TRANSCRIPT OF THE AUIR MEETING OF THE
COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Naples, Florida
September 20, 2010

LET IT BE REMEMBERED, that the Collier County Planning Commission, in and for the County of Collier, having conducted business herein, met on this date at 8:30 a.m. in SPECIAL SESSION at 2800 Horseshoe Drive, Naples, Florida, with the following members present:

Mark Strain, Chairman (Absent)
Melissa Ahern
Donna Reed-Caron, Acting Chairwoman
Diane Ebert
Karen Homiak
Paul Midney (Absent)
Bob Murray
Brad Schiffer

ALSO PRESENT:
Mike Bosi, Community Planning Manager
Heidi Ashton-Cicko, Assistant County Attorney
Nick Casalanguida, Growth Management Division/Planning & Regulation
Thomas Eastman, Real Property Director, CC School District
MR. BOSI: Chair, you have a live mic.

COMMISSIONER CARON: Good morning, and welcome to the September 20th, AUIR special meeting for the Collier County Planning Commission.

Commissioner Strain had some personal business that he had to take care of today, so he will not be with us. Mr. Midney was also going to be absent.

I don't know about Ms. Homiak, she may be coming shortly. I don't remember the other day whether she said she was going to be here or not. But we do have a quorum, so we will get started, and we'll start by pledge of allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All right, let's turn the meeting over to start with to Mr. Bosi.

MR. BOSI: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Planning Commissioners.

Today we are going to have the AUIR/CIE, a special meeting adoption hearing.

There is one issue that I have to relay to the Planning Commission members. It's related to the advertising for the Capital Improvement Element, the amendment. That advertising did not make the Naples Daily News. The advertising for the AUIR did. So we cannot take action on the CIE amendment.

What staff's suggestion will be is we can take our appropriate action upon the AUIR. The CIE we will present to you when we bring the AUIR back for the consent agenda on October 21st and we will have our advertised public hearing for the CIE.

And it does provide one benefit: There was a memo that was provided earlier last week by Mr. Casalanguida related to our transportation impact fees and potential action, reduction, to those transportation impact fees by the board at next Tuesday's board meeting.

If the board takes an action to reduce the impact fees, they anticipated 42 percent, well, that will correspond into a reduction within the revenue available for transportation in their five-year capital improvement projects.

Because of that one project, or -- it will be affected by the projects that will be put forward. So the CIE that you (sic) will be presented to you on the 21st of October will be different more than likely than the CIE that's contained within your books. So you'll be taking action upon the CIE that the board will be taking action upon in their November meeting, so that works out well.

The agenda is on the overhead. We're going to start with an overview of the AUIR process by myself, a quick kind of tutorial, and then we're going to go to the two department fire districts and then down the line through our traditional with transportation and then drainage and the category A and then the category B facilities.

One of the things that I passed out to each one of the planning commissioners was a sheet that really -- that talks about the AUIR component, what the expansion of that system was based upon and what the levels of service that expansion is based upon.

Transportation and drainage are unique commodities within the AUIR/CIE world. They -- population is not the basis of their improvements.

(At which time, Commissioner Homiak enters the boardroom.)

MR. BOSI: Transportation actually used traffic counts, the volumes, the ratio of volumes to the system capacities within individual roads.

Drainage is more on terms of the base -- the information contained within the basin studies to be able to determine what's appropriate in terms of water quantity and water quality in terms of moving through the system.

The rest of your components are population based. Population are the triggers that calls for the new improvements.

A good example I always utilize is libraries. Libraries says we have .33 square feet per capita of library space. That's what the county, the advisory boards and the Board of County Commissioners has said what is appropriate for this county, and it's .33 square feet per capita.

So over a five-year period, if we're expecting 10,000 new people to come, we have to add 330 square feet of library space to satisfy that level of service. And that is how we -- that is the program, that is the equation that determines what's appropriate for the new facilities that are going to come on board.

If I could call your attention towards Page 6 within the staff report, and it talks about population. And as I was describing, population is one of the key components, one of the key factors, really, it's the driver for where our new improvements are going to come, at what level.
And on Page 6 you can see back in 2005 when the environment, the business climate and the demand for units was much different. The five-year growth percentage, we were estimating almost 25 percent. In 2006 it was 31 percent expectation of increase within a five-year period.

Obviously macro and micro conditions have changed drastically since then, whereas if you looked just last year it was only a 7.1 percent population increase for the five-year period.

This year, 2010 was the first year in the past three years where they've actually -- where the University of Florida's Bureau of Economic and Business Research -- and let me clarify, that is the official -- that is the official entity that is to provide per state statutes to the county and our Growth Management Plan the population numbers that we're to utilize.

And the Board of County Commissioners within the Growth Management Plan has designated that we're going to utilize the BEBR numbers, the University of Florida Business and Economic Research, but we're also going to utilize a seasonal adjustment. And when you see within the books, you'll see reference to a permanent population, but you'll also see reference to a peak season population. And all that peak season population is 20 percent above our permanent. And that's to count for the fluctuations that we experienced over the seasonal months.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: How is that calculated?

MR. BOSI: It's straight -- the permanent population and the permanent population projections that we're provided from BEBR, it's just times 1.2. And that --

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Right, but where do you come up with 20 percent?

MR. BOSI: Oh, that was an effort that was arrived upon by the county and the Department of Community Affairs three years ago. The way that we had done -- the way that we had estimated our peak season, we had a weighted population average, and we tried to expect what was our -- what was the number of seasonal units that were available, what was the number of short-term units that were available, trying to get a better handle upon okay, what each month, December, January, February and March, what was the number of people that were coming for each one of those months, based upon those occupancy and vacancy rates.

We found that it was -- that trying to track that and trying to keep an accurate number wasn't providing as successful as we would have liked. So we decided with the Department of Community Affairs to arrive upon just a 20 percent above our permanent population as the appropriate number for our seasonal population demands.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: So that's across the board? It doesn't take into consideration different areas, where it's obvious you estates area may not have as much of a peak so you're not --

MR. BOSI: No, no --

COMMISSIONER AHERN: -- going to need a higher level of service?

MR. BOSI: -- and it doesn't. And the reason why it is, is not -- and we don't think about it as segmented in terms of we don't deliver our service. We don't have a different level of service for the Estates residents, for our park lands compared to, say, the urbanized area. We all enjoy 2.9 acres per 1,000 level of service standard.

So we don't distinguish between difference in levels of service standards between geographic area. So we only try to estimate. That 20 percent is really also trying to capture what is the demands, the extra demands that are placed upon each one of these systems by the seasonal population. So we don't try to distinguish between geographic areas when we go forward with that.

And based upon that -- and based upon, you know, this much slower rate of population increases, we have found ourselves within a system where the majority of the categories, the majority of the category A facilities and the majority of the category B facilities that are contained within the AUUC/CIE book that was presented to the CCPC members, there's really no improvements that are being suggested. The levels of service standards are adequately meeting the demands against the population projections.

Drainage and transportation really are the two components where there's -- there are projects that are being put forward based upon the demands, based upon the completion of prior projects.

Another thing that I need to offer distinguishing about it is when I mentioned your category A versus your category B facilities. Your category A facilities are drainage, roads, your public utilities, schools and parks. Those are the systems that are accompanied and contained within by your Capital Improvement Element. Those are the ones that the State of Florida wants to make sure that each jurisdiction, that Collier County and every other county is maintaining whatever the levels of service that they've deemed appropriate, the state wants to make sure that those are being maintained at the level that we've expressed. And if we're not -- if we're not attaining those individual levels,
then there's certain actions and certain remedies that are associated with it. But we are meeting those.

On your category B facilities, your category B facilities are jails, law enforcement, government buildings, libraries, your dependent fire districts, those are locally regulated. I mean, locally determined and locally enforced. The state doesn't ask to see your Capital Improvement Element related to those facilities. So those are only dealt with within the AUIR.

And they also have a relationship to our impact fees, because the impact fees that we charge for those categories, we can't let the levels of service fall below what we're charging newcomers to say that we say we're going to provide for them.

So those are the two distinctions that are contained within the book. And as you'll notice, it is segmented into a category A and a category B facilities.

That would conclude my remarks in terms of just the general overview of the AUIR, other than a reiteration. From reviewing the improvements that are contained, you'll see that there's not a lot. There's not a lot of improvements that are being suggested because we're meeting the levels of service based upon the population.

And I had mentioned, this was the first year that BEBR had thought that we're going to maybe experience a little bit greater of a population increase for the next five years. While that's encouraging, I'm not sure anyone within this room is ready to say that, you know, that that 15 to 18 to 19, 20 percent population increases over a five or 10-year period is just right around the corner. Those conditions are still going to have to be played out.

As time goes by, as other leading indicators provide a little bit more clues as to what's going on within the local but also within the national and the global economy maybe we'll be able to make better determinations and put more confidence within these numbers. But at this time I think it's premature to say that we've got a departure from what we've seen in the last couple of years. I think we're going to allow ourselves to continue to look at the needs, look at the needs within the individual systems, try to identify what are the greatest beneficial next new projects for each one of our systems, so when that demand does become -- or is realized again, that the projects that we're going to put forward will be the most efficient and will be the best use of the public expenditures to be able to satisfy and expand the systems and reach the individual users of those systems.

And with that, I would offer any questions that the commission may have before we get into --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I have a question.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thanks, Mike.

Mr. Murray?

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Yeah, I just want to get something perfectly clear. In your -- on Page 6 and when you look at the chart, the BEBR estimate is not the peak or is the peak?

MR. BOSI: The BEBR estimate, those -- that is permanent, permanent population.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: So the peak would be 400,320.

MR. BOSI: Correct, correct.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay. Just want to be sure we all work from the same number.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Melissa?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: When are we going to have the new revised BEBR numbers based on the 2010 census?

MR. BOSI: The -- it will not be until next spring. That's when the BEBR -- every year the BEBR numbers come out, the preliminary numbers come out at the end of February. The official numbers come out right around the beginning of April.

The expectation with the U.S. census, the 20 -- this annual census, is next -- early spring, late winter.

February/March, is when we're going to start getting information from the Census Bureau.

I do know that BEBR and the census have a working relationship. So the numbers that will be provided next year from BEBR will have been influenced by the work of the census.

And the reason why, and I think that Melissa has asked the question is because one of the most impacting things I believe that's going to be contained in next year's population numbers, and you may see even a reduction from what we have this year, and it's all related to the vacancy rate. And what we -- what these numbers have not done an adequate job of capturing is the true vacancy rate that's out there, just because of the limitations in the way that the system works.

With the limitation in the vacancy rates that are going to be determined from the census work of this year will
be influenced upon next year. So next year you'll see a more, a truer -- I think a truer reflection upon what the permanent and our peak season populations will be.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: We talked a lot about that last year, about trying to capture that vacancy situation. And I know that everybody here is trying to do the best that they can in order to come up with a solid number. And obviously we'll know more with the census for sure.

Couple of things just for housekeeping. I guess we actually should for the record call the roll. And so let me do that right now before we get too far off track.

Ms. Ahern?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Here.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Ms. Ebert?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Here.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Mr. Schiffer?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'm here.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Mr. Murray?

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Here.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Ms. Homiak?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Here.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: And Mr. Eastman --

MR. EASTMAN: Here.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- and Ms. Caron are all here. And Mr. Midney and Mr. Strain are absent. So we're all set for that.

And go ahead, Mike.

MR. BOSI: Oh, yeah, one last thing that I probably should have -- I mean, I needed to include this within my opening remark, ask that for each section that's presented, at the end of each section if the commission could provide a recommendation upon that individual section, which will be provided to you for your consent agenda review on the 21st of October, but will also be forwarded along to the Board of County Commissioners for the November 10th meeting for the AUIR/CIE.

So for each -- after each presentation for each one of the sections of the AUIR, we ask for a specific recommendation from the Planning Commission.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thank you.

We'll move along and get the chiefs up here so that they can --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Donna? Donna?

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- get back to work.

Go ahead --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I still have a question in the executive summary.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- Brad. Yeah, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Page 6 below the population stuff, second to the last paragraph, you're discussing a concept there. And then that last sentence which you say what is noteworthy. What you're saying is that we do have an actual use that's much less than the demand we figured with impact fees and in our level of service because of vacancies. But now when those come back on-line they're going to cause trouble, because there's no additional revenue. Shouldn't --

MR. BOSI: It's not going to cause trouble. What it's going to cause is it's going to be an issue in perception. Because the demand -- there's excess slack within the system. And the individuals who are living in Collier County are enjoying a level of service that's provided that's meant for a population that's not here yet, or that's not here yet because of vacancy, because of empty units.

What it's saying, and it's really related to your -- for the most part related to your transportation improvements. You're going to see when those vacant rate houses fill up, all of a sudden you're going to see the pressure within the transportation system increase a bit. But there won't be relief in terms of new impact fees coming on to be able to provide excess capacity, because that excess capacity has already been built within the system.

And what all that's saying is we're enjoying a system that is built for a population that is above what our current population levels are right now.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But I think, you know, the way it's worded, it says here: No capital improvements will be allocated to satisfy additional demand.

It's not really an additional demand. I mean, we -- in impact fees we get into this, the demand is a number and the use could be much less.

MR. BOSI: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Or maybe much more.

So the point is I really think that it's not demand that's being placed on the system, it's as the use starts to equal what the demand was designed for. So it appears as if you're looking for or there would be the need for more money, and there's not. Is there?

MR. BOSI: And maybe the -- I should exchange the --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: The word demand.

MR. BOSI: -- demand to utilization.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I would think that would make it --

MR. BOSI: And I'll note that and I'll make sure that's noted within the executive summary and update the staff report to clarify that is, it's really the utilization of the individual systems that will change and not the demand.

Because one of the things, and it's inherent with the way that we do capital improvement programming, it's population based, but they're all tied to dwelling units. And when you've got potentially 25 percent of your dwelling units or 20 percent of your dwelling units that right now are unoccupied, you've got a system that's built to accommodate all those dwelling units that are on board, but all those dwelling units aren't exerting pressure on the system. And that's really where we're trying to -- we were trying to point out.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah, I'm just saying, get rid of that word demand, because in the impact fee argument there are people that argue that the demand's higher than reality. And you don't want to get caught in an argument in that sentence. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Mike?

MR. BOSI: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: You've got to think of it too is a container that's maybe three-quarters full, you know, the collector and the other, the major roads are D and E. So there's a lot of opportunity to fill that container, so to speak. So I agree completely.

MR. BOSI: Well, acknowledging that. And I'll make note within the executive summary as well, and provide an update to the staff report related to that individual statement.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, any other questions before we -- on the first section of the report before we move on?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Did you have a question, Ms. Homiak?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: No.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well let me --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- just to make sure I understand.

Prior to that, and I think the page or so before that, you discuss that the impact fee has a level of service that it tries to achieve. That's the demand service. And we're not allowed to go below that with actual level of service; is that correct? So is the level of service shown in all these elements the impact fee level of service?

MR. BOSI: No. No, there are many instances where the level of service that are contained within our books are higher than what is contained within our impact fees. You can never -- you can't charge people in -- related to your impact fees, you can't charge people for a level of service above what we're currently providing. Because that would be asking a new person to add to our system.

The basis and the equity portion -- and equity is the basis of impact fees -- the equity portion of the concept of impact fees are you're a new pers -- you're a new entity, you're a new family coming to our community, you're going to exert pressure upon the school system, your going to exert pressure upon the road system, you're going to exert pressure upon the library, the park system, all the things that accompany an individual household.

We're not going to ask you to improve our system by your contribution of your impact fees, but your contribution of your impact fees are meant to keep that scales balanced, that you're going to come to our community,
you're going to pay your fair share to allow for that system to remain balanced, to remain as it was as you came here. And that's really that concept of relationship between impact fees and levels of service.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. And so because we never are told what the impact service is, we can assume that every level of service in this book is greater than or equal to the impact fee level of service?

MR. BOSI: You most certainly can. If we ever had a case where the impact fees were higher than our levels of service, Ms. Patterson would definitely raise the issue with us.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, thank you. Thank you again.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I was just going to say, Amy Patterson is sitting right there. I think --

***Okay, let's get the chiefs up here so that we can get them out of here. This should be relatively painless.

Chief Rodriguez?

CHIEF RODRIGUEZ: Good morning. Emilio Rodriguez, Chief, Isles of Capris Fire Rescue.

This morning I have our AUIR to present, and basically it's the same as last year. We have no capital improvements for this year as well. So I'm here to answer any questions that the board may have.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Anybody have any questions for the chief?

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: No change.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: No change.

Somebody want to make a motion -- I'm sorry, Melissa?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I just have one.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead.

CHIEF RODRIGUEZ: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: You're showing a need for an additional station. Looking at the radius provided on the map, have you looked at other areas where maybe you could move the existing stations instead of adding an additional one to cover the radius?

CHIEF RODRIGUEZ: No, ma'am. It's not cost beneficial to move our existing station. If we move that station per the ordinance, we would lose that land. It's deeded for a way that we're not allowed to sell it.

And where we're located now, we are able to run our marine operations because of where our boat is located. So it's the best area to have our main station.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thanks.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll make a motion.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I move we forward the 2010 Isle of Capri AUIR as shown on the summary form.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Second.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All right, all in favor?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIACK: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHIEF McGALGHNIN: ***Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. For the record, Allen McLaughlin, Chief, Ochopee Fire Control District.

And our AUIR has not changed either since last year, so I'm here to answer any questions.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Anybody have any questions for the chief?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: These are the easy ones. We love getting these out of the way early.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll make a motion --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- that we move the 2010 AUIR Ochopee Fire Control as shown on the summary form.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Second.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, all in favor?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AIHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CARON: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thanks, Chief.

***Okay, now we're back to Norm. Now we'll go to transportation.

MR. FEDER: You say that with such enthusiasm.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I know. We love you, Norm.

Go ahead, the floor is all yours.

MR. FEDER: Okay. First of all, I'm going to give you a brief background and then we'll go page by page and see what questions you have, or issues.

I'm going to concentrate obviously on the AUIR component, but it's tied very directly into the CIE, which is going to change basically, based on next board meeting we're going to be reviewing the transportation impact fee.

There's two parts of that I want to make clear. What you see in here in the way of cost and numbers are basically structured based on current estimates, not on the impact fee itself. The impact fee, the only place you see it is up at the top when it talks about our level of service and unit cost. But that is not used in our CIE and our work program and other items. They are current costs.

But we are looking at going to the board on the 28th. Right now the formula appears to be doing a couple of things. First of all, we're going to look to take the utility portion out of the transportation impact fee. That amounts to about 10 percent of our impact fee. That was put in previously with the idea that growth pays for growth and that at least in like kind replacement the utilities are being moved basically -- in this case the county public utility was being moved -- based on the construction project and therefore should be an impact fee item therefore in the transportation impact fee.

As we move most of our work program further out to the east, that is no longer the case as we're not providing utilities in those areas, and we're recommending that that 10 percent portion be taken out and that utility address it either in their user fee or their impact fee as is appropriate, and we're working with them. Obviously with a much slower program it should be lesser dollar, but we're working through those particulars with them.

So that's about a 10 percent reduction. That will be in our Phase II is what we're recommending to the board, to come further in January. When you have a reduction, you implement it immediately.

The other portion of that, because of reductions in cost, components, and we did a full credit and cost analysis, is going to amount to, with all items, about 32 percent. So that will be the initial reduction, 32, followed up by a Phase II, which will remove the utilities about another 10 percent. That's where we are right now in methodology going to the board.

There is of course the Chambers issue of 50 percent reduction, so that's going to play out. So I'm going to give you sort of a feel for how that will change the CIE. But as was noted, that's going to be addressed after the board takes the action and we know where our impact fees are. But I'll refer to that as we go through.

Starting off on Page 17, what I need to make you aware of in the way of background, as I said, is the fact that basically ad valorem has been taken out of the transportation capital program. The only ad valorem you have is a portion, not all, of the debt service, which was for the backlog, if you remember. That was for the two bond issues that went forward for the gas tax bonding. Then there was an additional about 10 million that got reduced a little bit in the last couple of years, but basically 10 million and above that was used for the rest of the backlog.

When I came here in 2000, we had about a $278 million backlog. About 210 million of that was handled by
the two bondings. All of that additional money that was covering the rest of that backlog equation, as well as some of it that was helping to replace the gas tax loss of about 14.8 million a year, is now removed in the way of ad valorem, about 13 something is retained. And I'll show you that as we go through.

So there is no ad valorem now in the transportation capital program. There is of course in the operations and maintenance, and even that's been reduced, because I've had to use some of the gas tax as well to cover some of the debt service in the capital program.

Going into that, that's shown on Page 17. We've got a balanced program, if you will. Total of 268,728. As you go down that, and we're going to hit it later, but the impact fees is assumed at 67.5, and that is likely to be reduced somewhere in the vicinity of one-third or greater, as you know.

In the case of that 10 percent on Phase II, when you take the utilities out and you take the dollars out, it takes out the cost of projects, so that should be a wash. So it fires the major impact to deliver your projects is that initial 32 percent or what it turns out to be by the board.

Are there any questions on Page 17 that someone would like me to address?

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Any questions?

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Let me ask a dumb question.

You speak about ad valorem not being represented in there, but the general fund, where does that come from?

MR. FEDER: That is ad valorem. That's property taxes ad valorem.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Right. So I misheard you then, you said you didn't have any ad valorem taxes this year.

MR. FEDER: What you have is only the 13 of the 14-8 to cover debt service from the backlog previously, which couldn't be funded with impact fees. So that figure that you see in ad valorem there of general fund of 68,675, you look at that, that's a little over 13 million a year, covering the debt service of about 14.8. The rest of it's covered by gas tax.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay, thank you.

MR. FEDER: Any other questions on 17?

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Anybody else have any other questions?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Norm, our lane miles, is that still an appropriate figure for your lane miles?

MR. FEDER: No. That figure that you have there, the 6,255,000 is what is going to get changed with the upcoming impact fee.

And again, we use that as we've done in every AUIR. My note was we didn't use that lane mile cost as a way to develop the projects in the CIE because we use current cost. And that figure will come down approximately, as I said, a third to a half for the next cycle, depending upon the action by the board.

Page 18 just reflects what we just saw in 17. The pie is getting smaller and the ad valorem portion is reduced. The grant portion is the only one that's sort of going up. You look at it, the first one, our impact fees, if you look at the various years, has come down dramatically and continuing to fall off. Gas taxes are basically a step down, based on more fuel efficiency or the fleet. So it's a step down each year.

Our general fund, major hit this year. To balance the budget this cycle it was major -- it was predominantly on transportation capital program. As I said, all the ad valorem other than a portion of the debt service taken out of the program. We contributed everything in '10 as well as in '11 to most of that reduction that you had in the budget the last cycle.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Your grant funding, while it's up as a percent of your total budget is actually down in terms of real dollars.

MR. FEDER: Yeah, it's actually down just a little bit, as you see from the prior year, couple of the grants.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I just wanted to make a note of the difference.

MR. FEDER: We're in '10, and so it's down a little bit, yes.

But the good news is grants is helping to cover some, if you look over the trend --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I have a question.

MR. FEDER: -- but is just down a little bit, you're correct.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Mr. Murray?
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: In looking at that chart, for the period 2009 through '13, do you really believe you can collect 40 million a year?

MR. FEDER: Excuse me?

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay. For the period 2009 throughout '13 --

MR. FEDER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: -- do you really believe you can collect $40 million a year?

MR. FEDER: On?

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: On the impact fees.

MR. FEDER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Really?

MR. FEDER: Yeah, because we brought it down. If you remember, our impact fees -- and I think I showed you a table not too long ago -- we were up at 67 million three years. And it has come down, our dollars we had in there. If we maintain the current formula, we're fairly comfortable with that 12 and a half and then about 15 out, and being a little bit conservative in the outer years, we think. So that 67 million, 67-5, we think is a reasonable projection based on what we've seen with our impact fees. They have come down dramatically, obviously as you see by even that bar chart there.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay. But the 32 percent reduction would be based on new fees or retroactively?

MR. FEDER: If you take a look at the projection of what we're collecting, 12 and a half, 15 million, you take it off of there.

Now, it wouldn't be just a reduction in the impact fee. And that's something that we're going to discuss with you. Because if you take out the impact fee, as I hit my work program on the following page, you're going to end up then losing some of your grant funding as well.

So in the case if I lose what looks like would be -- and I'm a little bit ahead of what I thought we'd hit page by page. But if I call your attention to -- let's just jump over there, since it's been raised -- Page 22, and we'll go back for any questions you have.

As you can see, the -- this is the CIE or the work program that propagates the CIE on the following pages. Basically our capital program is down at $87 million total over five years. Of that, 67-5 is impact fees. The basic balance from that pretty much is grants.

As you look at it, you only have two construction projects in the five years, and you have two right-of-way acquisition projects. The right-of-way acquisition projects have previously and even in this scenario, which is going to change, based on what happens with the impact fee, has already been reduced significantly. The two right-of-ways are opportunity to make people whole that come forward, not aggressive acquisition.

And then the two construction projects, both of which have grant money tied to them. And so if we end up moving one of them out of the program, which is probably the 951 from Golden Gate Boulevard down to Green, then I lose eight million of TRIP funds as well.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, I wondered about that, because that was one of them that you recited as being a candidate. Just trying to square it --

MR. FEDER: Actually, if you look at the program here, just to give you a frame of reference, again you can look at it, it's 87 million of cost, 15, 21, 30, and then 11, okay?

If I'm going to take out of my -- and then going down on your revenues, 12-5, 15 of cost, if I take out one-third you can pretty easily see I have to address it year by year and balance year by year. So then I'm taking out effectively about five million a year.

So then if you go back up top here, what would you do? You definitely would take your right-of-way phases in the early years and either defer them or delete them. But that still doesn't get you there. Once you get out to -- that might hold you the construction on 41/951 by taking out in the right-of-way, but then you're still forced to take out that construction in the year '14 on Collier Boulevard.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: We are permitted to extend on construction projects, are we not?

MR. FEDER: You can extend a construction project. This is one that in 2011 is a projected deficiency, as you'll see when we go through on the AUIR portion.

Yes, of course you can move out, but then you've got some issues. If I move that out, one, since it's a
projected deficiency in '11, based on putting invested trips, as well as existing, then I'm not meeting it by '11, but I have a plan to get to it in '13 under this scenario.

With the reduction of about a third, let's say, or maybe half of the impact fees, then if I move that out of the program, the construction, and move the right-of-way significantly out, which I'd have to do as well, if I was able to keep all the right-of-way, then I am outside the five-year time frame. Then the question is from DCA, am I meeting my concurrency or are they trying to force us into a long-term concurrency process. And that only DCA can tell us.

I know they understand economic times, but they've also been very desirous of moving us into a long-term concurrency.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I see your juggling act. I understand it.

MR. FEDER: Okay. Let me go back. I think that answers your question. So as we reduce our impact fee, it's going to have significant impact not only on the impact fee portion, obviously, but also on our grants portion, if we can maintain it. Going --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Let's go back to 19 and pick it up.

MR. FEDER: Yeah, Page 19.

On Page 19 what you're relating to is basically the information. Again, our level of service is on the 250th highest hour. To Commissioner Schiffer's issues, I think he had valid points he was making, but it's a little less applicable to transportation in the sense that we're not based on population. We're doing it on the basis of actual trips out there and vested trips to the system. So I'll sort of hit on that a little bit as we go through.

As you go in here, the demand -- the real issue, and we tried to highlight this the last few years, we built 240 additional lane miles, added quite a few signals. A lot of people didn't realize that our maintenance budget was probably too low when I came in 2000. Hasn't appreciably gone up. But it was basically shadowed, if you will, by a very, very aggressive construction program. When it was under construction the contractor maintained it. When it was finished, it was brand new.

But you look at Livingston Road now, as an example, one of the earlier projects done under that aggressive construction program, it needs in places resurfacing, it needs re-stripping and pavement markers. And so that maintenance is coming due. And our maintenance budget is woefully inaccurate -- under funded.

And so we've been trying to raise this issue there's a life cycle cost to what we're doing. We had a very aggressive construction program. And while I'm moving a little bit of my gas tax to cover debt service in the capital program, I'm using all the ad valorem that I do get, other than the debt service, and my gas taxes, which are going down, as you see in value, to address maintenance.

And our maintenance has grown; our budget has not grown to meet the needs. So we're going to start facing that.

Plus we only a couple years ago, as you know, put in a bridge program. It was the first that we started getting reports from the state, who reviews all bridges of deficiency in our bridges. They are safe, nobody's going to fall in on a bridge, but yet we find that we had five and then we've had another four in the last report that are coming forward to us that need work and repair.

We set up a bridge program, you'll see it on think it's Page 22 when we go there. But even there we're getting pushed hard. So our maintenance issues, because our bridges, some hundred of them -- and that's major culverts as well as what you think as as a normal bridge -- are over 50 years old, which is basically lifespans of that product. So we're facing a lot of issues on our maintenance. That's what his --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Norm, I brought this up last year. And while I think your maintenance issues are a big issue, the life cycle situation, we built our roads to the same standards as they would build them in Miami or Jacksonville or Tampa. But our roads don't get the same kind of activity that those roads get. So wouldn't our life cycle naturally be extended beyond what the industry average would be?

MR. FEDER: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, because --

MR. FEDER: But let me characterize that. Basically the rule of thumb industry standard is about six to eight years on arterial, about 12 to 15 years on a non-arterial. Our non-arterials are probably more in the 20 range. They don't have the volume. Now, we do have the sun but we don't have the snow and the heat and that.

Our arterials though are pretty much sitting with industry standards. Those arterials that get that beating, as you say, for even heavier traffic and the like, same standards, they're probably not meeting the eight years, they're not
meeting the six years in some cases over in Miami.

So even the state DOT's resurfacing program, they're finding that they're resurfacing earlier over there.
And yes, we use the same standards, state standards national, and pavement and the like.
So we're getting our six to eight years as a rule of thumb. As I said, look at Livingston, when was it finished,
and look at what's happening to the condition of that. So it's basically within that time frame.

Now, that -- we look at in each instance pavement condition. Some are going to last 10 years, some are going
to last five to get that industry standard rule of thumb. But basically we're sitting in that area.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: But for example, with Livingston, isn't Livingston really a striping
issue, not a resurfacing issue?

MR. FEDER: There's both in there. You don't have what I have on 951 which is natural cracking and base
issues. But you do have -- if you travel down Livingston Road, I recommend that you try to take your right-hand turn
onto Vanderbilt Beach Road. You've got some heaving, you've got some pavement issues that are developing. You
definitely have your striping and your pavement markers, most of which are missing.
But you're getting to the point of maintenance requirement is the point I was trying to make, can I last a little
longer without it. But you've got some sections, and then you've got to add intersections where you're going to see it.
So it's mainly where the highest wear and tear, the nature of turn lanes at intersections and your striping and
the like where you need it now.

It's nothing like I'm facing, let's say, on Santa Barbara, north of Golden Gate or 951. But you don't want to
to get to that point. You want to be able to do an overlay, not to have to do major reconstruction, which is more costly.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I have a question.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: In that regard, just to make the point as clear as possible, you're talking
about an average 40-year cycle. So I would take that to mean that road A or bridge one, it would not be looked again
at until 40 years.

MR. FEDER: No, we're always doing a pavement condition, the state's doing, and then we follow up if
we've got issues from the state analysis on bridges. So you're always looking at individual facilities and responding as
best we can.

What that's really doing is taking nothing more than -- and it's actually the paving cycle, if you will -- taking
what your lane miles are of arterial and non-arterial, taking what your basic cost is for resurfacing or repaving of an
arterial and a non-arterial, right, factoring out then what you need to have annually, based on an eight and 20-year
cycle to meet it. And in reality, our budget doesn't do that. My budget would only allow me to do the full system in a
40-year cycle, not in the cycle that is basically normally required.

But no, you wouldn't address a road and then now come back in 20 years. We're evaluating it every year.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I wanted to make that point here, because it's absurd if anybody would think
that we wouldn't look at them. It's a totality; it's a bucket.

MR. FEDER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And within that bucket you take those roads and bridges --

MR. FEDER: Yeah, and what that does is tells you is overall you're underfunded, yes.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: But I will say this, though, the -- both you and especially Nick have been
properly complaining about the maintenance dollars that you need. We had a tremendous program for construction,
and we didn't put much in the way of maintenance. And you've been trying to make that point. I hope you can make
it even clearer because, quite frankly, all the good roads are going to go to hell otherwise. They're really not going to
look very well.

MR. FEDER: I think we're starting to get that point across, and we need to continue to do so. But I think it's
starting to come across. And we'll continue to make that point and make the need known. And we'll -- as I said, it's
kind of hard to do that in the time of no revenues, if you will. And we'll again do the best we can with it.
And obviously, just to finalize your statement, we're going to address the worst first.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And one last thing, if I may, just probably out of curiosity. You're no longer
using Synchro and you now have HIGHPLAN. What does HIGHPLAN give you that Synchro failed you in?

MR. FEDER: Basically we're using a combination of all of them, but HIGHPLAN -- go ahead, Mike.

MR. GREENE: Michael Greene, Transportation Planning.
Synchro is an extremely narrow viewed, very technically oriented and very detailed analysis. Our plan and level of service planning tools are better apted for the system-wide, the network.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: So does that mean that you wouldn't use Synchro at all anymore?
MR. GREENE: No, we still use Synchro, but we use it for narrower research, for smaller sections of the network.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: You've highlighted that you're no longer using Synchro, you're now using ARTPLAN and HIGHPLAN. And I got the impression that Synchro was going away.
MR. GREENE: No, that's not --
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, then probably you should --
MR. GREENE: Synchro is ever evolving.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Probably should qualify that a bit more, I think. Thank you.
MR. FEDER: We'll do that. Again, we use Synchro. It's -- excuse me. Using Synchro --
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I know the feeling.
MR. FEDER: -- in a specific project -- excuse me, lost my voice.
Okay, Page 20.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Wait a minute, don't do that to yourself.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Wait.
MR. FEDER: It will come back.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Nick's coming.
MR. FEDER: This voice just doesn't go away, it comes back, so it's on its way.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Nick's got you some water, Norm.
MR. FEDER: Okay, sorry.
Again, the Synchro is used in defined corridor studies, definitely in operational issues and projects, so you're much more detailed.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I got it.
MR. FEDER: Page 20 recognizes that actually we've a little bit turned the corner, at least one year, from '08 to '09. We're up two and a half percent in our trips. Not a significant increase. And when you take with the year before, you still haven't recouped all of the prior losses but you're starting to turn the angle to additional trips.
And then we do recognize the issue of the vacancy rate. And based on Commissioner Schiffer's comments, in transportation it's a little bit different in the sense of the way we do it. It's not just population and demand. We're assuming basically that vested trips are coming along as a portion one-seventh over time, and go into the background.
So when we go and do a traffic count, if I'm already three years into, let's say, a project, I assume that those trips are on there and so I'm not recounting them again. When in reality, if it's a vacancy rate that we're experiencing, especially like we're experiencing right now, I assume those trips are on the system and therefore the remaining capacity is available. Without a further review, let alone any additional funding, those trips could very quickly come onto the system, should we turn around and our vacant units start to get full. So it's a little bit different on transportation.
But that's the issue that we're trying to raise there, that while we tell you we've got capacity on some of our segments, that could change very quickly.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Norm, we made a change last year in that you used to remove from the trip bank after a year anything, and now we don't do that. This past year --
MR. FEDER: That's true.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- we've stopped --
MR. FEDER: We stopped doing that.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- and changed that, to more accurately reflect what's going on.
MR. FEDER: That's correct.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I just wondered how that's working and what kind of changes you've seen --
MR. GREENE: It's actually working --
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- as a result.
MR. GREENE: -- very well. We're still doing field audits. We're not just automatically removing trips from
the trip bank. When the structure's up, we're waiting until we see some of them be occupied. So we're trying to balance the trip bank to cover the vacancy.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yeah. And I thought it was a very important thing. We talked about it last year, and you guys have done it. And I think that's -- I think that was a very good thing to have done. I just -- you know, I hadn't heard anybody comment on it before.

MR. FEDER: No, we appreciate your support in that. And yes, that was our response to this same note. And we'll continue to look at it. But we just raise it again to make sure you understand that that's an issue out there.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Has it actually -- probably not this year, because I don't think we've had anything. But it hasn't actually prevented anything from going forward, so it's --

MR. FEDER: No. And we've got some excess capacity out there in locations, as you're going to see. We do have some spots and that's what we're going to cover right now, which is really the essence of the AUIR. What you have on the next page is -- just shows you graphically, if you will, that overall statement about a system-wide two and a half percent with about half of them showing a decrease and about half an increase over time. Just shows you where the trips are changing.

And you look at it, it's got some interesting factors in it and items. But basically that gives you a feel for where trips are changing.

Page 22 we talked about something that is the five-year work program, which has been reduced based on reduced revenue stream. But again, we further addressed, as soon as we get with the board on and they make their decision on the impact fee level as well.

Yes?

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: In specific, looking at various programs -- and I realize you have to moderate, I understand that. But what happened to the shoulder safety program? Was that wrapped into another program?

MR. FEDER: No, we had a very small program on that and we had to pull that out.

This is again the fourth year of major reductions within the program. And we had a very sizeable reduction in transportation to try and balance the budget this year.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I noted that out on Immokalee Road going out toward Immokalee that there was some shoulder work.

MR. FEDER: Yeah, we've got a LAP project or a project with the state that was doing some shoulder work out there. And that isn't shown specifically in our programming here, that's a current project under LAP.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, the word safety is in it, and that scares me that it's being reduced. I understand you have to make decisions.

MR. FEDER: When we do resurface we do try to, where we can, address some of the shoulder needs.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay. So if I were to make a generalized statement, which would not be appropriate, but I'll make it anyway, I look at intersection safety capacity improvement, and that's up this year, but the shoulder program is down.

MR. FEDER: The intersection safety capacity is also pulled together. There were two intersection categories, if you look at last year's. They've been pulled together, they've been kept. It's down a little bit, but not much.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay. All right, I just -- I was wondering if we were focusing on western Collier as opposed to some of the outbound roads.

MR. FEDER: No, basically what we're looking at in the urbanized area, you still have some widening needed on the arterial system, but generally most of it's been done.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I would think.

MR. FEDER: The concentration is heavily on operations and maintenance of maintaining the capacity and efficiency of what we have. Of course the growth issues which are limited pretty much in this program right now would be in the eastern counties where you're widening the roads still, or proposing to.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Norm, I had a --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Melissa?

MR. FEDER: Yes, that's fine. What's your question?
COMMISSIONER AHERN: For developments that were accounted in the trip banks that applied for the extension under the new legislation, are those starting to fall off if they're not vested --
MR. FEDER: They're not in the background. Because we're doing it based on counts, so we're not doing it by population or totally by that. You're assuming your background count, and then we're only addressing vested trips to look at projection of where our deficiency might be in the future.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Right. But as soon as these projects are approved, then you're calculating those trips, so --
MR. FEDER: Our real-time concurrency -- let Mike get that.
MR. GREENE: Most of the projects that received extensions were in the zoning stage. And we don't put vested trips into our system at that stage. We wait until they get through that and they're going for their SDP's.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Do you know what percentage you had? I'm just trying to estimate how many projects may have either paid the first portion and got the three years extension but then if they don't pay the balance then they lose that right.
So how many projects have either gone back to the bank or are not moving forward that are being added back into the bank?
MS. GREEN: None of the projects that have been approved and gotten their extensions were removed from the bank that are being added back in. They're all still in the bank, if they received their approval and they're moving forward with their payment. If they stopped making their payments and they're withdrawing their status, then we go through annually and remove those dormant projects.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Okay. So you're adding the trips back to the bank.
MR. GREENE: Yes, we're allowing that capacity back to the remaining trips.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Okay, thank you.
MR. FEDER: Not adding it to the bank. That would be --
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Right, right.
MR. FEDER: -- vested trips. So it's actually adding it back in --
COMMISSIONER AHERN: To the --
MR. FEDER: Not having it in the background or in the bank, if you will, yes.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead, Brad.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Norman, on pathways, sidewalk and bike lanes --
MR. FEDER: Yes.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- what is going on? Because last year we had a nice blend of 500 thou. a year. This year we're going to spend 25 and then we're going to go next year, spend a lot of money, and then we drop off. So what's going on with that?
MR. FEDER: What you have is payment in lieu. And we had some state dollars, grant money for pathways. And so it recognizes both of those and the two years to implement. And then we go into what we have programmed, and we don't project any -- although we may -- we're going to try to get, but any more funding from the state and with development down, payment in lieu is down significantly.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. But that one year where you're going to do one mill., 460, is that a particular project you have in mind, or what is --
MR. GREENE: That is in Naples Manor. We did a walkable communities assessment, and we received over $800,000 in community development block grants. And we leveraged the $500,000 that we already had identified for a sidewalk project in that community. And we're doing about six sidewalks and intersections and safety upgrades all right together.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I got it, thanks.
MR. FEDER: So as I said, that's back to the grant that we --
Going on --
COMMISSIONER AHERN: I have one more question. How do you calculate the contingency?
MR. FEDER: Our contingency is meant to provide a portion beyond what you have in your capital program. Realistically it's the dollars available, and we try to keep about a five percent contingency where we can, but you'll see the numbers don't provide for that.

Page 15 of 64
Page 23 is basically --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Norm, don't go on, I have a question.
The transfers, 60171, what are the transfers to other funds? What --
MR. FEDER: Your transfers right here that you're seeing, some of that is staffing and some of it is I.T., portion of it is I.T. All of our indirect and direct that we pay internally to other entities in the county.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. That figure --
MR. FEDER: We pay to legal, we pay to I.T., we pay to others.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Right.
MR. FEDER: And some staff, yes.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. Good, thank you.
MR. FEDER: On Page 23 is sort of a workup of much of what you've seen already. It's just basically looking at your revenues, your expenses and your revenues. The debt service is at 14-6, as you see across. A little over 13 of that is out of ad valorem; that the only portion of ad valorem in the capital program. The balance of that of course is by gas tax. And then you see your sources where they're being spent and where they're coming in. And that's consistent with the numbers you've seen so far, total of 268.
Next pages are basically going through section by section. I'll ask Mike, if you have a question on that.
This is the workup from the realtime concurrency program. And if you have a question on a segment, I'd be happy to entertain that.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: There's a note on here that says that the trip bank adjusted per revised DCA, what was it adjusted to or from?
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: You need to put the mic. so we can hear you.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Sorry.
What was it adjusted to or from?
MR. GREENE: Which I.D. -- segment I.D. are you referring to?
COMMISSIONER AHERN: 36.2. And 36.1.
MS. GREEN: That segment is actually a state road. And we're required to use the state's level of service, which is one higher than ours so it allows a lower service volume. So that when you adjust the remaining capacity and the trip bank per their requirements, you show fewer remaining trips on that segment.
MR. FEDER: We use level of service D and E, the state uses C and D, generally.
Any other questions on Pages 24, 25?
(No response.)
MR. FEDER: The meat of the AUIR is on Page 26. This reviews actually the segments that are either currently deficient based on current traffic volumes, which as you see is Golden Gate Boulevard. Which unfortunately if you look at our work program, you see only a portion of the right-of-way within the five years, not the full right-of-way, nor construction.
Then you have existing deficiencies when you bring in vested trips, not just the actual count on the street right now, if you will, on the road.
You've got County Barn. Realistically that is being resolved with the six-laning that was recently opened on Santa Barbara extension. You've got Davis Boulevard and the state route, as well as Collier Boulevard. Both of those are our projects just about to be let.
And our FY10 projects, that because of state issues and permitting got delayed, but are about ready to be let.
And then you've got 41/Tamiami Trail, which we advanced the PD&E with the state. They've got some design, but they don't have anything to follow on the state system.
We are however working on the intersection of 951 and 41, which should provide some relief to that segment failure. But the main line is only two lanes there and it does have some issues and we're working with the state on that.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Did the DCA fall apart there?
MR. FEDER: It had three or four different renditions. In the final there was a group that held, a smaller group, and they are providing and they've already provided funding towards our current update of the PD&E, the project development and environment study, as well as the design work for an at-grade solution that we're working on now.
So there still is a consortium, it just wasn't a consortium that we first initially had that would have also addressed main line improvements on 41.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And the decision to keep it at grade was whose?

MR. FEDER: The decision at grade is a funding issue. We are developing, though, the at-grade in a manner to provide the full footprint for grade separation and to make sure that we have very little if any throw-away, should we get to that point.

We do have an effort, a Tiger Grant or stimulus funding to try and go grade separated, if we can. But right now funding-wise we're moving on an at-grade improvement that accommodates the future grade separation.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: That gives me confidence, thank you.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Norman, why isn't Old 41 shown as deficient? It says up here that it's deficient in 2011. It doesn't show here, and it doesn't show on your map.

MR. FEDER: It may be an error.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: 41 and Old 41.

MR. FEDER: Yeah.

Is there a reason for that, Mike?

MR. GREENE: I don't see it -- it was -- Old 41 was nearing deficiency in our previous AUIR, and because of the reductions in traffic it's no longer listed as a deficient segment.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. Well, somewhere in here it says it's still going to be --

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I.D. 62.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- deficient in 2011. I should have marked where it is.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: It's I.D. 62.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Page 24, I.D. 62.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yeah, 2011.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: That's an error. That needs to come out.

MR. FEDER: We'll get that corrected. But it -- I know on tape --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Actually, it should still be listed as deficient.

MR. FEDER: But it is now not shown as deficient because the trip issues are going down on it. But yes. 2011, we are showing, as I mentioned, Collier Boulevard, two segments as coming on deficient in 2011. And again, you've got other issues out.

On Page 27, basically graphically represents what we just went over on 26.

Your current deficiency is the Golden Gate. Your evolving deficiencies are in the orange. County Barn being taken care of with Santa Barbara. The 951 and Davis by projects we're about to let. And then the other portion of Davis with a project that the state has programmed and is moving forward on. And then the blue shows the emerging in '11 deficiencies.

The next pages just shows you two TCMA's. You have the northeast and the central TCMA's. The issue there is is that you're looking at north/south and east/west and you're saying do I have a link that may be deficient, but overall am I at least 85 percent of the north/south's or the east/west's facilities operating well, and that is the case that shows you the percentages, 90 and 94. You do have the same deficiencies, Davis and that section of Collier shown here. But overall you're still at 90 percent within that TCMA.

And then you do have the deficiencies on Immokalee Road/Livingston/I-75, which is pretty much gone away now with the eight-laning. And Vanderbilt Beach Road, Goodlette to Airport, which we do have an in-house construction project underway now that should provide some relief on that. Because a major portion of that problem was right at Airport, just west of -- excuse me, Vanderbilt, just west of Airport. And that is being widened out to take advantage of the six-laning further to the east.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Actually, the interesting thing about these charts is that we have more lane miles within these TCMA's and we are meeting the standard less than we ever have before.

MR. FEDER: Well --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Well, yes. Compare just last year. If you want to look at the east central TCMA, we were meeting the standard there 94.5 percent of the time, and now we're down to 90 percent.

If you look at the other TCMA, we were at 96.3 and now we're down to 94 percent. And we've added lane miles to every single one of those TCMA's, and --
MR. FEDER: And we're updating the service volumes. And I think you'll see that in the next cycle, the service volumes being added in.

Mike?

MR. GREENE: Parallel to this project we've updated the level of service, a service volume for the whole network based on all these projects that have completed. Those have yet to have been adopted and incorporated into the TCMA reports. So when we adopt those new service volumes, you'll see the percentages increase.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: When will that happen?

MR. GREENE: We're hoping to bring that by full vetting in the next couple of months. We want to go to DSAC and bring it to the Planning Commission and the board.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. All right, I'll make a note about that, thanks.

MR. FEDER: Please do.

Page 29.1, this is recognizing that you have funds that carry forward a role. Of particular note of course are the last ones there, which are the projects as I noted on Davis and 951 that are about ready to be let. That's why the volume there is high in dollars. The other, Santa Barbara/Polly, that figure is being spent out this year and most of it gone. But this gives you what is rolled in additional dollars that was still available beyond. It's all encumbered except for the Davis/951, which is about to be.

Page 31.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Norm?

MR. FEDER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Do we know what the level of service on these roads are going to be once these are complete?

MR. FEDER: We develop to -- we design to a 20-year level of service C. Our standard is D and E. Do we know what they'll be? Unfortunately you put in a good facility designed at D and then everybody says I don't know what happened, it's all consumed now.

Unfortunately you can't build it all at one time. That's designed at C as part of a network of all the improvements being in one place at one time. So -- if I've answered your question. You design it to get a level of service C within the network, but as you put in an improvement and people start using it sometimes you see less than C.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: So we don't know what the excess capacity will be once --

MR. FEDER: Well, that's part of what you're going to get out of this study and when you're done. But do we have some excess capacity now? Yes. We didn't design for today's traffic, we design for 20 years out. But we didn't get to do all the improvements is what I'm saying.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Okay.

MR. FEDER: Page 31 is basically taking what you've seen so far, putting it into the CIE format. There's nothing really changed in information here.

Again, I've got to bring to your attention the fact that this is likely to change a third, a half, whatever comes about on the impact fee assessment review with the board. And so that's going to change some of both projects and revenue stream.

Yes?

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Norm, is that -- is the $200,000 for the Everglades interchange, is that Collier County money or is that an FDOT?

MR. FEDER: It's county money that we put in in support of monies that we got from federal highway -- I mean, excuse me, from actually Washington congressional delegation for the last three years I think on that interchange.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: There's a note down here, a star for -- it says production ready candidate projects. And then there are a serious of numbers. Only one of those numbers -- I mean, they are tagged again back to the Everglades interchange, that's where the star is, yet none of those numbers have anything to do with --

MR. FEDER: No, those were meant to be tagged to the interchange. What you're looking at is Northbrook, you're looking at County Barn, ones where I've brought them production ready, or they will be shortly. In this case they are. But I don't have any construction funding, it's just trying to bring that to your attention. I do have
production ready projects that I can't move on at this time.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. But if you're going to note it that way, then you need to tell us what you're noting. Because right now that asterisk is --

MR. FEDER: We'll move the asterisk.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- there at the Everglades. And nothing is mentioned to what those other projects --

MR. FEDER: Yeah, we'll move that asterisk up to the word project at the very top so you'll understand those are the ones that are production ready. I agree.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Good, thanks.

MR. FEDER: We'll make that change. Good catch.

Anything else on 31, 32?

(No response.)

MR. FEDER: Okay, that basically sums it up.

What I'm going to tell you is that basically our capital program is pretty much gone away. You've got two construction projects as it stands now, most likely one.

The difficulty in my mind is where a -- what do I say, we're basically a donor county within a donor state. And we sought real hard to go get the TRIP funds and seek other grant funds from the state. I hate to lose them. But if we only have as our revenue stream those grants that we got and impact fees effectively, the impact fees go down appreciably, then we probably are looking at losing some of that grant funding as well.

We've got a year to try and restructure it. I don't know if things can turn around that rapidly. Prospects are we probably lose it, along with the reduction in program by the reduction in the impact fee.

And then we still have the maintenance program that is itself underfunded, but we also recognize we're in a very, very tight funding time. And most of that funding came out of the transportation program, recognizing the fact that we are in those very, very tight times.

The difficulty I have, and I've told you this before, is we've kind of come to the end of the road, and instead of blazing a new trail we seem to be going back to the beginning to walk the same road again. And I'll leave it at that.

Any other questions?

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Just a little housekeeping for you.

If you go back to Page 27, in which is your deficiency map -- for the record, Nick Casalanguida, Deputy Administrator of the Growth Management Division.

You have now two facilities: Golden Gate Boulevard, which is shown in red, and Collier Boulevard to the left of that north/south, which is shown in blue as a plan deficiency.

With both of those projects being deferred now through the reduction revenues, we do risk -- and I want to make sure the Planning Commission understands -- a fining by DCA for noncompliance. If we turn down a development order in those two areas, that applicant can petition DCA and say the county is not responding in the five-year plan to those projects, and we could be forced two things: Funded out of general fund or go to a long-term concurrency plan for those two links. And that's something Mike and I have discussed as a real possibility in the next year or two. And I wanted you to be aware of that.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: That's a good bomb to drop.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: No developer in Collier would do that.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Oh, no. They're already sitting there.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I do have a question.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yeah, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And this is actually for Mike.

Mike, this is for arterial and collector roads. Are the other roads in the AUIR process at all?

MR. BOSI: No.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. So all the other roads --

MR. FEDER: Only what's modeled in your long-range process. So you do have -- and we have very few collector roads. You do have some collector roads, but your local roads are not in that system. We don't establish a level of service for a local road.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And we don't put it in a category B or something, we just --
MR. FEDER: No.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: They're just taken care of by?
MR. FEDER: Maintenance.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. And the funding is mostly --
MR. FEDER: Ad valorem.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- ad valorem. Okay.
MR. FEDER: When you can, yes.
Any other questions?
(No response.)
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll make a motion. Do you want one, Donna?
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, I move we forward the 2010 AUIR for county roads with a recommendation of approval.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Second.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: As shown in the summary form.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I second that --
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Right, Bob?
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I withdraw my second -- no.
MR. CASALANGUIDA: Okay, well, I just want to make sure that you understand, the memorandum that Amy and I sent to you last week as may be amended by the reduction in fees going to the --
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: We're not working on the CIE right now.
MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, it will affect your AUIR documents, too.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I'll revise them, but --
MR. CASALANGUIDA: Yes. So in that memorandum we talked about what we would do, pushing out Collier and adjusting the right-of-way programs. So as long as --
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: So would you rather us not do an approval on this until the next meeting?
MR. CASALANGUIDA: Well, you're going to -- no, the documents are going to change. You can approve them as long as they're -- you're approving them consistent with the memorandum we told you, the changes we submitted with the memorandum.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: But do we know for sure that those will be the changes that will happen? What if the commission decides on something else?
MR. CASALANGUIDA: Then it would change.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All right. So perhaps it is wiser for us not to go forward with the motion right now and to wait until our next meeting --
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: It is a recommendation.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- and have it all happen together.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: But Chair, it is a recommendation only.
MR. BOSI: For today's meeting we're going to need a recommendation upon the AUIR portion. And to me the wording would be based upon -- you would make a recommendation of approval, but based upon the actions of the Board of County Commissioners related to the impact fee reduction. The corresponding project adjustment shall be made as appropriate.
And then the CIE that you will be presented on the 21st of October will have all those changes reflected within it, as deemed appropriate by the Board of County Commissioners.
MR. CASALANGUIDA: That will work.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, well -- let's just see what that -- in other words, based -- the only thing we're missing is based upon the actions of the Board of County Commissioners.
MR. BOSI: The specific level of impact fee reduction will have a corresponding effect --
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I mean, it's not wise for a board to make a recommendation based upon a hypothetical or an open-ended deal.
So what if we made it like we did based upon today and we amended that when we know what we're talking about?

MR. BOSI: You can make that amendment as part of the consent agenda review; you can just make that minor modification.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Heidi, if we have -- on consent can we make any changes? I mean, based on --

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Well, it's a little bit unique today because you're approving or making recommendations on the AUIR, and the CIE is being deferred. So it's not really going to be a consent item, it really ought to be a regular agenda item.

MR. BOSI: And the CIE will be. And I guess what you're saying is you'd like to -- and I'm not sure how we would do this.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, we could continue it to the 21st.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Right, it needs to go on a regular agenda item on the 21st.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Let me change my motion, is that we -- while we are, you know, ready to forward a recommendation, we will continue this to the 21st when -- after the BCC meeting. Okay? So it's a recommendation to continue.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Yeah. Because the AUIR is unique to Collier County, where you're primarily looking at the level of service standard.

And then the CIE is what is statutorily required, and we will need the formal vote for that.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I'll continue my second but with a brief suggestion.

In other years we've had the CIE afterwards and things will have changed. And we still had made a recommendation which became moot, so I don't see the difference, quite frankly.

MR. BOSI: That's a valid point.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Mike, for clarification, you could adopt a level of service review. That won't change. The maps that show the deficiencies, those tables in the TCMA, the links specific analysis, none of that will change, just the financial documents at the front of the AUIR. And the financial documents of the CIE will change. So you could approve the level of service standards and a snapshot review and then bring back all the documents.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: That's what it is. And I think what you need to do -- what we need to do is include his memorandum into the AUIR, because you sent it to us, but I didn't see it as being included in the AUIR. If it is included, then that becomes part of the process.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: But again, as they pointed out, I don't know what the board will go on the 28th, so...

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, that's true. But at least the predicate for what we would recommend is where I'm going.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: Sure. You could -- again, I'll be clear, if I can, you could adopt a level of service standard, the concurrency review of all the links and the TCMA maps and all the maps, none of those will change. What will change would be the financial documents. And you're going to get clean fiscal documents when you meet again in October, because it will be -- so you'll have all those to review again or look at.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I don't have a problem doing that.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Why don't we do this. And this isn't the wording of motion, this is just for discussion. We'll recommend approval as presented today, but we'll also recommend continuance of the final vote, subject to the financials presented on the 21st.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Could you also include his memorandum into the process, so that it becomes part of the program?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: What's his memorandum is a heads up we're going to be changing stuff, right? So he doesn't know if the -- the memorandum is hypothetical.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: It's a plan.

I'll go along with you. I'll --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It may be.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: -- second it, but I disagree with that part of it.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But what's the virtue of having the memorandum and the problem not
having it?

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, in an attempt to answer you, I see the memorandum, as I said, as the predicate for what the recommendation would be. We're accepting from the recommendation certain potential items. They will not sustain. So that would be the reason for it.

If it were in the staff report, it would be part of the AUIR. That's all.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But it's not.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: It's not a critical factor. The record reveals it now anyway.

MR. FEDER: Commissioner Murray, I might point out that the footnotes on all your fiscal ones do reflect the fact that there's a likely change because of board action on the impact fee, which may be your predicate that you're asking for.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Right. What I was attempting to do was make the record more complete as to that.

MR. FEDER: Yeah. And again, not knowing if I'm dealing with a third, a half or something different.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Right. I seconded it, I did so.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, yeah.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Absolutely. All those in favor?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Cherie' might be, because I'm not sure she under --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Well, for Cherie' we're going to take a break now and give her 15 minutes to catch up.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But are you clear on what the motion was, Cherie'?

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm not sure you actually made a motion.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Right. And then it appears everything after that became a motion, so that tricked you.

So should we restate the motion, or will you be okay with that?

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead, restate it.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Just to be clear. We reviewed the 2010 AUIR and all the supporting data, and we recommend approval. But we're going to do the final vote subject to the revisions of the fiscal data from the commission -- you know, the CIE.

MR. BOSI: To the October 21st meeting.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: On October 21st.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: That's probably -- the other one probably was clearer.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: And we will take 15 minutes for Cherie' right now.

(Recess.)

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, is everybody all set? Then I guess we are back in business.

***Norm, the floor is yours again for stormwater management.

MR. FEDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I can be fairly brief on this. Just like with transportation where that $27 million shortfall was addressed, about 24 million, 17 in transportation, about seven of it came out of stormwater between fiscal year '10, the current, and '11 in budgeting. So major portions of the change came out of the transportation and stormwater.

In the case of stormwater, what had been .15 mills, roughly about 12 million a year, going down a little bit as assessed values went down, was converted to .1 mills. And another three million was taken out of fiscal year '10. So you see that reflected in the AUIR in front of you.
The AUIR in stormwater is not quite as defined. We've been working towards that with this committee, as well as our own efforts in doing watershed master planning, developing specific criteria.

Right now what we have is projects that we've done the permitting on, and have been the focus, and our job has been somewhat simplified. What you see in this AUIR is essentially that our funding, other than my monitoring required on other projects, a little bit in NPDES and a little bit in that planning to try and get to a more solid level of service analysis system-wide for deficiencies analysis is all on LASIP, which I have until 2015 to complete my permits. We are looking to try and ask for an extension, because it would be difficult with our current funding to do that.

Plus we have needs again in maintenance. You don't build these systems and not maintain them. And yet we have little funding in maintenance and we find that some of the weirs and other issues need to be addressed, and so we're going to try and see if we can get an extension to that 2015 under a .1 mills going forward, should that stay.

So that's basically what you're seeing in the AUIR here. There's a little less of the definition of deficient segments, other than the fact that as you know the concentration has been on Golden Gate triangle. That has been accomplished by putting in some retention and the pumping. And the tertiary components of that are being addressed by the CRA to get the water over to that pumping and out.

Gordon River, which we had some other projects, but basically we stopped at the Freedom Park, the old Water Quality Park. We've added a pump in to get some of that waters at the headwaters of the Gordon River and get it through the park and clean.

So the concentration now is solely on LASIP. But as I said, we've got maintenance issues. We need to try to find a way within that .1 mill to be able to do that, as well as LASIP. And yet it's very tight, at least estimate-wise, to finish LASIP by 2015, so we'll seek an extension.

Jerry, anything to add to that?

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Questions? Go ahead.

No one has --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, I'll have one. And it's really the watershed management plan. How does the secondary system -- it feeds into that, correct? Or where is the role of the secondary system in the watershed management?

MR. FEDER: Okay, basically, and I'm going to be simplistic, and then I've got an expert here that I know knows it very well, so if my simplistic doesn't do it, Brad, please call in the expert.

What I'll tell you is you've got your primary system of canals that are basically how we move water away from the overall system.

The secondary is bringing it from local or tertiary stormwater management over into that primary system, again trying to not just drain the swamp flood attenuation, but also water quality, trying to retain it, trying to recharge the aquifer and address those issues as well.

So basically the way I'd look at it is almost like the road system: The interstate is the primary. All of what we call arterials the state calls minor arterials and major collectors; the Livingsons, Airports, Pine Ridge examples are the secondary. And then your local roads, if you will, are the tertiary system.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Thanks.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, I have a couple of questions. On Page 37, under 510059, it talks about transfers, reserves and debt service.

MR. FEDER: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Are there actually all three of those in there, or is it --

MR. FEDER: It's really only the debts --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- chart on 40 says it's just debt service.

MR. FEDER: It's just the debt service. That is the purchase of the Freedom Park lands. But there's also about a million -- there's a million a year that we're getting from Water Management District that effectively covers that debt service.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. I just think to be clear, you should either create three lines and put zeros for there are no transfers and there are no reserves, all right? That dollar figure just --

MR. FEDER: We can just label that solely --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- relates to debt service --
MR. FEDER: -- as debt service is what you're saying.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Right. So that everybody's clear on what's included in that number.

MR. FEDER: Mike, make sure we make that change. Go straight to debt service, which is all it is.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: And then I guess a question too down here under projects.

Your stormwater master planning, is that the watershed management plans?

MR. FEDER: No, it is not. That is taking that and developing a methodology, much like transportation, to identify your deficient segments.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Where are the watershed management plans included here and --

MR. FEDER: They are not.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- where are the dollars for that?

MR. FEDER: This is just covering the stormwater activities that are funded under that .1 mills. I'll let Nick talk to you about the watershed master planning that's being done on the other side of our house.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Then I have a question. Your secondary system repairs --

MR. FEDER: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- you have less -- you have fewer dollars slated to that category than you do for your master plan.

MR. FEDER: Correct.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Is --

MR. FEDER: Not what I want to be but that's --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- that good planning?

MR. FEDER: That is a necessity to be able to identify where to best spend my dollars. And that's what I'm trying to do with the master planning.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: So is that a committed consultant fee? Is that why it's --

MR. FEDER: No, it's not a committed consultant fee. That is an ongoing -- a lot of it is actually asset management right now where we're going through and identifying exactly what we have, what its capacity is. Remember, we discussed that last time. So a lot of it is what I will call asset management and identification of spot deficiencies, which we're trying to do maintenance on. As you can see, very few dollars on maintenance.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Well, I mean, everybody knows we need more in the repair and maintenance. I don't think it takes anybody too brilliant to figure that out. Transfer some dollars and help yourself out.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: And you'll see that change over the five years. The problem we have is you have an MPO adopted long-range transportation plan which drives your five-year CIE. So you don't have a long-range stormwater master plan.

One of the problems we have in this county is we're applying for grants and then justifying to one community why a project is more viable to another community. We always get hit with, well, there was flooding in this area, so why not work on this project.

So if we have a long-range adopted stormwater master plan, we can kind of take that guesswork out, apply for the grants and then say this is a board approved reviewed every couple of years adopted master plan.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yeah, I'm not questioning the need for a master plan, I'm just questioning where the dollar amounts for that master plan came from.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: I can answer, if you want.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I mean, I don't know. You said it wasn't to a consultant to do it.

MR. CASALANGUIDA: It's to gather and collect data and we'll hopefully get it gone in the next couple of years. If our goal is, is we get it done in the next two years you're going to see this change over the next AUIR and CIE and drop way off.

But we set aside a budgeted amount over the next five years to do that. Our goal is to try and get it done early with less than that dollars. But we thought that was the minimum.

When you do your long-range transportation plan, it's done approximately every five years and it costs about a million to a million and a half dollars. So you can see we're trying to average it out over a, you know, period of time. We're going to try and be conservative and piggyback on the watershed management plans, if we can, and then go right into the long-range stormwater plan. But if we can't, at least we're showing a consistent amount.
Hopefully in a year or two you'll see this switch, stormwater plan will be done, the long-range planning will come off and go into maintenance.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, thanks.
MR. FEDER: Commissioner Caron, to your point, and it's well made, obviously the maintenance dollars are insufficient. We note that. That's why we're trying to see if we can extend the time frame for implementation of LASIP. Because right now, very tight. If I can implement LASIP by its permit provisions of 2015, actually last in 2014 being let, if I get an extension of that time frame, the goal would then be to extend out LASIP and to be able to address more in maintenance issues, which we do have in the system.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: How long are you anticipating extending LASIP?
MR. FEDER: We'll find out what our options are. But usually we've got a five-year and we'd ask for a five-year extension. We don't know whether we'll, one, be granted that or, two, if all of a sudden I would have so many more provisions placed on the LASIP that I would want to stay with current schedule under current permit.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thank you.
Anybody else have any questions?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Quick question. The land for stormwater retention off of roads and stuff, is that part of the road budget or the --
MR. FEDER: No, that is part of the stormwater. Matter of fact, for instance, Santa Barbara extension, a portion of that paid for a LASIP canal and project there. That was paid by LASIP, both the land and the construction.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So there is no right-of-way acquisition in here for stormwater?
MR. FEDER: Yeah, there is. And you're just seeing general dollars, but that's both right-of-way phases and construction and design.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Somebody have a motion?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll make a motion that we move the 2010 AUJR for stormwater management forward with a recommendation of approval.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Second.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All those in favor?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
COMMISSIONER CARON: Aye.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Any opposed?
(No response.)
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. ***And next up is potable water. Or potable --
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Potare.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- as Commissioner Strain likes to say.
MR. BEALS: Good morning. For the record, Nathan Beals.
It's potable water.
I'm here to answer any of your questions.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Does anybody have any questions on the potable water?
COMMISSIONER AHERN: On the first page you've got a note in here, it says that with the increase in population projections, NERTWP will be reactivated, permitted and constructed. I'm assuming as the new BEBR numbers come out with the census we're anticipating those to go down, those will be reevaluated?
MR. BEALS: Yes, the northeast plant's reevaluated each year as populations come out.
As early as -- as soon as, what was it, the '06 AUJR, we had projected the northeast water plant last year. So we've deferred it as populations have decreased.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: It's still out in '27 right now, right?
MR. BEALS: Yes, it's in 2027 currently.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Donna, I have a question.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: In your -- and I'm back at the Exhibit A of the CIE. The expansion related projects, where do you intend to expand?
MR. BEALS: Most of that money -- there's less than half a million in most years. If I'm looking correctly -- is this Page 53?
MR. BOSI: Yes.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Four I think I'm looking at. But it's on 53 too, yeah.
Well, let me make it easier. Does any of that study need to go into picking up some of the Naples service areas? In other words, I still have this pet peeve that the people who live in the Naples service area have a lesser quality of water pressure than the rest of the county. And therefore we shouldn't orphan them. So is any of that having anything to do with that? That could be yes or no.
MR. BEALS: Tech -- no. Because we don't have any jurisdiction over those areas. They are outside of our water service district.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But they are within the county, obviously --
MR. BEALS: Correct.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- and they're not within the city.
MR. BEALS: Correct.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead, Melissa.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: On Page 44, the previous GPCD's were at 180, and now we've reduced it to 170. Is that accounted for this here? I mean, I'm trying to figure out how the --
MR. BEALS: The last year it was at 170. At the '08 master plan it was at -- I'm sorry, previous to the '08 master plan it was at 185. And through the master plan process we reviewed the level of service and dropped it to 170.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: 170.
MR. BEALS: We have a master plan scheduled for next fiscal year FY11, and we'll be looking at those levels of service again, and we don't have -- it may be going down, it may stay the same.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: So what's this one based on?
MR. BEALS: This is based on the 170 from the '08 master plan.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Okay.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Anyone else?
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I think it's probably silly, but same question in another form that Commissioner Schiffer asked. Only he wasn't very specific, or perhaps he was. Orangetree, they get kicked out another four years. Was that a result of an agreement with the Orangetree facility, or --
MR. BEALS: No, the reason for the Orangetree, last year we were going to interconnect it in 2023, and due to the drop in the population growth in Orangetree service area, they're able to maintain reliable capacity with their existing plant until 2027. And at that time we're planning currently to bring on our northeast plant and decommission theirs.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Now here's one case where capacity is one thing, and that's all good and well, but I've heard a lot of complaints over the years about the quality of their water, and that was another issue I thought prompting it.
MR. BEALS: When we take ownership, we will definitely be doing an analysis of water quality and system reliability to see what needs to be done.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I think that's been an ongoing issue right along.
MR. BEALS: We have a project for Orangetree evaluation as soon as we are able to get in there.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I hear what you're saying. I'm disappointed. I don't live there.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I think everybody was concerned initially, Mr. Murray, because they had serious problems out there.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Absolutely.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: And I think everybody had hoped we would take it over a lot sooner, but not to happen.
Okay, do we have a motion? Or does anybody have anymore questions?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll make a motion that we forward the 2010 AUIR for potable water with a recommendation of approval.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Second.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIKA: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, I'm against. And I'm going to be against until somebody starts studying bringing the whole county to the same level of service.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. All right.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: The orphaning part of our county I'm not in favor of, so one against.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: So we have a motion for approval and that motion passes 5-1. Thank you.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, who was the opposed?

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: One is Mr. Schiffer, the person who made the motion.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: He made the motion.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: It's a protest.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Just trying to be friendly, that's all.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: It's a protest.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But it is serious.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And nobody takes it --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: No, I hear what you're saying.

***County sewer.

MR. BEALS: For the record, Nathan Beals. I'm here to answer your questions.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thank you, Nathan. Questions?

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Is the CIE going to change this --

MR. BEALS: No, ours will not be changing. We're on track.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: So we should probably go over the CIE.

MR. BOSI: No, because we can't take action. We didn't advertise for the CIE.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Oh, that's right, I forgot.

MR. BOSI: The CIEDC (sic) today will be the CIE that's going to present to you on the 21st.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, if nobody has any questions, just so long as you keep our sewers happening, we're happy campers, okay?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll make a motion that we forward 2010 AUIR for wastewater system with a recommendation of approval.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I'll second.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I have -- I'll second that, but I do have a question that I'd like to pose.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Oh, thank you. That's why I had asked.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: On Page 57, I made a comparison, as we all did undoubtedly, those that had the books from last year and years prior -- my apologies -- but in the retained and deficit constructed capacity the numbers changed. Why? And I can understand that numbers might change, but why will they change? Just give me an insight as to why they should change.

MR. BEALS: If you look at the following page on 58, note nine explains how we calculate the minimum and maximum retained capacities. And it's the change in the required capacity from one year for the minimum and the change in the required capacity for eight years, which is how long it takes for us to permit, construct, design a new plant or expansion. And that's where we get the maximum.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: So your variable is the eight year? Which by the way Mr. DeLony said it was 11 years. But okay, that's the variable?
MR. BEALS: Yes. And it's all based basically on the population. And as the population changes, each year that then creates that minimum and maximum to change and fluctuate, depending on the amount of growth or lack thereof.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I suppose you could see the issue. We strive to try to figure out what it is that's being done with regularity and with consistency even, and this makes it very challenging. I see the footnote and I appreciate the footnote, but it makes it kind of wild.
The differential is not that significant, I guess, but it's just I guess what is it, a clean record, is that what it is?
MR. BEALS: Yes, sir.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: All right. Well, I had seconded the motion. That was my question.
THE COURT REPORTER: I have Ms. Ebert seconding the motion.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: I did, yes.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, all in favor?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.
Anybody opposed?
(No response.)
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: They've got the county covered here.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All right.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Do we have the wastewater level of service for south county, or we did all of them?
THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Mr. Murray, I can't hear you real clear.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I'm sorry.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: My apologies. I guess I'm talking to myself, almost.
Did we consider this motion to be inclusive of all the wastewater activity?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay, that's fine.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: ***And you get to continue with solid waste.
MR. BEALS: For the record, Nathan Beals, here to answer any of your questions on solid waste.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Does anyone have any questions on solid waste?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I have a question, and it might be for Nathan and it might be for Mike.
Mike, back in the appendix we're starting to outline that we're borrowing from funds that are being set aside for the new cell at solid waste, right? Isn't that right? We did it last year. This year we've seen -- as we come up in especially the category B's -- let me find that page in the back, the list of all the -- somewhere in the back. Hold on. In the appendix this year you have a list of all the --
MR. BOSI: The financials, the revenues that are coming in? I believe Nathan had just on a side conversation had mentioned to me --
MR. BOSI: Is this this year's or last year's?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: This is this year's. And it's loans from solid waste, which seemed to be the balance of last year.
So the concern I have, we don't see payments back to that loan. Well, let me cut to the chase. I don't want the wastewater department foreclosing and owning the county. So does this mean pays the -- we don't want them to rule the -- how are the payments? You know, because we are borrowing against it, correct?
MR. BEALS: I spoke with the operations director for public utilities before I actually came this morning.
We loaned the general fund from solid waste -- I'm sorry, I believe it was 4.6 million last year. And we're expecting about $700,000 payback per year. And so it will take about eight years to pay back.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. But we -- even this year we have, I believe, and maybe they'll come up, we have other departments using that fund to balance their profit and loss statements.

MR. BEALS: Not that I'm aware of.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. Then I'll wait till we become aware of it as we go through it.

That's my only question.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, anybody else?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: No, we don't have to look for it. As we go it's clear in the departments.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I only have a comment.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Good job.

MR. BEALS: Thank you. I can't take all the credit, our Solid Waste Director is here. He did do a lot of good job work too.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: We knows we think he does a good job.

MR. BOSI: And this will be -- if there's no other questions, there's one comment -- I'm sorry.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead, you can finish your comment.

MR. BOSI: It was just echoing what Mr. Murray said. If you look on Page 76, if you look at the average disposal rate in 2001 for this county at 1.32 tons per capacity, and then you look at what we've -- in just nine years, the reduction, over 50 percent at .52.

And what that means is not only are we throwing away less stuff and burying less stuff and recycling more things within the spirit of sustainability, but in terms of that pressing issue that was in 2000 and 2001 of how are we going to replace this landfill, Mr. Rodriguez and his team, through their aggressive recycling programs and their improvements within the system, has really provided this county a tremendous amount of cushion in terms of addressing a tough issue. And just in sort of the same spirit of recognition of what Mr. Murray's comments was.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: It definitely has been huge.

To that point I have a question. The new recycling project that you're putting on Goodlette, where are projects like that accounted for?

MR. BEALS: The AUIR is for the landfill capital projects. And we review those during the budget process each year for the other non-CIE, non-AUIR portions.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: So that would fall outside of --

MR. BEALS: The landfill capital projects.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: So it's not considered a capital project?

MR. BEALS: I'll let Dan Rodriguez answer that.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Good morning, Planning Commissioners.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Good morning, Dan.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Dan Rodriguez. Thank you.

They are capital projects, and they're part of our operating budget. We have a capital component of that, so yes.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, thank you.

Okay, how about a motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll do it. I move we forward the 2010 AUIR county solid waste with a recommendation of approval.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Second.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All those in favor?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.
Any opposed?
(No response.)
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thank you.
MR. BEALS: Thank you very much.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Very much.
***And next up is the Collier County school. Mr. Eastman gets to make a presentation. Fantastic. We never hear from you.
MR. EASTMAN: Yes. The school district has only two capital improvement projects: One is the Bethune Education Center in Immokalee, and this is the razing of an old building and replacing it with new facilities. And we also have a large HVAC project at Pine Ridge Middle School.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: What's an HVAC?
MR. EASTMAN: That would be air conditioning and heating.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thank you.
MR. EASTMAN: Does the Commission have any question?
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Anybody have any questions for Mr. Eastman?
(No response.)
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Oh, come on, guys, that was much too short and simple for Mr. Eastman on his first try.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: We could razz him a little bit.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I have a question. How do things like -- there's been some talk about in conjunction with this proposed biomedical park, or whatever we're calling it these days, that there would be a science-based charter school started. How does that affect the overall school planning?
MR. EASTMAN: The school district, the public school system's interested in monitoring charter schools relative to our enrollment projections. And it's possible that we could have a partnership or issue the charter for that and work with them.
I personally on the facilities side have no knowledge that that's going on or negotiations have begun. But it's something I could check out for you --
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, thank you.
MR. EASTMAN: -- follow up.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thanks.
Okay, do we have a motion?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I move we forward the 2010 AUIR Collier County school capital improvement plan with a recommendation of approval.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Second.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All those in favor?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.
Any opposed?
(No response.)
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: ***And we have Mr. Williams up next for County Parks and Recreation.
MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning. Barry Williams, Parks and Recreation Director. I'm here to answer your questions.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead, Melissa.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Do you want to go page by page? I'm going to be --
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yeah, absolutely.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: -- jumping to 97, so --
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead. You may jump ahead.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Okay. On Page 97, a couple of questions. What's the difference between an interdepartmental transfer and an intergovernmental partnership?
MR. WILLIAMS: Can you tell me which ones you're referencing on that page?
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Let's see. FPL greenway, Isle of Capri, Big Corkscrew and Pepper Ranch.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Top two lines.
MR. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry?
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Top two lines on that page.
MR. WILLIAMS: I gotcha.
The FPL greenway, the interdepartmental transfer, that is a transfer from the Transportation Department. They are actually constructing the greenway, the FPL greenways between Davis and Rattlesnake Road. And intergovernmental, that's an example -- and I think you're referencing the Isle of Capri?
COMMISSIONER AHERN: And Big Corkscrew.
MR. WILLIAMS: And Big Corkscrew.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Oh, no, that's a transfer, I'm sorry. Interdepartmental partnership, Isle of Capri and Pepper Ranch.
MR. WILLIAMS: Okay, the Isle of Capris, the intergovernmental transfer is between the State of Florida, Rookery Bay and the Board of County Commissioners. It's where a kayak launch that they are developing right off of 951, we're in discussions with them right now about our maintaining that property once that project's completed.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Okay. And the -- now that one's listed, okay, as partnership.
And the interdepartmental partnership with Pepper Ranch?
MR. WILLIAMS: That is another relationship that we're exploring with Conservation Collier. Conservation Collier's part of Collier County government, and what we're looking to do is to develop a recreational access, working with Conservation Collier to develop a trail head for recreational use at that facility.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: And reference -- I guess part of my question in reference to all of these is where, you know, Pepper Ranch -- Conservation Collier purchased these a year ago for $13,000 an acre and now we're going to pay them $230,000 an acre. And under Conservation Collier's ordinance, that -- part of that, they are to provide access for the public.
MR. WILLIAMS: I understand. And I appreciate that question. I hear this question frequently through these proceedings.
The $230,000, the unit cost that we've assigned, there would be no transfer of money. We use our impact fee study that gives us that unit cost; that's the dollar that we use just to characterize the costs associated with transfer.
There is actually no transfer of funds between us and Conservation Collier. The agreement that we would have would be to provide our staff to do -- and you mentioned Conservation Collier. They do have that in their mission to make available for recreational use. What they're looking for, though, with them having a staff of three people, we have staff sufficient that could provide for the admission into the trail head, taking monies, those type of things. So that's what our role would be in that.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: So that cost would be covered by Conservation Collier to Parks and Rec?
MR. WILLIAMS: Well, it's part of a negotiation that we're having now. Typically what we will do is if we provide for a particular recreational use, we'll charge user fees. Typically those user fees offset the operating expense associated with that activity.
For the most part Parks and Recreation, our user fee are cost recovery. Overall the entire department is about 38 percent, so we would use any revenues that we would have that were coming in to offset our operating expense. That would be the arrangement that we would have with Conservation Collier.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: And when you say like in this case user fee, you mean to access the facilities?
MR. WILLIAMS: If that were the case. If that were allowed in our agreement with Conservation Collier. We haven't worked throughout all those details.
If Conservation Collier obviously had a prohibition about charging user fees based on their mission, then that wouldn't be part of the deal.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Okay. Yeah, because I think that's part of -- I mean, the taxpayers have already purchased the land. It seems --
MR. WILLIAMS: It seems like they should --

COMMISSIONER AHERN: For the taxpayers to have to continue to pay to utilize what they already own --

MR. WILLIAMS: I understand. And I would just offer that, you know, typically there is operating expenses associated with anything that we do with Parks and Rec, and so those user fees do a good job of offsetting.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: So in none of these cases none of this money is actually transferring, it's just your -- and that was my -- my point was the 230,000 is based off the impact fee study. And I was trying to figure out why we're using an arbitrarily -- you know, an arbitrary number that's really not realistic.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, it's -- I guess the one thing I would point out with all these transfers, there is no exchanging of cash. We aren't paying this dollar amount in order to provide for these transfers.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: So what's the benefit of using that number?

MR. WILLIAMS: I think that -- and Mike, I don't know if you can help me as far as how we characterize our unit cost associated with these transfers, but -- and I think that when you look at the spreadsheet you'll see the value associated with it. Beyond that I'm not sure that there is --

MR. BOSI: It's strictly for accounting purposes. There's no real monitory transfer.

And think about the utilization when you talk about interdepartment transfer, and the Pepper Ranch and Conservation Collier program is a great example of double benefits. Because Conservation Collier was something that's been twice approved by the voters to preserve environmentally sensitive land that has a mission purpose to provide that access.

Well, they've gone out and they've identified Pepper Ranch, they've acquired it, and they're going to provide that access. But they don't have the staffing level to actually maintain those facilities.

Parks and Recreation has the staffing ability to maintain those facilities and they can acquire lands, they can acquire acreages back into our park system included with our park system between that interdepartmental arrangement that is established between Conservation Collier and the park system where the rights of the individuals within this county, the people can utilize the facilities. Parks and Recs will staff it to a specific level. Conservation Collier makes those lands available. Those lands are not only part of Conservation Collier's inventory, but the portion that the park system utilizes and maintains can be brought into our acreages so we don't have to double -- we don't have to have another additional land purchase to increase the acreages in the recreational spaces that are available.

So there's benefits on two different purposes that are accomplished through that.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think your question was why do we put $230,000 as a value for it.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Right.

MR. WILLIAMS: And we've explained this in the prior years as saying it's a placeholder. It's not used for any particular purpose. The value that is identified, it is conveyed as far as this transmittal process, but it's not used as any characterization of the amount that we would pay for the transfer. So it is a distracting number, I realize that.

MR. BOSI: And I'll distract you even more. The unit cost will be updated based upon the recently (sic) impact fee studies to be 197,000. But once again, that's a utilization for an accounting purposes (sic). And once the establishment that there's real (sic) no money that's transferred, those are just numbers to be able to show if there was a value associated, this is the value that would be associated with that type of action.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Okay

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: So Mike, you just said, and I was going to ask questions on Page 98 about the new impact fee and the new service standards. What did you just give us as a figure?

MR. BOSI: $197,110 is going to be the -- when the board adopts the parks impact fee study update, that will be the new unit cost that will be utilized.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thank you.

MR. BOSI: But once again, every acquisition that parks would make, even though there's none suggested within this five-year program, but that next acquisition of land that parks would go out and acquire, they're not going to go in with an obligation to pay 197,000, they'll pay whatever the market is bearing.

MR. WILLIAMS: Madam Chair, just as a point too with that number and the documents that you have, we didn't have that number at the time these were put together. So when you consider this, we would want to bring that new index number forward with that.

There's a note on Page 94 that references unit costs, $230,000 acres (sic) based on 2009 impact fee study unit cost will be adjusted prior to the September 20th, CCPC/AUIR special meeting. Unfortunately that didn't occur.
Based upon the impact fee update and indexing expects to be finalized mid to late August, 2010, that would be recharacterized with that new number.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: So when are we going to talk about that number? I mean, when is --

MR. BOSI: You won't. Until the board acts on it, we can't -- and once again, it's a unit placed for an accounting purpose, and it has no real bearing upon the -- it has no real bearing upon the capital improvements that's being suggested within these individual sections, it's just trying to put a cost of what is the average cost of the acreage within the existing inventory.

MR. WILLIAMS: The one point though to make after previous years discussion about this same issue is that it is indexing downward. I think that was kind of the concern, that that seemed overly inflated. And I know that, you know, that's been something that we've had discussion in the past about.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yes, go ahead, Mr. Murray.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: All right. I'm going to return you to Page 90. This will be a question for you, Barry, and also with you, Mike. Because I established early on that we had -- the population is 400,000, whatever that number was, 20 percent added, not the 333,600. So I'm looking at the bottom of Page 90, and we see an unincorporated population of 393,463. And up above we see in bold using the peak season unincorporated population.

Do we have a differential here because I'm missing something?

MR. BOSI: No, this is the one category we're not using county-wide population. This is only unincorporated population. This doesn't include the population of the municipalities. Therefore, you've got a lower number than the majority of the categories that use county-wide that includes the populations of those cities. So that's why you see a discrepancy within the community park, which is different from the regional parks.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: This is the -- we did the roads, they don't use population. We did water and sewer and they are local.

MR. BOSI: They're district.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Right. We haven't done any others that I know of so far that use --

MR. BOSI: The handout that I provided that I referenced --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, no, what I'm driving at is I don't remember that we have done any based on population until this time. And I guess I was trying to establish, if the number 393,463 is valid and that's what we're going to use, that's fine.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I just wanted to be sure that I understood correctly, because that's why I did that -- took that issue in the first place.

And that $230,000 is -- we went through this every year that we've done this. And all the persons who are new are going to get used to something like that. I don't -- the 47, acres I found out why that happened.

And then I note in here in the regional park there we do use the 443,531, which is different than what I had established this morning as being a population number. I'm just looking for consistency. And I can't find where I put that. 400,320. And here we have 443,531.

MR. BOSI: Yes. And once again, the one utilizes -- if you look at the sheet, the hand-out that I handed out this morning, it says regional parks and then it says community parks.

In regional parks you use peak season county-wide. That's the cities and the unincorporated areas of populations for the entire county.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, Mike, yes, I understand. But if you take 393,600 and you add 20 percent to that, it comes out to be 400,320.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: He's using the --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: You can do the arithmetic --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- 29 percent.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: -- really quickly.

MR. WILLIAMS: You're looking at community parks at this one?

MR. BOSI: You're saying that the --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I'm only saying what little I know. I'm looking at your chart and the BEBR estimate for 2010 is 333,600. And as you indicated early on, it's a simple calculation, you take that number and you multiply it by 1.2.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: I think that's taken through the first part of the year. So you have to look at the other chart, the population chart in the appendix that that includes through October. Because I did those calculations myself to figure --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, yes, but --

COMMISSIONER AHERN: -- to figure that out.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I want Mike to help me with that on that basis for this reason, that you've said that we use peak population --

MR. BOSI: Yes, we do.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: -- based on that. Now, that's a two months number, that's the added number, right?

MR. BOSI: No, it's the 20 percent.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Twenty percent.

And I presume that it's based on that number that's right there, the BEBR estimate, and not on a series of calculations that modify that estimate.

MR. BOSI: And maybe I need to go back to the very beginning -- maybe I need to go back to the very beginning of the -- this line of questioning, and the establishment that there's a difference between the unincorporated and the county-wide population, and there's a difference between our October counts and our April counts as to what your numbers are as to arrive upon your peak season. It's just your -- it's your permanent population, whether it be at April or whether it be at October, times 1.2.

And maybe I'm still amiss, because I'm not sure where the inconsistency may lie.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I think the inconsistency for me would be then that you needed to explain that in your charting. I've read out the outset that for purposes of peak population, choose the months of X and Y. That's what you're telling me, right?

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay. That's not reflected here. And that's where I'm coming from. Because when we get numbers that vary, it does look as though it's not clear, all right? I'm sure there's a great explanation for it and I'm looking for that. If 443,531 is fine, I'm good. But I just want to be clear.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Mike, a suggestion, because I had some confusion too, is if you could actually put a chart showing county-wide and non county-wide, both permanent and peak, I don't think it --

MR. BOSI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: You know, you can get that in here somewhere, but it's -- and I think the problem is that if you did a chart, we wouldn't be sitting around playing Mr. Calculator and messing it up, okay?

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And from my point of view, when I'm reading this stuff and I'm looking at the prior year and I'm looking at this and I'm trying to do the calculations, I don't have that information clearly. I might get it later on, that's why my notes are scratched out quite frequently, but in this case I didn't get that.

Okay, that was my issue.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Donna, I have a question.

MR. LEFEBVRE: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And based upon that, if you look at the community park area, we -- okay, I'm sorry, not the community park. If you look at the regional where -- what this is telling us is we're below?

MR. BOSI: Correct. We are not meeting the levels of service that we have adopted at 2.9.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And why is -- the regional's based upon the seasonal, the peak population, correct?

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And why isn't the community?

MR. BOSI: It is. It's based on seasonal as well. It just doesn't include the pop -- the difference between --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, got it. Got it.

MR. BOSI: -- the two is the cities.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah, it's the taking out of the city to -- you know what might be good is if you could show on this chart, even though it's not our level of service, if you could show a graph line that is the permanent population. I think that might -- I'd be curious to see how it looks. I mean, are we getting close to
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Actually live here, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah.

MR. BOSI: I can most certainly add an additional line. And it's just the --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: It doesn't mean anything other than it makes us --

MR. BOSI: It would have no bearing other than just to give you the understanding of what the permanent populations would be based upon.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, there's enough regional park for us. It's not enough regional park for us plus them.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I know we've had this conversations too.

I know we've had this conversation too about peak season, but every time I look at this I just wonder how it can -- you know, we're putting this number in and we're using it for all of -- for the totality. And it is representative of really not the totality. I mean, I can't imagine -- maybe you can tell us that it grows in fact that big, but I don't know that the use is that significant.

That's been a stumbling point, as well as the 230,000, for some time.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Murray, I'm not sure I understand your --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, a peak population number, okay, I don't know that if we looked at the parks and every day the people who use the parks -- I'll give you a for instance, as my mind works, anyway. We have the kids in the summer, they're not going to school, they're using the parks. And to some degree you might say that's a peak, okay, because that's a considerable increase in the daily usage versus the rest of the year.

But peak population is usually construed to mean when those folks from up north come down here. And I know an awful lot of people don't go to the park, but obviously you folks know that an awful lot of people do go to the park.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, and, you know, your park system is very diverse. I think, you know, certainly with the peak season, if you've ever tried to go to the park during peak season you know what that's like. That's where everyone is that comes down from the north.

You do make mention of our summer. I mean, the only month that we're slow in Parks and Rec is September. It's like every other month is extremely busy for us. And people use the park depending -- as you mentioned, the summer, typically the locals use our pools, use our summer camp, use our parks. And it's extremely busy for us.

And then the shoulder seasons, you know, we have a little bit of both. So I'm not sure if that to gets your --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: No, you're answering the question. You know, and I'm not going to go much further than that. But when we think about having 20,000 plus foreclosures, and the loss of all the jobs, which means the loss of all those young families, it just strikes me there's a subtraction there of some significance and yet we're still using numbers that are in my mind just too high.

I cannot dispute them. I must trust that what you have done is a calculation based on reality, or reality as you see it, as you can calculate it. But I just wonder, based on -- we're in a recessionary situation and we're talking about increasing need. And that just doesn't jive for me.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, again, I would point out that we're looking to increase needs in creative ways. I mean, where we don't have the funding currently to build facilities and, you know, we're just following the school board, I think, you know, one of the things that we've used very effectively in the county is the ability to partner with the school board and develop facilities based on similar to what we mentioned earlier with Rockery Bay and such where we have staff, we can maintain the facility where there's lands available, where we don't have to purchase more, but we get them through intergovernmental or interdepartmental transfers.

So we're not trying to spend money to expand, we're basically looking to use the resources that are already there and try to do it in a creative way.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Let me make something clear: I have no doubt you folks are working very hard to do the right thing. That's not my purpose in qualification. But my job, our job is to look at it in the appropriate critical way to determine whether or not we're on track.

MR. WILLIAMS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And given -- I think it's a valid question, given the number of people that
we've lost in this community, particularly young people, I don't see a measure of that in this calculation. And it's silent in the calculation. It's probably in there, but I don't see it. And I don't know that I want to see it necessarily. I don't know that you could capture it, in truth. But I think that is what if anything in the public's mind is perception of question, that would be one of those factors.

I end with that, thank you.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Barry, the transfer of the 47 acres, I mean, there's a big deal here that it should have come out of community parks and instead we took it out of regional parks and blah, blah -- but it's going to a regional park.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, last year we had it characterized as regional park land. And the intent behind that was we were moving the 47 acres. The 47 acres was given us -- provided to us from the Golden Gate Estates Land Trust.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Right.

MR. WILLIAMS: And the purpose of that was, in discussions we were having, was to take those 47 acres, provide it to a project that the school board and transportation were considering, and then we would have land associated with our big Corkscrew Island Regional Park purchased by transportation for us on that behalf. So we were characterizing it, we were taking those 47 acres, characterizing it as what we would be using for Big Corkscrew Island Regional Park.

What's happened is that deal is not happening. There's not going to be 47 acres that's given to the school board and transportation for the purpose that they thought. We're retaining the 47 acres. And so we wanted to put it back in the inventory where it was appropriate. It is best characterized as community park acres, so that's why we kind of -- we've withdrawn and put it back into that category.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: If it doesn't get out into something else --

MR. WILLIAMS: That's correct.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- is that what you're saying?

MR. WILLIAMS: We are having some discussions with the Golden Gate Estates Land Trust about those acres. For us, I mean, the acres are on the wrong side of the road. I mean, we have most of the folks that would use the park on the other side of Immokalee Road. And we would like to, you know, respectfully request the Golden Gate Estates Land Trust to divest ourselves from those 47 acres and reapply them somewhere where it's more suitable for park.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. On Page 93 and 94, does Page 93, does that -- actually, that relates to your community parks, not your regional parks.

MR. WILLIAMS: And that shows on page -- yes, yes. We're basically returning the 47 acres back into community park land.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, I was looking at the wrong -- okay, we're good.

Does anybody have any other questions? Melissa I know did.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Mike, this might be for you.

The -- on Page 98 it shows a level of service options. And it comments that the 2.2 reflects the lowest level of service that could be adjusted on the 2009 impact fee study.

Does the new study change that number, the 2.2?

MR. BOSI: I'd have to defer to Amy to the specifics. But my estimation would be no, it doesn't, because I don't think there's been a significant change within our inventory between last year and this year, but --

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

No, we're actually in a mid-year indexing this year, so we didn't take into account level of service in this study. This is only -- last year was a full study and this year is an indexing.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Okay. So I guess my other question, there's a chart on -- or a map on 103 and it's showing the federal and state owned parks.

Is there any way to look at -- the amount of acreage in Collier County that's federal and state owned is probably one of the highest in the country. And then we have so many communities that are gated that provide their own facilities.

I mean, at some point you have to question how many people are actually using parks versus their own swimming pools and tennis courts. And then when you look at the amount of federal and state owned parks and
lands, it just seems like you were saying, that the number of parks that we are required is really high.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Melissa, we've been having this round and round for the past number of years. I brought up initially several years ago the issue of the state and federal parks.

And I think it -- if I'm not correct, that Page 98 is supposed to address that because the BCC also agreed and said we have to give them some sort of recognition.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Well, and that's what I was looking for in here, but this chart is only showing if you reduce the level of service, it doesn't really calculate additional acreage provided from state and federal.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Well, that would be the basis.

MR. BOSI: That's why we provided you a representation of all the state owned and federally owned park areas.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Right, but it's not in the calculations.

MR. BOSI: It can't be part of the calculations.

MR. WILLIAMS: From parks perspective, if I may say a couple of things, and I know, you know, you've heard me say this before in terms of the characterization of state lands, federal lands and even Conservation Collier lands. You know, we're distinguishing a level of service for park lands that deal with what we consider active recreation. These are soccer fields, little league fields, pools, you know, those type of amenities associated with park land.

When you're talking about the state and federal lands, there is recreational components to that. But you can't -- you shouldn't look at it the same way. 75,000 acres of Fakahatchee Strand is not a place where you can take your kid to play soccer. It's -- you know, there is a small area that you can recreate with trail heads and pathways and what not.

So we're -- the other issue I think, though, for DCA is that we cannot characterize land that's not managed by the county and have an agreement. Although there are some examples of -- and I mentioned Rookery Bay where we have been able to solicit and get agreements where those lands that we have under agreement where we're maintaining them we can count towards our level of service requirements.

What we wanted to do too, and it's not been mentioned yet, but in the past AUIR cycle we actually had included 625 acres of ATV land that had exceeded our regional park land. My goodness, it was like, you know, we had more than we needed in terms of regional park land.

What we've subsequently done for this year is remove that, and for a couple of reasons. There's a question about whether or not that agreement's going to make -- it's currently in litigation, and South Florida Water Management is working with the county on that.

It's not clear, and there's been a number of examples where South Florida Water Management have tried to secure this 625 acres and they've not been successful. We felt that as staff it would be best for us to not recommend and characterize those 625 acres. We wanted to pull those out until it was clear exactly what that deal was going to be.

But the another thing I would want to mention about those 625 acres is that it did overly inflate, much in a way what I'm describing with the state and federal lands, 625 acres for a specific recreation use for ATVs. It takes away from a level of service that we're looking at to define better as those, you know, park lands that again are more suitable to active recreation.

The last thing I'll mention, and we wanted to provide for you this table that you have and that you're referencing. There was a question about well, if we were to pull -- in the county park lands that we manage, we manage about almost 1,700 acres, there's about 340 acres in our regional park land that is what we would characterize as preserves or, you know, lands that can't be used --

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Water management.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- for active recreation.

So we looked at well, if we were to take those lands out, what would that do to our level of service. And so what we provided for you was a level of service option. And we wanted to bring this forward to the Board of County Commissioners as well that just looked at if we were to reduce our level of service to -- you know, and you see across the top of the chart level of service 2.2, that's the minimum that we can have. 2.9 is where we are now.

If we were to reduce our level of service and we were to take out those preserve lands, you could see the difference of what we would have. Actually, I want to say I'm getting a little tight here, I think we actually are saying that with this, you can see with 2.9 we're barely going to meet our level of service with actually being 46 acres in the
hole. Which my understanding is that that's an acceptable place for us to be.

MR. BOSI: I mean, right now currently at the end of our five-year program, we'd be 50 acres short. And I think we have identified projects within this six through 10 that would be able to rectify that. So I don't think we are in -- we are in a noncompliance issue.

We provided this chart as part -- and as Madam Chair had indicated, this has been an ongoing discussion for the past four years within the AIUR. How do we recognize that the state, how do we recognize the federal and the privately held recreation facilities that are out there, we know they're out there. Well, we can't include those within our levels of service, we can't include those within our impact fees, because we don't own them, we don't control them. But we do recognize that they're there.

And if you feel that 2.9 is too high of a level of service for this community based upon the amenities and based upon the characteristics of the private communities, here's where your options for recommendations could be. So if you feel as a body, you feel that 2.9 is just a little bit too high, based upon the state, the fed, the privately held recreation facilities, the swimming pools that are out there, these range -- here's your range of options for a recommendation you can make to the Board of County Commissioners recognizing all those other facilities. And that's what 98 was meant to do.

Because we can't incorporate it -- I understand how you -- let's see how mathematically that expresses itself. But we're restricted upon what we can and can't count. But we want to recognize and give you the options and the latitude that's provided for within that page.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: You stimulated Marla to come up. May I ask -- are you finished?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: May I? I need to understand something.

If we're extracting certain lands that are already in inventory, and the question I have is the components that make up the overall value of $23,000 an acre, western Collier on the beach versus whatever, are we going to inflate then the value that we attribute to acreage by taking out those lands that are lesser in value or lesser in --

MR. BOSI: That was an option that we dropped. We never took -- we decided that taking out the limited preserve wasn't going to serve the purpose of what we --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay, but --

MR. BOSI: -- were trying to accomplish.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: So the components that are used to realize that number, are they static year to year?

MR. BOSI: No. No, the value of -- whenever the impact fee is updated or -- they will look at each acre of land within the ownership of Collier County, place a numeric value or a market value upon each acre of land based upon the current bearing of the map at that time, and arrive upon a unit cost.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: So just for sure, so I'm clear, we take the booked value, okay, that we had in a given year and then we look at the value that is now ascribed to those lands based on the appraisals?

MR. BOSI: I'm not sure what you mean when you refer to book value.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, the book value is that which you purchased at.

MR. BOSI: Oh, we don't -- once it's purchased --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Once it's purchased, you don't care what it is.

MR. BOSI: Unless we purchased it the same year we're doing the impact fee. Well, then it would have relevance, because that gives us a real-time bearing upon that.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, okay. I mean, we don't want to get into strange stuff like -- it's not business in the same sense that I would relate to it.

But what I'm trying to get to is that if we recalculate every year, that's what you're saying, we take the totality of the inventory and we --

MR. BOSI: Every impact fee study.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: -- look at the value that -- that's the appraiser's value; is that correct?

MR. BOSI: Sure.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay. And then that's where we get our 230 --

MR. BOSI: Think about if you owned five parcels of land. Every year you'd be like I wonder what my value of that land is. Well, you wouldn't say what I paid for it, because that's not the value of your land, that's what you paid
for it --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, I would if I were in a tax situation. But okay, fine.

MR. BOSI: If you paid at that time. But five years down the road that value hasn't changed. And each year you'd say, okay, the market value would bear "X" for each one of my properties; we'll take the average and that's the average of my acreage that I own.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: That is the reason why I asked the question, whether by extracting any property that might have lesser appraised value, we tend to inflate the other.

MR. BOSI: Yeah, no, we haven't extracted any from the inventory.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Donna, a question.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And Mike, I think the reason we have this conversation every year, it's your fault. Because it's the way you put this together. The level of service is acreage.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. So I think what you should do is when you analyze it, analyze the acreage. If you come up with a need to buy more acreage, then put value on it. And then you could use that number to go through it.

But what you do is you come in here and you essentially put value on the whole park system, a dollar value, and it totally confuses the issue. The issue is 2.9 acres, and that's what we want. And it's only the -- the value of it only becomes an issue if we have to go get some more. Don't you agree?

MR. BOSI: The value of it has (sic) nothing other than for accounting purposes. When we go acquire that new acreage, as I said before, we wouldn't -- it doesn't care what the unit cost is asked, it's what that geographic piece of property is going to bear at the time that we're trying to acquire it.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But if you look at it the way you do it in the summer, you start out taking a number, and then we talk about it ad nauseam here every year, and you throw it on all the acres you have. And then somebody's going to point out that an acre in the swamp isn't worth the acre on the beach and then we go on and on with that for a while.

MR. BOSI: Exactly. And we say that the value of all the properties on average equals this number. And there'll be discrepancies --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But maybe you should analyze it in terms of the real level of service, which is acreage. And then if we have to start buying some acreage to make up something, you could start figuring out how much money you need to do that.

MR. BOSI: As long as we would know the location of where that is. But it would still be an arbitrary number, because if we say we're going to acquire it in three years from now, the number that I arrive upon now I couldn't tell you what the real value would be in three years. So it's always going to be that arbitrary process.

And remember, the primary purpose of the AUIR/CIE, are we satisfying the level of service demands, not are we appropriately accounting for what our potential future costs are going to be. The primary purposes of this exercise is to make sure we're meeting our levels of service, and that's acre -- are we acquiring enough acreages.

How -- what value we put just to be able to show what the potential acquisition cost is going to be, you know, there's not a right answer on that in how you express it. Because when you get to that purchase, it's going to be what the market's bearing at that time.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And the confusion comes when you take there's not going to be a right answer on that, and then put a value on the whole inventory and then start analyzing it that way.

I would recommend analyze it by the acreage, the level of service that's important. And then figure out a way to start putting value. Because you do have specific things you're doing, and you'd probably be better guessing at these different values than you would with a common denominator.

MR. BOSI: Oh, I see what you're saying. is try to place individual appraisals upon the acquisitions that we're planning so therefore the project costs could be a little bit more realistic in terms of what we could be expecting.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Right.

MR. BOSI: And I understand.

And the one thing I would clarify, that if you look within the five-year program, there's not one acquisition
outside of an interdepartmental transfer, so I understand -- I wouldn't even have that opportunity to do that --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Work on the level of service. Unless you enjoy this conversation every year.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Marla, it's your turn. Jump in.

MR. RAMSEY: Well, I could just, you know, refer you back the last five years to the same thing that I have said every single time I have stepped up, is that we are -- our level of service is acres per thousand, we don't care about the dollars. That's a state element. How much it cost us is not something that we're relevant with. It's a place holder, it's always been a place holder. And we go for cheap whenever possible, so your dollars are being well spent. And we're not spending 230,000 for swamp land.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Right. And here's what I'd rather see you do is analyze it by acreage, which is what you're saying, and then you're going to start bringing some acreage up, adding more acreage, and start guessing at appropriate prices. In other words, you're going to be out in the swamp buying it in this range, you're going to be on the beach buying it at a different range. Rather than, like you said, every year we have this conversation. And the conversation doesn't even matter, but we enjoy having it for some reason.

MR. RAMSEY: We just don't -- we can't have new people show up so that we have to go through it every single year.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And we've got to wean them in on the same problem and it's -- but anyway.

MR. BOSI: I think by year three we'll get --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Well, in point of fact, let's, you know, get back to partly what happened though, is we are now acknowledging some of the park lands that were just being totally ignored before. And both the Board of County Commissioners as well as this board have said that's a good idea. We have to take them into account in some fashion or another. To just say, well, it's a federal park and so we ignore any recreational value to it was also wrong.

So what everybody's been trying to work toward is some sort of, you know, acknowledgment of what's out there and start focusing on the needs of the population and not just on the numbers of thousands but on the needs of those thousands of people. Because if we've got plenty of hiking trails, then you don't need to go buy hiking trails anymore. And, you know -- so we need to concentrate on what we actually need for the population base.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: Madam Chair, if I may, could I just ask Sid Kittila to come up and talk about Page 98, I believe? I don't know that I spoke clearly about that.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Let me ask a question on Page --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: No, you haven't. But finish, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Let me ask a question on 98. If you look on 96, it shows we're in -- we have a deficiency in regional park land.

MR. BOSI: Yeah, that corresponds with what's on 2.9.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: With the 2.9, okay.

What number on Page 98 brings that into compliance? Does any?

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: 2.7.

MR. BOSI: 2.7 gets us on the positive side.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. So Donna, in your thing is look, we have a lot of state -- or federal and state park land around here. Maybe we don't need a 2.9. Maybe we could gladly justify, which we can do in the motion, reducing the 2.7, which brings us into compliance. And that's what we should be doing, not --

MR. RAMSEY: Let me ask. When we went through this thing on Page 98, what we were really trying to do is that there are other communities throughout the state who use the word developable land. And that's really what our park system is really about. We're trying to find lands that we can turn into athletic fields. And I'm going to use North Collier Regional Park as an example of that. We bought 212 acres of lands there, of which 90 acres had to go into preserve, so that I could have the other hundred some acres available for activities, like soccer fields, etcetera.

So we had to buy almost double the amount of acres in order to get to the active side of it. And so part of what we were trying to do is if we took preserve lands out and we just went after what the level of service was for developable land, knowing that some day you might have to buy 200 in order to get to 100, but then only the 100 would go into the inventory as level of service, that's where we were going. It became impossible to do, okay,
because they have to come as a unit.

And so the only thing that you have in front of you right now is dealing with the ATV acreages being out, okay. But if we had a way that if you're going to reduce the level of service and there's a way to attach itself as such that it could be actively developed or lands that would be developed for active recreational and not for preserve elements, that's where we're seeking to get to. We just haven't been able to do that as easily here as they do in the middle of the state where they don't have as many preserves requirements for water management.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And that's the same frustration a developer would have: I'm going to buy 100 acres, I'm going to put preserves. So you're stuck in the same game.

But it's these preserves that make Collier the special place it is. So the point is I'm not going to give you any sympathy because every developer in town's doing the same thing. But he's taking his full acreage, he's getting units for his preserve, so you should be getting full credit for your preserves as the acreage.

MR. RAMSEY: Except that we'd -- it depends on the level of the service that I need. If I need to put in 10 soccer fields and that's what my level of service says that I need, I might have to buy a lot more lands to do that. But then you'll look and see and say, well, you know, you've met your level of service so you don't need any more lands. I'm saying yeah, I need four more soccer fields but I've met my level of service based upon the fact that a lot of it is preserve lands but not active lands. That's the dilemma that we've come up against.

So I just leave that to you, because we couldn't come with an answer yet. We don't have it.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, what do you think of the 2.9? Is that a level that the state would -- across the state where people are at?

MR. RAMSEY: Well, again, it's every one of them is different. And I don't know if it's in the back of this one, but we did the --

MR. BOSI: We did the level of service --

MS. RAMSEY: Level of service.


MS. RAMSEY: Lee County's like 10 acres per 1,000, you know, we're at 2.9. So every single community's got a different level of service based upon what is it that our community wants. What do we want our community to look like.

And some of those communities put all their preserve lands into it and that's why they have 10 acres per 1,000. We haven't done that. We've really tried to stay with active recreational lands in our level of service.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So the acreage you show is active recreational lands and not preserves?

MR. RAMSEY: Well, of the 1,700 that we have, we have about 300 of that. And most of that is at Tigertail and Barefoot Beach.

MR. WILLIAMS: Let me just correct. And that's where I was trying to get Sid up here, is in the Page 98, that does not include -- that does include preserve lands that we have.

MR. BOSI: Everything in inventory.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: How much preserve land do we have in Collier County?

MR. WILLIAMS: Are you saying --

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Natural --

MR. RAMSEY: Collier County owned?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: No, not Collier County --

MR. BOSI: 67 percent of Collier County is either placed in federal or state conservation.

MR. WILLIAMS: This graphic here is very descriptive. I think if you see it as it relates to the county, in the county park system we have about 340 acres. Conservation Collier, I don't know exactly their acreage. And then transportation, I know they have some, I believe some preserve lands.

MR. BOSI: Page 103 in your book gives the map, the color map.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I see that, but we have other preserve areas.

MR. BOSI: We have additional preserve areas within Collier County, but 67 percent of the land is already dedicated to preservation.

You're going to have preservation components to every parcel of land out there. We don't have calculations for that. But that will give you a pretty good understanding of the amount of land that has been set aside for preservation within Collier County in general.
MR. RAMSEY: And again remember, the Conservation Collier is the agency that provides the preserve lands for Collier County, not Parks and Recreation.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And that's not playground, their land.

MR. RAMSEY: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: The -- on Page 101 there's a breakdown of all the regional -- and actually community also. Do you have the ability, I don't mean for approval here, but to break the regional parks into how much is preserve land? And what was the word you used, buildable or --

MR. WILLIAMS: Developable.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Developable.

Are you able to split that into two categories?

MR. WILLIAMS: We have actually for this AUIR cycle looked at that. And we did -- it's not included in your packets, but we have the ability to do that, yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And do you remember what kind of ratio you came up with, or --

MR. WILLIAMS: You know, we had a couple parks that really -- you know, those 340 acres I mentioned got the bulk of it. So it was Barefoot Beach preserve, you know, which was about 150 acres, and then North Collier, which I believe was about 100. And Tigertail, which is also a major preserve area for us.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But do you remember bottom line, what is --

MR. BOSI: Twenty percent. There's 340 --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Twenty percent is preserve?

MR. BOSI: -- there's 1,700 in acreage and inventory for regional. There's 340 that is basically non-developable. It's about 20 percent of the available acreage that can't be utilized by the park system to develop their athletic fields and their active programs.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But that's -- you know, a private developer deals with a bigger number than that, so -- okay.

Then the only other question is we do show deficiency in the regional parks. So does that mean you recommend a different level of service? Which is kind of cooking the books.

MR. BOSI: No, no, we're not recommending a change to the level of service. We had heard for the past three years that the advisory boards and the Board of County Commissioners would like options. Ninety-eight is designed to fulfill that request. If you feel that an alternative recommendation for level of service is what is the consensus from this body, we would take it forward and have the Board of County Commissioners consider that alternate level of service, based upon the recognition of the state and federal lands and the privately held recreation facilities that are out there.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Madam Chair, I could make a motion, if you want.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Well, yeah, I mean, what this chart shows, I mean, is a difference. If you go to a 2.7 of like 100 acres, it's not --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: No, I mean, the motion I would make -- I'd make two. One is community parks, that one goes away. This one would be to approve it but recommend the lowering of the level of service to the 2.7.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I would second that.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, let me -- I've got to make one at a time --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: You've got to make two different motions.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah. Okay, so the first motion is move --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Is on community parks.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Move to forward a recommendation for the 2010 AUIR of approval for community park land.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: As is.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: As is.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay, I would second that.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, all in favor?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.
Any opposed?
(No response.)
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: So now on to regional parks.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Second motion would be to move the 2010 AUR for regional parks with a recommendation of approval, and also a recommendation that the level of service be lowered to 2.7.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Second it.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. Just for discussion, I just had one question before I call the motion, and that's on Page 102 where you take into account the regional parks in the city, and/or you've listed community parks, but you're not taking them into account in your inventory in any way. Why would community parks just across the board be excluded?
MR. BOSI: As I noted, within the way that we calculate the levels of service for regional and community, the regional included that the county-wide population as a whole, the community parks does not include the populations of the cities, therefore, we do not include the parks of the community category that the cities' providing, because we do not include their population.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. So that's a discussion for another day if we are ever in the negative on community parks. Thank you.
MR. RAMSEY: I just -- Marla Ramsey.
If you're going to add the community parks from the cities, you'd have to add the cities' population into the inventory --
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Right, understood.
MS. RAMSEY: -- which we currently don't do.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yeah, understood, which we don't do. Thank you.
Go ahead, Brad, you're going to make a --
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I did. It's been seconded.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And I seconded it.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: And I'll call the motion.
Excuse me, do we have somebody who wants to speak?
MR. EASTMAN: Just anecdotally. Barry and I worked together trying to get the youth organizations out on the fields using either Parks and Rec facilities or school district facilities. And given the issue of wear and tear on particular sports fields, be it Pop Warner or youth soccer, we have a true demand in this community for those types of things. The school district hosts little league. We don't host any type of adult softball or anything, that's all handled through Parks and Rec.
And I think there's a perception that, you know, we have these big preserve areas, but no one is, as Barry mentioned earlier, and I think it's a point that needs to be reiterated, nobody's out there playing soccer, nobody's out there playing little league or Pop Warner in the Picayune Strand.
And these are true community facilities that help with our youth and our community and great team work and fight against obesity. And they're restrained. I mean, we don't have a wealth of these facilities. We have to deal with volunteer organizations and stuff, trying to get facilities for them.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, if I may, I think -- I couldn't disagree with your idea. But what's presented to us is purportedly the valued availability, that which is concluded as needed to fulfill all of those things that you have indicated or desired or you desire that they be.
You're making a case, I think, unless I misheard you, I think for us to approve a higher number, 2.9 or whatever, which would then create a deficit that they need to go out and buy more property. Unless I mishear you.
I'm trying to understand. I heard the plea, and it's a valid plea. You want to do all these things, but what's being presented, as I understand it, is adequacy, the population, the need.
THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Eastman, if you could just get on a microphone so the public can hear you.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I'm sorry, Cherie', I didn't realize he didn't have a microphone over
there.

MR. EASTMAN: Commissioner Murray, I'm really not making a recommendation to change the level of service. The school district's not -- doesn't have a party in this fight. I'm just trying to change the perception that there's this wealth of sports fields available, and that's really what I was trying to get at.

And that anecdotally, from working with it day-to-day, there are organizations for youth sports that need facilities. And there aren't a wealth of facilities. We're not over parked. At least with respect to that regard in terms of what I experience in my job day-to-day.

But the recommendations for the county parks, that's strictly county business. I'm just trying to discuss a perception issue.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay. And Tom, I thank you. I remember the people from Pop Warner showing up at commission seeking opportunity to use, and they were claiming that there were school facilities that they -- you know, that they thought they might be able to use.

One would hope that we are embracing that, that we're having as much as possible with the school facilities shared with the parks. But there are only a couple of places I know of, and maybe a few where that's possible.

And I don't -- I don't disagree with your plea, just that what I'm trying to state is that I think that what we've been offered, the two things meet, the population against the level of service. So that's all.

MR. EASTMAN: I guess not every acre of land that may be considered park is equal for every particular purpose. We do work well with the Pop Warner, we have them on our site. They're always welcome. It's been a good relationship. And I know we're all in the same game of trying to make the community better.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And Barry, I think that's an excellent suggestion that Commissioner Schiffer made to extract -- not to extract but to side-by-side of the park land which is preserve and which is useable for park, so that we can get a better insight into net useable as against total acreage, because it's a misnomer for us; it doesn't work for us.

MR. WILLIAMS: And just to make a -- I appreciate Mr. Eastman's point.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: As do I.

MR. WILLIAMS: And we have multiple agreements with the school and multiple locations throughout Collier County. We were talking off-line, we were thinking seven or eight different sites where we've been able to share that.

And I think, you know, that is a good point that we would want to make is, you know, in terms of a discussion, if you've never been to a local park, your perception may be that no one uses it. And we deal with that quite often, where people may not use the park because they may have their own private recreational amenities. The fact of the matter is, our parks are very well used. You know, we have included in part of your packet utilization figures of that.

So -- and encourage you to visit your local park, certainly, and see some of the things that happen. Fall sports are on right now for us. And, you know, this is one of our busiest times. So it's -- your motion, and I know you're considering it, is reducing from 2.9 to 2.7. I think that we're not looking to get in the midst of your motion, we wanted to bring back to you 2.9 recommendation based on what we could see.

But we do understand with some of the consideration for the state and federal land and other type of recreational amenities you also help us get to where we need to be with our AUIR as far as meeting our level of service, so I don't know that we're opposed to that.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I just -- as long as -- if, and this is -- you may not know this, certainly, but if you were to extract all of the lands that are considered not usable for active park activity, would we then have a deficiency?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Of course.

MR. BOSI: If we were to take 340 acres -- if we're deficient at the five years with everything and we take 340 out, we're going to be 340 more deficient.

MR. WILLIAMS: You throw an ATV park back in there, though, and -- so yes, we would be deficient if you took those acres out. But we certainly can bring back in the next cycle a characterization of those acres. I think that was Mr. Schiffer's point.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And what we would do then -- I mean, the 2.9 is with preserves. Always
has been. So obviously if you take away the preserves then we have to adjust that factor, which essentially will again cook the books and balance it back out.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Maybe we should wait till next year.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead, Melissa.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Are there any calculations that show out of all of the parks the percentage of the acreage that is what you were talking about, like ball fields and more of an active portion of the park as opposed to what portion is more passive?

MR. WILLIAMS: And I think that's the question at hand is whether -- we've done that internally, we don't have it included as part of your packet. Certainly next year and through the next cycle we could characterize it that way and show you that.

I could tell you, for regional park land, you know, and what is it, Sid? I want to say it's 1,000 acres for regional park land; does that sound right? A thousand acres, about 340 are, you know, considered in this preserve category.

Our community parks for the most part, and that's about six, 700 acres, I don't have exactly that number, that breakdown, for the most part our community parks are totally active recreation. We don't have as many preserve areas associated with our community parks as we do our regional parks.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I think over the years we've been trying to force the issue of a more well defined way to analyze our parks and our recreation. I mean, they were different things. And we're still not there. Obviously you all have done some additional work that we haven't seen yet in trying to get to a calculation, developable land versus your land in total. But you're not there yet, because you decided not to bring that forward.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, I did want to mention one thing that we are participating in. We are working through a master planning process for parks, and that's something that's been -- we had a master plan developed many years ago, and there's been the need for an update. And the times we're in, and certainly we're looking at doing this as efficiently as we can. We are working with Tindale-Oliver, and Nick has talked about the master mobility plan, and we were able to negotiate with them to do an update of our current master plan. So we think that's going to be useful.

And part of the analysis and what they're doing is basically looking at these meetings, the AUIR process and trying to sift through that and provide some recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners. So I did want to mention that.

We do feel like our next cycle, with the ability of having that master plan, that parks master plan, we may get to some of those answers -- some of those questions that have arisen through this group, so --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: And you expect to have that by next year at this time?

MR. WILLIAMS: We do. The Growth Management Plan stipulates that it (sic) to be completed by the end of December. We're going to be right there. We think it should be done, we're looking at January, February. We actually have a series of events that are coming up in the next couple of months that will begin to bring together public input and involvement in that process, so -- but we're looking at end of January, February of 2011. So next year we'll have that data for you.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Well, and as we've seen, you know, next year we can make changes again based on the most current and up-to-date information that we're presented with. I mean, for sure.

We're just trying to get to a real figure. We don't want to short little kids ball fields in favor of, you know, my wanting to go to the beach or whatever. That's not the point. The point is to analyze everything that we've got and everything that we might need based on the needs of our population. So it's getting to that real number. And we haven't been able to extract it out quite yet, I don't think.

Go ahead, Melissa.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Just one more comment. And maybe my wording is off. But when I say passive, I don't mean preserves, I mean other areas in the park that may be for picnic or something else. It seems like your main issue is ball fields. So, you know, maybe there's a way we can look in the future of addressing that issue as opposed to acreage on a whole that's not going to satisfy that need.

MR. RAMSEY: Just let me just for clarity situation, when we talk about an active activity, I mean, when you go to the ball field to play soccer, when you get done with it a lot of times they will have picnics afterwards or their group will get together. The parking lot is all associated, you know, with the activity that's being happening (sic) at that location, and recreational needs are always changing. I mean, you know, we're now into Lacrosse. We never had
Lacrosse in this community before. We've added that to our rectangular fields which, you know, we call soccer, but use it for field hockey and Lacrosse and football and, you know, all kinds of different things.

So when we talk about an active facility, it kind of does encompass all of that, including the restroom facilities and the meeting rooms and other things that you need to have to have a good recreational opportunity for our community.

So it's hard to say okay, well, I'm going to take out this, you know, 300 feet because it's just a picnic area, when that picnic area really is an enhancement of everything that happens in the park. Because when they come to the park, they sometimes come for the day.

MR. WILLIAMS: Another point, too, if I may, and I think I understand your point, we do have preserve lands that, you know, in North Collier comes to mind where we have cypress and pine that you're not going to go picnic or walk through. But then we have other -- and we're talking about active recreation. I think Ms. Ramsey's correct in associating these other things that may seem passive but are also included in that --

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Green space.

MR. WILLIAMS: Pathways, green space, picnic areas, all those kinds of things. So that is a distinction that's important to make.

And when we're talking about this 340 acres, we're not talking about those things, we're talking about these cypress pine stands that you don't do --

COMMISSIONER AHERN: You can't touch.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- those things.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, I --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'd like to call a vote.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- think Mr. Schiffer was going to make a motion.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Oh, I made it. It's been seconded. I'm ready to --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, and it's been seconded by Mr. Murray? Thank you.

All those in favor of the motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.

And anybody opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All right. We'll revisit -- and it sounds like, guys, that you're working to get us to a comfortable place and the board to a comfortable place. I know it seems like it's been like pulling teeth, but sometimes that's what it takes to get to where everybody needs to be.

So I hope you will take it in the spirit that it's meant, we're just trying to get everything better and get us to where we belong, so --

MR. WILLIAMS: We promise we won't march in soccer players to -- thank you.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thanks, Barry.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Madam Chair, speaking of comfortable places, if we get a head start on lunch, we can beat the crowds.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: We can do that. If you'd like to retire for lunch, then that's fine by me.

And I'm sure it will be fine by Cherie'.

Thanks everybody. We'll do that and we'll be back at 1:00.

(Luncheon recess.)

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Welcome back, everybody.

***This afternoon -- first this afternoon is county jails. So Chief Smith.

CHIEF SMITH: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. For the record, Greg Smith, Chief of Administration for the Sheriff's Office.

I'm here to answer any operational questions you might have regarding the information contained in the
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, the first thing would be a good reminder to everybody to speak slowly. I'm sure that she couldn't get anything that you just said. So just as we go forward, everybody needs to chill. Thank you. Just a little.

Thanks. Does anybody have any questions?
(No response.)
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I do. Your level of service, are you comfortable with that?
CHIEF SMITH: I think we are. We certainly haven't seen any trending upward with regard to jail populations. If anything, it seems to be stable or even trending downward slightly, so --
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But since -- but it's not within the five years. But you do start to get in trouble -- well, that's too far down the road. Never mind. You're in good shape.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I will say, you guys do a good job.
CHIEF SMITH: Thank you, Commissioner Murray.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Would you like to make a motion, Commissioner Murray?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Does that mean they never get out?
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: What?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Nobody escapes is what that -- yeah, I'll make a motion that we approve the 2010 AUIR for county jails with a recommendation of approval.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Second.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All those in favor?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.
Any opposed?
(No response.)
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, we're all set. Thank you. Next?
CHIEF SMITH: ***Okay, that takes us to county law enforcement. And again, for the record, Greg Smith, Chief of Administration for the Collier County Sheriff's Office.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I do have a question.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Peak season, are you using the number for peak season, the same number that county parks was using?
CHIEF SMITH: I don't know what county parks is using. We are using the peak season.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: They are? You verified -- okay, that's all. Just my purpose was consistency, that was my thought.

In looking at this, we have 771 inventory, but you have a surplus of 178-9, which is a nice thing to have, if in fact it's really a surplus. That's statistically a surplus.

But with the foreclosures and the rest of the conditions that we have, have you increased -- or not increased, but you've maintained the scheduled patrols and the rest of it?

CHIEF SMITH: From an operational standpoint, we are pretty much conducting business like we have for a while. We see, you know, downward trends in both calls for service and in the crime rate, which is a good thing. It's allowed us to maintain a certain vacancy level. To date we have 180 vacancies at the sheriff's office. A good number of those being in patrol -- or in the certified sectors, not all in patrol. It's evenly spaced out through the agency.

So we -- it has resulted in us keeping open some vacancies in order to make sure that we're where the county has issued budget guidance. So we are doing that, as much -- I'm sure all the county departments are doing the same thing.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I misunderstood this application then. A five-year surplus with deficit, it
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appeared to be as a surplus, which suggested to me you had more people than -- but I guess you're saying it's the other way.

CHIEF SMITH: Well, I think what this actually is, is they take like the square foot of our buildings and then, you know, do some kind of machination to tell you what the suggested inventory would be to service a number of proposed officers.

We have never budgeted that way, we have never staffed that way. I think that's just the number that they use for comparative purposes.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And that's where it gets a little strange again. It's not only buildings, it's the police cars as well.

CHIEF SMITH: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay. I remember now and clearly. That was it for me.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Any other questions? Melissa?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Uh-uh.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Page 126. You have a productivity committee recommendation. Do you want to talk about that?

CHIEF SMITH: Do I want to talk about that?

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yes.

CHIEF SMITH: Would you like to talk about it? I'll answer whatever --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Well, we're going to.

CHIEF SMITH: I'll answer whatever question you'd like to ask.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: If we went to -- if the BCC went to .0912, what would that do to your service in this community?

CHIEF SMITH: Well, again, I think it's important to understand that this report, the AUIR, does not speak to staffing levels. The agency will always staff what they think is appropriate and put that in their budget documents for submission.

I can tell you that the one percent that they suggest, if we're only talking about road patrol deputies, which is what they're stating, then we're already in essence there. That's about where we're at today. In fact, we're a little less than that. But if you talk about the certified law enforcement officers that encompass any number of positions, other than just patrol, then we have significantly higher numbers, and that gives yield to the 1.96 number that you see above.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All right. But they are saying here that they're just talking about the road patrol. So you're telling me you're already there.

CHIEF SMITH: Yes, ma'am.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: So that's a good thing and that probably should be noted in your report to the commission.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Question.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And Mike, this is kind of to you. Why do we have this building square footage to support the 1.96? And that was the last time we use the reference to building square footage, right? So why do we do that?

MR. BOSI: The value of the level of service relates to what Chief Smith had indicated. We utilize 1.96 officers per 1,000 as our current level of service. But it's not the officers that are really inventoried, it's the square footage that would house the officers that are what we monitor within our capital improvement programming.

So when we have a surplus of square footage that would support addition -- a level of certified officers, operational, they're not obligated to staff at that level, they staff at what they feel is appropriate. It's just a constructed square footage would express to that level.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But why would you come to a denominator for a police officer of square footage? Is it -- Amy jumped up, so I think there's a clue there.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Brad's always been quick on picking up on the clues.

MS. PATTERSON: Amy Patterson for the record.

The 1.96 officers per 1,000 population is the level of service established by the last impact fee study. During
this impact fee study, which is currently ongoing, we're looking at a better way to translate that level of service to square footage. Because like Chief Smith said, this has caused ongoing confusion between the actual officers and the officers related to a level of service. So that was part of the direction last year was to find a better expression of level of service, tied closer to what we're measuring here which is the buildings and the equipment needed.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But why do you go to square -- to building square footage? I mean, I guess you could go to ground beef or something else, but why do you go do that as a denominator?

MR. BOSI: Because those are the bases of your capital expenditures.

MS. PATTERSON: Right.

MR. BOSI: And this is what we're --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, the cost of a police officer, isn't there a lot more to that than --

MS. PATTERSON: And it will be --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- just equipment and --

MS. PATTERSON: Similar to libraries and some of the other facilities, there are -- there's books, there's equipment, there's furniture. In the case of law enforcement there's patrol cars. We'll be able to express that better through some sort of square footage or square footage type of number versus police officer. Because it's not indicative of what they actually have for police officers. So when we do our calculation, we're coming up with a number that's completely different than the number of officers they actually have serving the public. So it's confusing.

We're not saying that we're not going to acknowledge those things that we're needing for a police officer, but rather we're finding a different way to express those items: The cars, the equipment, the building.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. But the square footage is confusing to me, so if you do find another way --

MS. PATTERSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- I'll be --

MS. PATTERSON: The whole way it's done has been confusing.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Just out of curiosity now, what is the square footage of a 1.96 police officer?

MR. BOSI: Well, I think that's the Rosetta Stone that we haven't been able to provide to you.

MS. PATTERSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So the confusion is well justified?

MS. PATTERSON: Yes.

MR. BOSI: And it was something that we squared away at the beginning of the impact fee study update, that we asked the consultant to look around and find out a better way to express it.

And the one thing that Amy had noted to me was that Tindale-Oliver had recognized that officers per thousand or officers per population was a standard methodology throughout the state in terms of how you express a level of service. We just asked them for how do we translate that into a more straightforward representation to put before the advisory boards and the Board of County Commissioners, and that's what we're hoping for within the impact fee update.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: One comment. The phrase building square footage only shows up in this level of service description. You know, when you say building square footage to support the number of police officers, why don't we just get rid of it? Because you're not showing any square footage from that point on.

I mean, the whole analysis is one point, is the number of police officers per thousand.

MS. PATTERSON: I think --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: There's never square footage popping up again.

So other than -- I mean, what am I missing here? Everybody says they're confused, so I guess I've just joined the club.

MS. PATTERSON: I think we had refined down the level of service standard from last year. I think we might have shown it in two lines. And this year -- because I think we had some more information in there about building square footage. I could be wrong, but I think we were trying to help and maybe made it even more confusing than it was to begin with.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah, last year you didn't have the word square footage.

MS. PATTERSON: Okay.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But why drag square footage into this? And you say oh, because the libraries do it. We'll have that conversation --

MR. BOSI: No, no, no.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- there. I mean, as the world evolves, the last thing in the world that brings with it as square footage is denominators.

MR. BOSI: Because the basis of what we're doing is building, we're constructing square footage, we're constructing space to house officers. And that correlates to our levels of service. We say we're going to have 1.96 officers per thousand. We have to build space to be able to accommodate that levels of service that we're proposing. And that's why it's tied back to that space, because we can't -- we have to have a place for these officers to be able to do the jobs and the tasks that's performed. Whether it's when they're out from the field inside, you know, back to their home base locations, they have to have a place to work and to process and do the things that they need to do. I mean, that's why --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah, among other things.

MR. BOSI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And therefore, why did you take that one thing? And you don't have to answer. It's just that the building square footage I think is a -- I mean, that doesn't make any sense. And the number of police officers --

MR. BOSI: Yeah, because it's not -- and you're right, it's misleading in the sense that that is not the -- that's not the only component that goes up into making the cost to provide for --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I mean, you could choose horsepower for his car, that would make as much sense to me.

Okay, enough said.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: We had this discussion last year as well. When you look down and it says officers and then value cost, officers are not really individual officers, that's just the square footage for those officers.

So I think yeah, it's time to rethink how it's expressed so that everybody gets it. And it should be gettable for everybody in the world, not just for Mike Bosi or for you, Amy, or the Chief.

MS. PATTERSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And if I may chime in, they don't own the building, but they own the police cars; do they not?

MR. BOSI: Oh, we -- and I'm not sure in terms of the ownership. I know we construct the buildings in budget for the construction of their buildings. I'm not sure --

CHIEF SMITH: I can help you with that.

By state statute, the Sheriff is forbidden to own real estate.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Right.

CHIEF SMITH: So he certifies need to the county and then the county includes it in their capital works plan, and that's how we get our space.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: So in this effort to try to capture everything, while square feet are included, we also include the equipment, which is the police cars and so forth. However they have to be budgeted separately, don't they?

CHIEF SMITH: They are.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: So it's kind of compounded.

CHIEF SMITH: And I'm not sure if this is going to help at all, because I've got to tell you, I'm just as confused as anybody sitting here as to why we do this. And every year I think to myself, there's no relevance, why do we report it, you know, like this? And so I understand your frustration and share it.

But as a separate independent Constitutional officer, the Sheriff doesn't go to the county for anything other than his buildings. Everything else regarding operational issues, regarding how he'll staff, all of that stuff, he is free to develop whatever plan he wants. And he just submits his budget to the county, certifying as a chief law enforcement officer that this is what it takes to do the job.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Yeah. Now I realize that's true. But is it not also true that Skip takes care of the buildings and the sheriffs, you take care of the equipment purchases, the capital acquisitions. You or another...
person. I'm talking about the police cars and so forth.

Would it serve us -- and this is truly a question -- would it serve us to have a reference, if you will, the square footage that's relevant to one part of it and then the other capital equipment, so that we can see that the composition of 1.96 really is representative of those components? Does that make any sense?

MR. BOSI: I think it makes sense, but I'm not sure if that's the appropriate manner or way to display the information, because of the unknown that we have specifically made the request to have the level of service express itself in a more straightforward manner to the impact fee consultants, and they're going to provide recommendations to us in terms of how to make the necessary modifications.

And that impact fee study will be brought before the Board of County Commissioners in December, and those options will be available.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: We have next year.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHIEF SMITH: It seems to me, Commissioner Murray, that what we do is we take the cost of providing that deputy and then we somehow, you know, take that associative cost and we convert it to what we know the cost of a square foot to be so that we're all operating with the same universal currency, so to speak, and then that's the way it's reported.

But certainly to me, I understand what you're saying, and it's the same thing that we think would be beneficial as well, identify the cost of furnishing a deputy and tell us what it is so that we can see that this is what --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Basically that's really it. And if Tindale-Oliver does a good job for us, fine.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: The thing you're going to do in December, is that going to come down to a square foot cost?

MR. BOSI: I'm not sure what the options -- impact fee consultant, I just don't know what they're going to provide for us to be able to, you know, address the specific issue that -- you're right, we were -- this is the same discussion we had last year, and we expressed the difficulty. And I remember it was -- I believe it was -- if it wasn't a recommendation, it was a statement that was made a couple times that the Planning Commission would like to see a better way to express the level of service standard.

And when we were in -- this past spring when we were in negotiations with Tindale-Oliver about updating this, those comments were echoed and forwarded to the consultant based upon these concerns that have been expressed today.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So we're going to leave it this year so we can have it again next year. So it will be next year --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: No, it should be solved by next year, Brad.

MR. BOSI: With the adoption of the impact fee study --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: We'll see. I mean, if it's a square foot cost it will never make sense to me. Because I think what Bob is saying is correct, is that there's a lot of different categories --

MR. BOSI: Yes, serious --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- some of which you're building, some -- and that's nice that that's even separate so that the county knows what they have to deal with and mix it into theirs.

And the other is the equipment and everything else. And I think that for us that's how we can see if in fact everything is taken care of for the use and inventory.

MR. BOSI: And as part of the draft, they have the total capital cost for, you know, provision of law enforcement services. And four percent is land value, 38 percent is building value, 58 percent is equipment value. And this type of information will be shared with you as part of the AUIR. We'll give you those keys towards what you're breaking down.

So these are areas that are being explored right now with the impact fee consultant.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay, that --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So maybe we won't have this next year.

MR. BOSI: I will strive to make sure that we don't have this discussion.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: This AUIR, looking at our notes, it's definitely a form of deja vu.

MR. BOSI: Yes.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: The -- can you take the word building square footage out this year then?
MR. BOSI: Absolutely.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: All the way to support and just use the same factor? Last year we had no
discussion of building square footage.
MR. BOSI: Absolutely.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I would make a motion.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead, Mr. Murray.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: That we recommend approval of the 2010 AUIR summary for law
enforcement. I guess that should be sufficient on its own.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And I'll second it under the assumption it includes removing the building
square footage --
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Correct.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- that you referenced.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: That would be correct.
MR. BOSI: Noted.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I think that was acknowledged.
MR. BOSI: Acknowledged.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All in favor?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.
Any opposed?
(No response.)
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All right, thank you.
CHIEF SMITH: Thank you very much.
MR. BOSI: Thank you, Chief.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: ***All right. Next, county libraries.
MS. MATTHES: Marilyn Matthies, Library Director.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Welcome, Marilyn.
MS. MATTHES: We have no construction projects planned for the foreseeable future. Otherwise, do you
have any questions for the library?
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Anybody, questions?
Mr. Murray?
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I'm toying with -- you do it -- I didn't remember from last year that we were
doing it for five years. But it turns out I guess that's a good way of going about it.
The impact fees anticipated, last year you projected 960,648. Did you ever get anywhere near that number?
MS. MATTHES: 500,000 -- no, five? That was a five-year estimate last year.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Let's have you come up and speak on the mic. That would be better
for Cherie' and for the record. Thanks.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: You're right, and thank you for correcting me. It is for five years. But it's a
rolling number, isn't it? Or is it? Because you had a prior number.
MS. USHER: Hi. Susan Usher, from Office of Management and Budget.
It's a five-year number. Every year we update it, depending on what's going on in the market. And all we can
do is based on what's happening today and projecting out, based on population growth.
So if today we're at a very low number and population growth is only two percent, then we take today's
number and grow it by two percent. That's how we do the calculation on all the impact fees --
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: That's straightforward.
MS. USHER: -- in Category B.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Straightforward and it's honest, and that's a good way of going. I guess.
But I just -- you know, looking at it, when you say to yourself -- because we know that the impact fees
received have been very small.
MS. USHER: Yes, they have.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: So when we see a number that although it's declined and it's -- again, I
marked it five years, still, you just -- you know, it provokes the question, gee, I wonder what we did get to. Because
otherwise it's a -- it could be construed as a filler. And no, I said could be construed that way. You've said how it's
done, which is honest.
MS. USHER: It's calculated.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And -- excuse me, we have an uncle over here that's not behaving.
I just was concerned that we are in a state of decline, it is declining, your numbers are declining, but not by
enough to make me wonder.
And so that's how you do it.
MS. USHER: Uh-huh. I do it on all of the category B's that way, the calculation. I look at where we are
today and then I grow it by the population growth.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And for Marilyn, I have the question which is inevitable because it was the
question we asked last time.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thank you for that.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Thank you.
You assigned -- and that's been a constant, you assign $25 an item, no matter what the item is. And how real
is that in terms of today? And I know that it's a conglomeration from the highs and the lows and so forth.
MS. MATTHES: It truly is an average. And it's really maintained that value for a number of years. Because
of the higher value books, we aren't buying as much of anymore. More of that information is available on line
through data bases on the Internet. So we're not buying those really expensive books in as large quantities as we used
to. So the $25 is still a viable number.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Because you're -- and I don't want you to go crazy with this, but my
supposition then would be that that being the case, if it represented a significant or fairly significant number in terms
of those costs and you're not buying as many, that suggests that with that same $25 we're able to buy other items such
as CD's or DVD's in greater numbers? Is that a reasonable statement?
MS. MATTHES: We're -- not really. We're spending the money that we have. And the average cost per
item is about $25. Whether we're buying more items than we used to, probably not. We certainly had an influx of
money to purchase materials for the new South Regional Library.
And if you noticed, a few years ago we were under what our level of service was for a number of items. But
once South Regional opened we really caught up with that number. So we're actually a little bit ahead of the level of
service now.
That's also partly resons -- in a response to our staff decreasing. We don't have as many staff members to
actually weed out the old materials, and so they're staying on our shelves longer, but we also have more space to hold
them. So, you know, it's just a balancing act --
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I hear it.
MS. MATTHES: -- at this point.
So are we buying more quantity materials? No. We don't have as many people to process those materials
either. But the materials are actually staying on our shelves longer. So maybe we have a travel book that that we
should have gotten rid of two years ago, maybe we have some travel books that -- or finance books or investment
books that really are out of date and we really haven't had staff to get rid of them from our collection yet.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay. Well, that's where I was basically leading. Because ultimately when
you do get staff again and you do start restating those kinds of activities -- reinstating -- then the question will become
will you be short? Will $25 be enough to sustain you or will you modulate that to remain at a $25 figure?
MS. MATTHES: Yeah, I think it depends on the market at the time. And it depends on -- we look at the cost
per items annually. So right now it's still okay. Will it be okay next year? Certainly I can't predict that. But it's okay
right now.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I just wondered if 25 was still a good number.
MS. MATTHES: It is.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Because it's been a number now for what, five years?
MS. MATTHES: Pretty close to that.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Yeah. And as a composite, you know, we've had inflationary and we've had deflationary.
MS. MATTHES: You can think of it this way: We used to buy large reference materials for all of our libraries. Not every title for every library; some of the smaller libraries didn't get the, you know, real expensive titles. So we've cut down -- initially we cut down on the quantity that we did get and now we're actually even reducing that quantity further. So, you know, it's a gradual step.
And we aren't really noticing a lack of need of service for those large purchases that we no longer make, because the information is available elsewhere.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And that would bring me to the last part of this, which would be the issues of complaints. You would know by the number and type of complaint whether or not you're satisfying the marketplace, so to speak. And you're not in any sort of situation where we're getting a lot of complaints about the absence of or --
MS. MATTHES: No, no, we aren't. We have an easy complaint method on our website and people can easily ask us. If they're not asking in person, we have a comment section. And I seldom hear that oh, you got rid of that expensive finance guide. Most often we hear, I'm 60th on the waiting list for this new best seller, when am I ever going to get it? That's the comment that we get.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: It's a different kind of complaint, right.
MS. MATTHES: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Thank you.
MS. MATTHES: You're welcome.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Anybody else?
Go ahead, Mr. Schiffer.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And first of all, this might be a good role model for the last thing, because they have buildings separated from in this case items. In that case you might want buildings and equipment or something.
But anyway, this is just like I think housekeeping stuff. The unit cost we have, $25 per volume, we can change that be item too, right? And these are things we did last year --
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: I think we did last year.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: -- and never caught up with it. But we'll -- three or four years we'll get it.
The revenues, the impact fee allocated to new books should be items, don't you agree? I mean, let's just make it all items. I mean, the new people here are having trouble, maybe.
MR. BOSI: On page --
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Under revenues. Yeah, I'm on Page 134. You have a unit cost of $25 per volume. So that's (sic) should be per item.
This is really important stuff we're doing here now. But I guess if we go back and back and back. We have to spend time.
Under revenues, it's allocated to new not books but items. Do you see it, Mike? You look puzzled.
MR. BOSI: Yeah, uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. And then down under revenues it says library materials. Just say library items might be good there also, just so that it's clear.
And then the only other thing, it just dawned on me when you were talking, you know when you put the books out for sale on the table and we buy them and put them on E-Bay and sell them for more? Why don't you just sell them to E-Bay and make -- you know, just the handling scam will make you rich. So --
MS. MATTHES: Staffing. Staffing.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, get some high school volunteer group to run E-Bay auctions of your stuff rather than --
MS. MATTHES: We actually accept donations from the public in the name of our Friends of the Library,
and they go through and pull out the most expensive items, and they do sell them on E-Bay.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. Because everybody buys one of those dollar books, they're going to run home and sell it on E-Bay. Maybe a couple will read it, then sell it on E-Bay.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Do we have any other questions?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I have one more.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead, Melissa.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: It looks like as far as the buildings, there's years worth of inventory left. In terms of the actual items, you're showing a need in 2012, '13, which will probably be remedied by the new BEBR.

But in terms of impact fees, how is that split? Which is paid first? Whatever's deficient?

MS. MATTHES: Impact fees are used to purchase growth books intended for new population.

Replacement books, if we're replacing an investment title, a best seller, they're really purchased all essentially together. Although different funds can be charged for different parts of an order.

We're ordering actually probably on a weekly basis to make sure that the books and materials and items come in at a regular rate, as opposed to all coming in at the first of the month and nothing coming in after that.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Okay

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. On your operational statistics at the back of this report, any surprises for you there? Anything that you were not expecting?

MS. MATTHES: No, not really. Our use of electronic materials, our downloadable books, our language programs that are on line now instead of on a CD are certainly increasing in usage. More people are using those on-line resources than have been in the past. And certainly it's a much easier collection to manage than a physical collection.

Jail population seems to be going down. Our jail circulation seems to be going down. We're affected by everything else that everybody is affected by. If tourism is down in the wintertime, certainly our peak months, January through March, April, are -- have less circulation. So we're similar to everybody else.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I have one more.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Can downloadable books be overdue?

MS. MATTHES: No, they can't. They disappear from your Ipod, your MP3 player, or they become disabled, you actually have to take them out. So there are no overdues for downloadable books.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: So we lose the currency on that.

MS. MATTHES: We do.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll do it, if you want. And it will be two motions. First one will be for -- recommend we forward with approval 2010 AUIR for library buildings.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Second.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay, all in favor?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.

Any opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All right.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Second motion would be that we forward the 2010 AUIR for library materials with a recommendation of approval.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Somebody else?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: I'll second.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thank you, Ms. Ebert.
Thank you. All in favor?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.
And none opposed, I could count that myself.

Thank you. Thank you.

*** And now we are down to Mr. Page, EMS.

CHIEF PAGE: Jeff Page with Emergency Medical Services.

And I'm here to answer any questions. As you can see, really not until the last two years do we really have anything planned out.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Questions?

Go ahead, Melissa.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Again, these numbers from impact fee studies, you're showing you needed -- you didn't need equipment but you need building replacement, land replacement for two -- or not replacement, I'm sorry -- for two --

CHIEF PAGE: Two stations.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: -- new stations, right. And on the front you're showing additional revenues required at the 3 million, 750.

My question is, why use the $900,000 number that was based off of 2006 impact fee study using a 2005 land cost? Why not be more realistic and have a number that may be attainable as opposed to so high?

CHIEF PAGE: Well, our impact fee studies are actually coming before the board I think next month. So that's all going to change.

But those numbers were based on the numbers that we had then. So you're right, they need to be updated, and that's what we're currently doing.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Right. It makes it look like you need a lot more funding than maybe you actually do.

CHIEF PAGE: I understand.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: When is your new study coming up?

CHIEF PAGE: Second meeting in October?

MS. PATTERSON: Yeah.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Second meeting. So we would also have that new information by the time -- on the 21st?

MR. BOSI: No.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: We would not have it on October 21st?

MR. BOSI: No, the second meeting in October is a week after. You guys meet the third week in October.

The second meeting of the BCC would be the fourth week of October.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: No, no, no, the BCC's going to hear them in their first week, which is week two.

MS. PATTERSON: No, the second meeting in October.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Oh, the second meeting. Okay, I'm sorry, I thought he said the second week in October.

MS. PATTERSON: We'll have the recommendation to the board ready by the October 21st -- by your meeting on October 21st. That executive summary will be loaded and ready to go to the board. You just won't have the benefit of the board's action.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Right, right. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, that thing we continued won't have the benefit of the board's action, which means it will be still hypothetical.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yeah.
Go ahead, Mr. Murray.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: No, let's --

MS. PATTERSON: Sorry, excuse me.

The one you continued, transportation, is going to the board September 28th.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay, never mind.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Jeff, I realize that you bill customers of EMS, and I know that in many instances you probably don't get the money from them. But in another set of instances, whatever that number may be, you do get refunds from insurance companies and so forth. You get I call it a refund, because it's an expense that you're getting money back.

We don't ever see that explained as revenue. It's not truly revenue in the same sense that you and I might think about it, but it's an offset to expense.

CHIEF PAGE: Correct. Back in 1981 the board then basically decided -- and it varies from location to location, but they decided that they would like to take about 50 percent of what it cost to run EMS from ad valorem taxes and base the fees on the other 50 percent.

And any given year, I mean, you're making a guess of what you're going to collect in revenue. But typically this year I think we ran about 2,000 more calls than we did the previous year, so our revenues are up a little bit. But it's --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, your expenses are also up, too, likely.

CHIEF PAGE: Well.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: If you planned for 20 helicopter activities and you had 30, at $1,000 a mile -- what is it, 1,000 a mile, something like that? One year you said something about $1,000 or something like that.

CHIEF PAGE: Or, the cost per hour of the helicopter.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Per hour, that's what it was.

CHIEF PAGE: Yeah, that's about a thousand --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Per mile was a little high. Per hour is not cheap either.

What I'm driving at is that when you use -- you know, you use this for one purpose and that's another, I realize that. But what I'm driving at is let's say in one year that you had 30 calls and 17 of them you got refunds from the insurance companies. Your budget will be operating a little happier on that basis.

Do you reflect that in your budget then, just as you have here, carry forward, is that reflective of a little bit of how shall we say, float?

CHIEF PAGE: Well, any additional money that we collect in revenue for the most part goes right back to the general fund. I mean, it's not something that we necessarily carry forward.

But this last year the board allowed us, because we did so well on collections last year in revenue, we actually were able to take that surplus and purchase some of the -- replace some of the ambulances that were deteriorating. We were behind and still are on those replacement schedules.

But it's just based on whatever budget that we end up with what -- we reduce like every other department, you know, and you've got to go from there.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, unfortunately unlike every other department you're running at a deficit in terms of time, which is response time, and you're running in a deficit in area. And I understand you have battalion chiefs or whatever you guys call them running around in their cars operating as, how shall we say, logistically there. They're troubadours, okay. And I don't know if that represents a significant additional expense or a benefit to you.

And have you determined that yet? Because I know that was a stopgap method associated in part with the issues with the fire departments.

CHIEF PAGE: Well, not necessarily. The intent there with the MedCom, is what we call it, Medical Command. But the intent with the MedComs is is that they backfill vacancies and zones where maybe I have a unit transporting into the hospital, they may backfill that vacancy.

They're not really a replacement for the fire departments, because the fire departments still respond as a first responder. They've never quit doing that. So there really was no connection with the MedComs coming on board. It was another method to help us backfill concurrent calls. We have problems with, you know, calls appearing in the same zone, sometimes as many as three or four. And so you try to get a MedCom in there, they can go to the most serious calls. And they do serve a supervisory type position in the fact that they're an additional medical command, so
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Well, sorry for the misjudgment I made about it being associated with the fire department. But I knew that I thought it was a good idea. And I just wondered if you determined whether or not that is actually beneficial financially for you or it doesn't matter whether it's beneficial for you, it's an idea that has to stay.

CHIEF PAGE: Well, it is something that's really working out for us, and I'll tell you why. I think I told you last year that about 65 percent -- and this number is pretty static -- but about 65 percent of the time when we respond, it doesn't result in a transport. In other words, there are automatic responses, like a car accident where people call in, we respond.

But what we found is that with so few -- and I consider it few -- when you're only transporting about 40 percent of the calls that you're responding to, it's actually better to have less transports and more response capability, all right?

So what we did in just this last year, we noticed that 75 percent of the flights that the helicopter was responding, say an accident on the Alley, at a certain mile marker they would automatically fly out. Well, 75 percent of those times there wasn't a transport required. And once we realized that we said, you know what, we're not going to send a helicopter till we get someone on scene and they verify that there's a need for a transport.

So we've taken that measure. And, you know, EMS is all about that. I mean, every year you're looking at different ways to skin the cat. And that's just one of the things you do, you adapt. So it's -- you know, I don't know what we'll be doing next year.

And the other thing, I would tell you this, is that four and five years out when you're looking at the AUIR, I don't even know if I'll need those stations then. Because where I think I need them this year, it may not be the case next year. And it keeps changing.

And if you go back in the books, you'll see sometimes where our growth stations that we planned out seven, 10 years out, things like this, they change, because the call volume is actually more concentrated here now.

So those are some of the things. And, you know, the other opportunity, we do have joint stations with some of these fire districts. So who's to say, I may not even need to build this station. We may just collocate with somebody else at a different location.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Yeah, you hardly have any variables in your occupation, I see.

CHIEF PAGE: I'm about the only thing that stands from year to year.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I'm done.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Other questions?

Go ahead, Melissa.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Do you ever consider modular buildings as opposed to --

CHIEF PAGE: Actually, we were looking -- one of the stations that we have or the land that we have at Logan and Vanderbilt, we were looking at possibly putting a trailer there on a pad. But once we got with facilities and they had, you know, actually looked at what the cost associated with that -- because we were going to do it as a temporary measure. But it really wasn't that big a savings.

We currently run out of one at Ave Maria currently. We're staffed there jointly with Immokalee Fire Department. And I think in the next year or two they're due to build a joint facility for both fire, EMS and law enforcement there.

So we take those opportunities when we can get them. But modular for whatever reason just didn't work out. It was something I was really interested in. Because I thought I could just take this thing and move it to the next spot.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: That's what I was thinking.

CHIEF PAGE: But it didn't really work out that well because of permitting and there's a lot of requirements with it.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: That's a shock.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I have one other question, if I may. If you were done. Are you done?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I'm done.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: This just occurred to me, that if Jacks. Labs go forward and if they then have a hospital out there, that might tend to relieve things, providing that hospital is established to operate as we would say, a general hospital.
Have you begun the thought of exploring that, or poking into that?

CHIEF PAGE: Well, I can tell you this: I was just meeting with hospital officials, both with Naples Community Hospital and then HMA at the Pine Ridge facility, and it works a lot better for us when we have multiple destinations that we can transport to. When we just had Naples Community Hospital before -- I mean, right now Marco residents can actually go to the HMA facility on Collier Boulevard there. It's much closer than the NCH facility.

So what we're always looking to do is at the point the hospitals can get their cardiac care up to a level that allows for us to transport them, for the most part serious heart attacks go to the main campus at NCH downtown. But now just recently there's been a cardiologist group that's going to be working out of the Pine Ridge facility, which will allow us to transport there as well. So we won't have to bypass that facility now to go to the hospital.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: There'll also be at Collier as well.

CHIEF PAGE: Right.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I can assure you of that.

CHIEF PAGE: Yeah, we're always looking for that. And certainly any opportunity -- both facilities have offered us in the past and currently the ability to run out of their facilities to use as a station, so to speak. So that's something we're also interested in.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And I don't want to tell you your job, and I'm not suggesting that I'm trying to tell you your job, but the thought occurred, inasmuch as that hospital may be a teaching hospital or a specialty hospital, maybe getting a poke in early to try to see whether or not regardless of what it ultimately turns out, maybe there's a section there that could be the receiving and treatment for at least some aid, qualified aid there, as opposed to that long trip in even to Pine Ridge is a nice trip.

CHIEF PAGE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Other questions?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I move that the 2010 AUIR for emergency medical services be forwarded with a recommendation of approval.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Second.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All those in favor?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.

CHIEF PAGE: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: ***Now we're down to government buildings.

MR. JONES: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Hank Jones from the Department of Facilities Management. Our general government building AUIR has no new construction in the next five years and very little in the outgoing years, other than a couple of projects which continue to roll from year to year, as needs arise.

Do you have any questions?

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Any questions?

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Oh, yes. Could you imagine.

The $345.58 unit cost, what period of time is that from, the last impact fee study?

MR. JONES: No, that's basically the number that I've developed here looking at past costs for facilities that we've just completed. But factoring in some very difficult relationships between the work we're now doing, which is a lot of conversion work, purchase and convert, which is entirely different than building new structures. So I've tried to temper down the cost and project forward what I think a new building would cost us. It's way down from what it was in 2007.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Yeah, and I know that there's a double asterisk statement here, representative
projects. So which of course makes one question what, you know, representative in your case as professional you're taking those eligible and they're eligible because? Can you help me with just --

MR. JONES: Well, since the title is general government building, I didn't use the emergency service center, because that was a much more complicated type of building. But I used predominantly the courthouse annex and some of the fleet facilities. More general maintaining service type buildings.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I thank you for that, because I think that's a more effective way of doing business.

And I also note too that the impact fee anticipated is 1,123,648 less than '09. Wow, you really did take the cut, didn't you?

MR. JONES: Well, and I think -- I don't know what's coming out, but I know I've been doing a lot of work with the impact fee study that's going on right now. So I'm waiting as well to see what finally comes out of it.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: And my final question/statement is: You have in available inventory 28,721 square feet over '09. Was that the acquisition of the former Elks Lodge?

MR. JONES: I'm sorry, which line are you looking at? Over '09?

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I'm talking about the available inventory.

MR. JONES: Well, yeah. And you said in 910, that 27,556 is the Elks Lodge facility that came on line.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Okay. Just wanted to be very clear that it is.

Those take care of my questions.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Anyone else?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I have one.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead, Brad.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And it goes to, you're going to get 3.1 million to pay back the solid waste loan?

MR. JONES: That portion is just for the purchase of the property, the Elks property.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Right, which you borrowed from solid waste.

MR. JONES: That's right. And in addition we borrowed the construction cost. But the total package, which I think was 5.8 million, is being paid back over eight years by the avoidance of the lease payment that we were making, which was 626 odd thousand dollars per year.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: But it shows us on Page 211 you're going to pay down 630,000. In other words -- so you're keeping some of that revenue from that appraiser's rent for operations?

MR. JONES: I need some help.

MS. USHER: Susan Usher from Officer of Management and Budget.

Money was borrowed from the solid waste fund to purchase the property. I believe some -- we rearranged some allocations in the capital-wide capital projects fund, what we call 301, which is usually funded by general fund monies. And I think what we did is rearrange, we collapsed some projects that were completed and then gave additional money so that they could renovate the building.

But the 630 represents the money we borrowed from solid waste, and we're paying it back. So that's the 630 a year over eight years.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And last year, and I guess it shows on that other page, you borrowed four million, 618 dollars from them. And then so you're going to pay them back at 630 a year.

MS. USHER: Plus interest. So that eighth year, it may go into a ninth year. The interest is -- the actual cost of the money per year. Right now interest rates are very low, we're not earning much on our money. But if interest rates were to go up, we have to -- see, utilities has that money -- could have had that money and they could have been earning interest on it all this time. So what we're going to do is pay back the money that they could have earned interest-wise on the county's investments.

So right now the principal is about eight years. It may go into a ninth year, once we figure out the interest aspect of it, because there's costs with that money.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: The revenue is the -- here's -- let me make it simple. Forget the numbers. Is it -- you're getting back a big chunk of money from the property appraiser's rent payment. You're paying a lot less than that back on the note. So in other words --

MS. USHER: No.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: You're not?
MS. USHER: They -- in our budget they had a rent payment at their old site. We rounded up to 630,000. And what we did is we decided to build an amortization schedule that just transferred that amount of money to help pay off that debt with solid waste.

The Property Appraiser -- okay, the -- we paid the rent. Because the board is supposed to supply the facilities to the constitutional officers. So we had a place in our general fund that said this is property appraiser expenditures, but the board has to pay for it.

So every month we made that rent check out and we would send it. And instead of sending it to an outside entity, now we're taking that money and -- or annually with 630,000. So now annually we give that to solid waste to pay them back.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: And I get that. My question comes, though, and this year the revenues show 3.1 million coming from the property appraiser's rent payment used to repay solid waste for Elks Lodge.

MS. USHER: Right.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: That's the thing that's confusing me. In other words, I know what you're doing, in lieu of paying the rent to private citizen, you're paying the rent to the dump for letting you borrow against the money they have for down the road.

MS. USHER: Right. But you take five years and that's what it amounts to.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So what's this 30 -- in other words to me it looks like you're getting 3.1 million.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: It's a five-year figure.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Oh, over the five years.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yeah. It's 630 times five.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: There's where I messed up.
MS. USHER: Yeah, we have to pay the debt back. So I just sort of gave you a little bit more information.

Instead of saying general fund transfer --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yeah, I got it.

MS. USHER: -- to solid waste, I wanted to tie it into the Elks Lodge, and this is about how much money we would have had to pay anyway had the Property Appraiser stayed at the building across the courthouse.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: No, no, that's good. It's washing. The mistake was mine in not understanding the five-year accounting.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Any other questions?
Go ahead, Melissa, you've been waiting very patiently.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Under Owned Facilities on Page 174, the CDES buildings obviously make sense. Why is the Tax Collector not included in the study?
MR. JONES: That's a good question. I don't recall. There were certain ones they didn't include, right?
MS. PATTERSON: Amy Patterson again for the record.

Outside funding source besides impact fees are ad valorem. That's the same reason why CDES isn't in there. Whatever the funding source was for the Tax Collector was one that we put onto the weren't going to include in the study category.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Okay
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Go ahead.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: I'm done.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Oh, okay, that was your only question? All right.

I have just a couple questions, I think.
The future building here, which I recognize is out in these out years, but the building in the Heritage Bay, I'm surprised they're even showing up here any longer. I mean, they should just be wiped off the face of this thing. For all intents and purposes they're meaningless, I think.

MR. JONES: Well, the planning cycle -- I'm sure Mr. Camp can explain, but the planning cycle for a structure like that, if it comes to pass that the BEBR study would indicate that say the economy gets back on the road and that area of the county starts building, the planning cycle has to start. Because it's a 10-year cycle almost to get something like that on the road.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: So you're using a 10-year cycle?
MR. JONES: I'm just throwing that out as that's when a typical planning cycle would start -- would take if you were going to put a major construction project out.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All right. That's stretching.
The -- your current impact fee unit cost, Amy, is $306 per square foot?
MS. PATTERSON: That was the cost in the last full update, which was in 2006.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Right, but we don't have the new one yet, so why isn't that the figure that gets used?
MS. PATTERSON: If they have better representative costs because of current projects, which a lot of the facilities now don't have, then they'll use the impact fee cost. But as that becomes more outdated and if they have a better cost, that's what we've traditionally been using. We're under study now and we know that number's coming down.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: You said earlier that you tried to adjust because you know that you're no longer building new facilities and those always cost more money than refurbishing old, like the Elks Club where you went in and you just rehabbed a building.

Yet one of the buildings you used as a basis was the courthouse construction, and that was all new, so --
MR. JONES: That's correct. Because basically the AUIR is for basically new construction. New buildings.
And so I was looking for representative new structures that we've completed that would be representative of new office structures for the future.

MR. BOSI: And can I -- and really, it goes back to that request that we had earlier where you were mentioning about related to the parks. And a good example is libraries. Libraries we didn't use the impact fee number, we used the number we got from the south library, because that was the last project that we utilized. So we said that's a much better representation of the reality of the construction.

And what Skip and Mr. Jones have tried to do is try to give you what the reality -- a more realistic approach towards -- based upon past experiences what that cost would be.

I think the line of questioning would have been, you know, is it appropriate the ones that we choose, then that's maybe a different field. But the reason why, is when we have better information related than in an impact fee study, if we have more up-to-date unit cost, we want to give you just exactly what you had said, a truer representation of what that real cost would be.

And I think maybe some of the differences are, some of the projects that we chose maybe aren't in your purview as best representing what would be a new project that we're going to put on line.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Well, I guess it just goes back to when that project started and what were the construction costs at that time versus what we're hearing now and what we can foresee over the next five years. And I'm just saying I think that these figures are still a little high.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, I think, Donna, one thing is you've got probably soft costs and other things in there too. Architects, those silly --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Oh, those architects, man, they run it up every time, don't they? Oh, man.

MR. BOSI: And I will reiterate, I know through both of -- between real property efforts and facilities efforts is we're not tied to a cost when we go forward. We look for best value engineering, we look for how we can be as most efficient within the acquisition for any new projects.

So we place this as a place for the accounting purposes, but once again, we stumble that this is not the obligation that we will have --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Yeah, no.
MR. BOSI: -- we will have a much different actual cost when we do identify that next project.
MR. JONES: The other thing that frequently comes up is that the figure that I'm using here is not just a cost per square foot for some cement blocks and wallboard, it's the total project cost, which is the planning of it, the permitting, the hearings, all of that rolled together. This is actual return soup to nuts cost.

I also caution against the fervor of everybody saying oh, well, right now I can get my bathroom remodeled for 10 cents on the dollar what it used to be. The only -- right now the only thing that I've seen is there's been some labor efficiencies that you're getting. The material prices, if you check the indexes, the material prices are not
changing that drastically. And they -- furthermore, all it's going to take is a little kick, I hope, in the economy and all these prices, mark my words, will jump back up quickly.

Because there'll be a -- when people -- there's a built-up need coming to us, and when it breaks, everybody's going to want the same tradesmen, the same materials at the same time. I think materials and everything will catch up. Maybe not go right back to the 2007 levels, which were crazy, but they're going to come back up higher than they are today by a considerable margin, I think. My opinion, though.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: You have a -- we have very few leased situations left.

MR. JONES: That's correct.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: We've been trying to get out of them, I know.

MR. JONES: We are out of all of them except the very few that I've listed.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Except the four that are here on Page 175.

Obviously the FDOT one, I'm not even sure why that one has to be included. For 50 bucks over 10 years, that's the best deal that anybody's ever gotten. So kudos to whoever negotiated that with FDOT.

But the Tax Collector's Office at Greentree and the one at Eagle Creek, those are convenience for the public to some degree or another. And is it in these economic times still really viable to be doing those kind of convenience ones? For example, Greentree is not that far from Orange Blossom where you've got services right there. I mean, it's a matter of a couple of miles. I don't know.

MR. CAMP: That's a -- for the record, Skip Camp.

That's a great observation. And the county manager sent a written document to the constitutional officers to try to collapse some of those convenient leases. The Tax Collector was adamant about keeping those two. But we absolutely thought that it's not that far, this is a great facility at the North Collier Government Service Center. They could handle it. But the Tax Collector as a constitutional officer decided he wanted to keep those two locations. But that point is well taken.

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Okay. Well, I mean, as a planner I see that personally I love Greentree, but I just don't -- I don't see it as -- you know, I mean, there's a couple hundred thousand dollars a year that could go back into other things that are -- would seem to be a lot more vital. Anyway, that's just my personal comment.

I guess we're going to need a motion here, if nobody else has any --

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Yeah, I --

ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: -- further questions.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: -- have one question of Mike.

Given that -- you know, and I heard you and I understand you and I agree with you, it's a pent-up demand and that demand will initially or within short order exceed capability to produce. But it will flatten out.

However, if BEBR were to give us numbers at some percentage higher than what he has as realistic costs, when would you start pulling the horn, you know, making the noise that there's something strange here?

MR. BOSI: One, I would say that the relationship between BEBR and whatever costs that government facilities could come up with are -- there's no connection. BEBR allocates population projections, and the population projections really have no relationship to unit cost for construction.

Where -- if we kept continually the BEBR projections that were provided for us year after year not materializing, I think that's when we would go back to our conversation with the Board of County Commissioners saying is BEBR medium still the appropriate rate of growth for this county based upon whatever window, or whatever the statistical sample, as long as it was significant enough that we felt that we no longer were in that environment, we no longer felt the growth that BEBR was projecting at the medium level. We'd have to go back to the Board of County Commissioners and engage the Department of Community Affairs in that discussion in saying, you know, based upon the past four years there has been a minimal population increase, but the population projections that have been provided by your designated source has been much higher than what has been realized; therefore, we think it appropriate to go to BEBR low population projections.

And that would be the appropriate action if we did find ourselves in that scenario towards where they were always grossly over-estimating what we were to expect in that five and 10-year window.

COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Thank you. I guess I really wanted to say the impact fee study but stop, you've already answered my question.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All right, motion?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I move that (sic) the 2010 AUIR with a recommendation of approval for
government buildings.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: Second.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Second.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: All those in favor?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.
Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: That brings us to the end.
Now, obviously we don't have anybody here from the public. Amy, do you want to speak to us again?
Okay. Then I'll entertain an motion.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Well, first of all, Friday meeting is not necessary.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Not necessary.
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: So I move we close the AUIR hearings for 2010.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: I second.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Thank you.
All in favor?
COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.
COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.
ACTING CHAIRWOMAN CARON: Aye.
We're out of here.

***************

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by order of the Chair at 2:10
p.m.
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