

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING OF THE
COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Naples, Florida, October 4, 2018

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
Stan Chrzanowski
Patrick Dearborn
Edwin Fryer
Karen Homiak
ABSENT: Joe Schmitt

ALSO PRESENT:

Mike Bosi, Planning and Zoning Manager
Corby Schmidt, Principal Planner
Jeffrey Klatzkow, County Attorney
Heidi Ashton-Cicko, Managing Assistant County Attorney
Tom Eastman, School District Representative

PROCEEDINGS

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

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the Thursday, October 4th 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: Okay. Our secretary is not here. Her last meeting was last month. We'll deal with that at the end of today's meeting, but right now I'll do roll call.

Tom Eastman?

MR. EASTMAN: Here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Stan?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ned?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm here.

Karen?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And then Mr. Schmitt has got an excused absence.

Patrick?

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. That takes us to addenda to the agenda. We have one item on the agenda today, but we have two items that were scheduled from a previous meeting we need to recontinue to the November 1st meeting. I'll read those off and ask for that item to be continued to November 1st by a vote.

First item is PL20170001729. It's the Grey Oaks Development PUD change. That one is at the intersection of Golden Gate Parkway and Airport Road. Is there a motion to continue till November 1st?

MR. KLATZKOW: And is anybody here from the public to speak to this?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I didn't see anybody. Other than the staff people in the audience, are you here? No.

MR. KLATZKOW: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, I looked. I didn't see anybody out there. I figured there wouldn't be.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Moved.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Made by Ned. Seconded by?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Second.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: By Stan.

All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries, what is there, five of us -- 5-0.

Next item to be continued, same situation, is PL20170001548. It's the Grey Oaks MPUD. Same location. The first one was the DRI. This is the PUD portion. Is there a motion to move this -- to continue this to November 1st?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: So moved.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: By Ned.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Second.

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 5-0.

Thank you. That gets us past our addenda to the agenda.

Planning Commission absences. Our next meeting is October 18th. Does anybody know if they're not going to make it on the 18th?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, then we'll have a quorum.

Approval of the minutes. We've all been emailed or somehow got our minutes from September 6th. Is there any changes or corrections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Hearing none, is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: By Patrick.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Second.

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 5-0.

Ray's not here, so we'll forego BCC report and recaps, I assume, Mike?

MR. BOSI: Yeah. I didn't prepare a detailed report. I just will let you know the Seed to Table GMP amendment and CPUD was approved at the last meeting.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you. Chairman's report: In regards to our meetings, Mike, we used to get a pre-agenda coming up, like, for now we -- like today we'd have a pre-agenda for our next meeting so we'd know how much time we've got to allocate to it. So could we start getting those included back in the packets again?

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That would be helpful.

***And that takes us to nothing on consent, and our first and only advertised hearing that remains is 9C, and it is PL20180000271/CPSP-2018-2. It's the annual update for the -- called the AUIR, the Annual Update and Inventory Report for 2018.

And just -- this is not zoning, so do we need disclosures or any of that from the County Attorney's Office?

MR. KLATZKOW: (Shakes head.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I didn't think so.

Okay. Mike, look forward to your introduction.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Mark?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: The top of my page says 2018-1. You said dash 2.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mine says dash 2.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I mean, I think we all know what it is. It's the AUIR, but --

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I don't know why mine says something different, but it's happened a lot.

MR. BOSI: Mike Bosi, Planning and Zoning director. And we will check to make sure that we coordinate that the correct title is being consistently utilized.

As the Chair indicated, this is the Annual Update and Inventory Report, the annual Capital Improvement Element update as well for 2018.

I have a really quick introduction PowerPoint; it just talks about the overall purpose of what the AUIR is, and then some other information related to the proposals contained within.

AUIR, it's, you know, a one-year snapshot in time. It tries to identify the projected needs and required improvements from all the infrastructure and service-providing departments. They're based upon adopted levels of service, and it should be noted that it's a snapshot in time, and it changes as your demand equation changes, but also as the revenue equation changes.

There's two different categories -- well, there's three different categories. Category A is your concurrency facilities: Roads, drainage, potable water, wastewater, solid waste, parks, recreation and schools.

Category B is law enforcement, jails, libraries, emergency services, government buildings; and C is the coastal zone management. It's a non -- it's a non-concurrency. It's a non-impact fee related category, but it was added a couple years ago just to ensure that -- the attendance to the health of our beaches are maintained.

How do we project growth? Per our Growth Management Plan, population estimates shall be based upon the most recent population bulletin from the University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research, commonly know as BEBR. And we have a seasonal population adjustment within our Capital Improvement Program, and we understand that between the months of December through March, April, we have an influx within our population, so we coordinate and correspond our infrastructure allocation for a 20 percent increase above our permanent population to handle those spikes in demands at those periods of times.

Some of the specific components like Public Utilities uses a little bit different formula than just a straight 20 percent, but that could be provided in a little bit greater explanation. And how do we make a determination of how we build? And it's based upon -- it's your population. It's a math equation. In this AUIR we are projecting for this five-year period 35,380, and our level of service is .33 square feet, and it's simply a math equation as to what the additional square footage we need within this five-year period to maintain the levels of service. And those correspond not only to library but all the individual divisions and components of the AUIR.

It's the level of service against the population that dictates what's the improvements that are needed to maintain the same type of services that individuals when they first came to Collier County experienced, to maintain those as they move forward.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Pardon my interruption. Point of information, I guess, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: And maybe you'll defer to Mr. Bosi, but are we invited to ask questions now, or should we await the completion of his report?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It depends. I mean, we've got -- we usually ask a lot of questions of departments. If you have something in general, if Mike doesn't answer it during his presentation, it might as soon as he finishes up with his.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Perfect.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Then each department -- if we have questions in each department, then they can address your questions separately than Mike.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you. Thank you. Sorry to interrupt.

MR. BOSI: Oh, reasons.

Other reasons AUIR establishes a rational nexus required for capital impacts fees for both of the categories, and approximation of revenue projected over the capital period to determine the county's ability to

construct and adopt to the adopted levels of service, and projects in the AUIR must be growth related.

And why this matters to the Planning Commission is you're regularly presented petitions for growth, you're regularly presented petitions to amend the Growth Management Plan, and this formulates the backdrop, the comfort level as to whether we are maintaining the levels of service that we provide on a year-to-year basis in relationship to the individual petitions.

And one of the things that I think -- or I guess a common discussion point within the petitions is the AUIR and the capacities that are provided within each individual road segment. So these do set the -- this does set the background for the evaluations of these individual petitions you're going to make over the next -- over the next 12 months.

And this is the realities of growth that Collier County has faced over the past six years, and 2012 was dropped off just because it's outside this little six-year window, but it would provide the same type of consistency.

Over the last seven years, the State of Florida has allocated our population right under 2 percent. As you can see from the years indicated, there's a range from 1.97 down to 1.89. So we've been in a tight concentration and in a steady pattern of growth. It seems to have been -- just the over a decade of experience I've had with the AUIR, we've hit a sweet spot in the sense that that stability, that constant 2 percent increase -- and it's mirrored pretty good to reality in terms of comparison to what we had projected in the next year coming and what we -- the population we've received.

And it's allowed for our infrastructure providers to have a steady approach as to when the next increment of improvement's going to be needed.

And this is interesting in the sense that here are the COs that were issued between October 1st of 2017 projecting out approximate values of March 31st, 2018. And where I would draw your attention is the areas that have been circled within that light teal blue. Those are the top 10 PUD site developments, so you can see where the growth is happening. It's along the Immokalee corridor, but most particularly where the growth is being located is the East Trail.

If you look at the areas that are really growing, the COs, it's that East Trail corridor, that 951 intersection that finds the greatest concentration of pattern and development.

And also, through coordination with the County Attorney's Office and the Chair, modified a bit what the recommendations we're asking for the Planning Commission. We realized that the recommendations were a bit stale. They were left over from a couple years ago, and we really analyzed what the statutes required, what the LDC requires, so we modified them a bit specifically what we're asking, the recommendation after you hear the presentations or have questions for the individual divisions and departments, to accept the attached report, to accept the Category A, B, and C facilities while it's in the projects and revenue sources with any modifications that you make with Category A facilities set forth to include the schedule of capital improvements to the annual CIE update, and to accept the CIE schedule of improvements and, by reference, the school district's Capital Improvement Plan.

With that, that's the overview of the AUIR. Any specific questions that you would have of me? And then after that I think I'd like to engage the Planning Commission how they would like to move forward. Prior years we've had presentations; prior years we've just went straight to questions. So it would be at the pleasure of the Planning Commission as to what they would like.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Let's start with Ned's questions first on your presentation.

Ned.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, when I went through this document, I noticed use of different terms to mean approximately the same things: Capital improvements, facilities, assets, but for the most part, if not exclusively, I think what I found was dealing with improved real estate of some kind or other, whereas a capital asset would include tangible personal property that has a life expectancy in excess of a year. Is, like, heavy equipment or automobiles or trucks, are they included in this?

MR. BOSI: They are included within the cost of new stations, new increments. What would be a good example would be an EMS station. The cost of the equipment associated with that EMS station, that new proposed EMS station would be included, whether it be law enforcement. Those (sic) equipment is

included in the terms of the overall cost that is related to the new unit and those accessory -- but it focuses upon the actual -- the physical building of the unit.

Parks is an anomaly in the sense that Parks only concentrates upon the acreage activity and does not contemplate or get into or try to quantify the capital improvements that are actually on -- or facilities that are on the park acreage. So the Parks does sit as somewhat of an anomaly.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Thank you. My next question: Things have been allocated into Categories A, B, and C. Was that explicitly done by the Board of County Commissioners, or was it done by staff? How do we get to the point of having these allocations?

MR. BOSI: It started with the State of Florida. It started with the State of Florida, and the State of Florida said that local governments must maintain a concurrency management system, and they've dictated that early in the late '80s, early '90s that the concurrency management system had to maintain your public utilities, your roadways, your park and recreation facilities, and your stormwater management as requirements for concurrency management. So they established that Category A facility.

Category B facilities --

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Before you go to B, do we have any flexibility with respect to adding items to Category A?

MR. BOSI: We have -- it's at our own individual local discretion in terms of your Category A facilities. If you wanted to include schools, if you wanted them to include roads, those are options that this Board of County Commissioners has made.

So if you wanted to bring a Category B facility into a Category A facility, I think we could probably find the legal pathway forward.

MR. KLATZKOW: Mike, isn't it true that the entire AUIR process is a Collier County process and not state mandated?

MR. BOSI: Yes.

MR. KLATZKOW: We could structure it as we please.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you.

Okay. My next question, sources of authority for our involvement. And I'm glad we're involved. And you're absolutely right, it's important that we be involved because so many things in the AUIR touch upon votes that we have throughout the rest of the year that are going to impact the levels of service that have been established and sometimes get very close to if not actually encroach upon the LDC and the Growth Management Plan, judgments that we have to make. So I'm really glad this is in front of us, but I'm not sure where the ordinance source of authority comes for our involvement.

I notice on Page 3 it said -- this is 3 of 148 or Page 97 of the packet, depending upon what you're referencing. It says, "The CCPC charge is to provide, quote, recommendations to the Collier County Board of County Commissioners on specific projects and associated funding sources for inclusion in the schedule of capital improvements within the CIE during Fiscal Year '18/'19 annual update."

And then it goes on to say on Page 3 that our role is to make recommendations upon the appropriateness of the county's current levels of service, and it also says that we are to evaluate budgetary priorities and determine appropriateness of the county's currently adopted LOS standards.

So that's the language that I found in there, and I'm gathering that it was put in there by staff. It's all fine, but is there an ordinance referenced that we should look at as well?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The LDC, Michael, has a Section 6.00.00 that discusses infrastructure, the AUIR, and the CIE and what we're supposed to be receiving from staff, and it's quite a bit different than what you've just read off, because we haven't historically followed that. I think that's something that probably needs to be corrected.

Heidi?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: The process has evolved --

COMMISSIONER FRYER: You're mike's not on, I don't think.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: There are two parts to what you're hearing today. One is the AUIR, which as Mr. Klatzkow said, that's something that the county created, and the other is the schedule for the Capital Improvement Element. That's governed by Chapter 163. And that's evolved in the sense that at one time

changes to the Capital Improvement Element were deemed amendments to the Growth Management Plan and, therefore, the Planning Commission's recommendation was required.

But when Mr. Scott took office, he revamped the program, and so now the adoption of the Capital Improvement Element is not deemed a Growth Management Plan amendment.

So the county, as a matter of policy, brings it to the Planning Commission to continue to obtain the Planning Commission's recommendations or acceptance of the plans.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Well, I think it's good that we see it, and it's good that we vet it and challenge things. And I just want to be sure that we're doing everything that we're supposed to be doing and that our scope is as broad as we've been directed to extend our scope and that we're not overstepping it as well.

MR. KLATZKOW: To answer that question, you are the perfect body to be hearing this. You are not exceeding your scope, and this is a great service to the Board of County Commissioners to have it vetted through you before it goes to them.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But if we were to read the Land Development Code and what the task for this board is, it doesn't involve the AUIR except for the CIE portion, and that involves -- basically the AUIR is something that goes directly to the BCC.

We've been receiving it since Joe Schmitt initiated it way back when, and now we've been reviewing it in detail. But right now, in order to review the AUIR, there's a lot more data that really needs to be provided than what we're ending up with.

And based on that, I think -- and for this board to accept the AUIR is significant, but to approve it or provide any detail on issues we don't have in front of us today is problematic.

MR. KLATZKOW: No. I disagree. You're the local planning agency. You are, by statute, the local planning agency, and anything having to do with planning should come through you, and your recommendations, you know, are valuable, and this process is valuable.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, Jeff, then I'm at a loss, because in reading this report, I finally realized that it's based on our budget. We don't have the 800-page budget in front of us to review, and that needs to tie specifically into this, and the revenue sources and all that are not -- they're just stated. The documentation to support that is hundreds of pages that the Board reviews. We don't review the budget.

So I'm at a loss to go too far with this without having all that backup material for review and understanding it. And it's going to take a lot longer than one meeting to do something like that.

MR. KLATZKOW: That's entirely up to you what you want to review in the context of making a recommendation.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: To that point, what is our timeline? What if we wanted to spend more time on this than just today? Are we locked in by, say, the BCC's schedule?

MR. BOSI: In regards to we -- it's advisable to be able to adopt this within the calendar year of 2018. So if we can't make the November meeting, we would have to try to make it at the last -- the December meeting. So if you wanted --

COMMISSIONER FRYER: So potentially some flexibility. I'm not suggesting that we need to or should take more than a meeting, but that was going to be one of my questions, whether we were locked into --

MR. KLATZKOW: But, again, this entire process that we're going through right now is not required by Florida Statutes, all right. If the Board, for example, had questions, they could pass this on to 2019. There is no deadline that I'm aware of to get this done.

This is a planning process. It's a valuable process that Collier County does. Not every county does this. I guess the majority of them don't, I believe. And it really enables us to maintain a level of service over time where other counties who don't really look at this issue, it slips from them.

So it's a planning tool. It's a planning issue. It helps with the Board's budgetary processes where, you know, they need X number of dollars for roads, they need X number of dollars for libraries. This is how we're figuring out how much this is. But at the end of the day, it's a voluntary process that we do here to keep the quality that Collier County expects of its services.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you.

Continuing, if I may.

On Page 5 there's a reference to this language: "The process of capital improvement programming for the county is a linear equation." And then it goes on: "The equation would be new population times level-of-service standard equals capital improvement."

I accept that as far as it goes, but we're not talking about maintenance as well, are we here? We're just talking about, like, adding new roads versus fixing old roads.

MR. BOSI: The AUIR is only focused upon projects that are related to the demand of new populations. This does not include any maintenance schedule. This is not a document that tries to account for a schedule of maintenance improvements for any one of our -- it's only related to growth.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Interesting. Okay.

Let's see. So I think this is my last general question.

The phrase "impact fees" is used a lot, and I believe I understand what is meant by that. Are impact fees able to be used for maintenance?

MR. BOSI: No.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman, right now.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody have any other questions of Mike's presentation?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Mike, unless the Planning Commission has a better way they'd like to approach it, normally we just take it an element at a time, preferably in order, and I'd just as soon we go that route first.

Now, as far as presentations go, I have read everything, and I've done this for a number of years. I don't need any presentation myself, but other members of this Planning Commission may. Does anybody need each department to make presentations? If not, then let's just start with our AUIR first element, which is Transportation, and have any questions from this panel, or if staff has anything they want to say before we ask any questions, you're more than welcome to.

Let's start with that. Does anybody have any questions from the Transportation section?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I do. Do you?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ned, you just go first from now on. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No, that's okay. I'll just move right into it, because I think the rest of us may not have as many questions as you'll have, so...

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you. Attachment F, which is an extremely helpful spreadsheet -- and I asked for and received the underlying Excel spreadsheet, and when I got that, I was then able to see the formulas which really added a lot of clarity and answered a lot of what would probably have been stupid questions that now I don't have to ask. So thank you very much for sending me that spreadsheet.

At the top -- it's on Page 24; I guess it's 115 of the packet, under the header it says, "Collier County 2016 Annual Update and Inventory Report." I think you just need to change your date; bring your date up to 2018.

MS. SCOTT: That's correct. It's a typo.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Let's see. A subject that I have asked a number of times, and quite possibly because of my own limitations, brings me the need to ask it again, but I think it's very appropriate here. And it has to do with the concept of vesting and trip banks and a related question that -- the extent to which we are obligated to allow developers to exceed into deficiency areas based upon information known today when those increases are beneath what they could have done had they not asked for a deviation or a rezone or something like that.

So those are the three areas, and perhaps I could maybe just ask it open-endedly. Could you explain those three terms: Vesting, the trip bank, and maybe it's more of a legal question. When we get -- developers come in and their agents come in and they say, you know, you need to approve this because it's going to result in fewer -- less automobile traffic than we could put in had we not asked for this rezone, but then in the looking glass, if you will, or with the ability to view present conditions, we can see that that would throw us

into a deficiency situation.

And the fact that it hasn't been development in accordance with it's original zoned PUD suggests that there may be a good reason for that, that maybe the demand wasn't for that, and when this number -- when that deficiency number was established, it was with a view of lesser demand coming into being. I don't know if that makes sense. Care to comment?

MS. SCOTT: I think there's two different definitions of vesting, I think, as I'm listening. I think there's vested development rights, and then there's vesting from a concurrency standpoint. And I'm looking at Jeff.

MR. KLATZKOW: And, Trinity, feel free to help me with this conversation. Everybody has the right to develop their property sooner or later, and you cannot stop that right saying we just don't have enough -- we don't have enough of an ability for our road system to handle it, all right. That's on us. That's one of the reasons we go through this AUIR process, to see how much capacity we have, how much we're going to need, how much roads we should build, where we should build it.

You can declare a moratorium, for example, if you have a short-term problem, but there's no such thing as an indefinite moratorium. And the purpose of a moratorium is so that, okay, we're going to stop growth here for a period of a year or so, so we can figure out how we can get out of this mess, but eventually you either get out of that mess, or you allow the development and you just have crowded roads.

We're kind of in a curious process here because we've got capacity on many roads, which allows the development, but we don't necessary have enough capacity to allow everybody, ultimately, to develop. When we get to that, we're going to have to figure it out. I don't know if anybody has that answer. I know staff is working on different transportation concepts.

But for a developer to say, you know, you have to approve me because if I do what I'm zoned to do it could be worse, that's a nonsense argument by the developer, all right, and I've never understood the argument. The proposal comes to you. You view that proposal, you know, as it is rather than what they can do, and make your decision accordingly.

Usually when they're trying to rezone, it's because they can't develop the property as it is zoned. So don't tell me that, you know, well, if I developed it this way, I'd have more traffic. Well, if you could development it this way, you would, but you can't.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Right.

MR. KLATZKOW: That's an argument that's been used. I've never understood it.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: What's the longest you can impose a moratorium for?

MR. KLATZKOW: Man, I don't like more an a year. I'll go beyond a year, but we better have a real plan in place on that.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: You mean -- by a plan, you mean funding and everything?

MR. KLATZKOW: Everything, yeah.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I think I've got vesting. How about trip bank?

MS. SCOTT: Well, vesting -- a lot of our larger developments -- I'm sorry. For the record, Trinity Scott, Transportation Planning manager.

Many of our larger developments, Lely, Fiddler's Creek, Heritage Bay, many years ago when we instituted the concurrency system, there was a vesting determination that was done, and so most of those larger developments have vested rights, and we bank those trips within our system. So they're already kind of holding their place.

MR. KLATZKOW: They prepaid their impact fees.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: That's what I wanted.

MR. KLATZKOW: What they did was -- and Nick Casalanguida was instrumental in this -- is that you would prepay your impact fees, and we would use those impact fees then to expand the capacity of the roads so that the roads were there before the people were there. That was the concept.

And so rather than simply issuing the impact fees on permitting or CO, depending upon when we've done this, they prepaid them, and it enabled the county to expand the road system earlier than we could have, but we would bank them. Say, okay, you've already bought 100 homes worth of trips, you're vested for that,

okay. We can't say no if you want to put those 100 in, and we did that very successfully for many years. That's was six-laned -- that's what ultimately six-laned everything was that system.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Got it. So when something goes into the trip bank, it's assigned to a particular depositor at that bank. It's not generally available.

MR. KLATZKOW: Yes.

MS. SCOTT: Yes.

MR. KLATZKOW: Well, he can sell it, in a sense. There's some assignability of these things. But, at the end of the day, from a practical standpoint, the developer wants to develop, and this gives them assurance that the county's not going to say, no, you can't develop, we don't have the capacity.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: And there are many things that that applies to, like stormwater and water and sewer, and -- stormwater was a bad one. I shouldn't --

MR. KLATZKOW: No. The one that we've done was transportation. That's been the --

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Yeah, but concurrency also pertains to water and sewer.

MR. KLATZKOW: Concurrency also pertains to water. We've never really had an issue with maintaining concurrency on sewer and water.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: I remember -- the only moratorium I remember was due to sewers.

MR. KLATZKOW: That must have been a long time ago.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: It was, yeah. It was before your time.

MR. KLATZKOW: That was before George's time.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Yeah. It was Jim Mudd, yeah.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: My next question appears on Page 26 of 148.

MS. SCOTT: If I could -- Commissioner Fryer, if I could just touch on trip banking and --

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Please.

MS. SCOTT: -- when a project actually gets banked.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yes.

MS. SCOTT: When a project comes before the Planning Commission in a zoning petition, the majority of the time -- and I'm not going to say all the time, because sometimes there's an associated Developer Contribution Agreement that might call for that vesting to be done concurrent when the Board is approving the PUD. Typically, those trips are not banked at the time that you see them. They get banked when they come in for a Site Development Plan or a PPL, plan and plat review, through our development review section.

They then go back, make sure that there's sufficient capacity available. The person pays a portion of their impact fees, and they receive a certificate of adequate public facility, and then those trips are physically banked at that time.

So when someone is coming before you, not always, but most of the time, they are not within that concurrency system.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Interesting. Frequently the term is used, and it certainly appears prominently on Attachment F, but I can't think of many occasions where the developers' agents have stood up in front of us and said, by the way, we have this many trip-banked vested trips, if you will.

MS. SCOTT: Right. Most of the time it has not occurred, unless they're coming in for an amendment and it's one of those older PUDs that paid some time ago.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Got it. I want to go now to Attachment G, if I may. Trinity, are you ready?

MS. SCOTT: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Under Attachment G, there is a reference to improvements that are expected between now and 2023, I thought, maybe -- well, maybe beyond that.

In any event, particularly with respect to the ones that are going to become deficient between now and 2023, I see a number of references under -- pardon me. I didn't bring the right glasses -- under solutions where it's repeated the solution is continue to monitor. And these, to me, seem to be situations that -- well,

thank you.

These are situations -- it doesn't work. Thanks anyway -- where, don't we need to be planning in more detail than just saying "continue to monitor"?

MS. SCOTT: Excuse me. I'm not following with the technology.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. On Attachment G.

MS. SCOTT: No, no, no. I was just forwarding it so everyone who's viewing would have it as well.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yeah. I see, one, two, three, four, five, six times under the solutions column that it says "continue to monitor," and some of these are getting pretty ripe.

MS. SCOTT: So when we are looking -- and, by the way, I have Jeff Perry here from Stantec. They also assist staff in preparing this document.

When we are looking at our traffic counts and doing our projections, we use a minimum of 2 percent for the growth factor or what the historic growth factor is. So if the historic growth factor is less than 2 percent, we still project out to 2 percent. So we feel that we're very conservative. If the historic growth factor on the roadway would have been 5, we project that out.

So we continue to monitor those things. If we have a new roadway that's coming online, perhaps a parallel roadway, we'll monitor for that parallel roadway to be widened and watch the traffic redistribute.

Also, some of these roadways could be impacted. Why we look at this on an annual basis, if there's construction; Vanderbilt Drive had been closed for 18 months. You see an increase in traffic along U.S. 41. Well, that's obviously because the folks were diverting over.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I understand that concept.

I'm looking at one of these that's going to become deficient in 2020, which is coming up pretty soon, and that's the North Trail between Wiggins Pass and Immokalee. That says "continue to monitor." Is that an example of a case where other roads have mitigated the traffic on that segment?

MS. SCOTT: Well, in this particular situation I would say yes, it may occur, but also that is the section where folks were diverting. Vanderbilt Drive was closed for 18 months and just opened this past March. So those counts certainly came up as people were diverting over.

I would also submit that once Livingston -- I'm sorry -- Veterans Memorial is punched through to Old 41, I believe that we'll start seeing some folks divert over to Livingston north/south to get to their destination.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Thank you. That is helpful.

Let's see. My last question on traffic, and maybe it's already been answered at least in part by the County Attorney, so if that's the case, I apologize here. But in areas which have been designated TCMAs or TCEAs and it's clear we've got a problem, we've got a congestion problem right now, are we limited in recommending solutions to the various solutions that are set out in Transportation Element 5.5 like special parking for carpoolers and things of that nature? And if so, have those things ever been empirically tested or validated?

MR. KLATZKOW: Well, you're free to make whatever recommendations that you want. That's what you guys do. As far as the validation, that's a staff issue as to whether or not this stuff actually works.

MS. SCOTT: To my knowledge, it has not been.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Just as a layperson reading the list of items, they don't seem to be very robust in my judgment in relation to having a real meaningful effect on traffic, but maybe I'm wrong.

Okay. I think that answers my questions on traffic, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Does anybody else have any questions on traffic?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you, Trinity.

MS. SCOTT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think the next item up is stormwater.

Ned, do you want to ask your stormwater questions?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yes. I just have a couple; maybe just one.

On Page 3 of 148, or Packet Page 123, I meant, of 148 or Packet Page 123, there's a reference to a five-year deficit of about three million. And under Section 2, supplemental revenue sources, it says "none

required," and yet we're projecting a deficit. Could you comment on that?

MS. PATTERSON: Hi. Good morning. Amy Patterson, for the record.

Actually, this document was revised substantially from the time that we reviewed it with the County Manager's Office to today due to the delay of the implementation and adoption of the stormwater utility. The stormwater utility was delayed by the Board at the first budget hearing in September, which would have provided additional revenue to meet the five-year plan needed in stormwater.

In addition to what you're seeing in front of you over the five years, there's at least another \$120 million of identified needs in the stormwater program on the capital side of the house, and \$80 million --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Slow down a little. I know she's probably having a hard time typing that fast.

MS. PATTERSON: Sorry, sorry -- and \$80 million at least of backlogged maintenance. So we did scramble a little bit to dial this back to the five-year period.

At this point in time, what we're being allocated through the General Fund and 111 is what we have available to use for the stormwater program. And, absent of that, we will continue to move out with the utility potentially or be looking for alternative revenue sources outside of the stormwater utility.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: But if I recall correctly, this is the only situation where we're facing just, like, a naked deficit, an uncovered deficit and no action required. It seems somewhat anomalous in relation to the rest of this AUIR.

MS. PATTERSON: It is different from anything else in the AUIR, and I think with the -- like I said, with the suspension -- the one-year delay of the implementation or the consideration for the implementation of the stormwater utility has sort of put us in this unique limbo.

Should the utility fail or fail to be implemented then, obviously, other strategies are going to have to be looked at to address the needs of stormwater, but at this time, right now we're proceeding under the direction of the Board to go out and do public outreach and to look at the issues that were raised as part of the public hearing related to the stormwater utility.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: So if this deficit can't be filled, is staff prepared to reduce expenditures by like amount?

MS. PATTERSON: We already have, so we have -- we have a balanced budget, and so all we're showing is the need in the next four years, and we would continue on with reducing our projects to make the available --

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Well, I realize this is projected through to 2023 so --

MS. PATTERSON: So you would -- essentially, as long as we're directed to show the need, we will, but we also will balance to the budget that we're provided. And I know that there's conversations as to other strategies that may be used should the -- so, obviously, we've spent over three years working on the stormwater utility concept, but should that be -- should the Board decide that's not the direction they want to move in, obviously, we would have to consider other strategies, because the problems aren't going away. We have to figure out a way.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: And, therefore, wouldn't you say that the phrase "none required" is incorrect?

MR. KLATZKOW: It's a level-of-service issue.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Reducing level of service?

MR. KLATZKOW: It's no different than any other infrastructure, okay. What do you want for your library system? What do you want from the roads? Well, depending upon what you want, you've got to spend X number of dollars. The Board has elected, at least for this year budget, not to expect -- not to expend what staff has asked for. At the end of the day, that reduces the level of service. Now, whether that level of service is A, B, C, D, or F, you know, as time goes on --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It might help, Ned, if you wanted to understand the historical issues involving especially that element, in 2003 -- you can go online and see the AUIRs going all the way back, I think, to 2003. I've reviewed them all 2003 through 2016 in regards to that issue. And you might look at those and then determine what happened in 2017 and this year in comparison, and that probably will -- there will be a lot of questions that you can get -- you might want to ask staff, because it will be after today before

you could review those, but it's something you may want to look at.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you.

All right. This question is broader than just stormwater, but it came up in my notes first. Well, I'll hold it for now. That's all I have on stormwater.

MS. PATTERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody else have anything in stormwater?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Mike, what's the next one up? I guess I could find it just as easy as you can. There's stormwater. Stormwater's got a lot of paperwork.

MR. BOSI: Potable water; Public Utilities.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Ned?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: None.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody else have any questions on potable water?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nope. Next one.

MR. BOSI: I believe would be wastewater.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ned?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: None.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anyone else have any questions on wastewater?

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: None.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Next one? Eric, did you have something you want to add?

MR. FEY: I did, yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. FEY: Good morning, Commissioners. For the record, Eric Fey, senior project manager for Public Utilities, engineer and project management.

I just wanted to submit for the record three revised charts that simply show some labeling that was inadvertently omitted from the version in your packet. There's no change substantively to what you reviewed. Just some labeling to clarify things for the Board.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you. And one quick question, not about the report necessarily. In prior reports, though, I notice that you had commented on the monitoring efforts of our aquifers, and previously they said they were either holding steady or doing fine.

Do you have anything that you could supplement later on, just send to us to let us know the status of those aquifers?

MR. FEY: Sure will.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Because that's just helpful knowing, going forward, because between roads and water, there's always questions, and that just helps answer one of them.

MR. FEY: Will do.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Mr. Chairman, my next question doesn't come up until Page 215 of the packet, and it just for -- you know, for discussion at the present time, it's going to be Exhibit A, Collier County Schedule of Capital Improvements, so I don't have any more questions until we reach that page.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, we'll walk through and ask if anybody else has.

So the next one is Solid Waste, and I know Dan was here. Oh, that's -- and I don't have any questions of Solid Waste. Our Solid Waste Department is real solid. So does anybody have any questions of Solid Waste?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That takes us, Mike, to the next one after that.

Schools. And Joe's not here, but I'm sure he wouldn't have wanted to ask -- well, no, we'll leave Tom alone today. Does anybody have any questions on the school system? Mike?

MR. BOSI: Okay. I just would like to note that school district -- we've had our annual school working group meeting where the school district meets with all the municipalities in the county to talk about

growth and projections and share information.

Had a real good meeting with them, and they are in the final determinations for that -- the location of the next high school. Two alternatives, I believe. It's Livingston east/west location, also Triple E (sic), which is off of the Vanderbilt Beach extension. Once that determination is made, the county is prepared to adequately provide the infrastructure needs to either of those facilities. I just wanted to provide that to the county, or to the Board.

And also I believe next year you'll see more specificity as to the direction that the school board's going to go within that location.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I know the school system is represented by Tom, and they don't show necessarily up for the meetings, but I do want to compliment whoever is doing their long-range planning, because in review of the rural areas where their planning efforts are already in place, you guys are way ahead of the curve in finding locations out there for the school system. So I'm glad to see that. That's good news.

That's the only questions I have.

MR. EASTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I'd like to put on the record Amy Lockhart, formerly Amy Taylor's, done a really good job. She is, in fact, our long-range planner. It's a team. And I'd like to thank Mike as well. We've coordinated with the county and worked well with the county siting our properties.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. And then that takes us to county parks. I have one question. And you have a -- go ahead, Ned. Now, you told me not till 215, so, okay.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I know I did. Well, it comes up on Page 216.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm just teasing you.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: But I'm organized strictly by page here rather than subject, and so I apologize for that.

My question about Parks and Recreation is that it's showing a surplus. And I found this on Page 216 of the packet where the revenue is -- excuse me -- yeah, the revenue is 47 million and the expenses are 17 million. Correct?

MR. BOSI: Correct.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: So we've got about a \$30 million surplus here and significant needs in other areas.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I mean, I think the land generates the surplus, and that's because we went up, and we've got not only land that is probably going to be transferred to other departments in some cases, but we've also got the issues involving the acquisition of the sports park, which really bumped us up. It really doesn't mean there's a liquid surplus, but it's like one of those surpluses that's not money. It's land. So that's probably where that is coming from.

If I'm wrong Mike, just say so.

MR. BOSI: Thank you, Chair. You're spot on.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Well, that -- just -- you said it well, but let me be sure that I understand it. So there's nothing that could be borrowed from this to pay for other needs?

MR. BOSI: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh, I think there's an attempt to move some land around, but that may be the extent of the borrowing from what I understand. But that's not even finalized yet.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Stan?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Is there anybody here from Parks and Rec?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I don't know. Do we need them for something? You have a question?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm glad they're not here, then. They're doing their job.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Just curious.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The only question that I have that I think, if the Board may remember, I remember from being on this board all these years, last year in particular, we as a board recommended that they add a very clear supplement to the Parks and Rec section isolating out the beach growth, the beach

needs, and all that. And I even brought the charts and graphs used in 2003 and 2004 as examples of what we'd like to see. I couldn't find it.

Now, there's several hundred pages. Maybe I missed it. I found a little blurb in the appendix that was not sufficient, but I would think when it gets to the Board, maybe some of the Board members remember it, because they endorsed that recommendation, so I would highly recommend that Parks put that back in or explain why they're not going to.

MR. BOSI: Noted. And I will carry that message to Parks and Rec.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And that's the only remaining comment I have. Anybody else have any others?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: I just have one question.

On the -- on Page 120 of 148, the notes -- and it's for regional park, I guess, it says 48 -- 46 acres for Rural Lands West.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: That's outside the 10-year window?

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: But in the adoption resolution on Page 9 of 14 it states that it's 35 acres, and it's next --

MR. BOSI: The Rural Lands West contribution, there's an inconsistency. So the resolution attached to -- it must be within the CIE. The CIE covers the 5- and the 10-year, so I'm not sure how that --

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Right. It's from 24 to 28, but it lists 35 acres for Rural Lands West. There's no projects, but it states it's 35, and this says 46.

MR. BOSI: We will align that with the correct -- because they are allocating the 46 acres, so we will align that within the CIE.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody else on Parks and Rec?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That will take us to the Capital Improvement Element. Ned?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you.

On Page 135 of 148 or 215 of the packet, whichever you choose.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: How about -- mine's totally numbered differently, so...

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Well, this is Exhibit A.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm just teasing you. We're doing the CIE, though, right?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yes. I think this is Exhibit A of the resolution, and it is the CIE, I believe. The second line item there having to do with Oil Well Road and Everglades -- the other columns are not filled in. They're blank. And that's the only situation where that's the case. Is there a reason for that?

MR. BOSI: I'll defer to Trinity Scott.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Sorry, Trinity.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Isn't that the section that's already completed? The mid-section is the one that's still going to be completed, if I'm not mistaken, isn't it?

MS. SCOTT: Correct. Once again, for the record, Trinity Scott, Transportation Planning manager.

You're correct, Mr. Strain, that section is complete. Let me just look and see if we maybe had a carryover line item in ours. Sometimes with ours, though, they'll kind of carry forward if we have outstanding -- if we're still obtaining right-of-way. Sometimes that court process will take some time even though the project's done.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I think what Ned's really getting at is if it needs to be filled in, it should be. And if it doesn't need to be, it probably shouldn't indicate so by being gone or something.

MS. SCOTT: Correct. We will talk with our budget folks and find out why it's still hanging out in there.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. My next question with respect to that exhibit is broader, and it has to do with the fact that revenues of 385 million and some change comes out to the same number for expenditures; 385 million and change. And I guess my question is how do you calculate this? It's got to be

more than just happy coincidence that we have exactly the same amount of money coming in as we're going to be expending going out.

Is this a matter of priorities? Is this something that would be obvious to us if we had more of the work papers in front of us?

MS. SCOTT: I'm thinking on how, because -- I'm actually looking to Amy maybe, because she might get more into the budgeting part of it than I do.

I know that when I'm sitting down and we are deciding which projects to move forward with based on the projections of what roads are going to fail soonest, you know, why do we not have a parallel roadway, those types of things, we start plugging things in and moving them around. We do balance. Sometimes we'll balance with money going to reserves.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. Well, I guess what I'm hoping to hear -- and I think it's the case, but please confirm, that you look at what money you have. That's step one. Then you add up your revenues, and then you can identify and prioritize expenditures, but they're not to exceed the amount of the revenues. I mean, is that how you do it?

MS. SCOTT: Typically. We do have an unfunded need, though, in transportation that we are plugging in with a balance line of an unfunded-needs line.

Another thing that we're also looking at when we're looking at projects is based on revenue projections for impact fee districts and trying to make sure that we are spending in the appropriate areas as well, because if the impact fee collections are only coming in in one district, then they can't be used countywide. We have to look at all of that when we're projecting what projects we're going to move forward with.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. All right. I think we're saying the same thing.

The sales tax vote that's coming up next month, does that play a role at all in this process or not? Have you made any assumptions about that --

MR. KLATZKOW: No, that does not play a role in this process.

MS. SCOTT: No. Everything in here is listed as an unfunded need. So there's a balancing revenue line item titled "unfunded needs."

MR. KLATZKOW: This is where staff tells you what we need, you review it, make recommendations. The Board's got to figure out how to pay for it.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. This is certainly not to be laid upon staff, but the news media picks up and reports the notion that if the increase fails, then there's going to have to be another bond issue. And I'm not -- maybe it's improper for me to even ask this question. But I guess I just -- I would like some assurances -- and this is policy issue -- that there's a third choice, which is to reduce expenditures.

MR. KLATZKOW: If you reduce your expenditures, you've got to change your level of service.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Exactly.

MR. KLATZKOW: We can certainly do that. That could be a recommendation from the Planning Commission but, you know, it's -- it's a zero-sum game.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Right. Okay. I mean, so there are really three approaches: There's the sales tax, there's bond issue, or there's reducing level of service.

MR. KLATZKOW: Or there's increasing taxes.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Or increasing property taxes, yeah. Got it. Thank you.

That's all I have on Category A.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good. Anybody else have anything on Category A?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Let's move to Category B. And Category B, first item up is county jail and correctional facilities. Does anyone anybody have any questions? Ned?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: It seems to me -- this is, again, a big-picture thing for the County Commissioners obviously to decide, but my recommendation would be that law enforcement facilities and EMS services really belong under Category A in terms of importance.

Now, I've been told, and I take it as a given, that under state statute Parks and Recreation has to be in there; I understand. But when you think about prioritizing what is most important to citizens and taxpayers,

residents of the county, that right up there with removal of sewage, which is very important, education, very importantly, would be law enforcement and emergency medical care.

And the Sheriff, I think, makes a case for the need to have a more modern evidence processing and storage building. And I can see situations where if you don't have adequate storage and processing facilities you're going to botch your chain of custody and you're going to have to release defendants without a trial because of a lack of chain of custody. So, you know, potentially putting more criminals on the street. So, to me, that's a pretty important thing.

And I'll speak about EMS when we come to it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. BOSI: And I would just note that we have allocated in the 50 -- or the '20, '22 to '23 the forensic evidence facility at 90,000 square feet has been allocated, so it's within the five-year capital improvement or the five-year window of improvements which last year it was outside of it. So we have heard the Sheriff's Office, and we're working with the facilities and our revenue office to try to align the needs of the facilities -- or of the Sheriff's Office for the new facility and the cost associated with that.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yeah, I understand that it's a priority and it's good, but to me it should be a Category A priority.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mike, in order to help us understand that scenario, we certainly wouldn't be able to expect that today. But next year when you come in for the AUIR, could you explain to us what the advantages and disadvantages are to go from a Category A to Category B, what it means from an intensity viewpoint and the benefits or negatives of it so we know why. We didn't put that Category B; the Board did. So maybe there's a change of heart, and it's a good question to take a look at some research on, if you don't mind.

MR. BOSI: Sure. And I can give you a short answer right off the bat. It means that you could deny petitions related to the lack of available capacity within those systems. Petitions would be evaluated against concurrency. It means that we would evaluate the capacity within EMS or law enforcement against the demands that each individual petition was requesting, and it would be subject to that same type of analysis that Roads and Parks and Public Utilities would be provided for.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Deferring the more detailed discussion to next year, as the Chairman suggests, that's a good idea. But isn't it fair to say, though, that priorities or needs that are in Category A are going to get taken care of first and at a higher level than those in B or C?

MR. BOSI: Those are policy decisions that the Board of County Commissioners make.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: No, I understand. Yeah.

MR. BOSI: But the inclination of -- that they do make the concurrency management system up, that those would be the ones that would gain the attention of the Board of County Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you. That's all I have on Sheriff.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody else have anything on county jail and correctional facilities?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody have anything on law enforcement facilities?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Let's move to libraries, library buildings and library material and collections. Anybody have anything on those?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nope. You're free today. Thank you.

And then Emergency Medical Services. Ned, that's your specialty. Do you have any questions?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, my main concern is that it has been characterized or categorized at the B level rather than the A. And I want to say -- this, I think, is going to be my last question, but it's going to come in the form of a comment and a recommendation.

There are really three points I have to make with respect to what's been proposed: First, there's a -- there is a huge projected shortfall here; a \$6.4 million projected shortfall, and if this need isn't funded,

there is going to have to be a reduction of the level of service, I would think, unless some other funding source can be found.

And with regard to EMS level of service, the level itself was already reduced back in 2007, I believe, to take a more accurate account of the difference between the urban part of the county and the rural part and being more realistic about response times on the rural side.

Now, there is a level-of-service standard of eight minutes for EMS response on the urban side and 12 minutes on the rural side. And so a further reduction to that would be a very negative thing, I think, for emergency medical care on the rural side. And so, to me, that's reason number one that EMS should be elevated to Category A. And I notice from one of the images that you have in here, I guess it's on Page 267 of the packet, it shows that the six million that we're falling short of right now, or not funded, would put three new EMS stations on the urban side and two on the rural side based upon population, I'm sure.

So I think that's a very high priority. We have a county of aging population, and people should be, I think, very concerned about how long it takes EMS to get to them after they call 911.

Second, there's something else very important than doesn't even show up in the AUIR materials, and I know that there's a lot of discussion going on within EMS in an attempt to find a good solution to this problem, but it still is a problem, and I think it needs to be voiced, and that has to do with the fact that Collier County has no trauma hospitals. And it's probably not generally known by people that that's the case, but it is the case.

And since we don't have trauma hospitals, patients who sustain traumatic injury, let's say, in a very serious automobile collision, the best care that they're going to receive is going to involve being helicoptered out to Lee Memorial or one of the trauma hospitals in Broward or Miami-Dade County so that they can get to the Trauma Center and into a surgical suite as close as possible to within what's called the golden hour from the time the accident occurs to the patient is actually in the surgical suite.

And in many cases the helicopter is not able to fulfill the golden-hour need for folks in Collier County. Sometimes this is just a matter of how busy we are, and in some cases it really can't be helped. But other cases, perhaps, it can.

We're taking in a new helicopter, a brand new helicopter soon, and there's an issue over what to do about the helicopter we have now, whether we sell it, take the revenue, or keep it as backup.

It's interesting to know that our first-line helicopter, whether it's the one we have now or the one we're going to get, needs significant maintenance annually, and maintenance at weeks at a time, and frequently these several weeks of maintenance take place during the summer months which, of course, affects those of us who are year-round residents. And if you don't have helicopter transportation available directly from Collier County, then you have to ask for it from somebody flying in from Lee or flying in from one of the other adjoining counties on the east side.

They can decline on the basis of they can't spare the helicopter, it's busy or whatever. So what you're left with is a situation where the ground ambulance will be forced to take the patient who needs a Trauma Center within the golden hour to a non-trauma center for stabilization, and frequently that level of stabilization will not extend the golden hour because what the patient needs is to be opened up and fixed by trauma surgeons.

So the patient gets stabilized to the extent that the medical hospital can and then transported somehow to a trauma center for definitive care that the patient needs.

So what I'm hoping that will be considered, I guess, by the county commissioners is either that we make an arrangement with the manufacturer of the new helicopter to supply us a backup during times of maintenance, particularly while the warranty's in place and, second, that we don't -- that we don't sell or otherwise dispose of our existing helicopter because it could be used for backup and be of assistance to the Collier County patients in times where the primary helicopter isn't.

And my final point has to do with interlocal agreements that Collier County EMS and other Collier County agencies are asked to enter into with other municipalities. And I'm intentionally not going to mention any names of other municipalities because I want to keep this at the general level, because it's really a general comment.

When Collier County is asked to supply additional resources in the area of EMS to another

municipality, it is exceedingly important that the county charge that municipality the fully loaded cost of the additional resources. If it doesn't, the county will suffer by having to absorb those additional costs. And this is particularly true where, in cases where, in the county's best judgment, that particular municipality is already well served and doesn't need the additional resources.

So what I urge for staff, and I guess for the county commission, is that every effort be made in making interlocal agreements with other municipalities to assure that fully loaded costs are recovered so as to minimize any burden, any incidental burden to the Collier County taxpayers and the patients.

And, Mr. Chairman, that is all I have.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody else have any questions on EMS facilities? Stan?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Just kind of for Ned. How many helicopters are in Collier County with all the different departments that have helicopters?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Oh, I don't know. The patient-transporting helicopters are composed of one.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: In an emergency, could you have other county helicopters rigged to transport patients?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I'm not able to comment on that. I'm not sufficiently acquainted with the subject matter. I suppose given enough time you could re-equip, refit a helicopter to become an ambulance helicopter, but it's not something that you could do right away, I don't think.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Just curious. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody else have any questions on EMS?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: So you would suggest a change in the level of service?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yes, change in the level of service --

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: So there would be more helicopters?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: No, just to have adequate backup I think is all I'm asking for at this point. Plus an agreement with the manufacturer to -- you know, when it has to take our helicopter for warranty maintenance that it supplies a backup helicopter for us particularly --

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: I agree with you. I think one is not enough.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Well, that's another question, and one may well not be enough. Unfortunately, there's no way that I know of that the county could force a private hospital to become a Trauma Center and, sadly, trauma center medical care is a financial loss item for hospitals.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Do you have all that, Mike?

MR. BOSI: Yes, most of that's operational discussion with EMS.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. You might just want to make a note that we've suggested having a more detailed operational discussion on some aspects of EMS, and that will open up the door for Ned's issue to be brought up under that agenda then. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Next one up is government buildings. Anybody have any issues on government buildings? I notice our Sheriff's Department's here. You know, we already did you guys. It was so complicated, it took hours, but we finished it.

And I don't have anything else other than where we're at, then. I think we've finished the review to the point of the presentations. Mike?

MR. BOSI: If you'd like coastal, any questions on coastal zoning? Gary's here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Gary's been sitting here all morning. I don't have any questions on coastal other than they ought to open up more areas for kayaking, but that's a whole 'nother program.

Anybody else have any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. With that, we're wrapping it up, Mike. Where are we at next? I think your motions --

MR. BOSI: I believe we're at the final slide of my presentation, which is the modified recommendations, the modified actions that we would be seeking from the Planning Commission.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'll read them into the record, and then however you-all want to discuss

them, amend them, or vote on them just holler.

First one is to accept the attached document as the 2018 Annual Update and Inventory Report on public facilities. Is there a motion or discussion on that item?

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: So moved.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Second.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Second -- third.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion made and seconded. Made by Patrick, seconded by Ned.

Discussion?

(No response.)

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 5-0.

Second item, to accept the Category A, B, and C facilities relative to projects and revenue sources with Category A facilities set forth for inclusion in the schedule of capital improvements of the annual CIE update and amendment.

Any comments, discussion, or motion?

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a second to the motion made by Patrick?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Now I'll call discussion. Anybody have discussion? Ned?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: May it -- may the motion reflect my strong recommendation to the county Board of Commissioners to reevaluate certain Category B items such as pertaining to Sheriff's Office and EMS for inclusion in Category A?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I have no problem with that. Patrick, as the motion maker, any problem?

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: So moved.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay with you?

Okay. Discussion?

(No response.)

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 5-0.

Number 3, to accept the CIE's schedule of improvement update and, by reference, the school district's capital improvement plan and the district facilities work program. Is there a discussion or motion?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Will that item be corrected before it goes to the BCC?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, the corrections we've made on record, yes.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yeah.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: That item either removed or number supplied to the columns.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER FRYER: I'll so move.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Made by Ned.
Seconded by?
COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Second.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Stan. Discussion?

(No response.)

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 5-0.

That gets us through the AUIR for this year, Mike. Thank you very much and, Corby, for all your work.

Now we have one item of new business. Diane's last meeting was last time, so we definitely need a new secretary. I didn't know if you-all had preferences for changes in the other positions, which is chairman and vice chairman. I've been chairman, obviously, and Diane -- or Karen's vice chair.

So let's start with Diane's position first. Is there someone who wants to make a motion for somebody to fill that position?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, you guys are -- Ned would -- I mean, would you --

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: I'd like to nominate Ned.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Ned's nominated. Seconded by?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Stan.

All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ned, you get the heavy responsibility of handling the names each meeting.

That's a tough one.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Stan's changing his name to Williams.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That works perfect.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I can say Chrzanoswki. I can say it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Any changes in -- would anybody else like to see changes in the other two officers' positions?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I'd move that the existing officers be reelected.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Second.

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.
CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries.

Thank you-all. That wraps up our new business. I don't think there's any old business, and there's no public here for comment, so that takes us to an adjournment. Would anybody wish to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: By Patrick.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by Ned.

All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We're out of here. Thank you-all.

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by order of the Chair at 10:17 a.m.

COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION



MARK STRAIN, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST

CRYSTAL K. KINZEL, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT & COMPTROLLER

These minutes approved by the Board on 11-1-18, as presented or as corrected _____.

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