



Meeting Summary

RLSA Restudy Public Workshop Requested Review/Input: Group 1 and other Policies

*January 31, 2019, North Collier Regional Park, Exhibit Hall
15000 Livingston Rd., Naples, 34109*

I Introduction

Speaker: Kris Van Lengen, Collier County

Mr. Van Lengen, Collier County Community Planning Manager, opened the meeting at approximately 6:10 p.m. and gave appreciation to the audience for attending. He offered assistance as needed to access information on the Collier County website.

He explained the meeting is a revisit of Group 1 Policies, and that audience members also provided some suggestions on topics to cover at the meeting, which have been incorporated in the agenda. These added topics address policies on the credit system and easements related to Stewardship Sending Areas (SSAs). He highlighted that Policies 3.11 and 3.13 were requested for discussion, and they address restoration and water retention areas. He noted that listening to the audience is the goal of the evening, and that the final item on the agenda is for Dr. Amanda Evans to talk about the process for consensus building meetings going forward.

Mr. Van Lengen described that the County's RLSA webpage has a library and summaries from past meetings. He noted the audio/video team is not present, so Facebook Live and video are not available this evening. The audio/video team will be available at the next meetings. He pointed out that group discussions and comment cards provide opportunities to be heard, and that participation is encouraged.

For next steps, Mr. Van Lengen said the upcoming February 28 and March 28 meetings will be consensus building sessions. Collier County staff is charged with completing a white paper, and staff's white paper will convey the public input gathered through the workshop series. The white paper will be publicly available in the timeframe of early May, and the public may provide written feedback to the paper. The feedback provided will be added to the packet that goes to the Board of County Commissioners. Staff recommendations and the public feedback will be presented to the County Commissioners, at which time the Board may vote to advance to policy amendments which will be then subject to the transmittal public hearing process, followed by State review, followed by adoption public hearings; or the board may vote for the staff to perform more data collection and analysis.

II. Policy 1.6 – 1.9 (SSA Approval, Environmental Assurances, and NRI Values)

Mr. Van Lengen began revisiting Group 1 policies with Policy 1.6 regarding SSA approval. He explained that property owners petition the Board for approval, and beginning with SSA #10 the Board allowed escrow agreements in five year periods, eligible for renewal for five year periods. The 5 Year Review Recommendations were for SSA approval to be conditional subject to expiration in five years if credits were not used or sold, or if the owner canceled. Use or sale of credits in any amount was proposed to lock in the SSA designation, meaning that the credit agreement and the easement agreement get recorded and are in full force and effect. The 5 Year Review Recommendation was similar to Board policy since SSA #10.

Mr. Van Lengen described that Policy 1.7 relates to environmental assurances, or the ensuring that SSA commitments are fulfilled. He said that consensus was observed in earlier workshops that more than one easement holder should be required. Currently the regulation allows for the County or other agency to be the easement holder, and the 5 Year Review Recommendation was to require three agencies as easement holders.

Mr. Van Lengen read an example of an easement agreement from a standard SSA agreement, highlighting that land management measures will be those customary measures of ranching in Southwest Florida. He referenced that Johnson Engineering has researched a list of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for a variety of land and agricultural management techniques, and the list with links will be available on the RLSA Restudy library webpage.

Audience member Meredith Budd asked about the intent of the BMP list. Mr. Van Lengen said the potential for using BMPs is open to the audience's recommendations.

Mr. Van Lengen described Policy 1.8 and 1.9 regarding Natural Resource Index (NRI) Values. He said the applicant submits updated or adjusted values at time of application, and County staff reviews and verifies the values. He displayed all the layers that make up the NRI values, noting the overlay designations of Flowway Stewardship Area (FSA), Habitat Stewardship Area (HSA), Water Retention Area (WRA), or open areas which were adopted in 2002; and the proximity index within 300 feet of certain overlay designations. He said that these two factors can be accessed from Collier County because they are part of the Collier County Geographic Information System (GIS) at this time. Species scoring is primarily related to panther habitat, but other listed species are also included. He said the standard is based on a prior standard used by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) called preferred and tolerated habitat. That standard was based on the land use and land cover index that is part of the USFWS matrix and an overlay of the indication of wildlife appearing at particular sites. Wilson Miller refined this using District data and telemetry points based on preferred and tolerated land covers, and this is open source information. He described that soils and surface water data is from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), which is also open source information. He said restoration potential and the land use/land cover index is an open source from the South Florida Water Management District. He said that some people want all the

data that went into the NRI scoring, and the County has a composite number for each acre, and the subdata would need to be re-created.

Mr. Van Lengen asked the audience for feedback on two discussion questions:

1. What ideas do you have concerning natural resource factors that measure the value of conservation?
2. Do you agree with the land management standards for SSAs?

An audience member asked about the index, particularly the listed species habitat index, which starts with panther habitat including preferred and tolerated habitat. Is the landowner valuing the score? Mr. Van Lengen said a qualified biologist consultant would value the score for the landowner. She asked how each acre is determined if there has been value assigned based on the Wilson Miller score? Mr. Van Lengen said he is not sure if scores are updated with new telemetry the same way that others have been updated.

When asked who does the updating, Mr. Van Lengen said the consultant for the landowner provides all the background information, and the County reviews and does ground truthing and aerial reconnaissance. When asked if the County knows the original scores for panther habitat, Mr. Van Lengen said he is not sure.

The audience member said the main question has been about the NRI values done in 2000-2002 with the understating it would be updated with completion of more panther studies. Has each acre been updated based on newer studies? Does the County get information on updated panther data? Mr. Van Lengen said there has not been a move to recalibrate scores based on primary and secondary habitat; the scoring is still based on USFWS preferred and tolerated panther habitat.

When asked if Stewardship Receiving Areas (SRAs) are evaluated in the same manner, Mr. Van Lengen said the SRAs are evaluated through a different process, and they are subject to the Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) process.

Dr. Evans suggested that it is wise to spend more time understanding this topic if the audience is still unclear. Discussion ensued about the standards set in 2002, and the concern that new research has become available and the scoring of acreage has not been updated. Audience member concern was that old data should be reassessed. Dr. Evans summarized the question and asked if the scoring is updated, or can it be updated?

Audience member Al Reynolds said he is a planning consultant who originally put together the methodology and the scoring system with assigned values. The data was the best available at the time. When an applicant seeks to establish an SSA, the applicant would find the current and best available data and apply the methodology of the scoring system. In 2002, the panther telemetry available was used to set a starting point from 2002. Any scoring today would reflect the most current data, which is more accurate and voluminous. The new data showing more current panther telemetry helps define panther habitat for scoring purposes.

Audience member concern was raised apart from the SSAs, because the open area can be developed, and the open areas of primarily farm lands are essential habitat for survival of the panther. Concern was that SRAs develop in open areas, and there is no requirement to look at NRI scores for open areas to see if they need to be updated. Mr. Reynolds said that is not correct; an SRA application requires scoring all land in the SRA using the same methodology used to score the SSA. He said that every acre in the SRA is scored the same way a score is applied to an SSA. If the SRA reaches a certain threshold, it has to be set aside for protection within the SRA. The most current data available must be used to determine if an area within the SRA must be set aside for protection.

Audience member April Olson said approximately half the acres in open lands are in primary panther habitat and adult breeding habitat. She stated that 2006 science used by the USFWS for the Panther Recovery Plan is an example of data, and sites like Rural Lands West have about $\frac{3}{4}$ of the site in primary panther habitat, yet the site scores under 1.2, or not environmentally sensitive. Therefore, she concluded, SRA lands are not be updated with the best available science. Mr. Reynolds said he respectfully disagreed stating the comprehensive planning level of the scoring system has successfully been used for nineteen years. He said the system is a tool that does not take the place of the Endangered Species Act or a permitting process.

Ms. Olson said the listed species habitat data is from 2000, and Mr. Reynolds responded that primary panther habitat is not a part of the scoring system. Ms. Olson suggested that it should be a part of the system because it is best available science, and Mr. Reynolds responded that the system was adopted and is used as a planning tool, noting that new data indicating listed species occupy habitat does get scored as habitat. He added that the innovative aspect is that this encourages owners to manage the land well, citing that an owner of SSA land is incentivized to manage land well to get a higher NRI score.

Ms. Olson said the use of primary habitat as a scoring measure would allow owners to earn credits on those lands and be compensated. Mr. Reynolds responded that the system is not designed in that way, noting that there are different opinions on whether primary panther habitat is the latest greatest science. Ms. Olson said the County program should be consistent with the USFWS method.

An audience member asked when an application is submitted, is the environmental rating of the land updated, and is the information available to the public? Mr. Van Lengen said the information can be made available to the public. The County's environmental group and GIS group work together on the review effort, and any work product can be made available.

An audience member said that SRAs might not all be properly classified. He asked should a serious wildlife area even be in a SRA? Mr. Van Lengen said such a philosophical question has to be reconciled with practicality. He said this planning tool is subject to information and opinions offered by the public. He said suggestions to make changes are welcome, and declarative statements with recommendations are most useful in the progress of this Restudy.

Meredith Budd commented that the notion is being raised that areas within the SRA can be pulled for generating credits. For example, 45,000 acres will increase to over 50,000 acres. She said she does not believe it is the intent to pull out SRA areas that are sensitive and give credit. Mr. Van Lengen said that is correct, and the idea is a hypothetical, not necessarily a recommendation.

An audience member said the NRI index has been used for nearly twenty years, and asked from an adaptive management standpoint, has the measurement tool been evaluated as to if its working or not working, and how it may be improved in the future? Mr. Van Lengen said there have not been any formal studies, however public feedback helps contribute to a sense of how well it is working.

The audience member asked if the threshold of a 1.2 score has been verified as being the right threshold? Mr. Van Lengen said such a recommendation is a good one to take to the Board to see if they want to evaluate that measurement.

An audience member said she spent years at the World Bank, and it is customary to do evaluations every five years. Mr. Van Lengen said the 5 Year Review was an exhaustive effort, and the Restudy that is underway constitutes another review. He suggested looking at the 5 Year Review effort outcome, and comment on whether more needs to be reviewed.

An audience member said the County claims all the data is available, however he has been informed that the data resides in the hands of the original consultants that were hired by the landowners. Mr. Van Lengen said both statements are true, and explained that the original data created as part of the system resides with Wilson Miller, which was purchased by Stantec, and they are still looking for it. Mr. Van Lengen said the data is open source, and it can be recreated by anybody. The audience member suggested the original data may be manipulated by landowners who have a vested interest and said it seems strange the County would not have the data. The audience member asked if it is publicly available? Another audience member said that data can be compiled from various sources, and it can be obtained by Googling.

Dr. Evans interjected to address the concerns being debated between audience members about the data and its availability, and she summarized that the NRI scoring system is a tool that has data inputted, and that data gets updated when it is inputted.

Mr. Reynolds said the agencies have data that is the most current. The data from 2002 was a starting point for a map, and anyone can find the public sources for all the data available online and come up with a score. He said anybody can create an index map with today's data using the NRI scoring tool.

Dr. Evans said the credibility of the data sources is a question, and there seems to be suspicion among some audience members. Mr. Reynolds acknowledged there are concerns about whether the system is transparent, and the County website has a report with all the sources of data, and scoring can be derived using data from 2002.

An audience member asked if landowners come in with a score for the SSAs and SRAs at the time that the landowner seeks to do an application; is each acre scored by the landowner's consultant? Mr. Reynolds replied yes, at the time of application, a biologist generates a map that scores the lands, and puts the data on a disk and gives it to the County for review and quality assurance. He said every acre in an SSA approved today has a disk with the data submitted to the County.

Ms. Olson said the Conservancy has done a lot of research, and she said the County wasn't given all the data in 2002. She said there is information that Mr. Reynolds is not sharing. She said that every acre of land was given a score in 2002. She said based on the score given in 2002, anything over 1.3 is considered environmentally sensitive and under 1.3 is considered not environmentally sensitive. She said the data from 2002 should be shared with the public because it's the starting point. She said this is the information that Mr. Reynolds says can be changed, but she would like to know where the original scores come from.

Mr. Reynolds explained the scoring to get to 1.2 is done the exact same way. Ms. Olson said technology and science has changed, and the 2002 data should be available for analysis. Mr. Reynolds said the map is a tool to look at.

Ms. Olson said data should be available to the public to know the starting point and how it was derived. Mr. Reynolds summarized that all the data was given to the County, and the old records are being collected in an attempt to recreate the 2002 map. He said everything shown on the x-ray map that had a score of 1.2 in 2002 is subject to the processing of a current application requiring rescoring with current data. Because there seemed to be confusion about whether the scoring is all based on data that only Wilson Miller has, Dr. Evans offered that the scoring system is the tool, but the data behind the tool is updated.

Ms. Olson said the updating for an SRA or SSA application starts with a base number in order to generate new scoring. She said the tool and the data itself is a concern. Dr. Evans asked what information is needed to resolve the concern, and Ms. Olson said the baseline data from the 2002 data needs to be publicly available.

Mr. Reynolds explained that until a private property owner comes to the County seeking SSA or SRA approval, nothing has changed on the property. The system is used when an applicant asks to be designated SSA or SRA. The applicant must submit current data at the time of submittal to score it according to the system. For instance, he said, if the Conservancy bought 100 acres and wanted to conserve the land, they would gather biological data, score it, and the County would review and assign credits, and the land would be put into conservation.

Dr. Fritz Roka of the Florida Gulf Coast University Agribusiness Center added to the conversation, acknowledging there is confusion about methodology and data. He said he did not believe that the old data is of value today. If there are panthers are in a certain area today, then the score would be different than twenty years ago. He suggested having a workshop to work through a scoring exercise to help illuminate that there is no secret to the methodology or the data. Mr. Van Lengen said the

workshop is possible by either the County or a private group, because the scoring is based on publicly available information.

An audience member asked when a biologist does the assessment, does the County have a trusted list of approved biologists who can do the rating? Mr. Van Lengen said a qualified biologist with certain credentials provides the scoring in the application. Mr. Van Lengen said the audience could suggest and make a declarative statement if they think a third-party reviewer should be involved in reviews of the submittals.

An audience member said that computers are used to do these exercises, and asked why is there no evidence that the material we are working with is updated? As an example, the audience member said Rural Lands West would not be allowed to develop as the applicant requests in panther habitat. She asked why the material does not indicate where can you build, where can you not build, and how many acres can you build on? Information developed since 2002 should dictate less areas suitable for development, not more.

Ms. Budd offered that she thinks the audience concerns over original data is really a desire to reevaluate where open lands, SSA and SRA boundaries are designated. She asked how much does preferred or tolerated panther habitat with no other resource value score? Mr. Van Lengen said the score is 0.5 for just panther habitat with no other listed species. She said that explains how a score could not rise to the threshold for protection. She said in 2009 experts reviewed the RLSA and opined on the 5 Year Review and found it is better for the panther than the current system; they provided additional recommendations to make it even better as well. She added that panther biologists may be needed to do another technical review.

An audience member asked if it possible to update the indices? Mr. Van Lengen said it is a difficult question to answer, and there are legal implications. The beauty of the 5 Year Review was that there were several parties working together. If the Board wants to proceed, and the landowners do not agree, the legal experts need to weigh in.

An audience member asked if the xray map reflects scores from the NRI worksheet? Mr. Van Lengen said the map's colors represent HSAs, FSAs, WRAs, and the intensity of color represents the number of points. Mr. Van Lengen said the threshold of 1.2 was derived to identify where preservation should occur within an SRA.

An audience member said there are more panther incidents in Golden Gate Estates since buildings have been developed in the area. She suggested that the Fish and Wildlife Agency should investigate because there have been many pet kills. She urged protection of the panther, or people will get hurt. Mr. Van Lengen responded that there is a panther recovery implementation team headed by USFWS with others from universities who are constantly studying the issue. He said the differences may be related to the pace of growth within Golden Gate Estates as opposed to outside of Golden Gate Estates. The initiative to build in the RLSA has only been realized in one town, Ave Maria.

The audience member reiterated that panther habitat is being lost. Mr. Van Lengen said literature indicates the incidence of human panther interaction has been slightly on the increase in Golden Gate over the past decade. Dr. Roka said in terms of data, there has been an increase in number of panthers in 22 years from thirty panthers to over 300 panthers. The audience member said the panthers are peaking in houses and endangering children.

III. Policy 3.11 (Restoration)

Mr. Van Lengen summarized Policy 3.11 by explaining that the purposes of restoration include: functional enhancement of flowways, widening and enhancement of wildlife corridors, enhancement of listed species habitat, and creation of wading bird habitat. He explained that the process includes evaluation by wildlife professionals, review by County environmental staff, and monitoring by County staff and possibly other permitting agencies.

Mr. Van Lengen advised that some SSAs have restoration within them, and some do not. The R-1 credits are for dedication of restoration and do not require any activity other than dedicating the area. Four credits per acre are granted in Camp Keais Strand, and two credits per acre are granted for the OK Slough on the east side in the Area of Critical State Concern (ACSC). The R-2 credits are for completion of the restoration, and success criteria must be met. Four credits per acre are granted if the owner completes the restoration.

Recommendations from the April 2018 workshop included: recalibrate the credits granted, consider stricter mandate for completion before credits are given, consider stricter success criteria, and monitor and verify for restoration success. Mr. Van Lengen said the 5 Year Review recommendations included reducing the R-1 dedication credits to two credits per acre. He said a cost-centric idea was used for the R-2 credits. For example, restoration for caracara was proposed at two credits per acre, exotic control/burring was proposed at four credits per acre, flowway restoration was proposed at four credits per acre, native habitat restoration was proposed at six credits, panther corridor creation was proposed at eight credits, and shallow wading bird habitat was six credits. Mr. Van Lengen then asked the audience for ideas with respect to environmental restoration within the RLSA program.

Ms. Olson alluded to the 5 Year Review recommendation adding more credits to the system. Mr. Van Lengen clarified that the 5 Year Review recommendation would add less credits to the system.

Ms. Olson said that all the credits that landowners are receiving are for the potential for restoration, and only 200-400 acres have actually been restored. If the owners are gaining credits for removing land use layers, and then also getting credits for the potential for restoration, the landowner is double dipping. Mr. Van Lengen agreed, and said the R-1 credits ensure there is no intensification of use on the property, and there is a slightly elevated maintenance requirement. He confirmed that a vast majority of credits granted are for potential restoration without having the restoration completed.

Ms. Budd agreed with the concern about credits for potential restoration. She asked who can do the restoration other than the property owner, given the restrictions of private property rights? She suggested the R-2 restoration credit will only be sought and restoration will only be performed when additional credits are needed.

An audience member said that Rural Lands West removed four or five layers of use, kept Ag-2 on a small portion, and got 10,000 credits for use removal. An additional 14,000 credits were granted for the potential for restoration. She said it seems excessive to get more credits in that fashion. She expressed concern that Group 3 policies only reference restoration credits; the Growth Management Plan (GMP) and the Land Development Code (LDC) do not provide direction on the actual restoration. Some of the restoration plans do not have a start date, and no metrics for progress, milestones or timelines. Instead the LDC says when success criteria are met, then the credits are awarded. She described an example of SSA 15, where the goal was to restore the flow way and wildlife habitat corridor in the Camp Keais Strand area. Success criteria included removal of two road grates and a pinch point farm road and restoration of native habitat. She said nothing mandated that the flowway gets restored. She said the GMP needs stricter guidance for restoration, including start dates because once construction begins, the habitat is impacted. She said SSA 15 is in an important corridor for panther habitat, and Collier Enterprises was not going to start restoration until they had a certain number of committed developers, and restoration would take ten years. She said that restoration needs to start at the beginning of construction or sooner because the wildlife will be impacted.

Mr. Van Lengen responded that timing of the restoration in relation to development and tying the success criteria to the goals are both good comments.

An audience member said there is a need for monitored review points of the restorations, and credits should not be granted until complete, which could take three years or longer. He said hydrology, herbaceous area, and shallow wetland restoration for wood storks can take a long time. He said giving the credits up front makes no sense, and we need to monitor and determine the final results. Mr. Van Lengen said the restoration plan contains success criteria, and it typically takes five years to determine if criteria are met. He agreed that granting credits upon designation of areas for future restoration is an issue. The audience member said nothing is done in return for the incentives. Mr. Van Lengen said when the R-2 process begins, there is monitoring and success criteria in place. However, R-1 credits are awarded for restoration dedication, and R-2 credits are awarded for doing the restoration. The audience member said granting of the credits is the issue, because there are about 16,000 restoration available credits, making it is the single largest source of credits in the system, and it has the loosest standards.

IV. Policy 3.13 (Water Retention Areas)

Mr. Van Lengen summarized Policy 3.13 stating water retention areas (WRAs) were originally subject to South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) permits and eligible to be used for water management in new towns and villages. They are not required to be designated as part of towns and villages. The 5 Year Review recommended they consume credits and become part of the SRA.

An audience member said the WRAs were important to water retention and water quality. The policy currently allows the WRAs to be used for stormwater management systems. The Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC) and Collier County Planning Commission (CCPC) commented that WRAs should not be used for stormwater management systems, and she hopes the county leaders will consider that. If WRAs are going to be used for water management systems, then she recommended considering a requirement for filter marshes as part of the treatment systems. She added that Camp Keais Strand is impaired for nutrients, and Rural Lands West proposed using the WRA for stormwater management, with discharge into Camp Keais Strand. She summarized that filter marshes have been used successfully around the state to reduce nutrients, and more information can be provided if desired.

Mr. Van Lengen acknowledged water management, pretreatment and a flowway management plan as recommended by the County stormwater staff are important to support water quality and quantity.

Ms. Olson said some WRAs have high ecological significance such a Shaggy Cypress Preserve. When that is surrounded by development, the habitat value is reduced for the panther. She said landowners should not receive credits for SSAs when development chokes off a preserve, noting the habitat functionality would be reduced significantly by development in those areas.

An audience member said maybe someone from the County environmental department could speak to the group to help give confidence that restoration is being done well. He suggested it would be nice to have an ecologist, USFWS and/or SFWMD representative speak on restoration practices.

V. Consensus Building and Conclusion

Dr. Evans said she will be working on the consensus building process. The issue of consensus building is not an ideal, it is a process, and this group will not reach consensus on every issue. What is helpful in the process are the type of comments on the Policy 3.11 slide presented earlier which are statements of recommendations such as: recalibrate the credits granted, stricter mandate for completion before credits are given, stricter success criteria and monitor/verify restoration success. Dr. Evans said she is hearing mistrust of past data and processes and concerns about transparency on whether what is said is being done is being done. She reiterated that the group's input will go into a white paper that will go to the County Commissioners, and tangible recommendations are most useful.

She pointed out that the members of the County's team are keeping records. She noted that recordings and meeting notes document all the meetings. Collection of the public comments are captured by tape recorders, desktop discussion worksheets, Facebook comments, and emails have all been collected and recorded for the past year. The collected data will be used and collapsed into topics. The intent is to take lots of data and capture in a way that is agreeable to the people making the statements, to be sure that the ideas are being captured properly.

At the next meeting sticky notes will help align comments. The tracking of comments has been done, and the input will be organized. The process will be interactive. Something specific can be prepared for future meetings, such as tangible recommendations; otherwise the year has been futile. The County staff wants recommendations to take to the County Commissioners. She advised that if there is mistrust, get the message clear so there can be actions taken. At the end of this process there will be topics of agreement, and other areas may not reach consensus. These non-consensus items will be captured, and barriers will be identified for non-consensus items. Dr. Evans noted that two County Commissioners were present (Commissioner McDaniel and Commissioner Taylor), to which Commissioner McDaniel responded that he would not be offering comment or feedback given the provisions of the Sunshine Law. Dr. Evans acknowledged that the Commissioners must observe the Sunshine Law and be quiet observers, and she reiterated that a County Commissioner would want clean and concise recommendations.

An audience member said he understands the audience does the work and then a white paper goes to the Commissioners. He thanked the two Commissioners for being present at the workshop, and said he is inclined to go directly to his Commissioner with recommendations rather than going to all the public work sessions for his input to be collected by staff, and then into a white paper that will then go to the Commissioners. Dr. Evans affirmed that a voter should be speaking to his or her Commissioner, but the point of this activity is to get public input on the Restudy of the RLSA. He asked if the Commissioners will make the final decision on the Restudy of the RLSA? Dr. Evans said the actions being taken through the workshops is to bring together a group with divergent opinions, so that the group can work together to identify points what can be agreed with a strong voice.

The audience member asked if Nick Penniman will continue as the Growth Management Oversight Committee (GMOC) chairman? Mr. Van Lengen said that he is not sure at this time. The Oversight Committee looks at all four Restudies to verify the Restudies are coordinated and that there is sufficient public outreach.

An audience member asked if the white paper will go to the CCPC? Mr. Van Lengen said it does not. The public hearing process for GMP Amendments includes the CCPC sitting as the CCPC and EAC, then to the Board, and then it goes around again.

Ms. Olson said a concrete recommendation is that she wants the 2002 underlying data on which the program is based.

Dr. Evans said the more precise the recommendations, the better. She said while some topics can become polarized, there have been many conversations throughout the year of workshops where many people were on the same page. Trust has been an underlying issue. The next two meetings are important for tightening up thoughts and recommendations and consensus building. The many pages of data collected from all the workshops will be organized to pull out specific recommendations.

An audience member asked if additions can be made to the feedback tracking? Dr. Evans said any changes can be brought forward by email or contacting the County staff, but feedback will not be redacted. She said when consensus is not reached, it will be identified and the barriers to reaching consensus are important because they could represent a whole policy issue.

An audience member said several attendees were in attendance, and they would like to endorse the paper from the Conservancy. Dr. Evans said that is fine.

An audience member said the issue of the data could be clarified if the original data was available and compared with how the data is now classified. It would help clarify the changes as someone tries to assess how the system is working. The original data and the new data would be helpful for understanding what has happened at the site. Dr. Evans said this is a helpful recommendation to assess the efficacy of the program. Dr. Evans said we are all living on land that was developed poorly, and it's important to resolve the best way to continue how development occurs.

An audience member said that Rural Lands West can be reviewed as a good study of the original data and updated data for comparison.

Mr. Van Lengen said the next meeting is February 28th and closed the meeting at 8:05 p.m.