

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker  
01-25-2018 Meeting**

**Comment Card**

Comment	Category
<p>The feeling amongst Collier County Residents is that we have once again been deceived. The promised limit of 16,800 acres rural land development has now expanded to 43,000 acres or 87,000 acres. History repeats itself here. The promised limitations on coastal growth in Collier County in the 70s and 80s were also ignored and reversed, leading to the current overdevelopment and overpopulation there. Learn from previous mistakes - coastal growth, Ave Maria, Oil Well Road and Golden Gate Estates.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Development Footprint / Overdevelopment</b></p>
<p>Environmental Confederation of Southwest Florida (ECOSWF) The first Rural Lands (RLSA) Restudy meeting on January 25, 2018 provided many speakers. It was unfortunate that the purpose, goals and potential desired outcomes with timetables were not part of the discussion. Decisions will be made during the restudy that will have consequences—taxes for new roads and infrastructure, more traffic congestion, loss of wildlife and sensitive lands, and availability of water. What happens as a result of the RLSA restudy will impact the quality of life of all the residents. The restudy needs transparency and an all inclusive group of stakeholders to give validity to the restudy.</p> <p>As state growth management laws have all but disappeared, growth management by local governments is more important than ever before. Government action that results in sustainability, meeting the needs of the present without endangering the ability of future generations to meet their own needs, is what Collier County residents expect and deserve.</p> <p>In 2002 Collier County adopted the RLSA program to protect agricultural land, direct incompatible uses away from wildlife, especially listed species, and their habitat, and to allow for appropriate development while avoiding sprawl. The original RLSA established that only 9% (or 16,800 acres) of the 182,000 acres would be developed and the rest would remain in agriculture and conservation. We urge this re-study process to address issues raised by members of the Collier County Environmental Advisory Council (EAC) during the 2007 5-year review process, most importantly the revised "credit" formula that allocated many more credits than the initial RLSA plan.</p> <p>The EAC also voiced concern about the potential impacts to the water resource availability of the Lower Hawthorn aquifer -- how will withdrawals from these new towns impact other users? This concern is echoed by the University of Florida, the Florida Department of Agriculture and 1000 Friends of Florida. Much has changed since the original RLSA was adopted and the 2007 5-year review. There are now three studies by panther experts, including the Florida Panther Protection Program Technical Review Team's 2010 Report that identifies the areas in the RLSA that are essential to the long-term survival of the panther. This new information and other information on climate change, increasing traffic and population growth, and updated water recharge levels need to be factored in a new proposal."</p> <p>A restudy program that factors in all new information and provides workshops that educate the public on all the aspects of the program, allows time for the public to ask questions, meets at a convenient time, and addresses the exact cost for roads and how water resources will be affected.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Water/Transparency/Agricultural Land/Development Control/ Panther Studies</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**

**2-22-2018 Meeting**

<b>Objective Input Card Feedback</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Category</b>
Keep Collier County from being over developed as Dade County/Miami area has. Preserve water resources and habitats.	<b>Overdevelopment / Preservation</b>
To make the RLSA better! Provide agriculture credits, create wildlife connections	<b>Agriculture / Wildlife</b>
Have actual impact on BCC's ultimate decision	<b>Impact on Final Decisions</b>
1. Reassess based on initial intent - 16,800 acres of development only. 2. Reassess Natural Resource Index values based on new best available science. 3. Recalibrate credit # needed for each acre of development 4. Calculate infrastructure costs.	<b>Development Footprint / Updated Data / Infrastructure Cost</b>
To assess the opinions and wants of an interested segment of the public regarding RLSA policies. I'm concerned that these sessions may not appear relevant to a larger segment of the population, either by their underestimation or an inability to educate/convey value.	<b>Impact on Final Decisions</b>
To begin talking about the issues. -Too Ambitious - Materials Needed - More info in advance, including topics for discussion and questions.	<b>Impact on Final Decisions / More Information Needed</b>
To provide for responsible, fair development of eastern lands that is best for the country economically and environmentally.	<b>Balance Development / Economy / Environment</b>
Not sure what the objective is at this point, but it doesn't seem good!	<b>Other</b>
There is a basic misunderstanding of some very basic parameters of the program that participants do need correct information on in order to make comments. These need to be addressed so people are basing input on accurate info. It is hard to come into a session as a new person who is unaware of program.	<b>More Information Needed</b>
To understand the RLSA and discuss ways to strengthen or make it a better program.	<b>Strengthen RLSA</b>
Need to consider the pertinent 5-Year Review Findings and recommend GMPA's Update data/science as needed, but don't take another 9 years!	<b>Updated Data</b>
To educate and motivate the citizens of Collier County to understand the environmental importance of the RLSA, and how the RLSA operates.	<b>Education / Environment</b>
<b>Group Worksheet Feedback</b>	
Just not possible to answer these questions without knowing more about easements and how they work.	<b>More Information Needed</b>
Let County buy the easement credits instead of selling them	<b>Credits</b>

RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker

2-22-2018 Meeting

Additional Comments Received

Comment

Category

This is the most important Collier County plan that will affect all citizens for the rest of time. We need to get it right.

1. Video record all sessions
  2. Start at the beginning. We don't understand why the second part of the session at the February 22 meeting began with policies in the middle.
  3. Have speakers comments posted on the website
  4. Have summaries of prior meetings available at each new session
  5. Provide questions in advance
  6. Have feedback forms after every session
  7. Change schedule for August meeting. People are on vacation. If you provide video and feedback options, we can participate. (Use technology)
- We need more citizen participation!

1. Improving outreach to citizens

Communications to improve attendance should be approached like any marketing plan.

- Explain what the program and restudy is-use language that is understandable and promotes interest
  - Tell them why it is important to attend
  - Explain the benefits of attending
  - Tell the time, place, agenda
  - Provide background information that is easily accessible on a website
  - Provide names of individuals who can explain the topic
2. Providing ongoing information/transparency
    - VIDEO RECORD ALL MEETINGS

Currently there is no information available to citizens who didn't attend the first two meetings. There is no frame of reference to be able to go back and evaluate what was said. Individuals who didn't attend can't get any information.

Speakers comments aren't available.

3. The Restudy Process-Intent is the key

Good dialogue and problems solving occur when there is a clear intent and good questions that allow for open ended brainstorming-not yes or no. If you start with something already written (Policies) it discourages new ideas. For example:

- Start a meeting with the intent such as, "Agriculture is an important component of the RLSA. Currently, we have lost X% How can we incentivize it? What will it take to promote it"

• Then, the facilitator leads. Break into groups as done in the second meeting. Brainstorm. Share ideas. Use recommendations for future meetings.

- Post and summarize all suggestions on the website so others can see and respond.

4. Website and links to background information

- The website is poorly constructed. The links don't work. Finding the "White Paper" took several hours and several phone calls to access it. I could not recommend it to individuals who were interested because I couldn't explain how to find it.

- There is no interactive application (like Facebook)
- There are no links to a depository of individual topics such as SSA's, WRA's, etc. so it is difficult to comprehend all the comments and recommendations from the past

We live in an age of technology. These things are possible to fix. Maybe someone from FGCU can help.

**Recording / More Information Needed / Need More Participation / Communications**

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**

**2-22-2018 Meeting**

**Additional Comments Received (Continued)**

Comment	Category
<p>The RLSA overview/history presentation at the Feb. 22nd Restudy Workshop—although brief—was much appreciated. However, the second part of the workshop concerning GMP Group 1 policies 1.7 and 1.15 discouraged public participation. Participants were asked about stewardship easements and super-majority/simple majority approval of a Stewardship Receiving Area (SRA), but absolutely no background information was provided. This part of the workshop was designed for stakeholders already familiar with the issues. In order to participate meaningfully one would have had to research the issues beforehand. Providing the public the questions in advance would have helped some, at least we could have tried to educate ourselves.</p> <p>Also, since Group 1 policies were the subject of the second part of the workshop, and Group 1 policies provide the purpose and structure of the RLSA, it may have been helpful for a summary of what the Group 1 policies say about the purpose and structure of the RLSA.</p> <p>Please accept the following responses to three of the questions presented at the Feb. 22nd workshop:</p> <p>1. What is the main objective of this Restudy process?</p> <p>The purpose of the Restudy should be to evaluate how the 2002 program is working to meet the three objectives of the RLSA program: to protect agricultural lands (and rural character of the area), direct incompatible uses away from wetlands and upland habitat to protect water resources and wildlife, and allow for development while avoiding sprawl. This “Restudy” should consider and incorporate the new information and data that has been developed since adoption of the program in 2002. Most importantly, the Restudy should take into account the two studies by panther experts based on years of telemetry data, the USFWS 2008 Panther Recovery Plan and the 2010 Florida Panther Protection Program Technical Report. Additionally, sea level rise presents a serious challenge to south Florida. A two foot sea level rise will result in significant salt-water intrusion which in turn will deplete our fresh water resources. The Restudy should consider sea level rise along with the proposed intense development of the RLSA and the potential impact on our water resources.</p> <p>Instead the thrust of the workshops reflects the County’s focus on the amendments proposed in 2009, and not examining the 2002 program as a whole. The 2002 RLSA overlay does a much better job of meeting the objectives of the RLSA program than the 2009 proposed changes; indeed some of the 2009 proposed changes are inconsistent with these objectives and the RLSA program. The Restudy should start with the 2002 program.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Need More Information / Preservation / Easements / Super-Majority</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**

**2-22-2018 Meeting**

**Additional Comments Received (Continued)**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Category</b>
<p>2. Are the stewardship easements adequate for protection of resources?                      No. First, as I understand most or all the easements remove many layers of land uses, but still allow agriculture 1 and 2 uses. This means that the grantors can move agriculture operations currently on SRAs to the natural areas in the SSAs intended to be preserved to help wildlife and water resources.                      My understanding is that the current 64,400 acres of agriculture will be reduced to 26,000 acres under the proposed RLSA development of 45,000 acres. About a 60% reduction. This will likely result in the landowners moving agriculture operations from SRAs to the "preserve" Stewardship Sending Areas (SSAs). How will the natural vegetation and wetland areas be preserved for wildlife and water resources? The easement should contain restrictions that prevent the landowner from starting agriculture operations in areas that have not previously been used for agriculture. Second, to provide adequate protection the easement needs to include specific management and monitoring requirements for which the grantor is responsible. If these requirements are in a separate document, this could hurt enforceability of the easement. Enforceability of easements, including the management and monitoring requirements, should be addressed in the RLSA workshop.</p> <p>2. Should a super-majority be required for approval of a SRA?                      Yes. The amount of development proposed for the RLSA will impact all Collier County citizens; it will affect everyone who lives and visits in Collier County. Thus, the additional scrutiny that comes with a super-majority requirement is appropriate. Secondly, the development proposed for a SRA will forever change the landscape, and the changes will be far-reaching. This is in contrast to SSAs, which hopefully at least preserve the status quo. As I understand SSAs can be unwound (although this possibility should be governed by strict criteria). For a plan that promises to impose such a dramatic change on Collier County, a process should be in placed to require the utmost rigor.                      Please place my comments in the record.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Need More Information / Preservation / Easements / Super-Majority</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**

**3-22-2018 Meeting**

**Comment Card Feedback**

Comment	Category
<p>Is 2 hours enough for good discussion? Thanks for the video and Facebook live. Explore water storage on farm lands - cost. Importance of economic diversity. Food Security. It is part of our brand - Florida Oranges. When you pave over AG it is gone forever. Residential and AG don't work side by side. Credits - What value will they have? Review again! Difficult to agree with Group 2 goals - need more discussion. Is that from the 2002 or 2007 restudy? Affects of credit system on small land owners vs. big land owners.</p>	<p><b>Water Storage / Importance of Agriculture / Review Credit system</b></p>
<p>The process worked well at our table. We were able to reach consensus on an idea that came first from the representative of the landowners (Stantec).</p>	<p><b>Group Process Effective</b></p>
<p>Very good guest speakers. Save AG Land from Development!</p>	<p><b>Importance of Agriculture</b></p>
<p>Need to meet in June and July. Explain why first set of amendments wasn't approved by County Commissioners and why we just can't review those and see if they are good as is.</p>	<p><b>Meeting Schedule / Five Year Review</b></p>
<p>The RLSA recommendations of 5 year review, has not worked to prevent conservation of AG land. The acres in AG since 2002 and as projected by Barron Collier Companies in 2008 based on recommendations to provide credits for AG preservation has and is projected to decline dramatically to 24,000-28,000 acres. More credits is not the answer. Already too many credits. More credits result in increasing development. Increased proposed development is a major reason for decline in AG acres. MORE CREDITS IS NOT THE ANSWER.</p>	<p><b>Importance of Agriculture / Review Credit System</b></p>

**Group Worksheet Feedback**

<p>1) To establish Ag. Advisory Council or roundtable with broad-based multi-sector membership to advise BCC on how to save AG in Collier County. Perhaps an existing platform could be used. 2) Include Commissioners in discussions and should include growers like Paul Meador. County should prioritize where infrastructure improvement goes to concentrate development to higher density with compact town centers - more land for AG.</p>	<p><b>Establish Advisory Council / Importance of Agriculture</b></p>
--	--

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**

**3-22-2018 Meeting**

**Additional Comments Received**

Comment	Category
<p>My husband and I have been attending these rural lands workshops over the past few months as Collier County citizens and voters, deeply concerned over the unrestrained growth in our county. We attend, listen, learn, submit comments and dutifully participate to the best of our abilities but find this process to be complex, cumbersome and in the end most likely of little merit to the decision makers. This is mere smoke and mirrors to allow the large landowners to develop environmentally valuable land for their profit.</p> <p>The policies you have us analyze and critique are based on a "rewrite" that was never adopted. (Really? those hopelessly complex policies attached in this email are barely interpretable for the ordinary layperson.) The original cap of 16,000 acres of land for development has suddenly mushroomed into 48,000 and possibly even more, based on a hopelessly complex and flawed credit system. Policies and promises made in the early 2000's are being renegeed. This is so reminiscent of the regulations passed, then retracted, for Collier county coastal development in the 80's and 90's.</p> <p>Can we not learn from those mistakes? Or learn from the mistakes of Miami and the east coast who have suffered greatly from unrestrained growth at the bidding of greedy developers?</p> <p>At the very least you and your colleagues owe it to the Collier county residents to hold hearings that are fair and impartial and allow those residents to partake in a viable discussion of rural lands development. The current process is clearly biased toward the landowners.</p> <p>Please reconsider this process.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Overdevelopment / Bias to Landowners</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker  
3-22-2018 Meeting**

**Additional Comments Received (Continued)**

Comment	Category
<p>Following up on the meeting Thursday “Protection of Agricultural Lands”, it seems there are no real protections in place. The acreage has declined from actual 94,498 acres in 2002 (phase 1 committee report) to the 40,000 acreage of 2008 based on credits compiled by WilsonMiller the landowners’ consultant. Table 4.3 “Proposed maturity Overlay Revised and Recalibrated” report compiled the credits and acreages. The WM arcane basis and process was coined “voodoo math” because no one seemed to follow its extreme complexity. I tried with minimal success.</p> <p>It was very informative that every table at our meeting gave a consensus top ranking of 10 to the need of preserving agricultural acreage. An outside unbiased arbiter would be perplexed.</p> <p>There were numerous reasons given by each table for the consensus of 10 including mine, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agricultural independence becomes more important as we have grown to import over 50% for many crops. Also the associated issue of food safety with unregulated imports is of critical importance as was indicated by two speakers. Considering NAFTA and tariffs negotiations currently in process adds even greater significance to maintaining significant amounts of agriculture in the foreseeable future. Also we need to consider climate and drought affects in California’s central valley and other imported food sources which are projected and could be a boon to Collier’s crop output and prices. It would be especially important in economic downturns to retain agriculture’s relative stability and labor employment</li> <li>2. Agriculture provides a major source of revenue and jobs to the county. Another consideration brought by our 3rd speaker and not previously addressed in the 2008 study is that proximity to new towns by agricultural operations such as spraying (by air) and impacting nearby habitations by water issues. Another issue not properly addressed is having islands of towns and islands of disconnected agricultural areas. This disconnected quilt pattern would greatly impact agricultural productivity. It would also impact the number of roads their costs to the public and road planning.</li> </ol> <p>The phase 2 report has words on preventing “premature conversion” of agriculture to (intensive) development. Workshop tables questioned this undefined term. Therefore reliance on “voluntary elimination of property owner’s rights” has no useful meaning since on incentives were indicated. Premature conversion implies that wetlands would be filled and concrete poured prematurely. This would be disastrous to retaining any agricultural expansion in the future and to habitat preservation of open or sensitive lands. As indicated above it could also impact putting in roads prematurely with attendant public cost impacts.</p> <p>With respect to the meeting, the 15 minutes allocated was quite insufficient to consider the 6 dense policies and then coming up with creative ideas for incentives. It would be helpful in future to limit lengthy presentations which don’t contribute much to the workshop. The number of policies involved should be limited to at most 2 or 3 at a time. They also should be presented verbally before asking people to relate to them. Suggest that policy material be put on-line and mentioned to your mailing list prior to a workshop.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Agriculture</b></p>



**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**

3-22-2018 Meeting

**Additional Comments Received (Continued)**

Comment	Category
<p>The RLSA Overlay is failing to save agriculture. Providing additional credits to preserve agriculture is not the answer. The County should prioritize where it will provide infrastructure to direct development to those areas, rather than allowing the landowners &amp; developers dictate where development will occur. Currently all agricultural land has been designated as open land suitable for development. The County should require more compact development, which in turn will result in more open land for agriculture. These matters are discussed in detail below.</p> <p>In 2002 when the RLSA Overlay was adopted by the County there were 176,000 acres of agriculture (including grazing) in the RLSA. See 10/2002 Executive Summary by County staff for BCC adoption of RLSA. Eight or nine large landowners (the Eastern Collier Property Owners or ECPO) are seeking to develop 45,000 acres of the RLSA, based on credits obtained and to be obtained from setting aside Stewardship Sending Areas. Ave Maria received approval years ago. Since adoption of the 2002 RLSA overlay, there has been a loss of agricultural land. According to the 2007 RLSA Phase I Technical Review, there was only 64,469 acres remaining under cultivation at that time.</p> <p>In 2015, ECPO submitted a Habitat Conservation Plan to the USFWS which stated that at build out agriculture land in the RLSA overlay will be approximately 24,000 acres. (Compare to a statement by Tom Jones of Barron Collier Companies in a 3-22-2015 Naples Daily News article that there will be approximately 28,000 acres of agricultural lands under cultivation at build-out.) Clearly, the RLSA overlay is failing to prevent conversion of agricultural land to other uses.</p> <p>The RLSA program has failed to protect agricultural land for at least two reasons: (1) The Overlay identifies most agricultural land as open land appropriate for development and (2) the excess of stewardship credits leads to increasing acres of development over the original intent of the program.</p> <p>I. Require More Compact Development; Protect More Open Land for Agriculture, Wildlife and Natural Resources.</p> <p>Instead of letting the landowners and developers determine where in the RLSA they will build, the County should take responsibility for determining where development is appropriate; the County should prioritize where it will commit to infrastructure and then require more compact development. By requiring more compact development, there will be more open lands that can be protected for agriculture and conservation.</p> <p>Further, the current proposal for 45,000 acres of development is misleading—under this proposal much more than 45,000 acres will be developed. The proposed 45,000 acres of development doesn't include any acreage for the road network necessary to serve this development. Not only will the proposed 4 and 6 lane roads with the corresponding cleared right of ways require considerable acreage, such roads will also stimulate land development on both sides of the road. Just look at what's happening on Immokalee Road from 951 to Randall. The 45,000 acres also doesn't include the sand mines in the RLSA. At least 3300 acres of sand mines in the RLSA are owned by same landowners that want to develop the 45,000 acres and there are other sand mines in the RLSA. Once the mines are played out, the land with its large quarries will not be suitable for anything but residential development. It cannot be restored. And the 45,000 acres does not include all the acreage necessary to support the infrastructure for such large developments. It appears that the amount of land remaining for agriculture at build out has been underestimated.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Compact Development/Protecting Agriculture Lands/Credits</b></p>

RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker

3-22-2018 Meeting

Additional Comments Received (Continued)

Comment

Category

II. Providing Additional Credits for Preservation of Agricultural land is not the Answer and Will Lead to even more sprawling development in the RLSA. To address the problem of diminishing agricultural land, in 2009 the 5-year RLSA review Committee recommended providing additional incentive credits for preservation of agriculture. While this recommendation was not adopted, it is now being considered in the current Restudy process. As discussed in A, B and C below, providing additional credits for agriculture is not a solution.

A. There are too many excess credits already.  
We really can't talk about providing credits for agriculture without looking at the credits already awarded and the whole picture. In 2007-08 we learned there were actually 315,000 credits, far more credits than anticipated by applying the NRI and removing land use layers (most of the increase in credits resulted from restoration credits being inflated). According to Wilson/Miller, the number of restoration credits was not possible to determine at the inception of the RLSA program in 2002; it took several years of data that provided detailed information on site specific conditions. So, in 2007 we learned that instead of the 16,800 acres to be developed, the landowners had enough credits for 43,300 acres of development. According to a 2008 Wilson/Miller Report, if the 5 year review Committee recommendation to provide additional credits for agriculture, panther corridors and tiered restoration was adopted, this would have resulted in 404,000 credits, which would entitle the landowners to develop 57,888 acres.

B. What has and will continue to create an incentive for conversion of agriculture land is the intensification of development which results from more credits.

1. Several ECPO landowners don't yet have enough credits for their own town. If the County provides additional credits for agriculture preservation, these landowners will be able to get enough credits to build their own town. This could lead to many towns in the RLSA, some projections show eight towns.

2. Non-participating landowners (small landowners), which own approximately 18,000 acres in the RLSA will more likely develop ranchettes because the intensified development of 45,000 acres will increase the value of their land for residential use. There is no evidence that providing credits for agriculture preservation will lead these non-participating landowners to continue agriculture and not develop ranchettes. Rather the opposite effect will occur. These landowners would have an incentive to develop their land.

C. Capping credits will create the problem of excess credits.  
Landowners view the credits as a right that entitles them to something. Capping credits results in landowners not being able to use all their credits in developing the 45,000 acres. Not allowing the landowners to use the excess credits could lead to legal challenges. If credits are capped for development in the RLSA, at some time in the future these landowners will likely push to get some value for the credits. The landowners may demand that their credits be purchased or that the cap be raised or that they be allowed to use the credits outside the RLSA. Providing more credits has a snowballing effect for more development.

III. Revise the Exchange Rate for Credits and Recalibrate the Existing Credit System.  
If the County is determined to provide credits to preserve agriculture and for panther corridors, then it could take two steps to help prevent overdevelopment, sprawl and loss of agriculture and conservation land in the RLSA. First, change the exchange rate to require 20 credits per acre of development. Second, recalibrate the credits so that the total number of credits, including credits for agriculture and panther corridors, does not exceed 315,000 credits. Reduce the number of credits awarded for just owning land that can be restored. Right now, landowners get considerably more credits for just owning land that can be restored. Then they get additional credits if they perform the restoration.

Compact Development/Protecting Agriculture Lands/Credits

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**

**4-26-2018 Meeting**

**Comment Card Feedback**

Comment	Category
I saw your electronic signs and they are the reason that I decided to attend. I searched for additional info online, but I could only find confirmation on the date, time and location. I could not find anything about the content of the meeting. The signs were very misleading. I attended to learn about the Rural Lands West development. Obviously, that was not the intent of the meeting. That is why I am leaving. I will definitely not return.	<b>Lack of Information</b>

**Group Worksheet Feedback**

We need to learn what works and what doesn't work	<b>Need More Information</b>
(1) Concerns about AG lands being lost to conservation or development	<b>Conservation</b>
Do all designated areas need restoration?	<b>Restoration</b>

**Additional Comments Received**

<p>Issues With Base and Supplementary Credits</p> <p>Base Credits</p> <p>1.How accurately and independently were SSA's established? It takes ecologists with expert and extensive knowledge to identify types of habitat forming flowways, natural habitat, and water retention areas.</p> <p>Why does the white paper indicates 49,209 SSA acres (for 15 approved SSA's) while policies 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 total approximately 94,982 acres? Per WM Sept.2008 "NRI based SSA's" total 92,000 acres.</p> <p>Furthermore there is no doubt that there have been many changes since 12 - 16 years ago when most of these SSA's were determined.</p> <p>2.How were NRI values established?</p> <p>They are also based on 12-16 year old "data". Have they been "ground truthed"?</p> <p>NRI's vary from 0.6 to 2.2. With what competence and clarity were these levels established? For instance the cutoff for NRI layers and values defining Ag1 and Ag2 at 1.2 or less. They appear arbitrary and certainly are not transparent.</p> <p>3.There is currently available a much better and transparent system and one less prone to arbitrary or less knowledgeable Input defining natural areas of flowway, habitat, and water retention areas. CLIP 4.0 "Critical Lands and Waters Identification Project" is such a system of definition and overlays.It was developed by Florida Natural Areas Inventory, University of Florida GeoPlan Center for Landscape Conservation, and Florida Fish &amp; Wildlife Conservation. In addition to demarcating the major SSA's natural areas it would provide priority values which could replace NRI's.</p> <p>It comprises biodiversity layers - including habitat richness and priority communities, ecological and landscape integrity layers, significant surface waters, floodplain and wetland layers, and aquifer recharge areas.</p> <p>Issues with supplementary credits</p> <p>Between transmittal credits 134,388 (16,800 acres) and adoption credits 315,000 (43,300 acres) and a multitude of credits were added up to somewhere around 404,000 subsequently.</p> <p>Concerns are with how and when supplementary were developed, and about how well their promised conditions would be implemented. Very importantly, how implementation would be verified. There are concerns with limited county staff, knowledge base, and management costs for an uncertain future.</p> <p>Credit valuation</p> <p>Subsequent to "adoption" The committee requested increased credits for ACSC agricultural lands from .15 credits to 2.6 and additions to 2.0 credits/acre on all other agriculture. Implications of these values (seemingly arbitrarily set) affecting other RLSA goals than agriculture were not provided.</p>	<b>Credits/Agriculture</b>
--	----------------------------

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**  
**4-26-2018 Meeting**

**Additional Comments Received (Continued)**

Comment	Category
<p>An expanded number of SSA credits would of course serve to favor more intensive development.</p> <p>Another example of credits suggested beyond transmittal and adoption is panther corridor credits which were offered. They would be useless if not built to proper minimum widths. Corridors were later determined to require approximately widths of one mile.</p> <p>We need to determine the history, accuracy and intent of supplementary credits Year issued and approved</p> <p>Amounts  Rationale/ purpose/ locations  NRI and acreage  Impacts on:  Agriculture --- Intensive Development --- Conservation --- Listed species ---Public land --- Infrastructure  Fragmentation of agriculture  Fragmentation of habitat, especially endangered and listed species (so called umbrella species)</p>	<p align="center"><b>Credits/Agriculture</b></p>
<p>Kris, On behalf of the League of Women Voters, I ask that you include in your presentation of GMP Policy 3 the following items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At tonight's workshop please begin with an explanation of how the current RLSA credit system works. We should not be asked to discuss adding credits to the system, as proposed by the 5-year Review, without the County providing an understanding how the current system works. This discussion should include an explanation of how the NRI values were established and how they are used in the credit system. Most importantly, please explain the methodology to determine the number of credits. (Note: Wilson Miller states in its 2009 memorandum that it used a different methodology to arrive at the number of potential credits.) It's clear from the RLSA record that many people do not understand how the credit system works. In 2007 the DCA described it as a "black box." Almost everyone was surprised in 2008 to learn from Wilson Miller that there were a potential 315,000 credits that could be earned, rather than the initial determination in 2002 of 134,000 credits.</li> <li>2. Please discuss Policy 3.2 and 3.7 on HSAs. Unlike the Policy provisions on WRAs and FSAs, which set out a percentage of area that has an NRI index value of 1.2 or less, Policy 3.2 does not provide this information for HSAs. Knowing what percentage of an HSA has an index value of 1.2 or less is important because an index value of 1.2 or less subjects the HAS to being used for earth mining and processing, recreational uses, and conditional uses. HSAs are environmentally sensitive areas, i.e. that are suitable habitat for listed species and are areas contiguous to habitat suitable for listed species. Why was it determined that portions of HSAs could be subject to earth mining and processing, recreational uses and conditional uses and why was a value of 1.2 chosen as the cut-off point? What does a value of 1.2 represent?</li> <li>3. Please discuss the implications of awarding additional credits, as proposed by the 5-year review. The public workshop should not be discussing adding credits to the system without the County also explaining the potential consequences of awarding excess credits. Wilson Miller's 2009 Report estimated that there would be 463,104 credits available if the 5-year Review recommendations on adding credits were adopted, enough to allow 57,888 acres of SRA development. We know now that Wilson Miller underestimated the potential credits—the 2009 report didn't include any credits for SSA 16 and 17, did not include the restoration credits now being considered for SSAs 14, 15, 16 and 17, and also underestimated the number of credits that would arise from wildlife corridors because the corridors Wilson Miller considered are much too narrow for the panther. Even if credits and acres are capped, the landowners holding these excess credits consider the credits an entitlement to compensation...how will the County address this?</li> </ol>	<p align="center"><b>Credits</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker  
4-26-2018 Meeting**

**Additional Comments Received (Continued)**

Comment	Category
<p>I was able to attend the RLSA workshop this evening, and I want to submit some thoughts for your consideration. Listening to the presentations and the discussion on Thursday left me convinced that we really ought to go back to basics. My own experience in land use planning in NJ (I was a Planning Board member and chair in a rapidly developing town, as well as chair of a regional land-use planning organization – way back in the 70’s) gave me a wee edge over others in the room in understanding what was going on, but I fear a great many folks there were totally lost. The avalanche of acronyms bewildered many, and few had the slightest idea of the history that led to the 2002 agreement and its consequences. For those who wanted to come, providing a simple primer through a link in the meeting announcement would have helped folks to understand both the terminology and the objectives of the session. Nevertheless, the whole process strikes me as a classic example of trying to put lipstick on a pig. In the 2002 agreement, the landowners created a monstrously complex deal that ran all to their advantage. We really ought to go back to basics and start over.</p> <p>As you move forward, here’s an outsider’s perspective that I hope you will find a way to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.First, however it happened, it’s clear the number of credits created through the existing system is way out of proportion to the market. Second, the bonuses allowed for each restoration have created an overall result that seems way beyond the original intent of the 1999 Final Order.</li> <li>2.The fact that marketable credits are created without actual restoration dooms whatever market you might have hoped to create. It’s completely logical to allow folks to determine the credits they might get if they opt to restore, but I see no rationale for letting them enter the market without the restoration actually being done. Creating an SSA in theory is fine, but creating it in fact ought to result in the actual restoration, which would logically be triggered by a buyer of the credits wanting to put them to use. The existing process rewards the large landowner with abundant credits within their own holdings, but nothing realistic for smaller landowner’s potential credits. They may turn to conventional development, thereby creating unwanted and expensive sprawl if areas designated as unavailable for development aren’t rigorously protected.</li> <li>3.Assuming that FSAs, HCAs and WRAs can be defined (subject to adjustment based on current circumstances and modern science) I believe they ought to be pre-defined as areas that cannot be used for development. Allowed density should be clustered to protect them, and additional development through credits would then be accompanied by actual restoration elsewhere. If the landowner chooses to develop at 1 unit/5 acres, conservation land will be protected through clustering, and supporting infrastructure cost (roads, sewer, water) will be reduced. If credits are exercised, including any other credit-worthy changes, additional land is then removed from development. All good, IMHO.</li> <li>4.Restoration of each sort needs to be guided by clear standards with plans that are reviewed by independent experts to ensure maximum chance of success, including regular inspections both during construction and for a reasonable period afterwards by county officials to be sure the desired outcomes are being met.</li> </ol> <p>To the extent that these changes are resisted as abandoning the 2002 agreement, my rebuttal would be that while lower overall densities will result, the decisions made in 2002 were in a different time with different attitudes about growth and environmental protection. Moreover, our knowledge about what constitutes “restoration” has matured, especially with regard to wetlands and wildlife habitat. And it’s obvious that the existing structure is not working to create a viable market for credits. Value in a market is created by demand, not by increasing inventory.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Credits/FSAs/HCAs/WRAs</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**

**5-24-2018 Meeting**

**Group Worksheet Feedback**

Comment	Category
<p>How many panthers are being tracked? Where are they concentrated and their pathways? How soon can wildlife return after wildfire? Long-term effects? Are new developments required to adopt panther safety infrastructure? Which is most effective (fencing, underpass, signage, corridor, etc.). Any ideas for softening stark interface between new development and natural area? Effective buffers. Best way to create new preserves (federal, state, local).</p>	<p><b>Conservation of Panthers</b></p>

**Additional Comments Received**

<p>Subject: Reconsideration of Natural Resource Scoring in the RLSA</p> <p>In 2000 Wilson Miller/Stan-Tec developed the Collier County Rural Lands Stewardship Overlay and the Stewardship Credit Worksheet. Created a series of layers that are assigned weights.</p> <p>Major categories of Stewardship Overlay Designations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Proximity indices (to FSA, HAS or WRA or preserve)</li> <li>• Listed species habitat indices (panther or other listed species occupied-preferred), panther occupied, other listed species occupied.</li> <li>•Soil/Surface Water Indices</li> <li>•Restoration Potential Indices</li> <li>•Land use-Land cover indices (FLUCCS codes)</li> </ul> <p>Values in each category were combined to give a cumulative score for each RLSA grid square</p> <p>In 2008 the Panther Study was released that showed the primary and secondary panther habitats. This designation should have been used instead of the listed species indicators used. It was not. Previous panther habitat data was based only on detection of collared panthers.</p> <p>This worksheet methodology, if it is to continue to be used, should be updated to include the primary and secondary panther habitat data and the whole RLSA scores recomputed.</p> <p>The number of stewardship credits required per acre to reach specific levels of use would be recomputed and the newly computed, updated values should be used to indicate the number of credits required per acre.</p> <p>Also in 2008, we were told that panthers did not use farm fields. We have since learned that while they may not sleep in farm fields, they certainly cross them and forage there. This should also be taken into consideration. It would have the effect of raising the ecological value of agricultural areas.</p>	<p><b>Stewardship Overlay Designations/ Panther Conservation/ Credits/Agriculture Land</b></p>
--	--

RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker

5-24-2018 Meeting

Additional Comments Received (Continued)

Comment	Category
<p>Re: Comments on Group 3 Policies</p> <p>I submit the following comments on behalf of the League of Women Voters Collier County as a follow up to the April 26th and May 24th 2018 RLSA Restudy Workshops on Group 3 policies. We make these comments and raise these issues for consideration by the County and for discussion at the Restudy workshops. Will our comments be considered and discussed? Please place an original copy of these comments in the record for the RLSA restudy.</p> <p>1. Habitat Stewardship Areas (HSAs)</p> <p>Policy 3.7 provides that HSAs with an index value of 1.2 or less can be used for earth mining and processing, recreational uses and conditional uses (public infrastructure). HSAs are environmentally sensitive areas, i.e. areas that are suitable habitat for listed species and areas contiguous to habitat suitable for listed species. Why was it determined that portions of HSAs could be subject to these uses? Why was a value of 1.2 chosen as the cut-off point?</p> <p>In addition, Policy 3.7 does not specify what piece stage of HSAs have an index value of 1.2 or less. This information is important in terms of understanding the impact. The Policy provisions on FSAs and WRAs both specify the percentage of those areas that have an index value of 1.2 or less.</p> <p>At the April 26th Workshop, you stated that you will look into these matters. We look forward to your response.</p> <p>2. Specific language modifications for HSA Policy 3.7</p> <p>A. Policy 3.7 should be revised to disallow Golf Courses as an appropriate use for HSAs. Golf Courses are not passive recreation. The activities related to landscaping and playing the course are high. In addition these golf courses are treated with heavy fertilizer and moderate pesticide use. Both the Collier County Planning Commission and the Environmental Advisory Council raised this matter at the October 2002 RLSA Adoption meeting and stated that golf courses should not be allowed.</p> <p>B. Delete the proviso in Policies 3.5 (FSAs) and 3.7 (HSAs) "where practicable" in reference to directional drilling. Both policies provide that "where practicable, directional-drilling techniques and/or previously cleared or disturbed areas shall be utilized for oil and gas extraction in FSAs (and HSAs) to minimize impacts to native habitats." FSAs and HSAs have been determined to be areas important for water resources and wildlife; why isn't it required that Oil and Gas Extraction in such areas use directional-drilling techniques and/or previously cleared areas to protect these areas?</p> <p>C. Protect our aquifers by reinstating the requirement for an Environmental Impact Statement. At the time the RLSA was adopted the Land Development Code required an environmental impact statement that would examine impacts to our aquifers in the RLSA. This requirement was deleted some years later from the LDC.</p> <p>3. Protect Water Retention Areas (WRAs), Policy 3</p> <p>A. Revise the GMP to include explicit elements that will preserve and protect our water resources. A goal of the Group 3 policy is "to protect water quality and quantity and maintain the natural water regime..."</p> <p>WRAs function as water retention areas for agriculture, and also help protect regional water flow, water supply and water quality. These wetlands soak up and store water during the rainy season, reduce flooding of neighboring areas and replenish underground supplies of drinking water. We've recently learned of concerns about Corkscrew Swamp Sanctuary losing water more rapidly in the dry season and actually drying up for a few months before the rains begin as a matter of course. This can have a devastating impact on Corkscrew Swamp and serves as a bell-weather on other areas in eastern Collier County that may also be drying up much more than in the past.</p> <p>Developments through their storm-water lakes and canals tend to move water southward much more rapidly than the original overland flow; WRAs tend to retard this movement. The Growth Management Plan needs to have explicit elements that will preserve and protect regional water flow and our water supply.</p>	<p>Habitat Stewardship Areas/Language Modifications/Water Retention Areas</p>

Additional Comments Received (Continued)

Comment	Category
<p>According to SFWMD Executive Director at an Everglades Conference in January 2009 "Counties and municipalities are overly dependent on the SFWMD to preserve and protect their water supplies. You must be more proactive in creating explicit elements within your comprehensive and growth management plans. We can only use what you give us to make decisions. You must take control of your own futures."</p> <p>In addition, proposed developments in the RLSA also appear to be altering WRAs to be lakes for their development (at the same time designating the WRA as an SSA). We'd like the County to look closely at this. Should developers be able to alter WRAs from the important water resource functions they serve?</p> <p>B. Modify Policy 3.13 to specify that use of WRAs as part of a storm water management system should be avoided. WRAs are preserve areas important for regional water flow, water quality and water supply. The use for storm-water treatment should be avoided. If, however, it is necessary to use part of an WRA to provide storm-water management, water treatment and/or water retention for the SRA, the acreage of the WRA used for treatment or storm water management for the SRA should be included in the SRA.</p> <p>C. Revise the GMP Policy 3 to require that new developments include measures to address water quality such as installing filter marshes as part of storm water management systems and waste water treatment systems that are constructed. The County can take action to help protect water quality from the impacts of new development in the RLSA. For example, Rural Lands West (RLW) will be discharging from its stormwater management system into Camp Keais Strand, a state impaired water. Discharges from RLW can further degrade the water. The County should direct Collier to install filter marshes connected to the RLW storm water management system to clean the water before discharging into Camp Keais Strand. This has successfully been done in other Florida communities. See, for example, the Wakodahatchee Wetlands in Delray Beach which is used by the Southern Region Water Reclamation Facility to clean treated wastewater and the Sweetwater Wetlands Park created by the City of Gainesville and other partners to reduce nutrients from treated wastewater. The GMP should be revised to encourage this approach.</p> <p>4. Protect Primary Panther Zone; Update the RLSA Overlay and Natural Resource Index (NRI)</p> <p>There are two peer-reviewed Florida panther studies that have been completed since the original RLSA was adopted and the 2007 5-year review. Based on these studies, we now know that some agricultural land designated as open land in the RLSA Overlay is very important to the long-term survival of Florida panthers. The two studies by panther experts are based on panther telemetry data and identify those areas in the RLSA that are essential to the long-term survival of the panther. (Kautz, R. et al 2006; Frakes et al. 2015). These Florida panther experts have identified the "primary panther zone" as the land essential to the long-term viability of the panther. Kautz 2006. The primary panther zone is the minimum area necessary to ensure survival of the Florida panther. Id. U. S. FWS relied on and cited the Kautz study in its 2008 Florida panther recovery plan, stating at page 89 "The primary Zone supports the only breeding panther population. To prevent further loss of population viability, habitat conservation efforts should focus on maintaining the total available area, quality and spatial extent of habitat within the primary zone."</p> <p>The RLSA Overlay designates some primary panther habitat as open area suitable for development—these designations are based on an outdated NRI. The RLSA Overlay and Stewardship Credit worksheet used to designate land usage in the RLSA was developed by Wilson/Miller in 2000. Wilson/Miller developed the NRI at that time to score each RLSA grid square based on its determination of natural resource value. If this methodology is continued to be used, it should be updated to include the best available science, i.e. the primary and secondary panther habitat as set out in the panther studies. The RLSA scores should be recomputed.</p>	<p>Protect Primary Panther Zone</p>



RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker

5-24-2018 Meeting

Additional Comments Received (Continued)

Comment	Category
<p>5. Revise Restoration Credits Provisions</p> <p>A. The GMP and LDC should be revised to add and tighten up requirements concerning Restoration. Currently, neither the GMP nor the LDC require that restoration goals such as restoring a flow way or creating a functional wildlife corridor be met before credits are awarded. Development of the open lands can in many cases cut off panther movement between the Florida Panther National Wildlife Refuge and Corkscrew Swamp and the OK Slough State Forest. Development of the open lands will also disrupt regional water flow south. Therefore, it is important that the SSA restoration is actually successful in providing a functional wildlife corridor or restoring a flow way. In addition, neither the GMP nor the LDC set out requirements concerning a start date for restoration, milestones to be met, metrics to be measured, or provisions for verification of accomplishing the restoration goals. Once land is cleared for development, wildlife will flee the area and panther/deer/bear movement will be impeded by construction activities. If an area of an SSA is to be restored, the landowner should begin restoration before or at least at the same time it begins site clearing. Currently, as we understand, landowners can and are delaying restoration efforts until they've got sufficient commitments from builders (or maybe enough houses sold). We learned at the April 26th workshop that although 50,000 acres are under an SSA, only 600 acres have been restored.</p> <p>B. The Credit System appears to award too many credits for restoration. The credit system should be re-examined as it currently creates excess credits, in particular concerning restoration. Take SSA15 (5259 acres) for example. Collier Enterprises will get 10,095 "base use" credits for removing 5 layers of land use on 4,820 acres (keeping Ag 2 uses) and 4 layers of use on 439 acres (keeping Ag 1 and Ag 2). However, Collier Enterprises will get an additional 14,178 credits for designating 3545 acres of the 4820 acres as land that can be restored, and then get another 14,178 credits for doing the restoration (total 28,356 credits: designating and restoring). Why isn't this double counting? Why so many credits for just identifying land that can be restored? Collier Enterprises gets credits for taking all land uses off except Ag 2—why should it also get such a large number credits (14,178) for designating this portion of the SSA as land that can be restored?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Restoration Credits/5 Year Review</b></p>

RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker

5-24-2018 Meeting

Additional Comments Received (Continued)

Comment	Category
<p>If Collier Enterprises implements the restoration, it will get an additional 14,178 credits for a total of 28,356 restoration credits. Note that this SSA15 is comprised mostly of FSA (Camp Keais Strand), HSA acres and WRA acres. Restoration credits should be awarded for completion of the restoration; credits for just designating an area for restoration should be re-evaluated. SSAs are supposed to be areas important for protecting water resources and for protecting habitat for listed species. Landowners cannot develop the SSAs. The goal of the RLSA Overlay is to direct development away from environmentally sensitive areas and important wildlife habitat.</p> <p>6. The 5 year Review Recommendations Will Create Even More Excess Credits. The 5- year review recommendations on Group 3 policies were to add credits for preservation of agriculture and wildlife corridors. In a 2009 report Wilson Miller estimated that if the 5-year recommendations were adopted, this would increase the number of credits available to 421,000 (or enough for 57,888 acres of development). Even these numbers are an underestimate. First, the 2009 report didn't include credits for SSA 16 and 17, did not include the restoration credits now being sought for SSAs 14-17, and also underestimated the number of credits that would arise from wildlife corridors because the corridors Wilson/Miller considered are much too narrow for the panther. According to the Panther Studies, a panther corridor along Camp Keais Strand needs to be a mile wide, if the panther corridors are to be viable. See 2006 Kautz and 2015 Frakes peer-reviewed panther Studies, the 2009 Florida Panther Technical Review Team Report and the 2008 US FWS Florida Panther Recovery Plan. If viable corridors are established, the corridors will generate far more credits than were envisioned by Wilson/Miller in 2009. Providing excess credits will have a snowballing effect of more development. Even if credits and acres to be developed are capped, the landowners holding excess credits consider the credits an entitlement. At some time in the future these landowners will likely push to get some value for their excess credits. Most likely, they will push for additional development rights.</p> <p>We agree that the County should consider incentives to set aside land for panther corridors and preserving agriculture, including the possibility of additional credits, but if credits are to be considered the system should be revised so that total number of credits does not add up to more than 315,000. In addition, credits should not be authorized for a panther corridor until the design for the corridor has been determined adequate by the US FWS.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Restoration Credits/5 Year Review</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**  
**5-24-2018 Meeting**

**Additional Comments Received (Continued)**

Comment	Category
<p>7. Policies 3.9 and 3.10 should be revised to clearly specify at what point in time no further expansion of Agriculture 1 will be allowed. According to 3.9, "Once the Stewardship Credit System is utilized and an owner receives compensation as previously described, no further expansion of Ag 1 will be allowed in FSAs and HSAs." It is not at all clear at what point the "stewardship credit system" is considered "utilized" and what compensation will trigger the prohibition on expansion of Ag 1. Policy 3.8 says compensation may occur through "creation and transfer of Stewardship Credits." This language adds to the lack of clarity. When are Stewardship Credits considered created and transferred, and must a transfer occur before "compensation" is received? According to the 2018 County white paper, it appears that SSAs 1-15 have been approved and the owners have received credits for SSAs through SSA15, and are currently seeking approval for additional restoration credits for SSAs 14-16. However, we learned at the April 26th workshop that all SSAs after SSA9 are in escrow. So when exactly is the credit system considered "utilized" so as to stop expansion of Ag 1?</p> <p>Policy 3.10 has similar language for Ag 2 concerning conversion of land from Ag 2 to the more intensive use of Ag 1. The point at which Ag 1 cannot be expanded in HSAs and FSAs is important. HSAs and FSAs are environmentally sensitive lands for protection of our water resources, regional water flow and wildlife. It is a goal of the RLSA to direct development away from these areas; however, the RLSA Overlay and GMP as it currently exists can result in the landowners expanding Ag 1 in HSAs and FSAs and moving Ag 1 operations from open areas to HSAs and FSAs.</p> <p>8. Modify Policy 3.11 to include language directing development away from primary panther habitat. The RLSA program was developed to establish a voluntary system to direct development to appropriate locations with protection of panthers being one of the main goals. Since adoption of the RLSA in 2002, there have been two studies and a report by panther biologists that have identified areas of the RLSA important to the long-term survival of the panther. Panther movement telemetry data, mortality data and analysis of the two studies and the Florida Panther Technical Review Team 2009 Report should be used to make adjustments to the RLSA program and to direct development away from primary panther habitat. Currently the RLSA crediting system undervalues the importance of certain agriculture lands for panther use. At the April 26th workshop, a representative of Stantec (formerly Wilson/Miller) stated that landowners include updated data when they submit their application for development. However, it's clear from the Rural Lands West development proposals, that they did not take into account the 2006 peer-reviewed Kautz panther study and the 2015 peer-reviewed Frakes Study.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Restoration Credits/5 Year Review</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**  
**8-23-2018 Meeting**

**Comments Received**

Comment	Category
<p>Biggest concern(s) at start of meeting: Too much traffic and taxpayers forced to make buildout possible</p> <p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: Same</p>	<p><b>Traffic/ Taxes</b></p>
<p>Biggest concern(s) at start of meeting: At this point I think Collier County needs to set their vision and possibly urban boundaries before sprawling out East. I think it's important for the County to incentivize reform and redevelopment before tax payers will be paying for infrastructure that could have been placed in the Urban Core. Given the current tax structure, we cannot afford the infrastructure out East.</p> <p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: They remain the same. Growth doesn't pay for growth. How long does it take for a development to become fiscally neutral? And is this cost/benefit getting taken into account as you continue to approve development in rural areas, such as out East?</p>	<p><b>Taxes</b></p>
<p>Biggest concern(s) at start of meeting: Impacts/ preservation of agricultural lands. Compact development (are we building for the future?) Water resource conservation (are we perserving for future?) Make multi-modal transportation work financially (by increasing density). Concern we're "building" our way out of problems (i.e. increased housing costs, tax revenue, road congestion). Catering to the wrong type of developers that do not share the values of the community = increased sprawl. Separation of uses vs. mixed use - Why do we cater to one subject of the population instead of building for many needs of the community?</p> <p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: Production ag seems pretty safe. But it certainly will increase the conflict between high intensity ag and natural systems and wildlife habitat. All of the presentations were fascinating and I do feel better about having some hard data and facts to study. Excellent speakers and Q &amp; A session.</p>	<p><b>Preservation of Ag Lands/ Water Resources/ Development</b></p>
<p>Biggest concern(s) at start of meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will new development handle its stormwater runoff without burdening existing infrastructure? We live in Winding Cypress that has a series of detention ponds.</li> <li>2. What kind of transportation infrastructure will be required? Who will pay for it?</li> </ol> <p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: Regarding waste water - is stormwater part of this? Is sanitary sewer paid for thru impact fees?</p>	<p><b>Stormwater Runoff/ Transportation/ Wastewater/ Impact Fees</b></p>
<p>Biggest concern(s) at start of meeting: Better understanding of how infrastructure and utilities will be paid for. Also, will there be enough water to fuel utilities?</p> <p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: Water issues remain</p>	<p><b>Infrastructure/ Utilities/ Water</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker  
8-23-2018 Meeting**

**Comments Received (Continued)**

Comment	Category
<p>I am concerned with the cost of infrastructure and burden on taxpayers of Collier County. Most of the burden will fall on coastal residents. Will infrastructure in the east rob the County of funds to complete necessary coastal projects? Oil Well Road took funds away from other county road projects, and maybe still is, because the money the County put out has not been repaid by the developer. Even after the presentations, my concerns remain the same. The answer that these land owners are "entitled" seems at odds with providing services to existing county residents to which they are entitled to expect such as roads, sewers, sidewalks, etc. We need to look at the build-out of eastern Collier along a time line with the boxes representing how available funds will be spent by year. If the first developer has taken all the available funding for 6 years, the next one cannot start until year seven, etc. You are not denying landowners rights, you are just saying we cannot pay for that right now. If they want to build sooner they can front end the expenses and be paid back starting at some point in the future.</p> <p>Also, In 2002 Collier had 94,498 acres of agriculture and by 2009 this had fallen to 89,397 acres or a loss of 5.4%. In the next nine years it has fallen again. We are definitely not adequately protecting our agricultural lands. The landowners say they will do agriculture until it pays for them to do development. The plan as it is now written is not adequately protecting agriculture. I was surprised other the trucker say that ag was moving east and south but ag in Collier is shrinking.</p>	<p><b>Taxes/ Protection of Agriculture Lands/ Infrastructure</b></p>

**Facebook Live Comments Received**

Comment	Category
Negations have ruined Naples	<b>General Comments</b>
What happens if the developer comes in pays for the development conveys it over to the county and then the home owners pay impact fees that pays back the developer.	<b>Development</b>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**

**9-27-2018 Meeting**

**Comments Received**

Comment	Category
<p>Biggest concern(s) at start of meeting: Providing inexpensive and safe drinking water for future residents - so much water to go to new developments. Sea level rise.</p> <p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: Zoning regulations must require pervious surfaces in order to build - near roads, sport complex etc.</p>	<p><b>Water Management/ Pervious Surfaces</b></p>
<p>Biggest concern(s) at start of meeting: Effect on natural wetland systems.</p> <p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: I'm concerned there aren't enough monitoring efforts on pollution or water levels. Therefore I believe the County needs to develop a robust model to test restoration and impacts in future. Also, clearer SSA management plans should be shared and County to provide good oversight.</p>	<p><b>Wetland/ Pollution/ Water Levels/SSA</b></p>
<p>Biggest concern(s) at start of meeting: Inadequate consideration of development on regional water flow and water supply. Inadequate provisions in GMP to address protection of water quality and water supply.</p> <p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: Need to require pervious surfaces in RLSA and in LDC.</p>	<p><b>Water Flow/ Water Supply/ Water Quality/Pervious Surfaces</b></p>
<p>Biggest concern(s) at start of meeting: Not enough water? Where is it coming from?</p> <p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: Less concern about the sources of fresh water. Impact of more "towns" on water run off affecting red tides and algae despite better understanding of how to manage all sources of water and better water restoration. Still a concern - need better management of flowways.</p>	<p><b>Water Supply/ Water Quality/ Water Management</b></p>
<p>Biggest concern(s) at start of meeting: After the hurricane the lift stations did not work - how will all the new development help or hinder this? Are residents in Golden Gate Estates going to be required to be on meter?</p> <p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: No. I believe that overdevelopment will ruin the area.</p>	<p><b>Lift Stations/ Overdevelopment/ Meters</b></p>
<p>Biggest concern(s) at start of meeting: Quantity and quality, waste water treatment and outflow and storm water run off.</p> <p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: Remain the same. Who/How will these costs be allocated</p>	<p><b>Water Quality/ Quantity/ Waste Water/Storm Water Runoff/Costs</b></p>
<p>Biggest concern(s) at start of meeting: Concerned highly about pesticides, fertilizers, blue algae and red tide that is in our waters. Concerns over quality and quantity of drinking water - long range. Preparedness for SLR.</p> <p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: Partially</p>	<p><b>Water Quality/ Quantity/ Drinking Water/ SLR</b></p>
<p>Biggest concern(s) following the presentations: Not much said as to how development in the RLSA will impact water demand. Not fair to say that conversion from Agriculture to Residential results in a net savings (or at least I'm not convinced).</p>	<p><b>Water Demand/Conversion of Agriculture to Residential</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**

10-25-2018 Meeting

**Group Worksheet Feedback**

Comment	Category
<p>Towns and villages make sense, Hamlets and CRDs do not. Rules requiring high density near town cores, variables outside; offer incentives to get more open land. Certain "essential services" needed before occupancy. Need strong zoning laws (beyond LDC). Variable prices housing. Need developers with vision - experiences in town development - not same old usual guys. BCC must understand the recommendations and pass them. 45,000 acres is included throughout section 4 - creep from 16,300 --&gt; 43,300. Need to reallocate credits - 8 credits/acre is not carved in stone, it was a number of convenience developed by Wilson Miller to make their plan work. Need to review natural resources overlay with latest science. Must incorporate green building standards.</p>	<p><b>High Density/ Incentives/ Essential Services/ Variable Pricing Housing/ Developers with Vision/Credits/ Natural Resources/ Latest Science/ Green Building</b></p>
<p>Hamlets don't make sense - too much infrastructure required to be viable. Does a village equate with an AARP self sustaining community? Wildlife - How are protected species going to traverse their habitat through developed areas? Who is the demographic anticipated and what services will they need (i.e. elder care). Are new towns going to be transient/seasonal?</p>	<p><b>Demographic/ Amenities/ Seasonal</b></p>
<p>In order to be truly compact and walkable the lengthy size of SRA's should be determined and limited. Should include specific requirements to ensure new urbanism principles - to ensure compactness and walkability. 54 hole golf course communities are not walkable. Min densities need to be increased. Adopt more specific criteria to guide development of towns, villages, and hamlets. Incorporate standards of new urbanism into Group 4 policies. Consider requiring architectural standards for towns and villages. Landowners should not earn stewardship credits for impacting habitat (i.e. RLW development surrounds SS17 which is primary panther habitat). SRA's should not be built in primary panther habitat.</p>	<p><b>Credits/ SRA's/ Habitat</b></p>
<p>Staging of permits when you have many developments (timing going in all at once) The permitting of a new community should not be done until the towns are built out. The developers should be on the hook for the infrastructure during the years of build out. Do we want new urbanism or rural sprawl? Will this zoning overlay bring us new urbanism? Will the overlay give us the greenspaces we value and incentives? Who is the target market and what do they want? Location of towns - not on privacy. Re-study credit values. The RLSA worksheet time hurdles. Overlays must be based on current science. Look for compact communities. The preservation of Ag and provide the compact rural development we want. 1/4 mile average walkability. More incentives for landowners. Property rights.</p>	<p><b>Permitting/ Infrastructure/ New Urbanism/ Rural Sprawl/ Credits/ Compact Communities/ Current Science/ Walkability</b></p>
<p>1/4 mile radii for walkability. Mobility efficiency - w/flexibility (cars may not be future). Minimize automobile centrality. Government support for amenities/ subsidy/ streamline. Minimum density increased. Increased cluttering. Need greenspace between SRA's/ buffering/ separation between SRA). Rethinking density within developments. Redefine wildlife corridors in relation to roads/ SRAs (use good data/science).</p>	<p><b>Walkability/ Mobility Efficiency/ Increased density/ Cluttering/ Greenspace/ Wildlife Corridors</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**  
**10-25-2018 Meeting**

**Additional Comments (Continued)**

Comment	Category
<p>I attended the public workshop held at the South Regional Library on October 25, 2018. I have a number of comments to offer concerning the materials made available regarding Section 4.7 of the Group 4 Policies. The format of the workshop did not provide time to raise them</p> <p>But, first, in the interest of full disclosure and transparency, I want to indicate that I am currently the Chair of the Collier County Senior Advisory Committee, a Board Member of Greater Naples Leadership and a participant in the Leadership Coalition on Aging. I am deeply concerned about the compatibility of our growth plans and the needs of a growing and aging population. My comments reflect these concerns and are intended to be constructive in nature.</p> <p>The following are my issues of concern:</p> <p>I. Item of General Applicability</p> <p>While it was not a part of the agenda for the Workshop on October 25, 2018, I believe we have made the process of permitting the development of SRAs too complex and over regulated. When a developer and his/her attorneys are faced with so complex a set of rules, they tend to layout what they want to maximize profits and then prepare a long list of variances needed to make it happen. This is done in an atmosphere in which numerous exceptions to rules are expected. Wouldn't be better for managing development if there were only a few basic rules for which variances would be difficult to obtain rather than a long list of restrictions and rules from which any reasonable project would expect a long list of exceptions. Over regulation in many cases end up being more permissive than a few fixed rules that are firmly adhered to. Simplicity certainly lends itself to public understanding which is in short supply in Collier County on this subject.</p> <p>II. Demographics of the new population in the RLSA</p> <p>Although you made it clear that the population estimates come from State of Florida designated sources, you said nothing about the demographic make-up of the 47,000 new residents. Our expectation is that the age distribution will reflect at least 50% of the people being 65 or older, and far more over age 55. These are the "Baby Boomers" that are now retiring in record numbers.</p> <p>III. Density projections in towns and villages</p> <p>Attachment C of the RLSA overlay notes that the planned density of towns and villages is 4 DU/acre except where Affordable Housing exceptions are granted. It also seems to indicate that the calculation of density is an average over the permitted area. This makes no sense near town centers. If we are going to allow an average maximum of 4 DUs/acre across an entire SRA, does that intend that on the out skirts of the town, we only allow 1-2 DUs/acre in order to stay under 4 DUs/acre while allowing mixed and denser housing at the center. The density within a mile of the town centers must allow mixed housing including multifamily units (density of 6-20 DU/acre) if we are going to offer affordable housing to our seniors and workforce. We note that the proposed but not yet approved affordable housing density bonus could allow up to 8-10 DU/acre, but these must be applied for and are uncertain. We need a density rule which specifies increased density the closer you are to the town or village center and leveled off as units are built further away. This reduces the cost of units at the town center, which permits seniors-- particularly those seniors that choose not to drive--access to commercial businesses and other amenities within walking or biking distance. The entire density scheme needs attention.</p> <p>From the planner point of view, it is important to structure town and villages to minimize the dependency of the population on automobiles for routine errands.</p>	<p align="center"><b>General Comments</b></p>



**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**  
**10-25-2018 Meeting**

**Additional Comments (Continued)**

Comment	Category
<p>Experience on other “Livable Communities” that emphasize walkability and bikeability have seen reductions on automobile trips of as much as 50%. With a population composition of more than 50 % seniors, we need to meet as many of their needs in the town center as possible. This means more planning and directions to developers. Specific land should be set aside in the town and village centers for amenities like the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Library annex</li> <li>- Small town hall and civic center</li> <li>- Community centers for children with pool and play areas</li> <li>- Senior centers</li> <li>- Professional offices for attorneys, doctors, etc.</li> <li>- Restaurants and taverns</li> <li>- Civic activity facilities</li> </ul> <p>These do not need to be built until the population grows to justify them, and that will be determined by the market. However, if the land is not set aside at the beginning, they will end up outside the town center and be less accessible</p> <p>In conclusion, we believe that the principles included in the AARP/WHO Livable Communities program should be applied as we develop the RLSA.</p> <p>IV. Planning Assumptions</p> <p>There are 1.4 seniors in Collier County over 65 to every child below 18. The influx of another 100,000 people will be primarily Baby Boomers, raising that ratio even higher.</p> <p>It is essential that we plan these towns and villages to meet the needs of the expected demographic which includes more the 50% seniors. The primary desire of this new senior population is to age in place. Most want to make one last move and then settle down. They then want to remain independent as far into the future as possible. They acknowledge that their life expectancy will now extend beyond the age at which they can safely drive a car, particularly at night. If they are not to become shut-ins at sunset, they need amenities nearby and should be willing to support them.</p> <p>We need to take the automobile out of its central role in community layouts and create neighborhoods where all ages can walk or bike to most of their intended destinations.</p> <p>Organized retirement communities are not the answer for everyone. AARP reports that only 10% of seniors over 65 live in such communities. For most, they are unaffordable and are viewed as expensive “old folks’ warehouses”, where they go to die quietly and out of sight.</p>	<p align="center"><b>General Comments</b></p>

RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker

10-25-2018 Meeting

Additional Comments (Continued)

Comment	Category
<p>V. Recreational Facilities                      The study suggests that a 54-hole golf course should be added to the new towns. This does not make sense in a county that already has 100 or more golf courses. The popularity of golf is diminishing and golf courses are expensive and environmentally questionable, requiring large quantities of water for irrigation and fertilizer for grass preservation. Maybe one 18-hole municipal-type of golf course would suffice and allow remaining land to be used for other recreational programs like pickle ball or biking and walking trails. Most people that are active golfer are young enough to still drive a car and there are adequate golf courses available to them.</p> <p>VI. General RLSA layout                      The current study seems to support the idea of locating the preserved areas in one consolidated area in a corner of the RLSA. Wouldn't it be more beneficial to spread the town and villages out and maintain wildlife transit corridors, connecting the existing mating and hunting areas so that wildlife and human populations share the RLSA on a more balanced basis? This might create more human/wildlife interactions but would be a reasonable concession to those that were there first.</p> <p>VII. Compact Rural Developments                      Annex C seems to indicate that all professional offices would be in CRDs. Unless the CRDs are located in the center of the new towns and villages, this is not consistent with building a "livable community". If CRDs are to be located in town centers, they serve no purpose as a separate designation other than to preserve land for the commercial, civic or professional facilities that will be needed as the town grows.                      Maybe the concept of the CRDs needs to be divided into two designations—a town center concept and an independent recreational/transit facility entity located outside of towns and villages.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>General Comments</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**  
**11-29-2018 Meeting**

**Group Worksheet Feedback**

Comment	Category
<p><b>Consensus Items</b>            Measure Internal Capture            Walkability within ¼ mile.            Narrow Streets            Shade Trees            Green Building Standards            Raise Min. and Max. Densities            Shrink Development Footprint            Don't set max DU's            7 min goods and services            Trails and pathways required            Require green building designs            Require mix of housing types            Require healthy community checklist</p>	<p align="center"><b>Group 5 SRA Standards</b></p>
<p><b>Consensus Items</b>            Incorporate Green Standards in codes as requirement (LDC).            Specify that businesses must be constructed in phased manner from building            Housing density as a function of distance from town center            Require low income housing as 10%            Require multi-mobility systems and trails            Goal for internal transportation capture  <b>Action Items</b>            Come up with specific recommendations            Turn these into LDC            Revise Land Development Code to incorporate statutory regulations to achieve desired residents            Educated developers as to what County wants – don't allow developers to drive the process.  <b>Non Consensus Items</b>            Low density near town center (2-4 unit/acre)  <b>Barriers to Consensus</b>            Lack of understanding by County Commissioners            Lack of understanding of what is needed to build a planned community – not gated golf course community.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Group 5 SRA Standards</b></p>
<p><b>Consensus Items</b>            Rural Lands Stewardship            Habitat Preservation            Wildlife Corridors            Required Management for endangered species  <b>Action Items</b>            Conservation concerns truly honored            Clearer borders for wildlife corridors on your colorful map (RLSA Status Map) or a second map demonstrating clearly such corridors and other protected areas (i.e. Corkscrew Bird Rookery Swamp etc.)            Other Items of Interest to the Group            Always SW Florida should avoid the high density and traffic problems of the Miami area. Green space, good water, wildlife, nature access, public beaches are the treasured aspects of life in Collier County which brings people here – we must preserve these, protect these as we grow. These are currently threatened by poor state government, red tide and blue green algae. We are polluting our area and paradise is threatened. We are grateful that Collier County is more responsible. Thank you for this informative presentation – very professional!</p>	<p align="center"><b>Environmental Protection</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**

**01-31-2019 Meeting**

**Group Worksheet Feedback**

<p>No discussion at table. There was concerns about recency and trasparency of data informing methodology for determining credits. People were also concerned about evaluation of effectiveness/ validty of 2002 methodology - a 16 year old method could be reasonably be updated and/or evaluated. The tables were well arranged and groups clearly marked facilitated discussion with colleagues if varying interests.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Credits</b></p>
<p>Need more data - how data was gathered - Habitat protected.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Data</b></p>
<p>Extra credits for salt marshes. Extra credits for tree inventories, protections and preservation. Detailed study of potential runoff. New and updated scoring system leading to reevaluation of entire credit system. County needs to take ownership of how credits are earned. Keeping argiculture lands is very important.</p>	<p align="center"><b>Credits/ Protect Ag</b></p>

**Additional Comments Received**

<p align="center"><b>Comment</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Category</b></p>
<p>There is still too much confusion on how the system works. People's concerns and skepticism need to be addressed so the process is transparent. Most of the time it is not the review that is being discussed but rather specific questions being asked.</p>	<p align="center"><b>General Comments</b></p>
<p>1. Policy NRI needs to be updated w/new data 2008 USFWS Panther Recovery Report, 2 panther expert studies, 2010 Panther Review Team report. Wilson Miller who determines NRI values (2000) acknowledged that NRI would be updated with new panther data. Also - County should hold NRI data, not private lands. Currently no transparency, no check on accuracy. What are values for each acre + how determined. Data should be accessible by public and County.                  2. GMP 3 Restoration needs to be tightened up. Currently, neither GMP nor LDC require start dates, meetings to measure progress, timelines, or that restoration goals be met before credits awarded. Sucess criteria not linked to restoration goals.                  3. Reverse 3.13 on WRAs to state that the use of WRAs as part of a storm water management system for WRAs should be avoided.</p>	<p align="center"><b>General Comments</b></p>
<p>Thoughts on other policies or questions to cover in the next workshop.                  1. Please discuss GMP Policy 3.13—WRAs and water management functions of SRAs.                  Given the heightened concern about red tide and blue/green algae and the havoc it has wrecked on our marine wildlife and coastal areas, now is an opportunity for the County to consider adding conditions to the RLSA Overlay that can help address this problem.                  Policy 3.13 provides that WRAs can be incorporated into a SRA master plan to provide water management functions for properties within such SRA. To allow this, the County (The GMP) could require in turn that the landowner/developer install filter marshes to clean up nutrients from water discharges and water used for recycling. For example, Rural Lands West (RLW) was going to discharge from its stormwater management system into Camp Keais Strand, a state impaired water.</p>	<p align="center"><b>General Comments</b></p>

RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker

01-31-2019 Meeting

Additional Comments Received cont.

Comment	Category
<p>Discharges from RLW could have further degraded the water. The County could add a requirement to install filter marshes connected to town storm water management systems and/or recycling systems to clean the nutrients from the water before discharging into Camp Keais Strand or other water way in the RLSA. Filter marshes as part of a storm water treatment system and also as part of a wastewater treatment system has successfully been done in other Florida communities. See, for example, the Wakodahatchee Wetlands in Delray Beach which is used by the Southern Region Water Reclamation Facility to clean treated wastewater and the Sweetwater Wetlands Park created by the City of Gainesville and other partners to reduce nutrients from treated wastewater.</p> <p>While I think the County should prohibit use of a WRA as part of a storm water system...afterall WRA are so designated because they are important environmental areas for water flow, water quality and water supply. But if this change can't be made, then the County should require a filter marsh component to be added.</p> <p>2. Will you be considering the recommendations of the EAC and CCPC as well as the 5 year review recommendations in putting together the white paper for the CCPC?</p> <p>Note that at the BBC 4/21/09 hearing on the 5 year recommendations, the County Comprehensive Planning Director and staff said: "We recommend the BCC accept all three reports: The EAC, CCPC and the 5-year review recommendations. Staff will look at all the data and analyses that supports what's being recommended by all 3 bodies." The staff expressed concern about creating surplus credits. And they stated that they didn't want the BCC to make a decision that doesn't have science behind it. Pg. 138-140. Shortly after that, the hearing ended because the landowners didn't want to pay for the amendment and the 5 year review recommendations were not adopted.</p> <p>3. Consider adding provisions to the GMP (Policy 3) concerning restoration. While Policy 3 covers restoration credits, implementation on restoration was done thru the LDC 4.08.06, which has several significant flaws: There is no provision concerning start dates (in fact no deadlines on anything), there are no requirements for metrics by which success can be measured, there is no requirement for milestones or a timeline to achieve the restoration goals, and the success criteria do not require that the restoration goals be met. What if the landowner fails to meet goals or success criteria or has completed construction of the project, but hasn't done restoration.</p> <p>Consider how little restoration has been done to date. For RLW Mr. Spilker told us that Collier Enterprises wouldn't start restoration until they had commitments from a significant number of builders and that restoration would take 10 years. The problem with this is that once site clearance and construction begins there are immediate impacts to wildlife and water storage areas. The construction would have disturbed and destroyed primary zone panther habitat and disrupted the area panthers currently use to move between Corkscrew and Camp Keais Strand and the Panther refuge. Panther experts have said that restoration of a corridor for panthers needs to begin before beginning site clearance/construction. The GMP should include specification on start dates for restoration. An example of the inadequacy of the success criteria provisions...RLW. SSA 15 Restoration Plan states that the restoration goals include restoration and protection of a regional wetland system, flowway and wildlife habitat corridor.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>General Comments</b></p>

RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker

01-31-2019 Meeting

Additional Comments Received cont.

Comment	Category
<p>The success criteria in the Restoration Plan include: removal of two road grades and the pinch point farm road, and restoration of native habitat (i.e. removal of invasives). Once RLW met these success criteria, the credits could be awarded...but there was no requirement that the restoration goals be met or even a requirement for an assessment of whether the goals were met. Even if it is not required to meet the restoration goals, there should be some discussion between the landowner and the County and a plan for taking additional steps towards accomplishing the restoration goals. Additional provisions could be added to the GMP to provide a framework for restoration.</p>	<p><b>Restoration</b></p>
<p>I said I would send you info on Universal Design. In general, it includes interior design issues in a new home which are installed to allow a younger retired couple to include changes right up front that will allow them to age in place. It involves things like widening the doorways a few inches to allow wheelchair access, rearranging kitchen cabinets so a limited mobility person can access everyday items. Some are structural changes and some are simple hardware changes. A lot of the universal design work came out of the University of North Carolins and was taken up by the National Association of Home Builders and others.</p> <p>Attached is a detailed check sheet containing a whole variety of items a new home buyer could pick from and a shorter fact sheet summary of what "Universal Design" is.</p> <p>When I mentioned that the cost could be as low as \$300.00 for including universal design, I was referring to the basic structural modifications and not the large list of hardware and cabinet options noted in the attached article by the Universal Institute.</p> <p>I am proposing to the Senior Advisory Committee that we recommend to the BCC that they instruct staff to review mandating that all new permit seekers for new residential construction must offer a universal design option and that the requirement is included in the rewrite of the four area plans you are currently working on. (Universal Design Features In Houses pdf) and (Description of Univeral Design word document) recieved.</p>	<p><b>Design</b></p>

**RLSA Workshops Feedback Tracker**

**01-31-2019 Meeting**

**Additional Comments Received cont.**

Comment	Category
<p>Conservancy Critique and Recommendations of Collier County's Rural Lands Stewardship Area Program: 2018-2019 RLSA Restudy and The Conservancy's Solutions for a Smarter Way to Grow in Eastern Collier County: Recommendations to improve the RLSA were collected.</p>	<p><b>General Comments</b></p>
<p>1.First, I endorse the suggestions submitted by the Conservancy.                  2.The county needs to provide the current acceptable data for using the NRI Worksheet in a publicly available form so it is easy for landowners and the public to determine the NRI for acreage in the RLSA. Obviously, that means it should be updated regularly. Should an applicant submit different data, they should be required to provide verifiable justification for such data.                  3.That same data, combined with any other relevant data should be used to re-evaluate the inventory of SSA and SRA lands. (This is big, I know, but a lot of data have been added or updated since 2002.)                  4.While I support the concept of a modest number of credits for formally declaring property to be destined for restoration, the credits available for actual restoration should be reduced. Moreover, the credits should not be awarded until the restoration work is actually done and verified.                  5.Where creating a habitat preservation area or corridor is proposed within SRA lands, that work should be done before actual development proceeds, and it should be suitably buffered during construction. That should include a plan for how such land or corridor connects logically to other habitat or corridors.                  6.Connecting back to earlier comments and issues, the transfer of Development Credits ought to be made more flexible so development can be located where there is infrastructure to support it. If feasible, credits from one planning region should be transferable to other regions (including the cities, also if feasible), and the county should study working models for such programs elsewhere to shape a program for Collier County. If the county needs to become (or hire) a broker to find credits on behalf of a willing buyer, I believe that would be a worthwhile investment by the county. That's probably the cheapest way to get the market started.</p>	<p><b>General Comments</b></p>
<p>Smart Growth America September 2018: The Fiscal Implications of Development Patterns – RLSA – Collier County was received.</p>	<p><b>General Comments</b></p>
<p>Thank you for patiently listening to our input last night. I know your job must be difficult as you have to consider ideas from many different stakeholders, who are all passionate about the issue, including myself! So I appreciated last night's discussion and that you were so open and approachable. I hope you know that the Conservancy is not against development. We realize that Collier County is growing. Our aim is to protect natural resources as the County grows. Our decisions are always backed up by scientific research and data from other specialists, such as our economic assessment from Smart Growth America. Anyway, attached is the Frake's RLSA study that we discussed last night. Page 18-21 of the document provide important maps that show the reduction in panther habitat functionality, if development proceeds as proposed by the HCP. Also, I attached our solutions list, which comes from the report. I know I handed it to you, but I wanted to also send it in digital format. Frakes Study October 2018 Impacts to Panther Habitat From The Proposed Eastern Collier Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan: A Quantitative Analysis was recieved.</p>	<p><b>General Comments</b></p>