's on the list for -- next year, is it?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Next year.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: For next year.

MR. JARVI: Yeah, it's -- I think the plans are 90 percent.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Uh-huh.

MR. JARVI: And -- so it's looking to go under construction next year. That's the next piece that we'll be doing.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay.

MR. JARVI: And if you remember back from the -- the confusing one that had the graph on -- the table on the top, that's, like, the next big project.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Just as Reed pointed out on this graphic, I want to jump in a little bit. You had made an observation, things look pretty good, and I agree with you. When you look at the colors, it kind of tells you a feel for what's going on in the county.

Our urban corridor is Collier Boulevard. So at some point in time when we get to the point of six-laning all these roads -- and we're not that far away -- we're really going to have to come to both the Planning Commission and the board and start saying, do we want to look at the whole urban area as one whole? Because having a link-by-link analysis, we have two transportation concurrency management areas, two squares, northwest and then the central one. Should we make the whole urban core TCMA, when we're looking at strategies for moving people and -- both pedestrians, on buses, as well as vehicles on a corridor -- not a corridor-wide, on an area-wide, and I think that's something you need to probably start asking questions about, because as we come forward with the mobility plan, that was one of the options.

Because all we're going to do at this point in time is start working on intersections and minor improvements once the six lanes are done. The board has said, we don't want this to look like Miami. You are going to have some overpasses and queue jumps. But, by and large, I think the community here has sat up said, we are not going to have these huge, you know, like Colonial runs like we have in Fort Myers, or especially on the east coast. That's not what we want.

So if we go to an area-wide kind of analysis and the board wants to maintain concurrency, we can do it that way. Pine Ridge may fail, but the other parallel facilities will do okay.

Everything right now that's in blue is within the next five years that we're looking at and key projects to look at.

The key now is the vacancy rate. I don't know, Mike, if I missed your discussion. Did you get into vacancy rates at all?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: No.

MR. BOSI: No.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay. And it's been, the past two or three years, always an issue. If you look at some of these developments, especially multifamily, and in the Estates, some of these streets, a third to a half of the homes are empty, and that's starting to change. These are trips that we're not going to pick up as part of development orders.

So the only concern -- I say it every year, and I remember the chair said, well, we'll blame you anyway when it happens, and kind of in jest. But I always want to bring it up so both the Planning Commission and the board knows, you do got excessive vacancy rates, and we don't have a good way to measure it.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: And, Nick, correct me if I'm wrong, it's not only the vacancy rate for existing homes, if you will. There's also a number of developments that are not nearly built out yet that are going to be coming on, God willing.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right. I can measure those to a certain extent because of the plats that are committed, and we've got them in the trip bank. I've lost the vacancy rate. I just don't know where it is.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Yeah, okay.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: And I don't have a good way of measuring that. So that -- and then if you look at the two urban areas where the numbers fluctuate a lot -- I think Reed and I talked about, you have several industrial parks, and you can realize, if you've got a plumber working in there who was doing 20 trips a day, you know, hitting the traffic counts all day long versus now he may have four trips a day.

So the two question marks that aren't related to something I can measure are business activity -- I can't get a good feeling for what people are doing -- and vacancy rates. So that's where we put that note.

We'll monitor a detailed analysis within three years of projected failure. Those are the areas we're going to probably just keep a real good eye on. And if we have to do some additional studies internally, our goal is to just focus on those, because if they start to jump ahead of us, we can always come back to the Planning Commission and the board and say, we've got a problem that's developing.

So I just wanted to point that out to you. Thank you.

MR. JARVI: And almost a perfect segue into the TCMA analysis, which is a -- not an area-wide -- but we have two TCMA's, traffic concurrency management areas, as Nick mentioned, the northwest and east central. And the one you see here is the east central one.

You can see there's two links that are in red. Those are both under construction, so those will come off. But we are doing well in our transportation concurrency management areas. We have to maintain -- or let me rephrase that. For development projects to go through, we have to maintain those at 85 percent of the lane miles being within standards.

And you can see this one is almost 95 percent, and the next one, which is the northwest, is 100 percent.

So what Nick has addressed verbally we haven't put on paper yet, but is -- if we did something from an urban countywide concurrency area, we'd have some lists like this and, you know, it would be an expanded list of all the urban areas, and we'd look at maintaining the capacity at some level, presumably 85 percent, as we do now.

Any questions?

(No response.)

MR. JARVI: And the last slide is -- as we have actually spoke about is the only thing really under construction from a major capital project perspective is the Davis Boulevard and Collier Boulevard under I-75 area, and this is just delineating that.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Does anyone have any further questions?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Nope. Want a motion?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: I would love a motion.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. And I'll give the short form rather than read the whole recommended.

I move we forward a recommendation to take the recommendation -- recommended action shown on the 2012 summary form for county arterial and collector roads.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. The motion passes, 7-0.

MR. JARVI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: I think we'll take a 15-minute break, and we'll come back at 10:50.

(A brief recess was had.)

MR. BOSI: Chair, you have a live mike.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Corby, I thought you were coming up next. Who's next?

MR. BOSI: Chair, we have Jerry Kurtz in drainage, and this will be the other component where there's actually some capital improvement programs that are being suggested.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KURTZ: Good morning. Jerry Kurtz, principal project manager for stormwater environmental planning.

I'm basically here to answer any questions you have. Our AUIR for stormwater management is pretty simple; just a few pages.

One of the things we're trying to do is eliminate the term "drainage" eventually in the Growth Management Plan, and I think -- I think it's a movement throughout the state.

A year's gone by. Drainage was important but sort of became a dirty word as stormwater management became more of a -- it became more of a resource, stormwater and surface water, to manage and not to drain away the swamp. And so now it's all about stormwater, I guess, slash, surface water management.

So a quick overview of our AUIR, the text portion, the facility summary form focuses on three or four main items there. We do talk about our capital projects program. And, number two, we talk about our NPDES, national pollutant discharge and elimination system permit that we have.

The county is an operator of a stormwater -- municipal stormwater management system. We get a permit through the federal program. We're permitted by the state, by DEP, to operate the system responsible -- responsibly. We have to meet quite a few criteria, and we report on that every year. And a lot of our resources are geared toward meeting the compliance of those items.

And recently we've really focused in on system maintenance, and a lot of our future projects will be on maintaining the existing infrastructure, so we're stressing that.

The -- a little bit on the level of service. The first thing that I think was indicated at the top of that form was level of service, currently C and D, not real desirable, but I did want to say that the level of service established many years ago in the 1990 board approved stormwater management plan. We're thrilled with the new approval by the board in December of 2011 of the Watershed Management Plans.

Years ago, 20-plus years ago, stormwater master planning was kind of the state of the art, and today it's watershed planning. And watershed planning -- watershed management planning is a much more holistic view. You want to manage the surface water and the stormwater runoff for the watershed, for the health of the watershed.

So we've entered the modern age with the approval of the Watershed Management Plan. Our whole program is going to be based off the findings of the Watershed Management Plan, which there are dozens and dozens.

So one of -- the Watershed Management Plan had a lot of initiatives that it brought forward. It brought forward 13 nonstructural initiatives more conceptual, maybe, policy things we need to consider, the way we do business. But one of the 13 nonstructural initiatives was a look at redefining the stormwater levels of service.

It's going to take some time and some effort, but we're planning on doing that. It may take all of next year, maybe even a little bit more, but, basically, very similar to all the other items in the AUIR. The higher the level of service you want to set, that means the more cost the program's going to take to meet that high level of service.

So you want to find that happy medium in between. As well, the larger the system, the more potential to, say, drain the water off a little too fast, too efficient possibly.

So we're always -- in the stormwater management task that we do, we're always on that tightrope. We're always trying to provide an adequate flood level of service but, as well, manage the resource to protect the environment and to recharge the aquifers and not pollute the receiving waters. Some of the big receiving waters that we have, the Picayune Strand, the Naples Bay.

So we run this fine line, and it's actually really challenging and a lot of fun to provide people a level of comfort in how fast we're draining water away from their homes but, as well, always with our eye on the wetlands, the wellfields, the estuaries, all these things. So we -- we're very challenging. We enjoy doing all that.

So I guess I want to tell you that we -- the fact that 20 years ago we looked at our system from a master plan standpoint and we identified that we're -- our levels of service are C and D, I don't think that's the case anymore. We've done a lot of projects in the last 20 years, dozens of projects. And when we can evaluate the impact of those projects as far as we've eliminated a lot of nuisance flooding, what I call standing water, it's a nuisance. It's in your front yard. It's in your backyard. It's -- the roads are a little wet.

We've eliminated a lot of that in a bunch of neighborhoods. So we will focus in on more flooding, the real flooding, which is -- which is -- affects the floodplain and the safety of keeping the water, you know, from ever a danger of flooding homes.

So we've zeroed in on that a lot, and a lot of changes have been made. So we really want to -- we really want to update our level of service, but it is going to take a while.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Jerry, if I might?

MR. KURTZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Can you explain level-of-service standard variable C or D? In the transportation, you know, there was the same notation, but with a different --

COMMISSIONER EBERT: What page?

MR. KURTZ: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: If you look on Page 23 on stormwater, it says variable C or D, and I missed that on transportation, which basically had another variable level of service.

MR. KURTZ: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: In your case, what is C and D? What's that number --

MR. KURTZ: We did a lot of looking at the level of service. The level of service is really -- and I'll zero in on C and D, but let me begin with a -- again, the concept for level of service would be to manage the flood risk and efficiently convey the water away from the homes and manage the peak stages. As well, there's a water quality component. You want to make sure your runoff is treated before it's discharged.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Excuse me for interrupting, but is this a mathematical calculation or is it a subjective assessment or what is it?

MR. KURTZ: It was, it was. There was a matrix done 20-plus years ago. There is a -- there is a numerical value. In fact, I do have a little chart that I could put up explaining it. It's a little complicated, but -- the old way they did it.

Yeah, I put this chart together. There's your level of C and D highlighted. How's that showing up? Not real well.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: No, it's coming fine. It's fine.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: It's good, it's good.

MR. KURTZ: Okay, good. Basically, if you start at A, A is excellent, and there is a numeric value of 8. And the numeric values go from 1 to 8, as they did it in the original plan. Basically A is no flooding of roads, yards, or structures with excellent water quality treatment and recharge.

Going to B, you start having some minor flooding. The ditches are full, and it's overflowing into some of the roads and some of the yards. No threat of structure flooding. It's a good level of protection, and that's what we would strive for.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: And these are system-wide assessments --

MR. KURTZ: Well, they're -- yeah, they're --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: -- rather than --

MR. KURTZ: They're by basin, they're by basin.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: By basin.

MR. KURTZ: Or subbasin, you could say, when you -- basin or subbasin. The basins are actually very large. It's more a neighborhood level, I'd say, subbasins.

And then D is where you start having roads flooding, yards flooding, and not-yet structures, and you're losing your water manage -- your water quality treatment. And then D is the worst-case scenario where your roads, yards, and some structures are flooding.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Well, how do you monitor -- who monitors this, and how do you accumulate statistics that leads you to this evaluation?

MR. KURTZ: This was done by -- the whole system got evaluated many years ago, 1990, 1989, as best they could then with the resources they had available, but it was part of that generation of that whole stormwater master plan.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: So the evaluation was done 15, 20 years ago?

MR. KURTZ: The master plan -- this was created as part of the stormwater master plan and the evaluation and the generation --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I'm trying to make this leap from 20-years-ago evaluation to 2012.

MR. KURTZ: Sure, sure.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: You know, this is -- AUIR is based on -- I mean, it seems like this established -- or this is the base by which you evaluate yourselves is a 20-year --

MR. KURTZ: I wouldn't say.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Help me. You know where I'm going. I'm trying to put together how do you evaluate how you're doing with respect to level-of-service standard, what is that methodology, how do you acquire statistics? Is it subjective, objective, is it a mathematical formula?

MR. KURTZ: It's a little subjective, but I think when we look at redoing this, we probably -- we're trying to define what the new effort would be to establish new level of service. Ultimately, I think we'd like to do some modeling of the whole entire system.

I mean, you can take it to any number of different levels. So we have to find that happy medium with what resources we want to put towards this.

But one thing -- and it's a -- multi, multi-faceted. When I wrote it all down, I came up with four pages of text, but the chart's a good summary of why we're -- where -- you know, the indication of the C and D.

But one thing I can say, Phil, to -- along those lines is we also -- all the new development that gets constructed today per the current design standards, I would say, meets A or B, probably mostly A.

So in that sense, you know, all the new residential development, all the new roads are not C and D. They're, in fact, A and B. But we need to flesh that out and explain that better as the Watershed Management Plan kind of indicated something we need to update.

But when we go back and look at the existing system, things that were built 20, 30, 40 years ago, this is where we have to look at how -- where our capital projects can maybe pick up the level of service in some of those older neighborhoods, so --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Yeah. Just an observation -- and this is my first time through this, but you and I have had other interaction on water before.

But it would seem, in view of the magnitude of your projected expenditures of over \$35 million and so forth in the projects that you list here, you are targeting -- or I think you should be targeting projects based upon where the need is most critical or where the deficiencies are the most critical resulting in unwanted water standing around or standing too long or streets flooding and so forth.

So I'm interested in, for the future, perhaps, having more quantitative data that's been acquired as to where the incidence of flooding is occurring, what is the primary cause of that, whether it's a weir that is malfunctioning or X, Y, or Z, or culverts that aren't cleaned out. I'm not in that field of endeavor -- but bringing something more than what, my words, a subjective analysis of where you're going to spend capital monies rather than a quantitative analysis based upon actual statistics gathered over the last -- over the last year, if you will.

MR. KURTZ: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: And I don't know whether -- will that manifest itself in your stormwater management plan or your Watershed Management Plan when completed or what?

MR. KURTZ: It absolutely will. And I agree with what you said 100 percent. We can no longer plan the program on anecdotal information or what somebody said happened the last time we got six inches of rain in one day.

Our ultimate goal -- and I alluded to it a little bit on Page 24 -- is we want to be able to run the model a -- the modeling that was done as part of the Watershed Management Plan, we want to be able to run that

over the whole system, a dynamic model, and let that modeling -- just like you would do a traffic analysis, let that model point out -- and the Watershed Management Plan did some of that -- let that model point out where we know, when we get six inches of rain in one day, we know what canals are not going to be able to keep up.

And we have that, and it's done, in a sense, for the Estates -- but to do that on a countywide basis -- and that would generate the capital projects and give that. So I agree with you 100 percent.

And we're kind of in transition right now. Looking at the projects, there's very few new little efforts for FY13. We're still finishing up that big Lely Area Stormwater Improvement Project, so most of the capital money's going towards. But -- and that will happen for the next three years.

But that project is done so much for really catastrophic flooding that occurred years ago in East Naples area. That project's going so well.

So we're -- right now we're kind of transitioning from finishing up that one huge capital project to being able to form the program more on the basis of letting the analysis show us where our deficiencies are and coming in with retrofit kind of projects and that sort of thing.

And the other huge thing is, in this transition period, we've really -- I'd say for the last three years, we've spent a lot of effort on getting a good handle on our inventory. Five, 10 years ago we really didn't -- we didn't know what we had out there, and we built a lot of stuff.

So right now in this interim period, we're putting all our inventory into the GIS and, as well, we're -- we've -- we're real close to finishing a study on all the water control structures. There's, like, 50-plus in the system. We're evaluating them, and we've found some that are in dire need of replacement. So that's going to be another big focus.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Do you see all of these modeling and planning efforts coming together within the next year so that, perhaps, AUIR time next year you'll have the results of that and more quantitative data to bring into the table to justify your recommended projects?

MR. KURTZ: Absolutely. That's the goal. I would love that to be the case, and that's my goal. But at the same time, we're moving -- we're advancing -- like, the Watershed Management Plan, I think, had 10 structural initiatives, which those are the big projects suggested, which we're looking at them, but not as aggressively as we're looking at the 13 nonstructural initiatives.

So we want to bring forward all of these things, like LID initiatives. There's a number of items that, you know, we want to advance together. But this is on the list of ones to --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: One more question. Are all of these efforts in conjunction -- probably rhetorical -- in conjunction with South Florida Water Management and their projects? I mean, they have a lot to do with the primary structures in the county, right?

MR. KURTZ: Yeah. Most of the infrastructure maintenance projects are in coordination with them, and all the projects that we -- where we improve water quality -- which a lot of them are in planning right now.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: They're in sync.

MR. KURTZ: We're in sync and coordinating with them almost on a weekly basis.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Thanks, Jerry.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Jerry, I have a question for you. Are you still working on the Golden Gate Estates area in their stormwater management?

MR. KURTZ: Yes, we are.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay. That's -- that was one of the questions and -- that I had. And my favorite, Cocohatchee Canal, are you having any problems with the weirs there at all?

MR. KURTZ: No. The Cocohatchee weirs, there's one, two, and three of the big ones, I guess, starting from Palm River where the tide break is.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay.

MR. KURTZ: Those structures are South Florida Water Management operated. They're all new -- fairly new structures. They've really set the -- you know, they step the water up in that whole basin, and we're pleased with how they established the control elevations in all those basins.

And our projects kind of mesh and match nicely with how they operate that system, so we're pretty

much in sync with that -- with those structures and how that Cocohatchee system's operated.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: So when -- when they lowered the structure, which they did last year -- because we were supposed to have a tropical storm that never happened, I mean, you could really see the draining, and we never got rain afterwards.

I would -- and I know that is kind of south -- you know, Clarence's, department, used to be. And is there a way that -- with that they can keep it backed up higher along the way so it can -- it seems like they really have it stopped at Cocoa 1, at Palm River, and then it seems to go down. And I understand that they're lower there and ours is higher. But just looking into the canal is a different story.

And, in fact, this year on Cocoa 3, there was no outflow at all, so we did not get any of the wading birds or anything that we normally have there. There was none. We did not have enough rain. So we are in a bad deficit right there, but --

MR. KURTZ: Yeah. That occurrence -- I know exactly what you were talking about. We were all watching it.

When a decision like that's made, we're all on the phone together talking back and forth. In fact, I was home with my laptop in my lap in front of the TV. And there's a website that the districts put up where you can see how they're operating those weirs on, like, an every-15-minute cycle, and it's available to everybody.

But they made the decision to drop -- start dropping those weirs in anticipation, you know. And you have to do it ahead of time, so you do it based on the current forecast.

When they were saying four to six inches of rain -- which we didn't get -- we only got, like, two and a half or three, but we all kind of, collectively -- we knew that decision was being made, and we watched the water go down.

But, if you see the graphs -- and I was watching them and I was calling our folks, coordinating with them. That was on -- I believe that was on Sunday -- Saturday or Sunday, and -- but they quickly -- they did open them on Saturday, but quickly -- and they might have left them open on Sunday, but by Monday or late even Sunday night they were back closed.

And it's all charted, and you can see that when we finally realized that it was going -- the storm was going out further and the forecast numbers started decreasing, they reacted perfectly and they closed them up tight, and the water levels did start coming back up.

So that's, again, the tightrope that we walk every day, really. We're concerned about getting too much rain too fast, but as soon as we see that we're not going to get it, we close -- start closing the system up.

And they really do an excellent job, and they really do it in communication with us almost constantly. I mean, when there's no storms out there, we don't talk that often, maybe every week, every other week, but when there's a storm, it's almost hourly back and forth, a lot of calls going on.

And so we were happy -- because we mimic what they do, too, with our system. They have to lower the downstream structures first. It doesn't do us any good to lower ours if they're not lowering theirs. So we all kind of get together and -- plus, they get advice from their -- their folks in West Palm.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I know, but West Palm is at the other -- on the other coast, and they can't always -- they do not see what's happening here.

MR. KURTZ: Well, their control room over there in West Palm is fantastic, and they have, you know, professional meteorologists over there. Not just one; they've got several. And it's really impressive if you've never seen it. Their control room over there, it's like -- it's almost like a hurricane center.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Like the EOC.

MR. KURTZ: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Brad?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: How much of the county do you think is at Level D? And, first of all, looking at some of the descriptions, do we have any public facilities that are isolated in a Level D type storm?

MR. KURTZ: Well, that's a great question. The whole basis of the establishment of the Level D I want to eliminate.

Back in the time, it was a good way to do it, and it's logical in the document that was produced. You can trace back and see exactly how they did it, and they really did a good job at it. But as far as what would be D today -- and remember 20 years ago, I think we were just deciding that the 25-year, three-day storm event was the new standard to -- everything to be built, which means raising it way up and building these robust water management systems.

So I would say, especially speaking to any new public facilities, anything that's built since, say, 22, 25 years ago, is not -- nowhere near a D and it's probably up at A or B.

So the only thing that could be at a Level D, you know -- and you can see these things around town, some of the real old structures that were not built on any fill, they were built on the existing grade. We have some roads like that, a few roads, but they're all minor roads, some real old structures. There's really very little left, I would say, that would meet D as they defined it back then.

The Watershed Management Plan has a great discussion on how to redefine levels of service, and it alludes to -- the way everything is done now is done on the design-storm event.

So even though they did look at the design-storm event back when they did this, now -- I'll give you an example. An evacuation route has to erode -- an evacuation road will have to be built to a quite high standard.

So you want to give that quite a robust level of service, and that should be designed to the 25-year, three-day storm, which they are.

Now, your little neighborhood roads maybe could be built to lesser standard, not elevated so high. That's an example.

So we really need to redefine stormwater level of service, and I think the end result will be a lot -- you know, as it's shown in the Growth Management Plan from this old study, it will probably flip flop. You won't have all C and D. You'll probably have very little C and D, and you might have all A and B.

But we want to do it right, and it's going to take some time. So we're just kind of defining the scope that we'd like to bring that effort forward. But it needs to get done.

And, again, it's part of getting the program now driven by all the great findings that came about from the Watershed Management Plan.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: The problem we have, though, is that you've stated that our level of service is a C or a D, so that has to be interpreted that the county is -- either has areas that are C's or areas that are D's, but I don't think that's really true from your conversation.

So could you -- here's the problem. Are we going to recommend an unacceptable condition? I don't think we should do that. So can -- why is the D in there? Is it some 20-year-old guys walking around?

MR. KURTZ: There's a huge qualifier, I guess, to that that -- you know, what was the basis? What was the standard of designating -- of things getting that designation? And, in fact, it is -- it's the 1990 stormwater master plan.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But you know and you stated both sides of the line; the private sector and the public sector has done a lot better on doing stormwater on all their projects, all your roads, all our PUDs, all -- everything. So why are we saying -- can't you drop the D so we can -- last year you never gave us a grade, but you're giving us an extremely failing grade and expecting us to recommend acceptance of that to the commissioners.

MR. KURTZ: I -- well, I'd like to qualify why it's still listed as C and D, and I thought I did that in the text portion and then this discussion as well, you know.

I guess, again, you'd have to go back to what is the basis for the C and D, and it wasn't really looking at design storm events. Like one of the things we used to hear is how often do you get the 25-year, three-day storm?

Statistically speaking, you're supposed to get it once every 25 years. Those are things that need to be given a lot more consideration as we revamp this C and D.

But I agree with your -- and I understand your concern if today, right now, we're still saying C and D, that could be an issue.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So how about this: Can we change that to be C with some minor areas of D, just so that it looks like -- I mean, I don't want us to approve an unacceptable condition. And the

way you're stating it, the whole county's in C or D, and that's not the case.

MR. SCHMIDT: If I could?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah.

MR. SCHMIDT: Keep in mind that the C and the D that's reflected on your Page 23 and on the screen in front of you, on the imagizer, are 20-year-old standards. They do not reflect the actual levels of service per basin that are required of developers and the design of their water retention and the detention facilities.

Those are found in the Capital Improvement Element, separate portion of a document that may not be in front of you today, and those transition period -- or that transition period that Jerry is talking about has been happening for those 20 years and continues to happen.

So as we design individual developments, and with the major projects like LASIP, we make up for past insufficiencies. The Estates, we're making up for all of those acres, for instance.

And as we reached that point, it's true. We'll have reached that point of balance, and we can reflect that we're now showing countywide we have that level of service being met at a higher standard.

But until that long-term project or those projects are being met, it was thought best by the county to show those lower levels of service.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Or, essentially, accept those lower levels of service?

MR. SCHMIDT: They had.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. But we -- in this report, what is our level? I mean, do we have no idea? What you're saying is wait a year, we'll get the Watershed Management Plan, and we'll figure this out so we can see what the level of service around town is?

MR. KURTZ: No, it's not saying that. It is true that -- the everything that's currently built and designed meets the -- you know, it's designed per the 25-year, three-day storm, as well as structures are all set at the 100-year-design storm. So, you know, all new development designed and permitted is certainly not being built at a C or D.

I guess it's -- the C or D comes with some qualifiers with it, and that's what we're trying to explain. It's like a remaining -- remaining historical --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But should we not carry the D along? I mean, should we recommend that we change the acceptable levels of service to a C only?

MR. KURTZ: Well, I have variable dash C or D, and with a description.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: This might help, if I could, because Jerry and I have been working on this thing for about a year and a half together, and I've got to give him a lot of credit. He's done an excellent job. He's been really focused on the plan.

Have you covered Page 25 yet, or they're just still --

MR. KURTZ: No, I haven't.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay. I think -- and I kind of whispered to him to talk about Golden Gate Estates, because when you talk about level of service, you're talking about countywide.

As Jerry pointed out, all new developments meet a tremendously higher standard. But you've got a whole legacy system in the Estates, even the urban Estates in certain areas that is probably E or F. I mean, if you look at, you know, it's holding water. It's not built, was never designed to handle 100-year storm, nevertheless a 5- or 10-year storm.

When you look at Page 25, you're not really approving anything that's driven by these letter grades. As Jerry pointed out, the first two years, almost first three years are entirely LASIP still, so there's nothing in Year 1 or 2 that's new.

I talked about -- we talked about roads a little bit, the program is going to transition under Golden Gate City, which is mostly asset management. It's not as much of a flooding issue. So that's going to drive it.

With your question, Commissioner Schiffer, it's really the Watershed Management Plan projects on Page 25 that probably we need to do a good job and make sure that we're explaining to the board that these are meeting level-of-service flooding issues.

Everything above that, whether it's LASIP already approved and we've just got to finish it, and Golden Gate City is going to be all asset-management repairs and upgrades to existing systems.

You had mentioned you had asked -- I think it was you that said, is the district coordinating with us? The stuff that's under the Watershed Management Plan, we're actually going to -- hopefully they'll fund most of that.

And there is one correction I wanted Jerry to point out. In FY14 on your Page 25, Project 60123, it's showing a quarter million dollars, \$250,000. That needs to be X'ed out. The district is paying for the balance of that bridge. We're only into it for a quarter million based on FY12, and 106,000 cumulative in FY13. We're not putting any money in FY14 to that.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: What is that?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Page 25, 60123.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yeah, FY15.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: 28th Avenue Southeast culvert crossing over the canal.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right. That 250- should not be there, and we'll just roll that into one of the other projects to balance the budget.

But I think -- you raise a good --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Here's my problem, though, is that, you know, even out in the Estates, if we say a D is acceptable, even though we call it unacceptable, that means that we're -- people are allowed to have flooded streets. I mean, shouldn't we be working to -- if something is below the level of service, to bring it up?

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And we're doing that with the design standards; lots of little things are trying to do that. But I just have a problem with having "unacceptable" acceptable.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It's -- and that's the problem. I think when we talked about this is we developed the business plan as your Level of Service D is existing conditions. So you're almost -- you're almost -- if you raise it, you're throwing everything into failure. We're basically saying by having C and D and -- notwithstanding that we're going to modify this going forward, you are at D, and you're going to be at D for a real long time in Golden Gate Estates.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And we have to focus on fixing that.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes. And it is in your program in your outer years. What will drive that is which one of those three projects gets priority. Obviously, I think, we have them listed as 1, 2, 3 in terms of priorities anyway.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So if we cut the D, you think there'd be a -- what would be the problem? I mean, I have plenty of experience explaining to my parents the advantages of an F grade, you know. So -- I mean, what if we just got rid of it and -- we could start raising those standards and saying that isn't acceptable, what's happening.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: You can -- if that's the direction is for us to explore that, we certainly will, but recognizing if we raise it, we're going to be failing in one area for a long time.

If you say your level of service is A and B, then we're going to be -- there's going to be a huge area that's at D, and we've basically said we -- how do you set a level of service that you already have an approved plat that doesn't meet that level of service. You're saying -- that was built to that standard.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Brad? Excuse me. Couldn't we just put a caveat on our approval?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, I think we can recommend studying eliminating, you know, the Level of Service D as acceptable, because it's called unacceptable. You could call it failure, you could call it -- I mean -- and maybe that's not as major an issue that we're spending the time on, so --

MR. SCHMIDT: And, again, if I could add, keep in mind, again, on the screen you're looking at something that's 20 years old. The Watershed Management Plan follow-up work to set some new standards will redefine this, and those Levels of Service D unacceptabilities that are conveyed by this chart will no longer exist, because you're measuring things in a different way.

Those insufficiencies in the system have been eliminated because of the compensation over 20 years of development at other levels of service. And so it -- dropping it out now or removing it entirely just simply means that you're remeasuring or affecting properties and calculations.

You wouldn't be impacting the results of the structures, the drainage facilities themselves.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: No, but we would be saying -- again, it's back to, you know, Mom, that F's okay because.

You know, we would be not accepting flooding streets. I mean, these things -- you know, if you look at D, that isn't acceptable anywhere in the county.

MR. SCHMIDT: I'm going to have to say it another way. This is a 20-year chart. It's not unacceptable to us. It was the day this was printed, and we're showing it to you as a matter of history.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay.

MR. SCHMIDT: He has other slides available that he's trying to show you that it's no longer the situation where this is unacceptable. We don't have areas where Levels of Service D are exhibited because of the improvements we've made. Where they are being exhibited are in those areas where we have yet to make strides in the programmed facility improvements that you're looking at.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: We're in semantics.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Right, I agree.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I think -- yeah. I think if you're telling us to relook at the grades, the Watershed Management Plans have said to do that. We will do that. But we have areas right now where we have issues. We're all aware of where those areas are.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Right.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: And we are focusing our program to that, notwithstanding, just like in roads, you've got to take care of what you own first. So we've got to make sure that existing conditions we have, we're not going to let them deteriorate in Golden Gate City.

If we've got to decide between a new capital project to improve level of service over maintaining an existing system, my vote will be maintaining the existing system first and then move on and, if we can, balance them with a little bit of both.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Do you have one more thing?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: One more comment. As I understand this, what we're charged to do today is to evaluate and then recommend projects, capital projects, that will strive to get to the standard level of service.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Right.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Okay. Just an observation and based upon the last 15, 20 minutes -- and I hear a lot about the future. But from my point of view the projects and the justification for these projects in the stormwater area do not give me that level of comfort that I saw, for example, in transportation where you have rated road segments and so forth as to they're failing or they're good and they're bad and they're so forth.

And I would hope that next year when these things come together when we are presented with a list of recommended projects, we can endorse them because they will speak directly to those areas of the county or those infrastructures that definitely are contributing today to a less-than-standard level of service.

I mean, that's what I think is missing, Nick, and it's more of a recommendation on my part --

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: -- that you're asking us to endorse some projects and, Phil Brougham, quite frankly, doesn't know the justification for these.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Let me -- I think we -- real quick. And I don't want to steal Jerry's thunder, but I've been working closely with him on this stuff.

On your Page 25, we can go down this in probably 10 minutes, and I want this commission's comfort level that we are, and we probably didn't do a good job verbally explaining it, but maybe if we just kind of run you through some of these projects you'll understand where we are.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: That's up to the chair, but I'm --

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Well, that's up to the board.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: That's fine.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: On your Page -- are you pulling it up? Perfect.

Your first slide, your Gordon River water-quality monitoring, that's just required by that project. Your Lely 51101, your LASIP, that's been that 15-year multi-community project. I don't think -- I think this Planning Commission, everybody knows what that is.

Again, your next line, that's your master planning that we put a nominal amount every year just to keep updating these plans. There's 40,000 in there every year.

Also required by law, your NPDS monitoring program, 150,000 a year. So those are your current multi-year commitments that are -- we show them, but they're required for us to do.

We get into the project I discussed earlier, Golden Gate City outfall replacements. We have a map -- we'd be happy to share with you, not now, but I can send it to you -- that shows all the different structures in Golden Gate City that are failing. Altogether, it's about a \$15 million project. Now, that's an asset management project that doesn't get into fixing flooding. A lot of Golden Gate City works really well; it's just that the pipes are deteriorating. So that's where you get into -- we've got to make sure we maintain what we have.

Your secondary system repair is where we -- on-call. Something fails, a swale gets blocked every year; a nominal amount of money. It's \$100,000 a year.

Your 28th Street Ave. culvert crossing, that's where you're getting into flooding. That's middle of Golden Gate Estates. That's on the Miller Canal where the district has diverted water coming down the Miller, and that is a five barrel bridge, I call them. It's basically culverts. We're going to go to a CON/SPAN. We're only going to pay about a quarter million. The district is going to match that up to a million dollars. They're going to pay the bulk of that, and that will hopefully reduce some flooding.

The next ones are weir replacements. Again, mostly asset management and some hydrology improvements. Jerry's working on each one of those right now.

System-capacity projects. You can -- you don't see a lot of those because we focus primarily on maintenance of the existing system. So you don't have a lot of system-capacity projects. Some of these are being driven by what projects utilities do.

What Jerry's done a great job at is when public utilities replaces a drainage system, and it's on the side of the road, he's been calling up and going, while you're doing that, because you've got to rip up my drainage system at the same time and replace it, I'm going to give you a design and a cross-section to replace it to that makes it better.

And we -- again, they're probably going to have a better robust program than we are. We may not be able to keep up with them. But every opportunity we have to jump on a project they're doing to leverage their dollars makes perfectly good sense.

So those are those next three projects right there.

And then, really, for this board, your Watershed Management Plan projects, those are the ones where you're talking about level-of-service improvements primarily, mostly in Golden Gate Estates. A lot of these above that line are maintenance and rehab projects that we have to do.

The northern Golden Gate flowway restoration is the one area where Commissioner Schiffer and I talked about you have an unacceptable level of service. It was actually designed that way. They designed it not to handle a storm.

These are multi-year; I think your estimates are 5 to \$7 million. I'm hoping we can get the district to fund the bulk of this stuff because we obviously -- they raise quite a bit of dollars.

So in your AUIR/CIE that you have here, really you're at Year '16, '17, and we're -- hopefully you're agreeing with us that that Golden Gate City area, Golden Gate Estates area, and that -- that's the biggest issue we have countywide.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: And my only point there, Nick -- and I accept all that good input

--

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: -- is if next year -- you know, there could be that kind of a justification put behind these projects for us. We'll see it, we'll study it. We'll say, wow, you know. This is an area that's failing. This project is pointed directly to correct that failure, et cetera, that would help me.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yeah. We didn't give you enough backup. I said to Jerry, it's just two

pages. I think we can do a little better at giving you a little more meat.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Enough said. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I just have one thing, Brad. When the level of service -- when Jerry put it up for you, we weren't supposed to see that, so you really didn't know -- weren't supposed to know what --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well -- but he called --

COMMISSIONER EBERT: -- what C and D were.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, but he called -- well, okay. I mean, he calls out C and D, so that's --

CHAIRMAN AHERN: We'll blame Phil.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I think we should know what he's describing as the level of service.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Are there any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Does anyone have a motion?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Before that, just looking at the agenda, it says that we should ask for public speakers before we close out every topic.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: I think at the beginning I made everyone aware just to come up to the podium.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Okay. So we don't need to do that every time. Good.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: I don't think there's anyone from the public here.

Do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll make one. I move we forward the 2012 AUIR stormwater management system's summary form with a recommendation of approval, and also I'd like to add to that that we recommend the stormwater establish an objective method of analyzing the stormwater in the county.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Approved 7-0. Thank you.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: We're moving right through this.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: ***Looks like Nathan is coming up next. Do you want to start with potable water?

MR. BEALS: Good morning. For the record, Nathan Beals, public utilities.

We'll start with the potable water system. Basically, we have no new expansion projects planned for the next 10 years, and I can answer any questions you have.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Does anyone have any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Anyone have a motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, just one quick question. If you look on your Page W7, it's your level of service -- let's see, it's -- W7; 35 in our book. What's going to happen to us in 2006 (sic)? Are we going to -- it looks like we're starting to get in trouble there.

MR. BEALS: We are -- that's the representation of the Orange Tree Utility's (sic). With -- if nothing goes on, based on the population projections and the level of service they have reported in the Growth Management Plan, that's how they look. They're currently not out of compliance, but there is potential.

There's been talk in the past about transitioning toward providing service to Orangetree from Collier County Water/Sewer District, but that's subject to board approval.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. The next question is on the -- Page 36, it shows existing and future water service areas. Now, it doesn't really differentiate between existing and future, does it?

MR. BEALS: No. That's the existing water/sewer district boundaries.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It's not the future? Because -- the question I'm asking is, down in the -- let's take the Bayshore area and all that; is that in our system or in this map? I guess it's not, is it?

MR. BEALS: The Bayshore area is not.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: The city.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: City of Naples.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Is anybody looking to bring all of the county residents into the county system?

MR. BEALS: At this time, due to it being as part of the City of Naples water service area, it's not being looked at to be brought into us.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. I mean, people do have concerns that it's not as good as the county system, doesn't have the required flows and stuff like that, or as good a flows.

MR. BEALS: They're meeting the requirements of their permits, as far as we know.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: I'll testify my flow is fine.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, I mean, designing buildings in that area, the fire flow's really low and, you know, the loser is the owners of the buildings that have to pay more for that.

Anyway, so there's nothing going on in the county that would ever cause people to think about incorporating all of the citizens into the Collier system?

MR. BEALS: Not at this time. That could, obviously, change next year.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Brad asks that same question every year.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Every year, yeah. I've got it down. Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah. I'll move we approve the potable water as presented in the 2012 AUIR.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Motion approved 7-0. Thank you.

MR. BEALS: ***I'll stay up here for the wastewater section.

Same comment: No new expansions in the next 10 years. I'm here to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Go ahead, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I move we forward with a recommendation of approval the 2012 AUIR for wastewater system.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Motion approved 7-0.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Tough day.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Do you want to keep going?

MR. BEALS: ***I'll stay up here for the solid waste as well.

Really, no new expansions. I can answer any questions, or I have the solid waste director as well here to help out.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Any questions?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I move we forward the 2012 AUIR for the solid waste with a recommendation of approval.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Second.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: (Raises hand.)

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Motion -- Mike?

MR. BOSI: Not to interrupt your motion. I think it was completed, but just wanted to -- I never miss an opportunity.

We always hear about, you know, some of the inefficiencies and the stumbling sometimes of government. When I started this process -- when I started, we looked back, and in 2000, it was 2016 we thought our landfill was done.

Behind the recycling program of Mr. Rodriguez and his team, we have -- and with the vertical expansion, we're out to 2067. And this is one of those good news of government where, back in 2000 it was 1.21 tons per capita, you know, for disposal rate.

We've more than halved that. And we're now being aggressive on the commercial side. So this solid waste team has done a terrific job, I think, for the overall citizens of the county, and I'd just like to kind of prop that up.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: I agree. And I think by 2067 we'll have something else in place to take care of the waste.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: One other thing. I also really want to give you a lot of kudos on this. Where I saw the change was when we went to the big barrel. That was huge. I mean, so huge, the neighbors were so happy you wouldn't see their wine and beer bottles, and they -- I mean, you completely changed everything. And that's really what happened.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: The neighbors.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Yeah, whatever. I just -- I can't tell you. I mean, our garbage -- I'd like to lower my barrel size, because I do a lot of recycling, and --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Wine bottles.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: No, I don't drink wine at all. It's just washing out containers, you know, making them clean before they go in there -- I've done that my whole life -- but it's such a huge change. And I noticed it the first month in my community when those barrels were put out.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, for the record, Dan Rodriguez, your solid and hazardous waste management department director.

That's great to hear, Planning Commissioner. And like you, and -- all the residents of Collier County have contributed greatly to the recycling planning. We are one of the largest recyclers in the State of Florida. In fact, Collier County is the second, third largest recycler year after year, and it's because of the conservation

culture we have here. It's the commitment by the citizens to recycle more.

And as Mike clearly explained, we have made this very valuable asset worth over a billion dollars, the landfill. As you know, they're not building anymore. They've haven't in the last 25 years. We've pushed its life out to 2067. And as the planning chair stated, new technology is coming our way, like single-stream recycling. And hopefully the -- we won't -- we'll lessen our dependency on the landfill even more.

And what we really need to get after, though, the next couple years is business recyclers. They do a good job in Collier County, but they can do a better job.

We recently completed an inventory of the material getting into the landfill. Still, 50 percent of it is recyclable, the cardboards, plastic, aluminum. And the majority of that is coming from multifamily, condominiums, as well as the businesses. And we have direction from the board to get after that, and that's what we plan to do.

So the AUIR will continue to be pushed down.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: One other thing I'm going to mention to you, your same company is up in Minnesota, Waste Management, and they need you up there, because I went up there, and you can't throw -- you cannot recycle like we do down here. It's unbelievable.

I mean, what they cannot put in, I said, it's almost not worth it the way they have them doing. So, please, put your expertise up in Minnesota.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Sounds great. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Question, Mike (sic). The big jump we have, though, isn't that due to the air space being raised or the capacity?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: You know, actually, the vertical expansion, I believe, added 20 years. I don't have it right in front of me. I can grab it. The vast majority of that is the recycling. We started that, thanks to our administrator, Dr. Yilmaz, and the Board of County Commissioners and the county manager had a strategic plan 11 years ago, and they said, let's make recycling/reuse the priority here for the community.

And what you've seen is C&D material, construction material, you've seen recyclables get pulled away. So we gained the vast majority of that to recycling and diversion.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I agree with that. What is the -- but the height, the maximum height we can go to now is what?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: The board approved -- the permit through FDEP is to 200 feet; however, the Board of County Commissioners specifically stated, let's only bring that to 178 feet.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. And we're -- what's the height now out there?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: It's at about 102 feet.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. So we could go twice as high as we are out there. Obviously, it's not exactly straight up, so --

MR. RODRIGUEZ: That's correct. With the board's approval to have Waste Management pursue the permit, we gained an additional \$350 million in disposal capacity adding that additional 20 years.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And then with your recycling, we'll never get near that?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well -- and that's the really good news. A lot of people say, well, why do you want to build such a tall monument to waste? The fact of the matter, if we continue at the rate we're doing, continuing to increase recycling, get after the businesses to recycle more, we'll never get to that capacity.

And, in fact, technology will advance to where we can go back, like we did previously two years ago, and reclaim those cells and take that -- those recyclable materials out of that landfill.

And, as you know, 65 percent of the material in the landfill that's put in there is soil; the material deteriorates to the point that it becomes soil, so --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: That's good. Good job. And it doesn't smell.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, our landfill doesn't stink, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Thank you.

Who else do we have --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: You want me to move that one?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: We did.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: We did.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Oh. Where was I?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Who else do we have in the audience that we could try to get through quickly?

MR. BOSI: And I think Amy Lockhart, for the school district's here, and she's here just to answer questions.

One of the things -- and I provided, I think, the CIP by email. It's a pretty extensive document. But as you can see, there was no new facilities planned within the five-year window. Based upon that, there's no inconsistencies with our capital improvement program.

We're looking for the recommendation that's stated on Page 63 that basically -- include by reference the school district's work plan within our CIE and forward a recommendation to approve the school's AUIR and CIE amendment.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Did anyone have any questions on the schools?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I had a couple.

MS. LOCKHART: For the record, I'm Amy Lockhart, the long-range planner with the school district.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Hi, Amy.

MS. LOCKHART: Hi.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I had a couple -- I notice in a lot of the PUDs that you get land and everything. How much property do you have set aside for schools at this point?

MS. LOCKHART: I don't have an actual acreage figure, but we do have actually three high school sites; we have four middle school sites; we have several elementary, maybe five or six elementary school sites.

Back in the early part of the 2000s, and beginning in 2000, we began on a very aggressive land acquisition agenda. Not all of it was achieved through the DRI process or a PUD. A lot of it was our own funding sources.

We do have a school site achieved; two, actually, a middle and an elementary, with Ave Maria. We have a high school site pending with them. We haven't located the site yet.

So those -- that was one of our last acquisitions through a DRI. Actually, no, the last one was Hacienda Lakes. We were able to obtain an elementary school site with your help. We greatly appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: And Parklands.

MS. LOCKHART: Parklands. We have had that site for a while, but we were able to keep it when they -- yeah, yes. You're absolutely correct.

Are there any other questions? As noted, we don't have any projects, any school projects within the five-year time frame. We're like roads in the sense that we have entered into asset management phase. Since 2006, we have -- prior to that, from 2000 to 2005, we grew roughly around 1,500 students per year and 2006, '7 and '8, we fell; we actually declined. It was just like a plummet from 2005 growing at about 13 -- 12-, 1,300 to -- we minused about 100.

But since 2008, '9, '10, '11, we've gradually increased; a hundred that first year, a couple hundred the next year. Last year we were at a little over 300. So far this year we have -- from last year, we've gained less -- a little bit less than 600. So we're picking up a little bit.

We don't anticipate any level-of-service issues, any concurrency issues. Because as we were also buying that property, we were also -- because we were anticipating growing at that rate, just as roads were anticipating growing at -- continuing to grow at that rate, we had built a lot of capacity.

Some -- that capacity may not be in the place where we are going to grow, but we'll monitor that and manage our attendance boundaries and be able to achieve our levels of service for five years and beyond without any -- we don't anticipate any concurrency level-of-service issues, so --

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: As a matter of interest, what is the school population?

MS. LOCKHART: As of -- we count on a month-to-month basis. Actually, the first days of school, we count every day. But as of Month 1, we're at 43,860 something.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Okay.

MS. LOCKHART: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll do it. Forward -- we recommend approval of the recommendation of the Collier County School System Capital Improvement Plan.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Second?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Motion approved 7-0.

Thank you.

Okay. Would the board like to go ahead and break for lunch, or you want to --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: We can take some staff and --

MS. WASHBURN: We're here for parks.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: For parks.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Let's do that.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Oh, that's going to take -- that's going to take a little bit longer.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Why?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: I don't -- parks doesn't have any scheduled improvements.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: It's going to take longer than seven minutes, I think.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Well, we don't have to --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, we can go eat at 12:30.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: We don't have to break at 12:00.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Okay, that's fine, too.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Yeah, let's get started.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: All right.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Let's get them out of the way.

MS. WASHBURN: ***Good morning. My name's Ilonka Washburn. I'm with parks and recreation. And we didn't really prepare any presentation.

Our community parks, based on the population and level of service, show a surplus, and within our regional parks we're planning the addition of Corkscrew land and Pepper Ranch that will also take us into the surplus.

So if you have any questions, I will try and answer them.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Phil, did you have questions?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Probably questions and comments, yes.

Within parks -- and if you look through all of the exhibits, and particularly in the appendix, there's some usage statistics and so forth and so on.

Level-of-service standard in terms of both community and regional parks -- and I guess this -- another, is, again, that's the acquisition or inventory of acreage of park facilities. And some of the inventory is raw land, undeveloped, some of it has been developed and have amenities on it for years and years and years.

But it seems to me that there should be some consideration in our level-of-service calculation for parks, having some consideration on the utilization and the demographics of the population that we're trying to serve.

To me, it's too surfacey (phonetic) of a level-of-service standard just to measure parks on acreage. I

mean, road capacity is measured in terms of usage, you know. It's the trips that are measured and so forth as you rate capacity and usage and whether a road is in failure and so forth. But when it comes to parks, parks are probably one of the -- next to road, one of the closest public facilities to the public that we have, whether they -- and it spans all generations, and the parks should be measured in terms of do we have the right facilities in the right location for the right set of people that are utilizing our park facilities.

And it just seems like our level-of-service standard ignores all of the things that are important. And I don't have any recommendation to make on this, more of an observation, that acres -- naked acres, to me, misses the whole point of level of service to the public in terms of Parks and Recreation.

MR. BOSI: And if I could provide you a little insight, we used to have a levels of service for our facilities. It was the decision of the Planning Commission -- or the recommendation of the Planning Commission and the decision of the Board of County Commissioners, I think, in 2007 to remove the facilities, because each individual park has -- each individual set of demographic, it's surrounding demographic populations, and because of those unique circumstances, and case preferences (sic) and age distribution, that each individual park had its own set of needs.

And in trying to standardize the level-of-service for what type of facility should be going on, a community park or a regional park did not give the flexibility for the unique demographic preferences.

The way that the park system has developed -- and we do have a facilities portion back in the supplemental data to show what facilities are existing and are planned for the various parks and the undeveloped parks as well.

The park system, as a new park comes on, has an extensive community outreach in terms of speaking with the residents and surveying the residents to what type of facilities that would be for each individual park as they acquire. But when we went back and we looked -- and it was after we made that decision, and when we did the level of service analysis, every community, every jurisdiction, every county, every municipality, the way that they measured their level of service was by acreages.

I agree with you, Commissioner Brougham, the more important part is what is going on in one of those acreages for each individual geographic area. And the park system has a pretty extensive outreach for how that determination is made.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: No. And I have -- I see every month the utilization statistics, and they keep real good tabs on how many people are using the beach park facilities, how many people are going in each park, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So I acknowledge that the parks and rec department made -- or has good handles on who's using the park facilities.

But what I'm concentrating on now is a level-of-service standard. And irrespective of what the rest of the state does, a level-of-service standard seems to ignore the most important factor on parks, which is how well are our parks being utilized. How well are we providing the right level of service to the public?

And it goes well beyond just pure acreage, in my opinion. I'm not -- I know -- I'm probably just speaking against the wall here, but I would really like to see some improvements as we go forward in future AUIR cycles and segments that give some acknowledgment to that.

In the appendix, you can see that some of the utilization of our parks has dropped off and yet we're sitting with a surplus of parkland in excess of our level of service.

And if our utilization is dropping off, what's that have to say about our level-of-service standard? Maybe we're not meeting the level of service that our public expects and, therefore, they're not going to our parks.

It's -- again, to me it's too shallow, it's too surfacey. We need more meat and potatoes. And, again, let's don't plan to acquire more raw acres and neglect what we have behind us, and neglect is contributing to a decrease in utilization.

MR. BOSI: I recognize that, and I will say on Page 215 we do have a recreation/facility-type guidelines, and these are unofficial levels of service for the types of water access points, athletic field, hard courts, indoor recreational facilities, pathways, those type of facilities.

We have an unofficial levels of service adopted for those, because these are part of our concurrency management system, and as I described, the inflexibility of if you set a levels of service for these in terms of allowing to change based upon the changing taste of the population in the community, that's why I think that

was part of that motivation for the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners to recommend that this be taken out of the concurrency management system, but be put more in a softer appendix-type document that says we've got a levels of service that are recommending guidelines, but -- and we try to adhere to them because, you're right, those type of considerations are the most important type of considerations that -- that go at, what are the facilities at the park.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I guess -- and I read the appendix, and I see those, and it speaks to what I said. I know they have all the statistics and so forth. And I guess my lobby would be that, irrespective of past actions and now they're very soft consideration laying in an appendix somewhere, that they be given more weight in the future, particularly if we're not -- if the population is not increasing at an accelerated rate but yet our utilization is dropping.

I mean, what kind of mind games are we trying to play with ourselves over level-of-service standard? And end of editorial.

But I would just hope that we can recommend or see some better consideration for utilization as a measurement of attainment of level-of-service standard or a modification of level-of-service standard in the future.

MR. BOSI: That's, I think -- that comment has been from the Planning Commission almost every AUIR, how do we bring the utilization, the -- to the level of service making it more dynamic.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Well, I can give you a suggestion then. I had a discussion with parks and rec director Barry Williams this week, and he said he would be more than happy to prepare a document that could address those issues for consideration by whomever the responsible party is.

So it's not just me. I think there's things that can be recommended by the experts that we can consider for future years, and I would recommend that we ask him to do so with the concurrence of the board.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Are there any other questions?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: No. And, Phil, for the legacy of it, we can do that, and we've gone through that. And in the beginning we used to do that, and we just got tired and caught in the weeds because of -- first of all, a lot of these communities have private recreation. What do you do with them?

You know, what is the age group of the people that really do live in this town, and what do you do for them in a public park?

So, I mean, it really got complicated to where we just wanted to make sure that we had land available for facilities and then categorize the facilities in the appendix and hopefully spot a problem there if there is one.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Yeah, and I value that, I respect that, as I look into the past. But I think we also -- I don't want to be redundant. I just think we need to give more consideration, and let's take a fresh look at that.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Well, I think parks and recs does that on an ongoing basis, and at some point we have to rely on the people that we have in place to make sure that those programs that are needed are there.

MS. WASHBURN: And we do, we do that. We had a master plan developed also in 2011. So we do monitor those on a monthly basis, if not weekly basis.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: My issue with that -- and I agree with you, and I agree with you. My issue with that is that no matter where the statistics lie and no matter where the budget responsibility lies, et cetera, there is not sufficient priority and attention and visibility given to the utilization and the proper maintenance of the facilities in our park system.

And I understand the way most of this happens, but I -- my objective is to give more visibility and more focus to areas of our parks and rec system that have not gotten the proper attention, whether it's through the budget process or whether it's through the AUIR process or whatever it is.

I still will -- I will maintain that viewpoint.

MS. WASHBURN: Well, we appreciate all the help we can get. We do try and give everybody equal attention within our parks. But any help we can get we appreciate.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I'm not criticizing. Believe me, Ilonka, I'm not criticizing parks

and recreation here. I think you guys do a fantastic job. Thank you.

MS. WASHBURN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I move we forward the 2012 AUIR community regional parks as per the summary form.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Thank you. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Motion approved 7-0.

MS. WASHBURN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Thank you. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: We have libraries here. Can we do library?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Sure.

MR. BOSI: Before we do libraries, could we have -- in Page 6 of the staff report, the last recommendation is a request to forward the GMP/CIE schedule update to the BCC with a recommendation to adopt.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: What page?

MR. BOSI: Page 6 of the staff report.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Mike, I'd like -- can we do that when we come back from lunch, spend more time on it?

MR. BOSI: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I mean, that's --

MR. BOSI: All the roads, the consensus of everything we just heard --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Everything sums up everything we've done before. I know that. But let's just, you know, do it with a full stomach.

MR. BOSI: Understood.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: That way we have something to throw up, I guess. But -- we're jumping back into C, but --

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. County libraries.

MS. MATTHES: ***I'm Marilyn Matthes. I'm the library director and, obviously, Page 131 is where libraries start.

And we have, obviously, excess capacity in our buildings, and we have no construction plans in this 10-year time period.

We are struggling to keep up with the level of service for books, because our meager impact fee funds are going to pay debt service for our existing buildings. So it is becoming more of a struggle, but we're not too far off.

Do you have any questions?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Anyone have questions?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I do.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Yes.

Marilyn, I have a question for you. With the new technology and everything and Kindles and everything else, are you getting less and less people into the libraries also?

MS. MATTHES: It varies. Certainly, technology is helping a certain segment of the population to use services in a different way.

What I'm going to hand out is -- shows a challenge for libraries. We're struggling to -- thank you, Mike. We're struggling to purchase ebooks, downloadable ebooks, audio books, because there are several publishers that don't sell to libraries. There are some publishers who double or triple the price to libraries for that kind of information, and it's a struggle.

So we're not at the point where we are going totally ebook or without print anymore. There's certainly a good segment of the population that still relies on print.

We have certainly a growing segment that does appreciate the ebooks and the electronic access, and we've tried to emphasize that.

Probably from 2010 to 2011 our circulation of ebooks has more than doubled, if not tripled, and it continues to go up, but we also have trouble purchasing the materials we need.

The sheet I handed out shows you a comparison of library pricing for three separate formats, the books, the ebooks, and the audio books. And for print books, it's pretty close. You can buy a print book for about what the library can buy it for.

Ebooks, downloadable ebooks, is a bit more dramatic, and the same is true of audio books, whether they're audio book downloads or actually the book on CD that we have in the library.

There's a lot of discussions at the national level with publishers and trying -- and vendors and trying to get some concessions for libraries, but it still is difficult, and you can see the price differences.

So, you know, down the road, are we headed for a totally electronic library system? Probably not, and not very quickly. But we find that libraries are changing -- the people's use of libraries are changing. Fewer people have that home telephone, fewer people have actually that home Internet connection.

Our wireless capacity at the libraries, we've tried to emphasize that over the last few years, and think we currently have -- we're installing a different type of system for wireless that actually monitors the wireless and tells us how people are using it.

In three libraries that have the new routers that we're -- that we've purchased, over the last two weeks, we've had over 500 people use our wireless within our library system. People are coming and spending the day in libraries.

One library in particular maybe doesn't have a lot of circulation, our East Naples branch doesn't have a lot of circulation, but it's full most of the day with people reading books, magazines, newspapers, using the computers.

And so the way people are using libraries keeps changing, and we try to keep changing to provide that service that people are asking.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Brad, did you have --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I do have one question. It's a small question, and it -- it shows that we certainly have enough square feet. Do you think that level of service is good, or should we just back away and see what the future has? Because, like you say, the library's becoming more than just a place to go get books. It's really the community center for people that don't live in communities with community centers.

MS. MATTHES: We did track the number of people who come into our libraries. And do we ever have a time when all our chairs empty? Probably not all our chairs. Some libraries are utilized differently throughout different parts of the day.

You know, if you are looking for a quiet place to read and study, you would not go to the Golden Gate Library after 3 o'clock or the Naples Regional Library after 3 o'clock, when the, you know, school kids get out. But in the morning are there -- is there still capacity there? Sure.

I think the way we're going to be using space will keep changing. And as we try to respond to community requests, needs, we're going to be reconfiguring space as we can.

Some areas that we really haven't worked with a lot are the businesspeople in Collier County, and that's something that people throughout the country are starting to do more. They're looking to their library, not just the business community, but students and the general public, as -- looking at the library as a place to actually go to create content, whether it's -- they're writing their novel of their lifetime or they're preparing a presentation for the business community that they hope to start a business for, or the high school kids or, you know, the middle school kids are using libraries to create their class projects.

So do we have enough space now? Yes. Should we want to add those kinds of programs later on, do

we have the capacity? Not without major configuration.

And some of our libraries have limitations. Our newer libraries have actually small study rooms for small groups, two or three up to 10, 15 individuals, and -- but some of our older libraries don't have that capacity, and we're finding that people do want to work collaboratively, and we need to make it so that they're not disturbing the rest of the public who are coming in looking for a quiet place to study.

So, yes, right now we're okay. As needs change, certainly, I would recommend down the road that we look at these additional uses and make sure that we can provide the space before we sign on for additional programs.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'm good.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Phil.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Just one question. The increase in ebooks, whether they're Kindles, Nooks, or whomever -- and I know that you facilitate the downloading or rental of those.

But in the past, people that read hardcover books, softcover books, and so forth would donate them, when they're done reading, to the library. Is there a mechanism that, when you're done reading your ebook, that we could donate read ebooks to the library?

MS. MATHES: No, there's not. There's license restrictions that prohibit people from doing that.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I mean, we could do it, but it would be illegal, probably? That's okay.

MS. MATTHES: No comment.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I move we forward 2012 AUIR library facilities as per the summary form.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Second?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Motion approved 7-0.

Thank you.

MS. MATTHES: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: ***Mike, let me ask a question about the CIE. Is there anybody who would not have to come back if we voted on it now?

MR. BOSI: Well, I think they're -- they've already left the building.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It's -- the court reporter has to and --

MR. BOSI: It's just a formality. You've already approved all the components that make up -- there's no modifications to that program, so it's simply if you would just recommend forwarding it.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Then I recommend we approve the 2012 CIE as presented.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Second? Anyone?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Oh, I thought you were doing it. Second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: No, no. I was asking for a second.

All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. CIE is approved 7-0. Okay.

So let's take a lunch break and come back at 1:15.

MR. BOSI: And at 1:15, it would be scheduled, I believe -- the next step would be the beginning of the Category B, would be jails and law enforcement.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Can we make sure they -- they're here?

MR. BOSI: Yeah, I know they're watching to see their place in line. Thank you, chair.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Thank you.

(A luncheon recess was had.)

MR. BOSI: We have a live mike.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Welcome back, everyone.

***We're going to pick up with, I believe, county jails.

MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. For the record, Greg Smith, chief of administration for the Collier County Sheriff's Office.

You have the report in front of you. There are no planned new construction projects within the next five years related to correctional facilities, and I'll stand for questions.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Anyone have any questions?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Just one. Is the Immokalee Jail Center still open or not? I occasionally see that you have activities going on out there, but --

MR. SMITH: It's never been closed. It's been underutilized, and that's by design, in order to, you know, get some staffing efficiencies and, you know, make the budget numbers work and that sort of thing. We've just been, like, combining. But it's always been open for booking.

And right now it's playing an integral part in some of the preventative maintenance that's going on with the main jail over here. We're having, like, close-down housing units there, and we transfer those inmates to Immokalee while we renovate their housing units here. So it's still active, still open.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: If you need it, it's there.

MR. SMITH: If we need it, it's there.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Hopefully we don't need it.

Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Go ahead, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll stand for a motion. I move we forward 2012 AUIR for jails and correction facilities as per the summary form.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Second.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Motion approved 7-0.

Chief, you're going to continue?

MR. SMITH: ***Okay. Which brings us to county law enforcement facilities.

The only thing of significance that I'd like to bring to your attention is the proposed facility at

Orangetree. That does come on the horizon in the next five-year cycle, and a facility that we do have a need for and that we will be asking the county to consider moving towards the design portion of that project.

Okay. Any questions?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Question. What does that -- what does that facility entail?

MR. SMITH: It is a substation. It houses all the law enforcement operational units that are dedicated to our District 4 out in the rural fringe area, to include Golden Gate Estates.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: No incarceration area?

MR. SMITH: No, no incarceration area.

MR. BOSI: And, currently -- they've been operating out of a temporary facility --

MR. SMITH: Doublewide trailer.

MR. BOSI: -- a doublewide trailer for how many years?

MR. SMITH: For the past six years now.

MR. BOSI: Yeah. So that's one of the next really needed areas of our improvement. We need to transition those officers for that geographic area to be able to support the facilities.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Ready? I move we forward the 2012 AUIR for law enforcement facilities as per the summary form.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Motion approved 7-0.

MR. SMITH: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Thank you.

Mike, are we at a standstill?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Dan Summers or something.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Emergency medical.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, we don't need --

MR. BOSI: Well, we had members of our facility management team here. Maybe they're still stuck at lunch; they cover government buildings.

On the Category B facilities, we have EMS, government buildings, and Isles of Capri Fire Control, and Ochopee Fire Control Rescue District.

I think we definitely would need for Dan to be here for EMS, but for Isle of Capri and Ochopee, I could at least cover on the surface.

Those two facilities have improvements, one at Mainsail Drive; the other is a permit situation at Port of the Islands. But both have said, and both have said for the past three years, that those facilities can only be brought on, one at the Mainsail Drive, when that fifth tower associated with the development comes on, and that will have the corresponding -- will bring the corresponding impact fee association with it for -- to complete the revenue necessity.

And Ochopee, it's -- when the funding does become available, they want to, you know, make that temporary station, which they're working out of a hotel room right now in Isle of Capri to a -- or Port of the Islands, I'm sorry, to a permanent station.

There was some discussion at the Board of County Commissioners about potentially trying to find additional ad valorem dollars to help with the construction of that permanent station. That hasn't gone -- it

hasn't gone forward yet, but that may be an alternative solution to the current proposal, and the current proposal is to continue to wait until funds do become available.

So both of the dependent fire districts have identified the areas where they need their new improvement, but they've also --

COMMISSIONER EBERT: They don't have the money.

MR. BOSI: -- said it's not programmed for anywhere within the five-year program. It's in the out-years. And as the conditions further define themselves related to the revenue, you know, that will be the dictation as to when they move forward.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay.

MR. BOSI: And I think I could probably, on the surface, be able to handle some questions related to those two dependent fire districts, if there were any. But, basically, it's -- they're standing put until, you know, the revenue situation unveils itself.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: If I might?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: In the case of Isles Capri, they are currently not attaining their level of service to Fiddler's Creek; is that correct?

MR. BOSI: (Nods head.)

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Level of service, negative four minutes. They're at seven?

MR. BOSI: Correct. And as you see, their existing station is outside of that 1.5-mile radius, the four minute response time, and that's why the need for that Mainsail Drive location is that next location. But as I said --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: They don't have land, they say, and they don't have the money.

MR. BOSI: Well, they do have land.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: They do?

MR. BOSI: As part of the condition of that PUD, the provision for space for the Isle of Capri has to be made, but it's not triggered until the fifth building is constructed.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Until the fifth building is started?

MR. BOSI: Yes. That's where the commitment for the space availability comes into play. That's also why it's tied -- that improvement is tied to that next building.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Has the building cost been re-evaluated? It looks like it's just the same number carried forward the last couple years. Are they going to wait until they may actually be able to fund it to look at that again?

MR. BOSI: The building cost has remained stagnant, and it's just because they haven't had the revenues to try to identify, and it's just -- and the impact fee study updates haven't reflected a -- I think, an increase within the building costs that we've incorporated with -- into the AUIR.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Does anyone have any other questions?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I have a question.

Mike, in the Hammock Oaks, isn't it three towers are built, and you're saying the fifth one, or is there four towers built?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: There's three.

MR. BOSI: I believe there's three.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Three, yeah. So I think you're saying the fifth one. In other words, one will be built. It will be the last of the towers.

MR. BOSI: Yeah, they've always -- they've already had -- the fifth tower was the tower that -- where the -- triggers the mechanism, they believe, for --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. So they've got two more towers to go.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: It's going to be a while.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And it's too bad we can't get their site to be moved up closer to 951 rather than way back there where it is.

MR. BOSI: Well, the one advantage about way back there is they're right on the water. And that facility does -- does have a pretty sophisticated dive team, and they're able to, you know, address fires within

both on the water as well, so that does give them an advantage at that location. But I understand.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Not the Mainsail. I'm talking about the Mainsail only. You're saying down -- the Isles of Capri, yes.

MR. BOSI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But the Mainsail's not.

MR. BOSI: Yeah, no, the Mainsail, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It would be nice to get -- okay.

MR. BOSI: And the interesting part about that Mainsail, there is a fire station just to the north of it, and I believe it's East Naples; they have a mutual aid agreement with them, so they help -- it helps offset the issues that could arise on Mainsail Drive.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: But none have come up? No issues have come up?

MR. BOSI: No.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Fire?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: You want to take them one at a time?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: 2012 AUIR -- oh, recommend approval of 2012 Isles of Capri Fire and Rescue District as per the summary form.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: ***Move approval of the 2012 Ochopee Fire Control District AUIR as per the summary form.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Second.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Both motions approved 7-0.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Move for adjournment.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Next up?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: We're getting down to the short ones now.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: County facilities.

MR. JONES: ***You ready for me?

Good afternoon. Hank Jones from facilities management. County buildings, county government buildings.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Can you speak into the speaker there?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: The microphone.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Microphone.

MR. JONES: Oh, sorry about that.

Basically, we have no new projects scheduled in the next five years, so it's a really easy -- easy report for me. But I'm glad to answer any questions you might have.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: You have excess capacity?

MR. JONES: Yes, we do. We have surplus capacity right now of about 211-, excuse me, square feet -- 211,000 square feet. It's shown on that graph that we've been tracking.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Any questions?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Small one. Building 8, isn't that a three-story building, or do we not own the third floor or --

MR. JONES: Wait a minute now. It's three stories, but it's ready for a -- it was built for a fourth story in the future some day.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. But in here we're listing only the first two. Is the third -- is the occupant of the third something different?

MR. BOSI: Public utilities. They probably own it.

MR. JONES: Okay. That's right, that's right, that's right. Utilities is on the third floor. That's the trick in dividing this up between general government buildings and the other district.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay.

MR. JONES: Divisions.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Makes sense. Ready?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Ready.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I move we forward the 2012 AUIR for government buildings as per the summary form.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Motion approved 7-0.

Thank you.

MR. JONES: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: That was easy.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Okay. Mike, do your dance.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Last but not least, EMS.

MR. BOSI: ***Yeah, EMS, and we have no representatives here in attendance --

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Dan, are you out there?

MR. BOSI: -- as of now. I did email them. I thought they were going to be here. I don't know if something came up within their schedule.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Do you want to take a shot?

MR. BOSI: I know enough to be able to answer the top-level questions that you may have.

The one thing I do -- there are no improvements to Year 5. Year 5 is the station at Vanderbilt Beach Road and Logan Boulevard. That has been their next improvement for the past couple of years, the next new improvement for the next -- for the last couple years. That is there. They say they're in the greatest need in terms of a hole within their coverage area to meet their levels-of-service time.

Within EMS there's a level of service for their urbanized area as an eight-minute response time and, for the rural portion to the county, a 12-minute response time.

One of the larger questions, I think, related to EMS, and it's reflected on Page 147, their summary form, and it's what is the strategy the county would like to employ moving forward for the next wave of improvements?

There's an option to add the station construction, which is the traditional mannerism, you can add an ambulance and equipment, and that is more of a floating type of a location. They wouldn't build a new -- a new station, but the ambulance would potentially utilize existing stations or park at a centralized location and respond in that manner. You can see there's a difference within the cost to provide that provision.

And then there's a third option to add ALS non-transport vehicle and equipment, which is a little bit more of a reduced coverage option, but it does result in lesser of a cost and lesser of a need for general revenue to augment the funds.

One of the things about Emergency Management Services that has been a troubling point for the Planning Commission, as well as the Board of County Commissioners, is the inventory of our existing facilities; a number of them are not owned by EMS. And so, because of that -- and if I recall correctly, the impact fee level of service is one station to about 30,000 people.

We have a level of service that's adopted that's one station to about 16,000 individuals. Because of that, our impact fee only pays for about half of each new station that's going to be constructed.

So EMS really has to depend upon the general revenue to close that gap. If your impact fee is only -- is only programmed to fund 50 percent, the only other source for funding for that is from the general revenue source, and that's why these options are being presented. And, of course, the -- on the surface, you're saying, we need the best we can get, but with that comes the obligation for the financial contribution from the general revenue fund, and that is one of the issues that makes the decision making a little bit more complicated.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: That is a big subject. It really is.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Under the revenues listed, what year is this based off of?

MR. BOSI: The revenues that are provided within the summary page were the ones that OMB and Susan, who's in attendance, had generated for us. So I would imagine the past -- the past year's ad valorem fiscal reports were the portion that helped generate the revenue summaries.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: So if we're looking at this option in five years, this could be totally different?

MR. BOSI: Oh, absolutely. The -- these revenue are reflective upon an impact fee collection environment that is much different than -- the need for that new improvement, if the growth -- and you heard the school district say, you know, four years ago we had lost a thousand -- or a hundred students. The following year we added a hundred students. Last year we added 300. This year they're expecting to add 600.

You start seeing, well, there's a trend, there's a connection, and there's individuals. If they're adding -- if we're adding school-aged children to the -- to our school capacity, that means those parents, more than likely, are coming down here for economic opportunity or for relocation for whatever purpose it is.

That would signal that there is sort of -- that healing process within the local market and would suggest, if you do -- a regression analysis would suggest that trend is starting to move positively forward.

So yes, the -- when the station begins to migrate more towards Year 3, towards Year 2, I think you'll see a little bit more augmentation to the revenues that are being provided.

But as of now, this picture has to be -- we have to look back to be able to determine what the revenue projections are. And based upon the nature of our county and how -- the directions we've had from the Board of County Commissioners, the direction to Susan is to be very conservative in those estimates because, you know, we don't want to project, you know, that we're going to have, you know, X amount of dollars where we know we're only going to have, you know, some degree below that. That's not the best way for capital improvement programming. I mean, we'd much rather have it the other way.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Well, it seems like, like you said, if people are moving in, but they're probably moving into places that have already paid impact fees. So as we get closer to the five years, then hopefully we'll start to see some increase in revenues from impact to contribute towards this.

MR. BOSI: Well -- correct, and I was somewhat remiss for not pointing that out during the overview. That is one of the issues with the current situation. We're going to add populations, but those populations aren't necessarily going to have new impact fees associated with them, because they're simply picking up the slack of surplus that we still have left over from those boom construction years.

But at some point in time, our inventories are starting to become a little bit more in balance and

hitting to the point where the developers -- the activity at North Horseshoe, which by no means is nowhere near what we were at the beginning of the millennia, is much -- it's a -- there's more activity, more activity than what was going on two or three years ago.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: And we're seeing more activity coming through our board as well.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Just a question, if you can answer it, Mike. I'm looking at Page 149, the population. Where in the world do those numbers come from?

MR. BOSI: The EMS system is countywide, so it is the countywide peak season population.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Okay. Versus the other population numbers, exclude Naples and Marco or --

MR. BOSI: For community parks --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: No, no, no. If you look at the table on Page 4 of your overview, with those numbers, how do they relate to the population numbers on Page 149? I mean, I'm -- I don't see the connection or the explanation of the difference.

MR. BOSI: Page 4 of the staff report you're referring to?

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Yes.

MR. BOSI: Yeah. Page 4 of your staff report, you are looking at permanent population only. So if you would look at 355,440, if you multiplied that by 1.2, you would get your total that -- that is the end basis for -- the end basis for the EMS system.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Well, just as a note, if you could annotate that, peak population or something, for us that --

COMMISSIONER EBERT: If you can --

CHAIRMAN AHERN: It says it at the top.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: If you can make it more clear for all of us.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Where does it say it? I missed it.

MR. BOSI: I guess -- it says 2012 AUIR, parens, peak season, but maybe I -- I should have said pre -- peak season countywide.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Okay. Way up at the top I see peak season. All right, I'm sorry.

MR. BOSI: And at the very -- at the beginning of the summary page, I think we do point out that using countywide peak seed (sic) populations. I could be a little bit more explicit on the table. And I apologize.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I give up.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Mike, did you say they -- the vehicles -- they do not own all of their vehicles?

MR. BOSI: The vehicles they own. It's the stations.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Oh, okay.

MR. BOSI: It's the stations. They don't own about half of the stations that we currently -- that we -- currently exist. Sometimes in -- an interesting note, one of the things about seven, eight years ago, we were really starting to focus and try the concept of co-location. I think everyone can appreciate the advantages, the efficiencies that co-location has for government buildings.

Co-location with the -- and for the most part, for the EMS, it's traditionally with your fire development. Because the fire departments are independent, we would rent space out of -- we would rent space out of one of the independent fire districts. We -- that -- that's kind -- that helps us meet our levels-of-service standards, but it hurts us on our impact fees, because we can't include -- we can only include the equipment we own as part of the impact fees as the cost to provide the service. We can't -- we can do nothing related to even the monthly rent charges that we provide for that space.

So that's really -- it's a Catch 22. You want the efficiencies of co-locations, but because the fire districts are independent entities, we go into their buildings, when we do our impact fee calculations, we don't get to -- we don't get to -- we don't get to count or classify the buildings that they're housed in to be able to reflect into the equation that determines what the impact fee should be.

That's why I said, you know, it basically is about 50 percent the cost of providing the service for the impact fees. And it's nothing that -- we can't cure that. We can only -- the only way to cure that is to build your own dependent station, but that goes against the fabric of what the co-location advantages are supposed to be.

So it's a unique situation, and it's one that general-purpose county government has struggled with, and the Board of County Commissioners has struggled with because it's -- I mean, out of all these services that we're providing, EMS and fire and law enforcement, of those basic health, safety, welfare components that have to be adhered to.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Mike, just -- I mean, let's just take a brand new station. That new fire station, it will be co-used and then, ultimately, we'll want to move out.

The impact fees for the fire district would build the station, the full station. We would go in and rent a portion of it, and then sooner or later we're going to move out in our own station. Can't we put the full impact of the new station, you know, the one we will build to move out into --

MR. BOSI: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- and escrow that while we're renting? I mean, why do we --

MR. BOSI: Well, it would have to -- that new station has -- it has to be constructed. There can be outstanding financial obligations to be able to include it, but you still -- until it's constructed, you can't include that in part of your impact fee calculation.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And there's no way we could build these buildings such that they're like duplexes where each one's building their own portion of it?

MR. BOSI: If we were able to reach agreements with whatever fire district that we were negotiating with, we most certainly could. We would construct and pay for our portion of the building. And that, to me, is probably the strategy that would be employed to be able to address the issue without having the collateral side issues associated with it.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: That would be good.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Just timing, I think, is the biggest issue in trying to do that.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: The one -- the locations that are proposed, do you know the background on how that was determined?

MR. BOSI: Well, I know it's basic -- it's determined in terms of the response times, the number of calls, and which stations are going to be able to address the highest numbers of calls and provide the greatest increase in meeting the level -- or meeting the response times that we have allocated.

Other than that general -- that's the formula of how they make the determination, and it's all numbers based. It's all numbers based upon number of calls for the geographic areas compared to other geographic areas. The station locations, which areas, based upon the spacial location of theirs, which station -- which areas have the highest numbers of calls and have the greatest distance for them to travel, and then that's where they fill in -- fill in that next improvement to be able to provide the greatest new efficiencies within the system.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Any other questions?

MR. BOSI: But like I said, that next wave is Year 5. There's still -- there's still a lot of debate that has to go on with the community as to what's the correct strategy moving forward. And I don't -- and I know there's not a decision at this time yet of what that will be.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: It seems premature to try to narrow or focus in on one particular strategy at this point.

MR. BOSI: Well, I think -- I think all the options are on the table.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Right.

MR. BOSI: And they do want to make sure that they are so they can find whatever will be the most effective in terms of not only -- in terms of affecting the response times in the system, but the recognition of the realities of the revenue.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Right. When we get closer, we'll know -- have a better idea of what the revenue stream is going to be.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: When they get along, we'll know.

MR. BOSI: And you'll see this again next year if we see -- if we see more growth, and if you see -- more particular in this, if you see -- if their system sees more of a trend towards not meeting within that area, they're going to have to bring it closer in. That discussion will become -- they'll have to be here with more solutions identified because it is becoming more of that reality, because it's Year 3 where you -- when you see something in Year 3, money is starting to be spent.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Right.

MR. BOSI: Year 5 is still that out-year. You know, some -- maybe some tentative planning going on, but Year 3, you start seeing some -- you start seeing some efforts towards acquisition, those type of due diligence activities that are the beginning of the process.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Right. Okay.

Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Here we go.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Here we go.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I move we forward with a recommendation of approval of 2012 AUIR emergency medical services as per the summary form.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Motion approved 7-0.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And that's it, Mike, right?

CHAIRMAN AHERN: I think that's all of them.

All right. Public comment? Anyone want to come up?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I just have one comment, and I say it every year. But like Karen pointed out, we've always imagined some day we'd have a Category C, which is going through all the GMP, and there's a lot of things in there that are timely.

For example, the watershed, had we had Category C, we would have remembered it the first year it was behind, not the tenth when we finally focused on it.

And then affordable housing was always one thing else. Is that something we only talk about at the end of the AUIR or -- because I think it would be -- if we had something in the GMP that's timely, I think those things that are not categories do not need a vote but do need a reminder, it would be a good idea to put in the AUIR.

MR. BOSI: And that idea, you're right, you have surfaced it before, because -- the watershed management initiative, that was a policy that we had within our Growth Management Plan in 1989 when we adopted it. It wasn't until two years ago that we actually followed through, or a year ago that we followed through and actually completed the initiative, and there's probably a myriad of reasons why that was delayed.

And during the EAR process, we tried to look at that. We tried to look and identify those time commitments, those commitments that were -- were tied to a specific date, but we haven't -- in trying to call those out. But we did -- we didn't coalesce them in the back of an appendix.

And I guess with that directive from the Planning Commission, Corby, we need to identify all time commitments within policies within the Growth Management Plan.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: If you just flip through it, you'll find them. Make a list.

MR. BOSI: Just for informational purposes.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Right. And then, you know, just make the list of what they are, add new ones, take off old ones, and then put "in progress," you know, "nothing happening," just so that we don't

forget them, because the watershed is an example of a very important one that was -- kept getting punted. And then after it got punted into 2000, I think it just was, you know, orphaned, you know, until we all started to worry about it.

MR. BOSI: Well -- and one of the things we also -- the watershed management was -- like I said, it was almost 20 years out-due. The parks master plan was another one that we had for seven and eight years that we had never completed, and we finally have that approved by the Board of County Commissioners.

So there are some that we made progress on, but I know there are some other dates out there, Brad, as you suggest, that we need to kind of remind ourselves that we have to do this at some point in time. And whether it be because -- for lack of funds, budgeting, whatever, we still need to be reminded to be able to adequately ensure that we maybe, you know, can plan for those type of activities and budget for it moving forward.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So get an intern or somebody to invent Category C for us.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Would you like to volunteer to do that?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: If they need a playmate, I'll join them, so --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: You know --

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: -- just to add another follow-on to that, I personally would really applaud an effort that could have the various master plans, whether it be watershed or parks master plan or whatever, to have those efforts driving, directly driving, you know, with some side input as to things that we're not addressing. But to have the plans which are vetted driving the AUIR, which is where everything -- the rubber meets the road instead of, sort of, back there in the background somewhere.

MR. BOSI: But, really, the AUIR is designed to satisfy levels-of-service standards.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: I understand.

MR. BOSI: And I -- maybe we'll have to think about that a little bit more how that -- their relationship -- because you're right, the relationship of the individual master plans dictate the shape and prescribe how we move forward for any -- for addressing water, how we address the transportation master plan, school master plan, parks master plan, how that moves forward, and in a relationship between -- I mean, there's a direct relationship between the parks master plan and the AUIR, you know, in terms of how it, you know, allocates, you know, program events for regional parks and community parks.

And there is a direct linkage. And maybe I'll have to -- I'll have to figure out a better way to be able to present that. But it has to be in something in summary form, because all of a sudden this AUIR would come --

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: No, no, no.

MR. BOSI: -- with a thousand-page addendum.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: Time out. I did not mean to suggest that I want to review all the master plans here at all.

MR. BOSI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: What I'm trying to suggest is that if we could see the connection and the drivers coming out of the various master planning efforts --

MR. BOSI: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: -- that are the principal drivers into the AUIR, then, to me, that would make a connection that says you guys are planning in the individual components, the crystallization of those plans, directly influences the budget, directly influences the AUIR, et cetera, and --

MR. BOSI: Understood.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: No, I don't want to review the master plans.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Any other comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Okay. Mike, thank you very much for all of your assistance today.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: And Corby.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: And Corby as well.

MR. BOSI: And I would like to personally thank the Planning Commission, Mr. Schiffer, too, for --

and hopefully we'll see you back here at some point in time.

But I know it's -- it's a little bit of a different animal than the type of work that you normally tackle, but it's directly related to all the PUD -- all the PUDs, all the rezonings, all the conditional uses. There's a tie into it all, and we appreciate the time and effort and energy, and the compensation we pay you has to be gratitude.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Let me just say from experience, the reason it's easy these last couple years is there's no money to spend.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: You go back into the cowboy days, this is a two-day battleground, and it's a very -- this is probably one of the most important things we do, even though it does seem to, you know, slide smoothly.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It's because there's nothing to do.

MR. BOSI: Oh, when we've got that growth demands that we were experiencing, if -- sometimes we do again, it is, because what I said, this is part of -- this is the other part of that economic development equation is maintaining the sense of place.

I mean, you hear of everyone who speaks of Collier County when they come here. They're impressed by the built environment. Well, this is part of maintaining that built environment.

So you're right, Brad, it -- when there's a lot more growth, there's a lot more pressure here.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: And I just want to say thank you, Brad. I've enjoyed serving with you over the last three years.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It's been fun.

COMMISSIONER BROUGHAM: We're going to need to have you write down your formula for motion making, though. We've got to document it.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It's simple. Watch the rerun a couple times.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: What would Brad do?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But then let me make my last motion. I move adjourn.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Oh, so moved.

COMMISSIONER VONIER: Second.

CHAIRMAN AHERN: Meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by order of the Chair at 1:50 p.m.

COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION


MELISSA AHERN, CHAIRMAN
Keene

ATTEST
DWIGHT E. BROCK, CLERK

These minutes approved by the Board on 11/1/2012, as presented or as corrected _____.

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED ON BEHALF OF GREGORY COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC.,
BY TERRI LEWIS, COURT REPORTER AND NOTARY PUBLIC.