

July 7, 2016

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING OF THE
COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Naples, Florida, July 7, 2016

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: Mark Strain
Wafaa F. Assaad
Stan Chrzanowski
Diane Ebert
Karen Homiak
Charlette Roman

ALSO PRESENT:

Corby Schmidt, Principal Planner
Heidi Ashton-Cicko, Managing Assistant County Attorney
Tom Eastman, School District Representative

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good morning, everyone.

Welcome to the Thursday, July 7th meeting of the Collier County Planning Commission.

If everybody will please rise for Pledge of Allegiance.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Before we start our roll call, I would like to make an announcement that Andy Solis, who used to be sitting to Diane's right, has resigned effective the 23rd or 24th. He has decided to run for County Commission seat for District 2. So we certainly will miss his guidance on this committee, and I appreciate all the time he has spent here. He was a good person to work with.

Diane, would you please do the roll call.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Yes. Good morning.

Mr. Eastman?

MR. EASTMAN: Here.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Mr. Chrzanowski?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Here.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Ms. Ebert is here.

Chairman Strain?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Here.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Ms. Homiak?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Here.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Mr. Assaad?

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Here.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: And, Ms. Roman?

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: Here.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. We have one item on today's agenda. I don't know of any addenda. I can tell by the overwhelming amount of public here today this is going to be a really in-depth discussion. And I'm saying that facetiously. It's quite an empty room.

So with that we'll move right into the next item: Planning Commission absences. It's July 21st. Does anybody know if they can't make it to the July 21st meeting? And we actually have two items on that meeting but they're going to be heard currently. It's the Pelican Marsh PUDA, so...

MR. EASTMAN: I will not be here, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Thank you, Tom.

Anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So it looks like we'll still have a quorum.

Approval the minutes. We received two packages of minutes. We'll start with the first one; May 25th, 2016. Does anybody have any changes or corrections? If not, is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: I'll move to approve.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Second.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Made by Charlette. Seconded by Karen.

Discussion?

(No response.)

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 6-0.

The second set was the June 2nd meeting. Same question; any changes and corrections? If not, is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: Move to approve.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Second.

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: I have a small suggestion for the minutes. Would you be kind enough to put the item when you begin discussion of -- when you begin writing the discussion on the topic?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, that's -- I'm not sure how she would do that if it's not said. I mean, we announce it, so...

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: If you're looking -- if I want to read -- when I get 70 pages of minutes, I want to retract one of the items, I don't know where to find it. It takes a long time to go down and see where we are.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: If you hit Control F and type in a keyword, like the name of the project or something, it will take you right to it.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Say that again.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Control -- one of the keys, the CTRL key; Control F. A little window pops up in the top, and you type in -- type in your name, and it will take you to every item, every comment you make.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: I put my name and get every item?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Every comment you made.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: BCC report and recaps: Ray's not -- Ray's -- that's okay, Ray. We can catch it next meeting.

Chairman's report: There's nothing new.

So we will move on to consent agenda, which has nothing.

***And then we'll move directly into our only advertised item for today. It's 9A. This has been continued from the June 16th Planning Commission meeting. It's PL-20130002636/CPSP2013-11. It's a resolution for self -- county-initiated amendments to the Growth Management Plan.

All those wishing to testify on behalf of this item, please rise to be sworn in by the court reporter. (The speakers were duly sworn and indicated in the affirmative.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Disclosures on the part of the Planning Commission.

MR. EASTMAN: None.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: We have disclosures on --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It's under advertised public hearings, so I was just going to do it. I don't think it matters.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Is this -- okay. So --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It doesn't matter.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: If we talked to staff?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I would just -- I was just acknowledging it for the record because it's pretty standard. We always do it. I don't see what it makes a difference since it's a scheduled hearing.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: I talked to myself a little on this one, but that's it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I hope you got a good answer.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Nothing I like.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I talked to staff.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And I, too, have had conversations with staff; nobody in the public.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Nothing.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Nothing.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Charlette?

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: None.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Corby, you normally start out with some kind of introduction, and then if the Planning Commission doesn't have any objection -- this is 122 pages of information -- usually we take it, you know, five or 10 pages at a time. Does that still work for everybody?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. That's what we'll do after we hear from Corby.

MR. SCHMIDT: Good morning, Commissioners. For the record, Corby Schmidt, principal planner with the Comprehensive Planning Department.

This morning we're here to hear the second batch of staff-initiated amendments to the Growth Management Plan. In this batch it includes the elements Conservation and Coastal Management, the Future Land Use Element, and a number of Future Land Use Map changes, the Golden Gate Area Master Plan and map changes there, Stormwater Management Sub-Element, Transportation Element, and the Capital Improvement Element of the GMP.

The greatest number of these changes are housecleaning or glitch amendments simply to add clarity, correct text or map errors or omissions, and provide internal consistency with other components of the GMP.

Some of them are associated with changes either that have taken place or are taking place with the Land Development Code.

Noticing here that there are some substantial changes being proposed to the Stormwater Management Sub-Element which would remove or move offsite discharge rates into another document. And also to mention that for a -- for two of these, the CCME and the FLUE, you will be seated as the Environmental Advisory Council for action.

This is where the listing begins in your staff report for the individual changes themselves. And I -- if it's all right with the Chair, I'd go over some of the more notable entries.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: What we ought to do, Corby, if we're going to work our way through the document, why don't we -- when we get to those pages, you could speak up and introduce them and -- to the point that you were going to now, and then we can ask our questions. Does that work?

MR. SCHMIDT: It does.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. The package is pretty much standard informational parts for the staff report through Page 15, and then on Page 15 we start with some narrative that is after the end of the staff report.

Does anybody have any questions? And, Corby, did you have any comments up through Page 15?

MR. SCHMIDT: I'm able to answer questions, but none that I would add.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody have any questions for the beginning part of it?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: I'm not sure -- I'm looking at numbers on pages and a lot of these are --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh, that's right.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: -- renumbered, and I'm not sure where you're talking about.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm trying to figure out how to accomplish this.

Staff report is through Page 10, and that's actually -- okay. I'll have to figure out a different way to reference it for you-all.

So let's just go through the staff report. Does anybody have anything through the -- through Page 10

of the staff report?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Other than the EAC.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah. I don't have anything.

And then what happens is, right after the staff report, we begin -- we have a page that says it's intentionally left blank, and then we move into -- it's titled 2.3, the extent of vacant and developable land, and that's the first part of the new text outside of the staff report, and that's kind of where most of this will be coming from, I believe. So --

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, following the staff report are a number of support documents for some of the changes being proposed.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. So the question becomes where, what page or what part of the report do you have your first comments on, Corby?

MR. SCHMIDT: I've prepared them to be as they came up in the staff report itself and then referenced in the resolution exhibits. So it's both places that I'm prepared for.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, then, you know, I think the easiest way is probably let's go through your highlights, and then we'll go back in and walk through the document for any changes or any questions from the various pages --

MR. SCHMIDT: Fair enough.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- since we all aren't reading off the page, more or less.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Do we go back to the staff report?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah. He's -- well, Corby's going to provide some highlights to the -- some more special issues that he wants to make us aware of, and then we'll move back right where we left off just now.

MR. SCHMIDT: And I would. I'm going to be working from the staff report itself where I have the notes that meet in the most (sic), and it is beginning on Page 2 of the staff report. And there are a number of changes here in these batch amendments that came from Board direction. At one time or another, we were asked to make certain changes, and those are reflected in these changes or in these amendments.

The first one being about mid page on Page 2 where it indicates in the CCME to revise Objective 2.1. This is recent direction from the county board in April of this year, and some of the support documents you just reached include the executive summary from that day along with a white paper explaining what that was all about.

The next one is the very next listing revising Policy 3.1.4. And there, again, a number of the changes in this batch are because of changes or revisions being made to the LDC or that have been, and this is one of those.

This is changing Wellfield Risk Management Zone language, and that follows LDC changes from their Section 36AA.

The next listing worth noting, about three lower on the page, Objective 7.1 and 7.1.2. These are simply no longer needed references to documents because things have changed with the regulations at those levels.

There's some explanation there, and we have staff from environmental to explain that if you have questions.

Moving on to the next page where there are levels-of-service standards mentioned under the Capital Improvement Element. Again, some of these changes come to you in groupings, and in this case it is one of those that came from changes in the previous Annual Inventory and Update Report, the AUIR.

So in Policies 1.5.D and 1.5.E, those levels of services have changed in the AUIR, and those changes are reflected here.

Moving down the page, another one worth noting: Although there are now statutory references that are more accurate, but we all -- we seem to refer to it as House Bill 7207, a number of changes -- comprehensive changes came down a number of years ago codified by 2011-139 and now appear in Chapter 163 and so on in the subsections.

Here with Policy 4.1 with the CIE, that reflects some of those changes in the way that a document is simply mentioned in another document.

4.2, a similar reference, where changes in 7207 allowed us to refer to other documents differently.

On to Page 4, there was a footnote section in the CIE that refers to abbreviations and acronyms used in the five-year schedule of the capital improvements and in the AUIR where funding sources are defined or explained.

In the last AUIR some of those changed, and when some of those changed, we looked at it comprehensively for the batch amendments and made wholesale changes to it to bring it all up to date.

On to the FLUE. About two-thirds of the way down on the page where it begins "eliminate ASI, Area of Significant Influence, there things have changed at the state level when it comes to Areas of Significant Influence. And in a previous cycle of LDC amendments -- and I believe it's from the first cycle of 2015 that was being recognized, but it has taken this long to make the changes in the Comprehensive Plan accordingly. So there's something that goes hand in hand.

The very next listing, revising the CIE policy references to 2.5, now numbered 2.6. That was a comprehensive change made in EAR-based amendments in the first batch of staff-proposed amendments and again here until we catch them all where levels-of-service standards were all moved into the CIE from the home -- let's call it the home documents where they were once mentioned.

On to the next page. The third bullet pointed listing there, the Rural Fringe Mixed Use District, again, something being given to us per board direction. The early entry bonuses for the Transfer of Development Rights Program was extended in '12 -- or from 2012 to 2015 and now again being asked to change from 2015 to 2018.

Moving down the page, looking at an entry that begins -- and there's a number of them -- revise RLSA policy -- overlay policy, 1.6 in this case. It's to reflect statutory changes concerning EAR-based amendments, and generally this is sort of a secondhand connection to the change in the statute.

Statute by House Bill 7207 was loosened up, let's say, so that every seven years counties who were previously required by the same rule to prepare an Evaluation and Appraisal Report no longer must do that every seven years. They now must have an Evaluation and Appraisal Review which tells the state whether there will be changes made to the Comprehensive Plan.

So at least in our pattern of activities, batch amendments coming along to you every couple years -- I think that's the way it seems to be falling into a schedule -- we may never have another full seventh-year EAR.

And so the way that the rule worked allows us to make changes as they are in this batch to the Rural Land Stewardship Overlay -- in this case just the map -- not waiting for an EAR. It can be done now, and that's simply what that one refers to.

A few more down on the page there's Policy 4.4, and that has the same effects; that change in the statute allows us to make that change, not necessarily waiting for an EAR to occur before we can make those changes.

The next one worth noting, revise RLSA Policy 5.5 and, here again, connected with changes to the use of documents, the listing of certain species and so forth, that are no longer needed as references in this document.

How we doing?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Just -- when you're finished, we'll go right -- we'll start through the whole program like we normally do.

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay. Then I'm going to continue, because we have a few more to note.

Now I'm to Page 6 with the Future Land Use Map Series, and the first entry there indicates that we're moving that horizon year for the mapping to indicate a five-year-further-in-the-future timeline.

Documents in your support section, before we reach the resolution, the area you already noted, some of those documents pertain to this change. It's simply a map change with support and data analysis.

Moving to the bottom of Page 6 in the Stormwater Management Sub-Element, this is an item that is partnered with another where those offsite discharge rates, by direction of the county board, were moved elsewhere.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Can we ask a question anytime we want?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Sure.

MR. SCHMIDT: I hope so.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: The item about offsite discharge rates being moved, is it being reconsidered, or is it still what they are and it's just being moved?

MR. SCHMIDT: I believe they still are what they are, and they're simply being moved.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So this is -- the additional basins are all -- that you show on here, that's the discharge rates you want on those additional basins?

MR. SCHMIDT: I'll have another staff member address that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We'll be getting to it again during our walk-through of the document as well, but that's okay; go ahead and answer.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Okay. No, no, no. I can wait.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Corby wanted to make some introductions and highlight the pieces that --

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: I can wait.

MS. MOSCA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I thought we'd walk through this like we normally do after Corby's introduction's complete.

MR. SCHMIDT: Continuing then on Page 7, there's a number of changes in the Transportation Element to the map series mostly having to do with the titles of the maps, dates on the maps, all associated with the Collier Planning Association -- or planning organization for the 2004 plan that is now, since it was written, adopted. The version I was working from was December of '15.

And that's it for my notes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Does anybody have any questions, general questions, they want to ask before we walk through the pages? I'm trying to figure out the best way to walk through the pages since I have them electronically and you have them by paper. I'll do the best I can to describe them.

Last time we -- a few minutes ago we left off on -- what I have is on Page 16, but it's the first text after the staff report. And it starts out 2.3, the extent on vacant and developable land.

And as Corby said, it's backup documentation. And it goes on for about 10 pages. I was wondering, can you tell us the value of those particular pages first? There are 10 -- I mean, I know what the data is, and I know what it says, but how did you use it for today's meeting?

MR. SCHMIDT: This information was prepared by Mr. Weeks, and I'll let him address that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. WEEKS: For the record, David Weeks, manager in the Comprehensive Planning section.

Commissioners, the purpose for that information is the support information for the change to the Future Land Use Map horizon year which currently goes out to 2025. We're pushing that out to 2030. But one of the requirements for the Future Land Use Element is that -- and the map is that we demonstrate that we have adequate land for different types of land uses; commercial, residential, industrial, et cetera, as well as infrastructure to meet the needs of the future population.

So when the Future Land Use Map pushes out, we need to demonstrate that, yes, we still have -- we will have adequate land for the different land uses, et cetera.

So that supporting information it not new. It was taken from the most recent EAR. The key point is -- that we point out is that even the 2015 population projections show a population less than the population projections from that last EAR to the same time period of 2030.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You kind of started to get into the question I had.

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The dating of some of the charts and all the other tables and the data is either 2003 in some cases and 2009 in the others. And we had a census in 2010. Why wouldn't we use more timely information? Because 2003, that's 13 years ago; 2009 is seven years ago. And that's why I was trying to understand how you use this information. Couldn't we have used newer, fresher information than this, David?

MR. WEEKS: We could have. What we were -- two things: One is, at least in some regard, most particularly looking at the land use, it was staff's judgment that from 2009 data up to about 2014 or '15 would have been the data year that we would have grabbed for this report -- did not think there was significant

change. Because of the economic downturn that we've experienced, we -- yes, we certainly had some growth, but it wasn't at the pace that it previously was. So if we have 10,000 more dwelling units in the big picture, we did not think that was significant, as an example.

Population's the same thing. The land use allocations that you see on one of those tables that shows how much is in agriculture, how much is in residential, et cetera, et cetera, again, we did not think it was significantly different, so we judged that it wasn't worth the effort to try to track down all of that information.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. That information continues for about 10 or 12 pages, and the charts finish up, and then we get into an executive summary that starts on Page 29 in my electronic files. I'm not sure what it starts on with yours.

Does anybody have any questions up -- for that back-up information?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, then if we move into the other body of the document, there's an executive summary about midway in concerning Stan's subject, the offsite flows, and we get right into this.

And maybe, Michele, this is a good time to make your -- have your discussion with Stan on those issues. And, Stan, do you know what section we're on then? Okay.

MS. MOSCA: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. For the record, Michele Mosca with capital planning staff.

Stan, to answer your question directly, some of the listing that's provided in the Stormwater Sub-Element, there are, in fact, errors such -- sorry -- such as the Harvey Canal Basin; the discharge rate is incorrect. We have some splits that need to be done. There's an omission; the Wiggins Pass basin.

So, really, the objective here is to remove the list from the Stormwater Sub-Element, publicly vet the proposed 16 new discharge rates through DSAC, and then again through Planning Commission and the Board.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Good. That's all I wanted to know.

MS. MOSCA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And that would take us -- if there's no other questions on moving this into a -- into the Land Development Code from the GMP, then that takes us through the stormwater piece, which was about 10 pages or so, and then we get to a blank page, and then we start with another page that's titled "Resolution No. 16-," and then that's where a lot of the information that we'll be discussing today for the remainder of the meeting comes into play.

It has an Exhibit A. Exhibit A to those pages say Conservation and Coastal Element, and in that we have the policies and changes that were made from the staff's side of things.

Electronically, it's on Page 42. I'm not sure what it is on yours. It says Page -- well, it's kind of blurred out on mine.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: It's 1 of 79.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: One of 79. Yeah, so let's start there. Through and up to that page, does anybody have any questions?

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: I have one question.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: It's just a clarification item. Okay. Let's see. I'm on Page 3 of 79, Item H, and it begins with future petroleum explanation -- exploration and production, and it's scratched out, and I'm wondering, did that move somewhere else?

MR. SCHMIDT: It did not move somewhere else. It already existed somewhere else.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: Okay.

MR. SCHMIDT: And so it was redundancy and not necessary in this document.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If we look at Page 42, which is 1 of 79 -- I'll try to refer to it as those pages from now on.

Policy 1.1.1, Collier County has established and will maintain an Environmental Advisory Council. I notice that the "will" is -- it's a housekeeping word to strengthen the sentence. Does that change any perspective from the fact that the EAC is not a separate body from the Board of County -- I mean, from the

Planning Commission? Does that have any effect on the changes we make?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Well, it is a separate body, but you're -- the Planning Commission serves as the EAC.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So this doesn't change that consistency then?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. If we move on, let's take it through Page 10 of 79. Does anybody have any questions through Page 10 of 79?

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: I had a question on Page 7 of 79.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: And I think this might be for Steve, possibly, as well. Just a consistency question. I noticed in some of the habitat preservation plans that there was a requirement in the example of the Florida scrub jay and the Florida black bear for informing local residents or public awareness, but in the other species, such as the gopher tortoise, the bald eagle, and the red-cockaded woodpecker there was no such comment about public awareness or inform local residents.

And so my question is why for the two and not for all of them?

MR. LENBERGER: That's a good question.

For the record, Stephen Lenberger, Engineering and Natural Resources Department.

Obviously, for the black bear it's to inform residents of the interactions with black bear, make sure you don't have conflicts, and that's pretty obvious to me.

For the scrub jay, I honestly don't know why it was put in there. Scrub Jay is -- the only place they exist in the county right now is in the Immokalee area. And I don't know the answer to that question, why public awareness. I would think it's good to have public awareness of all the species that might be in a residential community.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: I think that that was my point, Steve. We agree on that, because I know that there have been petitions that have come across this board's agendas that we have requested that the developer put "public awareness" and "inform the residents before they move in," and whether it's gopher tortoises or not.

So that's one suggestion that I have, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And why wouldn't we add language to that effect, though, Parenthetical 2 on the bottom of Page 6, where we introduce the Wildlife Habitat Management Plans in that sentence that we've added where it refers to, "the management plan shall also identify methods to inform local residents of the concerns related to interaction between," in this case it says "black bear and humans." But why don't we make it more generic; take that sentence and add it to Parenthetical 2 at the introduction of the habitat plans and then it apply to all of them?

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: Let me see where you're at.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I'm on Page 7, and I was reading from the black -- it's F. If you read Page 7, F.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: Oh, from F, yeah, okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The last sentence, if you take that last sentence and modify it so it's not specific to black bears but to all habitat plans and put it on the bottom of Page 6 as a additional sentence under the Parenthetical 2 that introduces the habitat plans for the species, then it would apply to all of them.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: I'm with you there, and I think that would be a positive addition and, therefore, we'd get the consistency among all of them.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Does that have any -- staff see any problems with that as an approach?

MR. LENBERGER: I think it's a very good idea.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm assuming staff's making notes on the changes, so I'm not going to do it at the same time.

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody else have anything for, say, through Page 10 of 79?

David, did you have something you wanted to add to that last discussion?

MR. WEEKS: Just real quickly, I think it will probably be a combination of that last sentence under Paragraph F and the similar sentence in Paragraph C regarding scrub jays, because the language for bear refers to the interaction. I think it's more of a safety concern; whereas, scrub jay it's an educational awareness. So I think a blending of the two.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, that's fine. I think you got the intent.

MR. WEEKS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, okay. So that's page -- anything else through Page 10?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I have a couple questions on Page 7 as well, but they involve the same issues. We've repeatedly crossed out the sentence that says, these requirements shall be consistent with UFWs South Florida Multi-Species Recovery Plan, May 1999, subject to the provisions of Paragraph 3 of this policy.

Why did we cross that out?

MR. LENBERGER: We crossed out all the specific publications and -- because previously we had added general language in the CCME stating that you'll use publications from the agencies as their technical assistance. I have that language. I can put it up on the visualizer if you'd like to see that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No. If we've crossed it out here because it's somewhere else, I'm fine with that. I just wanted to make sure, because I -- if we don't have a consistency referenced here, as long as we've got one elsewhere, that covers it. And that's what you're saying, right?

MR. LENBERGER: We have generic language which encompasses all the publications.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. On Page 8 -- no, that's the same thing. Oh, down on the last policy on Page 8 -- and this is not part that was underlined, so it's not new language. But while we're on this policy, it's a question. It says, Policy 10.5.1 and it said recreation that is compatible with the natural functions of the beaches and dunes shall be regarded as the highest and best land use.

And we get into this in a couple different projects. Recreation has got a very broad definition in regards to how people think it applies, and compatibility, likewise, has a -- it just depends on where you live. If you live next to something you don't want, it's never compatible.

So I'm just wondering if there's some way to define that in an entire manner if that's what the intention is, because "recreation," as a word, is quite -- quite broad. And at what point do we focus on that on how it could be detrimental to the natural functions of beaches and dunes? I mean, how is that managed?

For example, we've got boardwalks going out now with kiosks selling -- allowing you to rent different elements, and they're all scattered about the beach and such, and you're going to drag one out if you want to rent it, if you're a tourist and you go out in the water with it. Now, is that a recreational component that's deemed compatible?

MR. LENBERGER: Well, first, Policy Objective 10.5 and in the policies underneath it refer to undeveloped coastal barriers. So that would be like Keewaydin Island, but undeveloped coastal barriers would also include Delnor-Wiggins Park. So it has different uses on different islands depending on which one you're looking at.

That's a good point. We would have to take a look at the policies and further discuss that amongst staff.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It's not for changing today. I was just curious if that has been understood as to what it really means. Because recreational that is compatible, as members of this board, every time someone comes forward, everything they're bringing in is compatible in some manner or nature, and it's just -- this is just kind of broad, but...

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Yeah, it's loose.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: On the next page, which is Page 9 of 79, under Policy 10.5.4, you have exceptions shall be allowed for passive recreational structures. Is it within the realm of this ability to change that to "may"? I mean, is that -- because "shall" is pretty mandatory, so someone's going to argue they have a right because of the GMP to do what they're asking to do because it says "shall;" whereas, in the LDC there might be implementing language that provides standards in which they have to meet before they can be -- so I

think "may" might be a better word there than "shall," if staff is not in disagreement.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, it's not a disagreement, but it is a meaningful change.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. Well, I mean, if you -- I'm asking the question because it's something that was read as part of the changes in the sentence. If it's not something that can be done this round, I'd just like to leave that statement on the record as a question.

MR. SCHMIDT: We'll take that into consideration.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: See, if the LDC implements the GMP and you've got to meet the intention of the LDC in order to be approved, then the "shall" in the GMP really is subject to the standards in the LDC, and it doesn't make sense to say it shall be approved until we know they've met those standards. That's all I'm trying to say. It seems like the cart's before the horse.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: It's appropriate to change it to "may" if that's your direction.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh, I would suggest that. I think it's --

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I agree.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Good idea.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So Policy 10.5.4, "shall" will be "may."

Under 10.5.9, the county shall prohibit construction seaward of the Coastal Construction Setback Line except as follows: Construction would be allowed for public access, for protection, and restoration of beach resources and the case is demonstrated land use hardship related to safety concerns.

We just had a case come into the Board just recently about a Coastal Construction Setback Line variance. How does this language apply to Coastal Construction Setback Line variances, or does it? Do you have --

MR. LENBERGER: Well, it's directly related to construction seaward of the Coastal Construction Setback Line, so it directly deals with it, but also -- remember, the policies under 10.5 are for undeveloped coastal barriers.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. You're right. That takes care of my -- I missed that.

On Page 10, which is the last page we're into this first grouping, Objective 12.1, it talks about hurricane provisions. Maintain hurricane evacuation clearance times as required by state law, and evaluation clearance time, instead of "shall be," it's now changed "is" defined as having residents and visitors in an appropriate refuge. Then it goes on, and the last sentence says, the Collier County Bureau of Emergency Services continues to seek opportunities to increase shelter facilities and associated capacities under the direction of the Department of Emergency Management. The -- our Emergency Services Department has been asked to review every PUD that comes through, and they virtually -- I think they get them sent to them. I rarely, if ever, see comments about any kind of enhancements that they could provide as a result of those reviews.

Isn't this objective suggesting they can, and if they -- I mean, do we need to strengthen it? If we've got hurricane evacuation issues for, for example, areas that are more rural and they're creating a large town with new commercial and they have the opportunity to put refuges there -- shelters there for some of the public that lives in the urban area, is this the paragraph that we would use to suggest that as something that should be provided?

For example, as Ave Maria, does it have public refuges for the people escaping the urban area in the Coastal High Hazard Area when we have a storm event? Is that something we can be looking at for some of those rural towns that are going to be coming up?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, I think it can be.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. SCHMIDT: With this objective and, perhaps, a policy which follows to give some direction, that could be done.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's what I needed to know. Thank you.

The next section of pages -- well, actually that takes us through the end of the Coastal -- CCME.

And the next piece is for the Capital Improvement Element, CIE, and it actually starts on Page --

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: May we go back for a second?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Sure; absolutely.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: The language that we have here about the county to prohibit construction of any facility seaward of the Coastal Construction Setback Line, what happens in the case where you have a property that sits between two other properties that have been granted an exemption or protrude into the Coastal Construction Setback Line?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Lenberger will address that.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Hmm? Excuse me?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Lenberger will address that.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Thank you.

MR. LENBERGER: Okay. Which policy.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: I think it's 10.5.9, and everywhere where it said "the county shall prohibit," if you have two properties that protrude into the Coastal Construction Setback Line, and I happen to own the one that sits in the middle between two of them, am I prohibited from extending my improvements into the Coastal Construction Setback Line?

MR. LENBERGER: The example you're giving won't occur here because these are undeveloped coastal barriers, not developed coastal barriers.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: So we're not talking about urban areas or --

MR. LENBERGER: Right. We're not talking about Vanderbilt Beach or something to that nature. We're talking about, you know, Lely Barefoot Park, Delnor Wiggins Park, and Keewaydin Island where there is no construction beyond that line.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But if the situation were to occur like he's asking it, you could apply for a Coastal Construction Setback Line variance, and generally they create a line of protrusions that line up with your neighbors to the north and south. We just saw that in a recent case. And if you're not going beyond where your neighbors are, you could probably use that as a good argument as to what would justify you going up.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: The practice has been to connect the two pieces.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: And if you're not projecting beyond that, you're okay. And that still applies.

MR. LENBERGER: Yes, in the LDC; yes.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Thank you. Thank you, Mark.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Next item -- next section. It starts on Page 12 of 79 and goes on till that section finishes, which is the CIE, and that goes on through Page 15. Does anybody have any questions from the CIE side of things?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Twelve through 15.

Corby, under the CIE, Sections D and E, modify the potable water and sanitary sewer per capita qualifications. But then under Policy 4.1, I think B has been crossed out, so it's A. It looks like we're trying to put this into the LDC, so we're saying pursuant to Florida Statute, the schedule of capital improvements may be modified by ordinance not deemed to be an amendment to the Growth Management Plan.

So how are we -- how do you modify this, then, if we're not -- if we're not making it as a modification to the GMP, we just actually change it every year based on the data received to justify the change?

MR. SCHMIDT: Not as formal as an ordinance and not that informally.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. SCHMIDT: Each year when the AUIR is approved, part of that approval is the five-year schedule of capital improvements component of the CIE, and this allows those changes to take place at that time.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Except that today we're changing them; is that correct? Because they're underlined and crossed out. So we're changing them outside the AUIR process by the exception of this section today?

MR. SCHMIDT: I'm sorry. I'm not following because --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think you -- and I may be misunderstanding. If these changes can be made without a formal GMP amendment but they can be made through the AUIR process -- I think that's what you said -- how are we doing this today then?

MR. SCHMIDT: It's during the AUIR process.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. SCHMIDT: And it is with a separate ordinance or resolution but not the same -- and Heidi can explain a bit more clearly, perhaps -- not the same requirements as an ordinance which changes the bulk of the Comprehensive Plan.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. And I understand that, so -- I understand your explanation.

Are we changing Policy 1.5.D and E by actions today or through the Board's approval if they approve this section of the GMP amendments going forward?

MR. SCHMIDT: Today we are.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So it can be done two different ways. It can be done like we are doing today, or it could be done through the AUIR?

MR. SCHMIDT: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's what I was trying to get at. Okay.

And I don't have anything else on the CIE, which takes us through Page 15, if everybody else is okay with that.

Tom?

MR. EASTMAN: Corby, the change that's proposed for Policy 4.2 that works the same way, by going through the AUIR process, the school districts capital plan would be approved by the county?

MR. SCHMIDT: That's correct.

MR. EASTMAN: Ask that just makes things more efficient?

MR. SCHMIDT: And, again, it's part of that package from House Bill 7207 that gives us that flexibility.

MR. EASTMAN: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. The next item is on Page 16, and it is -- I'm getting back to there. I'm trying to see where the end of it is. It's the FLUE, Future Land Use Element. We'll take it the first 10 pages, so that will take us from Page 16 to Page 26. Does anybody have any questions?

Stan?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Yeah, I do.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Where's Steve?

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: He just walked out.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Oh, good. I can wait till he walks back in.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh, I think -- there he is.

MR. LENBERGER: I heard you.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: He doesn't get a break.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: It's his day.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: It looks like he's going to ask you a tough question.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Nah, just a series of small questions.

The list you have -- it's on Page 24 of 79. Australian pine, when you say casuarina spp, species, that means multiple species of casuarina?

MR. LENBERGER: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Does that mean all species of casuarina?

MR. LENBERGER: It says what, spp?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Spp.

MR. LENBERGER: That's multiple species of casuarina.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: All species of casuarina?

MR. LENBERGER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Okay. Then down to melaleuca, you have melaleuca leucadendra, and I always thought it was melaleuca quinquenervia spp. So you've got leucadendra species, or is that just redundant?

MR. LENBERGER: I didn't write this section, so let me just take a look at it.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: That's the next thing I was going to ask. Did you write this?

MR. LENBERGER: No. I think David --

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: David wrote it?

MR. LENBERGER: Let me just look at it.

MR. WEEKS: Where are we at?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We're on Page 24 of 79.

MR. LENBERGER: Twenty-four, Area of Critical State Concern changes.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: You have a list of exotic species. I have a lot of questions about the list.

Terri, do you know how to spell these?

THE COURT REPORTER: No, but I will look them up.

MR. LENBERGER: Okay. The melaleuca was not changed, so it should be the same that was in the Florida Statutes for the Area of Critical State Concern, which was written in 1974.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Right, but --

MR. LENBERGER: I don't know if that's the current nomenclature. I assume David just left it because that's the way it's in the Florida Statutes for the Area of Critical State Concern.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Leucadendra is a species, right?

MR. LENBERGER: I don't know the nomenclature chain but, yes, it's a species.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Now, why would you have the spp after melaleuca leucadendra? Because I think they changed -- the Florida Exotic Plant Council says it's melaleuca quinquenervia.

MR. LENBERGER: No. I understand what you're saying.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Okay. So that might be redundant. It might be just wrong.

MR. SCHMIDT: You're only doing that for her.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: I'm just giving Terri a hard time.

MR. LENBERGER: I'm not sure what --

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: So it might be redundant and it might be wrong. You're going to correct it?

MR. SCHMIDT: We'll check.

MR. WEEKS: Yeah. We'll check. And even if it's at odds with state statute, as Steve referenced, that goes back many, many years. And so we'll correct it to be the most recent, the most current, updated.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Updated.

MR. WEEKS: And we can always flag that when we -- flag that to the State when we explain to them there's a discrepancy between the two. Ours is updated; yours is not.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: And I notice you added a lot of -- you know, the castor bean. Naturally, I see that everywhere now.

Papaya? Whose bright idea was that? You can't grow papaya anymore?

MR. WEEKS: These were taken from -- I was thinking from the LDC. I think they might be listed right now in the LDC as being prohibited. And so we were trying to capture -- again, this started out matching the state's list, and the state's was very short. The county's is much longer.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Okay. There's a state list, there's the Florida Exotic Plant Council list, and then the county list?

MR. WEEKS: When I say "state list," I mean the ACSE (sic) regulations.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Where does the Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council list come into that?

Because you've adopted that in its entirety, and that's partially redundant with some of these. And I wonder why -- you know, like, what is it? Schefflera appears on both lists. Why? You know, just take it off.

You know, the redundancy is just -- is anybody comparing the lists?

Like, some of your stuff doesn't appear on their list. Some of their stuff doesn't appear on your list. And I'm looking at their list, and I'm wondering, is anybody -- is there anybody in this county that can identify every plant on this list when they do an inspection?

You're smiling, Steve, and you know why.

MR. LENBERGER: Well, first, the Exotic Pest Plant Council list is not referenced here. I don't see it referenced here.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Well, no. What it is, all of the species included in the definition of vegetation prohibited exotic contained in the Collier County Land Development Code, Ordinance 04-41, as amended, and that references the Florida Exotic Plant Council list. I think it's Category 1, but maybe Category 2 also.

MR. LENBERGER: Well, no. The prohibited exotics is the 10 or 11 species we have listed in the LDC. I know the landscape code references the prohibited exotic list you're referring to, but that's not under the definition for prohibited exotics. They use it as far as planting and removal and landscape. But I don't get involved with the landscape code.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Okay. So what's the difference?

MR. LENBERGER: This list here is listed to the ones identified in the LDC specifically. It's not referring to the Exotic Pest Plant Council.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: So we have a code that calls these lists -- these species exotic for some reason, and then we have a landscape code that adopted the Pest Plant Council's list and says you can't plant them and you have to remove them.

Are you kidding? Seriously? Two separate lists? Two separate enforcements?

MR. LENBERGER: Well, I don't know landscape code, but in the landscape code it does reference -- I think it's Category 1. I don't know if it references Category 2 as far as landscaping.

But for the preserves and environmental side, we're looking at the prohibited exotics that we have listed in the LDC.

As far as these other species that are listed here, they look like species that have been around a long time. And I'm just guessing from -- you know, when the Area of Critical State Concern rules were written, it was in 1974. These are long-time ornamental plants that have known to have been naturalized. And I'm sure that's why they were put on that list.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Why did you --

MR. LENBERGER: So, anyway, my guess is that these are on the state list. I don't have the Area of Critical State Concern rules in front of me at the moment, but I'm guessing that these are probably taken straight out of Florida Statutes.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Okay. So I can see why you added some of those. I don't agree with papaya. That's just crazy. Besides, you're growing them on county property all the time.

And downy rosemyrtle, why did you take that off the list? And earleaf acacia, I see that everywhere. Why is that off the list? Why is it crossed out?

MR. LENBERGER: Well, I easily say because they're included in the prohibited exotic list, so they no longer --

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Which you just said doesn't apply.

MR. LENBERGER: No, I didn't say the Exotic Pest Plant Council.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: I'm confused.

MR. LENBERGER: I said the prohibited exotic list in the Land Development Code, which is referenced just above those species that are crossed out. So they're already included in that list so they don't have to be repeated.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: I'm really confused on what list we're going where with. I'm just going to drop it right here. I'm -- I could go on all day. That's -- I'm --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You know, and I was --

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: -- not happy.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I would suggest, Stan, with your specificity and your ability to

confuse the typing that Terri's got to do, you know, it might be beneficial sometimes to have these kind of conversations with them with the staff person involved prior to the meeting so you understand it, and then it might be simpler to clarify at the meeting.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: In this case you might be right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Just a hint.

Okay. Anybody else have anything through Page 26. Well, let's start back on -- go ahead. Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: I'm not very knowledgeable in that field, so I'm learning quite a bit now. But the question is, why do you have to list all of those individually? Why can't you refer to the appropriate state list or, you know, whatever list that originates and updates, you make a generic reference to it, whatever it may be, and you skip all of that?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Because it changes.

MR. LENBERGER: A little of the history there, on the Exotic Pest Plant Council, they recommend that you not adopt their list. It's for all of Florida, it's break it (sic) down into, I think, North, Central, and South Florida. And certain exotics are, in certain areas, problematic, such as the lower East Coast versus other areas.

So they actually recommend that you don't do that. They recommend that you pull out the species that are problematic for your area and -- which is why, I would imagine, we have adopted the 10 or 11 species, and I don't remember exactly --

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: It is just a recommendation or it's mandatory?

MR. LENBERGER: It's not a mandatory. It's stated in -- on their web page. It actually states that.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Although the Land Development Code has adopted that list.

And I'll give you an example, bauhinia, the orchid tree, the big ones that we have growing in the courtyard outside this building are on the Exotic Pest Plant Council list. And if they were to adopt that list as part of the landscape ordinance, they'd have to remove those anytime they do any construction in this complex, along with the carrot woods that are in the parking lot. So, you know, I don't know where I'm going with this.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: You're very knowledgeable about trees.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Now, this is the same guy that said a couple weeks ago, why are we making people remove Brazilian pepper.

MR. LENBERGER: As far as the orchid trees on the grounds here, they're Hong Kong orchid trees. Hong Kong orchid trees are a natural hybrid. They don't produce seed, and they're not on any list, actually. Other orchid trees are on invasive lists of the Exotic Pest Plan Council.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: And yet when I look these up, they're bauhinia variegata. But you say it's a --

MR. LENBERGER: Hong Kong orchid tree is not an invasive species.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: It's not a variegata?

MR. LENBERGER: It's a neutral hybrid.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Okay.

MR. LENBERGER: It was found in the wild and has been cultivated through cuttings ever since.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We have a frustrated botanist on the Board.

If nobody else has anything from Page 26, if we could go back to Page 17, Policy 2.2.3. Something I notice that's not -- it's part of that paragraph that was modified, the last sentence; TCMA. I mean, it says, add projects to the Capital Improvement Element, enter into a binding commitment with the developer to construct the needed facilities or defer development until improvements can be made or a level of service amendment -- amended to ensure available capacity.

Corby, that part after "or," defer development until improvements can be made, how do you -- how do we do that? Isn't that like a moratorium?

I mean, we don't generally talk that much about the GMP at this board, so some of this language, when we read it again after -- it brings back questions based on actions we might have just recently had.

And if we can defer development until improvements can be made, that means until our road system

catches up, are we obligated to approve projects? I mean, that's almost like saying we can have moratoriums.

MR. SCHMIDT: The terminology is difficult, but the Capital Improvement Element offers a number of options when the situation arises; this being one of them.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I honestly didn't -- we have previously -- I can't use the word "inform." That might be too strong. But I think it's been strongly insinuated we can't turn development down indefinitely. They've got to have a window of opportunity. This one doesn't refer to that. It just says, defer development until improvements could be made, and that could be indefinite. And I was surprised to see it written that way.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: With our road system.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, road system is what -- the biggest issue. I mean, if the road's not there and it's not going to be there for 20 years, then we can say, well, you can't develop that area until the road system meets the capacity. We've got issues all over the county that could be resolved. But I just was surprised to see that language. Something to remember, I guess, as we review other projects.

Page 18, the Objective 4, continually refine the Future Land Use Element through detailed planning. And then under Policy 4.1 it says, planning studies must be consistent with the Growth Management Plan and further its intent and may address specific geographic or issue areas.

Is it the studies that have got to be consistent or the planning that's got to be consistent? Because in the first objective, "through detailed planning" -- it doesn't say "detailed planning studies." "Detailed planning." So it's the planning you want consistent, not studies. Because the studies themselves are being generated to probably look at something that needs to be reviewed that may not be consistent, and we might have to change the GMP to be consistent.

MR. SCHMIDT: There's really no text change here. It's simply being moved from above. And it referred to just the studies, so there was no impacted change here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, okay. I was just suggesting -- trying to understand what it means. So if someone does a study, the study can't be initiated to suggest a change to the GMP. It's got to be consistent with the GMP.

Then why have these studies? But we have a lot of studies. We have hundreds of thousands of dollars spent on studies. That's just another opportunity to take a look at something differently.

MR. SCHMIDT: Noted, and staff will consider it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Under Objective 7 on Page 19, we reference the Dover-Kohl in better places. I know it's a restatement and you're moving it to another section, but I haven't found us utilizing that very much. In fact, the couple of times it's been brought up, I think this board may have brought it up as an example of how does it fit to the Dover-Kohl study.

I don't see anybody using it necessarily in how we've designed some of the projects, including their latest review of the architectural standards, because quite a few of those staff found, after they looked at the Dover-Kohl study, there was a conflict.

What is the intention of having this as a high -- it's a high-level -- it's objective, so it's a higher level than a policy. It seems to be an overriding objective. And that document is how many years old now? I mean, it's been around for quite some time.

MR. SCHMIDT: It has.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm just wondering if it's smart to continue referencing it in here if --

MR. SCHMIDT: I would agree that it is, and it continues to be a useful reference certainly for the support policies under Objective 7 and for a number of the details staff refers to in that document.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So if someone comes in and they have an inconsistency with the Dover-Kohl study then, theoretically, that's in conflict with the GMP?

MR. SCHMIDT: Loosely, yes, but most of the policies that directly support Objective 7 are those that refer to encouraging certain things. And so you have experienced in the past with staff recommendations where these Dover-Kohl-based criteria or details are referenced, explained, given to you in the staff report, but they generally are not a basis for denial because they're what I would call soft recommendations.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Thank you.

Page 24. Stan didn't ask enough questions about this list, so I have a couple more.

About -- towards the bottom of the list it says, all other species included in the definition of vegetation, prohibited exotic contained in the LDC. Why not include the whole list in the LDC and not have the list in the GMP?

MR. WEEKS: Commissioners, that's one of the things we're going to do as far as looking into this further, taking Stan's comments in mind. We want to look at the list that -- I guess, "incorporate" is the right term, in this definition in the LDC but also the Exotic Plan Council list. It sounded like there's two different lists, and I'm sensitive to Stan's point -- to make sure that we capture everything that should be captured in here.

And, further to your point, Mr. Chairman, if we can simply provide a single reference to a definition or a list or, you know, some other source -- I agree with you, rather than listing some of those -- and, although, I would say that for those that are listed in the state's ACSC, I believe we want to continue to list them specifically, such as the first four there, the Australian pine, bishopwood, et cetera. Those are listed right now on the State's ACSC rule. I think we want to continue to call those out.

So the net effect of what we're doing is -- you know, the state will be able to see we've captured everything you have required, and then we're capturing additional ones that, locally, we want to prohibit.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I mean, as you've said many times, we need to not clutter the GMP too much with specificity but allow that to be in the LDC. That would work here. And as example, when something has to be modified, it's easier to modify the LDC.

And that brings into question the last reference, java plum. It's crossed out. Now, wasn't java plum the tree that came before the Board of County Commissioners that somebody wanted to keep on their property? And if they did want to keep it and it was not crossed out at the time, how'd they avoid a GMP amendment?

MR. WEEKS: It was a specific application that they were able to present to the Board and have approved.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So they got a small-scale GMP amendment? No.

MR. WEEKS: No. This is only applicable to ACSC. That was not in the urban area.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh, okay.

MR. WEEKS: And the reason that's crossed out, those bottom four, is they are captured within that definition in the LDC that's referenced.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. And then the following page, which is the top of Page 25, you added some references to mangroves and other, I guess, protected plants. Again, is that a list that would be better addressed in the LDC?

MR. WEEKS: Those are listed in the state ACSC rules. I don't think we've added them specifically.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. I understand now.

Okay. And that's the last question I had through Page 26. Oh, no. I had one more. Policy 3.1 and 3.2, you're modifying the acreage in FSAs and modifying -- well, that's the first one. Retention of -- 3.1 is protection of water quality and quantity, and we've reduced the acreage of FSAs from 31,100 to 29,645, or 1,455 acres, and we've added that to the HSAs. How did that come about?

I mean, did we do any more groundtruthing since the last RLSA? Because that was the whole issue during the RLSA review was how groundtruthed the acreage was. So how did we determine there was an error?

MR. WEEKS: I'll have to check. I think that was through -- I'm thinking that that was through a prior plan amendment. I'll have to check, Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. And, David, the second thing is, there's a big difference when you have acreage in FSAs and SSAs versus HSAs. HSAs -- no, HSAs are still -- where is -- oh, it's the next one down. W -- or Policy 3.3, WRAs. On the next page, the top of the page, Policy 3.3, we've changed the acreage in WRAs. And that's the same questions; how did we -- I mean, it's only 10 acres. How did we even determine that without any groundtruthing? And that was one of the things we didn't do when we initiated the overlay. And if you could just get back to me, you know, that would be fine.

MR. WEEKS: Yes. And, Mr. Chairman, if I could jump in right now. A comment I was going to make at the end, but we -- on behalf of staff, we would like to have a consent -- have this come back for

consent, as you're walking through with some specific changes, to make sure that we, if nothing else, provide you the explanation such as the items you're asking about here so that we could have those on the public record responding to some of the questions that are raised.

And some of the others -- I'll go back to that earlier discussion about the very first one about the language for listed species and education and so forth so that you can actually see the language. I know you would see it at adoption, but I would feel more comfortable if you had a chance to see it and give your approval or not.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We've got all summer, so -- we can't go to the Board anyways, so...

MR. WEEKS: There's no rush.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, that's -- I think that would be a good idea.

I would suggest, though, that after we -- when we come back for consent, we just work on those pieces that were discussed for changes and not go through the whole thing all over again, if we can avoid that.

MR. WEEKS: Right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If we go to Page 27 and go through Page 37, for the members of the Board, do you have any questions from those group of pages? That's still a continuation with the FLUE.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Twenty-seven through 37. That gets us into the mapping.

David, I have a question on Page 37 of 79. It's iii in the middle, towards the bottom of the page, proposed development shall be designed in accordance with, then it says, 10.2.2.4 of the ERP permit handbook.

I understand that, but Collier County reviews it, too, and don't we have standards that are enhancements to what the South Florida requires? So this doesn't prohibit Collier County's continued review? It doesn't limit us to just South Florida, does it?

MR. WEEKS: Corby, can you --

MR. SCHMIDT: Sure. I think I can address a portion of that, Mr. Chairman.

This is a change -- the underlying portion of 3 little i that is seen elsewhere both in EAR-based amendments as a placeholder until that document name was known and in the last batch where we picked up on the correct -- we'll still call it the basis of review document and now again in locations where it wasn't picked up on or there was still placeholder language from the past. But this does not change anything in the practices of the county.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's what I wanted to make sure.

So if we go to 31 of 79, and we've got -- after that we hit some maps. Does anybody have any questions in that series of maps that goes on for quite a ways?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: David and Corby, I notice that we don't have an interchange No. 19. I know we had one and it was on there. Could you just explain that? Because if you add the numbers up on the map, they don't -- 19's not there, and that's on Page 35 of 79.

MR. WEEKS: When the plan was originally adopted, we had 21 activity centers. And with the incorporation of Marco Island, two of them disappeared, and we did not go back and change the numbering system to reflect that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And I see that we have a lot of maps and all your activity centers, and there's 19 of those listed through No. 20. That's what some of the pages are. And then we get the existing zoning consistent with FLUE by policy maps. There's no page numbers on here. They're just the ones with the yellow highlighting and the more or less black-and-blue backgrounds.

David, do we have these maps -- and I'm talking about Map FLUE 1, 2, those maps there, the existing zoning consistent with FLUE by policy. Do we have those maps in a form that when you magnify them to review them at a closer detail, they don't blur out like these do?

MR. WEEKS: Yes. On the online version of the GMP, you can zoom in on -- these map exists, and you can zoom in.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. So they can be zoomed in there and the detail shows? Okay.

Well, then that takes us down, really, if we get past the maps, we end up on Page 59 of 79, and it's

the Golden Gate Area Master Plan, GGMP. And that goes on for a few pages. I don't know -- most of it's --

MR. SCHMIDT: The Golden Gate Area Master Plan is just a map change.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, then you've got a few pages after there, and I -- let's take it through the balance of the document. Does anybody have any remaining issues in the document?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Corby, on Page 65 of 79 under Policy 3.5, it talks about the future rights-of-ways. It's county considering a viable Thoroughfare Corridor Protection ordinance.

Policy 3.5.A.1, then there's a text break, and then there's this paragraph. All of the above must be consistent with the currently adopted Long Range Transportation Plan and/or other similar studies, agreements, plans, and programs, and Chapter 33.06.02 (sic), Florida Statutes.

This vague reference that's been added, when I emphasized "and/or other similar studies, agreements, plans, and programs," what is that? I mean, that could be anything anybody decides should be reviewed with that plan.

I mean, why would we want to add that vague language? I mean, there's a lot of private landowners out there doing their own studies, their own agreements, and are having their own plans and their own programs. How do we make sure that we've got some legitimate elements based on that sentence?

MR. SCHMIDT: Good question. It certainly was intended to identify only those studies/agreements with property owners, whatever it may be that the county is in agreement with or has prepared, so we'll look at that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It needs to be strengthened substantially, I would think.

Trinity, did you have something you wanted to add?

MS. SCOTT: Could we maybe add "board-adopted"? I think the intent of the --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anything to make it more stable.

MS. SCOTT: I think the intent of it was that there are times when -- in the Long Range Transportation Plan it will just show an area. And so a lot of times we'll do a more specific alignment study where the Board will actually adopt an alignment. So I think if you put "board-adopted agreements," that would strengthen that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, wouldn't all those -- those adoptions, are they all adopted as being consistent with the GMP? Because that's another threshold that I'm concerned about, and I'll be explaining why in just a few minutes in regards to some other pages I found issues on that I don't believe are necessarily in agreement with everybody who understood it. And I'm real concerned about where this vague language is going to end up going if it isn't tightened up substantially.

MS. SCOTT: We'll work with the County Attorney's Office, and when we come back under the consent and have a discussion about that, just make sure that we can firm that up and make sure that we capture the intent.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. And I have more transportation questions. I don't know if anybody else wants to jump in. If you do, please do. I'll just move through the remaining pages then.

On the top of Page 66, it talks about applicants seeking concurrency requirements, and you changed the reference to transportation division administrator, manager of the county transportation planning agency, parenthetical, presently the transportation planning section of the Growth Management Department, end parenthetical.

If all that's present and temporary, why are we changing it? I mean, why don't we just say transportation -- or Collier County Manager's designee or something like we do in other areas? What are we -- because titles over there, I notice, change like -- well, I'm not going to say what they're like, but they change constantly.

And I'm not sure it's really good to reference the titles anymore like we do. There's a whole slough of new titles swirling around in that building.

I mean, I know why. It's just that -- maybe we can be more generic in the way we reference this, so as titles change, it doesn't change other things?

MR. SCHMIDT: That's refreshing to hear, because the document as a whole is full of specific titles and identities --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I know.

MR. SCHMIDT: -- of people, positions, and so forth, departments, divisions. Trying to keep up with that, you're seeing them in every batch amendment to show you what is most recent. If there is a way to back off of that a bit and identify something less specifically --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, since you're coming back, could you get together with the County Attorney's Office and see if there's a more generic way? And if we could do that, it would solve a lot of issues across the board. It does pop up constantly. And I've been watching the titles change. And I understand why they do. It's just with so many, it makes it hard.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: It's a dangerous thing, because I can remember instances where the codes said that a certain person had to get a certain report, and when they went back looking for those reports, there was no longer that person. So you've got to be real careful with that stuff.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah. One time it said Stan Chrzanowski as county engineer and, boy, that wiped out all kinds of things. Then he retired. That ruined it.

MR. SCHMIDT: If I could explain a bit further, Mr. Chairman.

I believe a number of plan references are those taken from statute. Just as when it talks about the Comprehensive Plan, we refer to the Growth Management Plan for more specificity.

And some of these may be the same way where the rule or the policy is taken from a statute or direction given, and we try to add the specificity. It may be unnecessarily (sic) to come to this amount of detail.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, we can check into it since we're having a consent. That would be great.

I have -- and one of the things I did talk with staff about is -- and it's no -- it's Exhibit A. It starts talking about the TR1 - 2040 Cost Feasible Network. And there's some information on here that I don't think is --

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Where are you looking?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, it's a map. I don't know how to -- it's TR1 - 2040.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: It's Exhibit A.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It's Page 109, which is about 10, 20 pages -- 10 pages in from the end of your book. Ten or 12 pages in from the end of your book.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: It's Page -- it's right after Page 67 of 79.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ah, okay.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: In fact, mine has 68 of 79 on it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah. Mine didn't have a number on it. When these get scanned, sometimes it doesn't all come out. Oh, way over on the left-hand side in blue. There it is; 68 of 79.

There are two areas on this plan that I questioned, and Michele was kind enough to explain one of them -- both of them to me, and I disagree with one of them in particular.

First of all, one area is the Randall extension that goes into Oil Well Road, and it shows two scenarios, and that's a study area.

Is that correct, Michele, the dotted -- heavy dotted line?

MS. MOSCA: That's correct. That's the Randall/Oil Well Road study.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. And that's a study area because of a new town going in east of Golden Gate Estates called Rural Lands West that was formerly Big Cypress; is that a fair statement?

MS. MOSCA: That's correct, it is going in.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, it's being --

MS. MOSCA: It's a statement.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: They're attempting to --

MS. MOSCA: Being considered, correct.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: They're applying for it, yeah.

Also down to the south along I-75 we show a dotted study area that includes the Benfield corridor to the east of 951, but it also shows the study area extending all the way over to Everglades Boulevard. But as those of us who were here during the Big Cypress submittal back years ago, we know that at that time there

was a proposed interchange to I-75 going east of Golden Gate Estates in nonresidential land, and that land would avoid the eminent domain proceedings on hundreds upon hundreds of homes, single-family homes through Everglades Boulevard and Golden Gate Estates.

This is -- this plan should not be used limiting the study area to Golden Gate Estates to Everglades Boulevard. That study area should go beyond Golden Gate Estates to include the potential area of an interchange out past the Estates like was previously at one time considered when the Big Cypress project came in.

Currently Rural Lands West is putting a boulevard down along the eastern edge of Golden Gate Estates, but they're only showing it partway on their current plans.

There's no reason why the county couldn't look at that more closely as a much better alternative to the taxpayers than limiting the study area to Everglades Boulevard. And I would strongly suggest this is the wrong map to include in the GMP, for whatever reason you've got to do it, when it puts something forth that is really not helpful, in my opinion.

So, Michele?

MS. MOSCA: Sure. I think there's two issues here. You're speaking of the study area that's the Randall Boulevard/Oil Well Road study.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I understand that one. It's not questioning that one as much as the study area that's limited to the Everglades -- to Everglades Boulevard and I-75.

MS. MOSCA: Okay. Let me just make one correction first. The interchange, the ID on the interchange at Everglades and I-75, that is an error that needs to be corrected. It actually should be on the needs assessment project on the next map that you look at. So that is coming off this particular map. It was an oversight.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well -- and I have the same question about the next map.

MS. MOSCA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You're showing it again at Everglades Boulevard and I-75. It was my understanding from numerous discussions that that is not a done-deal. We're actually still considering further east, and that's not been thrown out yet. And if that's not the case, why are we doing these maps?

MS. SCOTT: For the record, Trinity Scott, Transportation Planning manager.

When we consider a new interchange, we have to go through what's called an Interchange Justification Report. When we do that, we have to run project traffic, and so they will put it on a roadway that already exists just to determine if there's enough traffic in the area to justify an interchange.

Then we go on to what's called a Project Development and Environmental Study which looks at an entire swath of area to determine, based on environmental impacts, impacts to residents, et cetera, where the best place, and they would come up with a preferred alternative.

This is a lot of things that we dealt with when we originally embarked on the Interchange Justification Report previously at I-75/Everglades and a lot of the information that was out there, that if an interchange is justified in the future and we proceed down that road, there's a very public process that we must follow.

And the interchange will not necessarily be at Everglades Boulevard if it's justified. It could be at DeSoto. It could be at some other limits in between, but that is things that would be studied more specifically as we got closer to that project.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well --

MS. SCOTT: So what we could do is essentially shade out an area in there for a potential for a future interchange.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That would be a much better approach when this one is as highly controversial as it is, and we have other options that could be viable. My concern is, once government puts something on a map, people begin to rely on it no matter what disclaimers you may say the map contains. And I really think this is going to be a hard sell if we leave it there.

MS. SCOTT: What we will be doing is removing it from the Cost Feasible Plan because it is not a Cost Feasible Project. However, on the needs plan, which is the next map, I believe --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right.

MS. SCOTT: -- we will look at that and shade that area and separate it from the other study area.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That would be much more applicable than this.

And that -- while we're on these DOT maps, the last or the second to the last map -- and it's 79 of 79. Actually the last map. It says, SIS Facilities Map. What's SIS stand for?

MS. MOSCA: That's Strategic Intermodal System.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. I just --

COMMISSIONER EBERT: It's what?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Government speak has so many acronyms. I just could not figure that one out.

MS. MOSCA: It's Strategic Intermodal System.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And that wraps up the questions I have. Does anybody else have any other questions they want to continue with?

MS. MOSCA: Commissioner Strain, I have some comments, some additions, if that's okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: She knows me by Mark, but she calls me -- okay, go ahead.

MS. MOSCA: What I'd like to do, with the Planning Commission's approval, is do a final quality check on the two maps, the cost feasible as well as the needs assessment projects, just to make sure we've caught everything, and we'll bring that back as part of the consent agenda.

And then, in addition to that, again, if acceptable, I'd like to add a note to the map, both the cost feasible as well as the needs assessment projects map, simply to say this map cannot be interpreted without the 2040 LRTP.

It's very similar to the Future Land Use Map and the GOP. There's a statement on the Future Land Use Map that states that it cannot be interpreted without that document.

It's important when we start talking about the study areas and the phasing of these projects, for example, cost feasibility during what time frame those projects are feasible. I think it just helps the reader understand the map a little bit more.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I have no problem. Can you -- that LRTP map, can you just supply us, not as part of the packet, but just supply us by email with that most recent map so we all can -- and we could take a look at it and see how it fits in with all this; that would be hopefully just to have for our records.

MS. MOSCA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And I want to thank staff for suggesting the consent. I think it will be a good way to clean this up. And I don't -- so with that purpose, we wouldn't really need to vote today. Staff will come back. We'll finish it up on consent. Does that work, or do you need a vote today and then have a consent vote?

MR. SCHMIDT: No vote today, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. WEEKS: Excuse me. Which actually means you need to continue the item then.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, if that's okay with the county. How long would it be continued for, David?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Couple years.

MR. WEEKS: We believe the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. That would be --

MR. WEEKS: Oh, could we make it two meetings.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. How about --

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Corby's on vacation.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- continue it to some meeting -- to one of the meetings in August; does that work, or does it have to be date specific?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Why don't you give a date specific. How about the first meeting in August?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Pick a date, guys.

Well, before we go there, we're going to also open it up for any public discussion. I know some members of the public have come in. I don't know if any of you had anything you wanted to add or discuss.

If you do, just come on up to a microphone. If I don't see you coming up, we'll move on.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you. Okay. What date?

MS. MOSCA: I have one additional change, if it's okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MS. MOSCA: This is within the Capital Improvement Element, Page -- it's my Page 13 of 79, Policy 5.5.D. We'd like to go ahead and update that paragraph to reference the 2040 LRTP, and we'll bring back that language at consent.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. That sounds good.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: August 4th would fit within your window of extension of the advertisement.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: David, does that work for you?

MR. WEEKS: It does.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Then I think that wraps up the discussion on this item for today. So with that, is there a motion to continue PL20130002637/CPSP2013-11 to the August 4th -- is that the -- did you say the 4th, Heidi?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Yes, I did.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: August 4th, 2016, Planning Commission meeting?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Make a motion to continue.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by Charlette.

Discussion?

(No response.)

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ROMAN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 6-0.

Thank you all very much. That takes us to the -- nearly to the end of our agenda. We have old business. Anybody have any old business?

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead, Waafa.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: A month ago when we talked about the deviation, Ray was going to come up with a list in two weeks. I haven't seen it yet. I'm sure he has a good excuse.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: You know what's worse, he wasn't even supposed to be here today. Mike Bosi's on vacation, so Ray inadvertently got here today, so...

MR. BELLOWS: For the record, Ray Bellows. The list has been compiled, and we were going to bring it when we have the zoning items, so it would be at the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Next meeting, okay.

COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Thank you.

MR. BELLOWS: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Nothing else? Any new business?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. With that, any public comments?

(No response.)

July 7, 2016

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Hearing none, is there a motion to adjourn?
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Motion to adjourn.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: By Karen.
COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Second.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by Stan.
All in favor, signify by saying aye.
COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ASSAAD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ROMAN: Aye.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: 6-0. We're out of here. Thank you.

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by order of the Chair at 10:37 a.m.

COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION



MARK STRAIN, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST
DWIGHT E. BROCK, CLERK

These minutes approved by the Board on 8-18-16, as presented or as corrected .

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED ON BEHALF OF
U.S. LEGAL SUPPORT, INC.,
BY TERRI LEWIS, COURT REPORTER AND NOTARY PUBLIC