LET IT BE REMEMBERED, that the Conservation Collier Land Acquisition Advisory Committee, in and for the County of Collier, having conducted business herein, met on this date at 9:00 PM in REGULAR SESSION in Board Meeting Room E third floor, Administration Building, of the Government Complex, 3301 East Tamiami Trail, Naples, Florida with the following members present:

Ed Carlson  
Michael Delate  
Wayne Jenkins  
Will Kriz  
Linda Lawson  
Bill Poteet  
Kathy Prosser-Chairperson

Collier County Staff: Alexandra Sulecki, Program Coordinator;  
Cindy Erb, Senior Property Acquisition Specialist;  
Mike Pettit, Chief Assistant, County Attorney’s Office;  
William Lorenz, Director, Environmental Services Department
The Conservation Collier Land Acquisition Advisory Committee meeting was called to order by the Chairperson, Kathy Prosser, Monday June 14th, 2004 at 9:00 am.

I. Roll Call

Ellin Goetz was excused; Marco Espinar was absent.

II. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Carlson is interested in discussing the mileage rate and cap issue. This discussion is slated to occur under the item “Committee Member Comments.”

Ms. Sulecki corrects error under item III (minutes are from June 14th not May 10th).

Mr. Poteet moves to approve the agenda; Mr. Jenkins seconds.

Motion to approve agenda was passed unanimously 7-0.

III. Approval of June 14, 2004 Minutes

Mr. Jenkins moves to approve the agenda; Mr. Carlson seconds.

Motion to approve minutes passed unanimously 7-0.

IV. Old Business

A. Update on Status of First Cycle A-list Properties – Real Estate Services Department

Cindy Erb reports:
- Closed Visnich on July 1st. Transportation purchased a small piece which was reflected amendments.
- American Business Park is scheduled to close on September 22nd.
- Gionet scheduled to close July 30th.
- Malt – Alex will present information on this.
- Talon & Fleishmann – still waiting for advisement.
- Golden Gate Estates Unit 53 – all agreements executed, asking for recommendation under New Business, closings in September and October.

Ms. Prosser asks about Malt. Ms. Erb Alex will be updating us on that; there has been some new developments.

Ms. Prosser congratulates the staff for an excellent job and Ms. Erb also extends appreciation to Ellen Chadwell of the County Attorney’s Office for her service.
Mr. Poteet asks if the workload is manageable. Ms. Erb replies that she has no problem with the workload.

Linda Lawson questions the survey for American Business Park; when was it completed?
Ms. Erb: American Business Park supplied the survey from and she agrees to confirm the date it was completed.

Ms. Lawson expresses concern for having up-to-date survey information completed prior to closing. Can we request updated surveys, would that be our expense? An updated survey should be required on larger parcels. Even if the seller’s provide something that is one to two years, she thinks an updated survey should be required.

Chuck Carrington replies that as a policy, a survey is not done for properties purchased by the county. If required, this can be done at the expense of Conservation Collier. If this board wants property surveyed we can do that. The problem is that it is not easy for the county to do that. We would need a purchase order and would need to receive bids; we would have to check with purchasing to see if we could just order a survey.

Mr. Delate: What specifically are you concerned about?

Ms. Prosser: Can I suggest that we move ahead on American Business Park. Linda, perhaps you can think ahead on future properties how you want to address this and bring something back to the committee.

Ms. Lawson: I’m satisfied that this point has been raised and on a large parcel I would like to review it on a case by case basis to decide if a survey should be required. It’s not that I have any fears, it’s just that I do this for a living and what I was initially suggesting was that between Cindy Erb and our closing attorney that the existing survey could be reviewed. Perhaps our attorney may raise the issue that she wants that updated. I think approaching this on a case by case basis would be the way to go.

Mr. Delate: I would agree with you on that.

V. New Business

A. Approval of Agreements for Sale and Purchase (pending return of signed contracts)

   a. NGGE Unit 53 properties

Alexandra Sulecki reports.
- Avatar (1.14 acres) The estimate was $4,700 - $6,400. The actual price was $10,700; with administrative costs of $900 the total was $11,600.
- Beardsley (3.79 acres) The estimate was $10,700 - $29,300. The actual price was $38,000; with administrative costs of $1200 the total was $39,200.
Beardsley (1.14 acres) The estimate was $4,700 - $6,400. The actual price was $10,700; with administrative costs of $900 the total was $11,600.

Cassidy (1.14 acres) The estimate was $4,700 - $6,400. The actual price was $10,700; with administrative costs of $900 the total was $11,600.

Hamilton (1.59 acres) The estimate was $4,400 - $9,000. The actual price was $15,000; with administrative costs of $1000 the total was $16,000.

Hanson (2.27 acres) The estimate was $11,700 - $18,800. The actual price was $25,000; with administrative costs of $1100 the total was $26,100.

McBride (1.14 acres) The estimate was $6,400 - $9,000. The actual price was $10,700; with administrative costs of $900 the total was $11,600.

Stewart (1.14 acres) The estimate was $6,400 - $9,000. The actual price was $10,700; with administrative costs of $900 the total was $11,600.

Zak (2.73 acres) The estimate was $10,300 - $13,400. The actual price was $30,000; with administrative costs of $1100 the total was $31,100.

Ms. Prosser asks why the estimates are significantly lower than the purchase price. Mr. Carrington reports that the property values are drastically rising due to the nature of the market in Collier County and the affect of Avé Maria to the Golden Gate Estates area. The next batch of estimates will be more accurate.

B. Second Cycle Property Presentations

Ms. Sulecki indicates information on maps and presents several slides to illustrate the information.

Please consider the following as I present these to you, we did not consider these in our last cycle:

- Distribution – illustrates this concept on the map, “Equitable geographic distribution.” There are levels of services for parks in Collier County. Our lands will not replace those; they will be in addition to. You may want to consider this concept as you develop your rank list.

- Complementarity – We are given a list of preferred habitats with an order of preference. Our goal is to identify the most efficient network of protection. This is a difficult and sometimes impossible task due to several factors. Given this challenge we can use complementarity which is defined as the degree to which a single area or subset of areas represent the total number of criteria found in a system or adds unrepresented attributes to the whole.

- Connectivity – the maps illustrate some technical problems. All PUD areas are not mapped. We want to consider how our pieces connect.

a. Hamilton

- This is an Urban Green Space
- Located in the Gateway Triangle redevelopment area
- The zoning is commercial, light commercial and single family residences
- Surrounding land uses is residential and commercial
- Vegetative is Pine Flatwood
- There is the opportunity for educational value from a nearby elementary school.
Management will be easy because exotics are low. A more complicated issue would be that the area is sometimes inhabited by vagrants; we will have to consider this with keeping visibility and asking the sheriff’s department to patrol the area.

Mr. Kriz: Is there access to this property other than the two lots on the north?
Ms. Sulecki: Not that I am aware of.

b. Maison
- Vegetative is almost all cabbage palm
- High exotics
- Miller canal 750 feet to the east
- There was evidence of drainage and fire in the past.
- Old linear clearings helped exotics come in
- Market value is $180,000 - $200,000
- Parcel is surrounded by non-conservation rural lands
- Land cover maps show no Cypress but some stumps
- The parcel is not in a well field protection zone
- We had a panther point and a couple of black bear points
- Natural Ecology has been disturbed
- No Public Access – No visibility
- Walking is the only Resource Based Recreation
- Management requires removal of exotics, which are less than 25%, but will be difficult due to no access.

c. Collier County School Board Magnolia Pond Drive
- Urban
- Small portion is in well field protection zone overlay (indicated on map)
  Outer protection zone – 20 year zone
- One 17.5 acre parcel
- Unusual access configuration
- Vegetative – forest & prairie
- There is access for nature based recreation, fishing, potential boat launch
- Good access, visibility, multiple types of resource based recreation, borders greenway
- Market value is $1.2 to $1.4 million.
- Management – no hydrologic changes necessary, exotics are low

Mr. Poteet states if the parcel is not adjacent to the canal itself. Ms. Sulecki confirms that there is an easement

Mr. Jenkins: Where is the additional property related to this property?
Ms. Sulecki explains that the other parcel fits with this parcel like a puzzle piece, indicating the map.

Ms. Prosser asks about the nearby development.
Ms. Sulecki replies that this development is Noah’s Landing.
Mr. Poteet adds that Golden Gate High School is also adjacent to the parcel and there are plans to build an Elementary school.

Mr. Carlson: All of these properties have limited ecological value, I would like input from Parks & Recreation.
Ms. Sulecki: For each property we send a list and a map with folios to a number of different departments including Parks and Recreation. This is one of the only ones we received a response.
Mr. Carlson: A letter in the portfolio would be fine

Mr. Poteet: This is the only property in Commissioner District 3.

Mr. Jenkins asks about the possibility of the bridge connecting from Golden Gate City.
Mr. Poteet: There is a Golden Gate Civic Association Meeting to discuss the possibility of the Tropicana Bridge.

Nancy Payton: Regarding the well field, I have noticed that other county departments are eager to use Conservation Collier money to help fund some of their projects. I was wondering if in future projects other parts of the county can be chipping in. With Florida Community Trust, I’m not sure we would see this as a partnership if things move forward with the Fleishman property. Lastly, I’m not convinced this parcel is for Conservation Collier but may be for Naples Bay Restoration.
Ms. Sulecki: To address the well field comment, the well field here is an existing well. The utility department said they would purchase those easements from us. There is consideration of contribution.

d. Collier County School Board Section 24
- The parcel is east of Golden Gate City, separated by the Golden Gate Canal
- The zoning is agricultural
- Consists of four 16 acre properties and a 1 acre piece
- The School Board may want to reserve 20 acres for a future school
- Vegetations none of preferred habitat but good quality natives present
- There is a small area on the southeast corner where I observed a gopher tortoise
- Access from along the canal easement
- There is a trail through portions of the parcel that appears to be well used by vehicles
- The estimated market value is $600,000 to $800,000
- Documentation of a red-cockaded woodpecker nest cavity
- High visibility, accessible, opportunities for natural resource based recreation, kayak, canoe

Nancy Payton: I understand that there’s a red-cockaded woodpecker preserve out there somewhere. I never received an answer on where exactly it is, but that may be out there. There are county lands nearby. There is a network developing for red-cockaded woodpecker habitats. A consultant evaluated it for red-cockaded woodpeckers and I recall the value was very high. There is another recreational use that the lands out there offer, horse trails. Florida Wild Life highly supports this parcel.
Ms. Sulecki: We will have additional reports in September and October.

C. Coordinator Updates

   a. Monthly Application Totals / Second Cycle Status Update

   Ms. Sulecki refers to materials distributed to committee members and presents the following:
   - We have added 10 acres in the sending lands
   - Received another application for 15 late Friday
   - Both from our outreach letters
   - Received a few more interested calls
   - Total of 230 acres under review, not including the multi-parcel projects
   - The costs to $14,000 per acre, that number always changing

   b. State Partnership Issues Update

   Alexandra Sulecki reports:
   - No movement on Malt due to conflicts with public access.
   - If no movement forward they will proceed to development
   - We discussed pulling from state and we will pursue it.
   - We are pursuing appraisals and are close to ordering
   - This is on A-list and we are prepared to move forward

   Mr. Carlson asks about the potential value?

   Ms. Sulecki: Originally $1.5 million, then $4 million; possibly $4-5 million now.

   c. Multi-Parcel, Multi-Owner Projects Discussion / Update

   Alexandra Sulecki provides maps to illustrate the information and notes that property values are escalating quickly now.

   i. Winchester Head

   Alexandra Sulecki indicates on map
   - We received a verbal offer of $70,000 from a grant from the Big Cypress Basin Board; we will use these funds to outsource administrative help, to acquire properties as quickly as possible.
   - I have given you some information from a firm who is interested in that.
   - We have four applications now and hope to present the report at the September 9th meeting.

   ii. North Golden Gate Estates Unit 53

   Alexandra Sulecki indicates on map.
   - Three parcels under appraisal review right now
   - We sent a letter to the GAC Trust Committee advising of our interest in a 7 acre parcel
iii. Gordon River Corridor – Update on June 9th County Workshop

- Have not received any applications; Fleishman parcels are not under review yet
- Three parcels are under evaluation; will have reports for the September 9th meeting
- Recently I learned of an organization called the Southwest Florida Land Preservation Trust. They have completed part of a pathway.
- I will be attending a meeting. The Southwest Florida Land Preservation Trust is a 501(c) 3. It started in the late 1980’s. They were working on bicycle and pedestrian paths along the Gordon River. Their pathway is located on the northwest corner of the airport. They have some plans for a foot bridge over the Gordon River. (Illustrated photos of the pathway)

Ms. Prosser: Alex I believe Scott Cameron and Pat Carol are still on that committee. Can you tell me where that meeting is at noon?
Ms. Sulecki: It’s at Mr. Cameron’s office.

Nancy Payton comments on the pathway located near the airport and submits that it is quite insufficient and uninviting. There are very little trees until you get down to the Australian Pine Forest, the parking is inadequate and the trail is uninviting.

d. Setting cut-off date for second cycle applications

Ms. Sulecki proposes a cut off date of July 31st. This will allow time for research, visits, evaluations and reports of the properties. Then you can rank in November and we can get to the Board of County Commissioners in December and January.

Mr. Poteet suggests that August 6th would be a better date, giving the public more time and makes a motion to use that date.
Mr. Kriz seconds

Ms. Lawson: Last year’s cycle, my recollection is that you did extend the deadline for some applications.
Ms. Sulecki: That was correct. However, last time a lot of applications came in at the last minute and it was difficult to get the reports out in time. If something wonderful comes in the day after the deadline I would certainly present it to you for your decision whether to accept or not.

Motion carries 7-0.

e. Miscellaneous

Ms. Sulecki: We have received a $16,000 contribution from mitigation by a private developer for a code enforcement case. Also I met with Lee County staff to discuss the projected greenways so we can be aware of potential parcels to coordinate greenways. (Ms. Sulecki illustrates potential areas on the map.)
D. Budget Projections

William Lorenz, Environmental Services Director, presents the following:

- We have proposed ¼ mil for FY05; the board approved that. The next meeting is to adopt the tentative mileage rate on July 27th; public hearings will be in September.
- With $28 million reserve in the year 2013, projected land management costs could be satisfied for 25 years.
- This is also based on capping land acquisitions at $75 million, I recognize that is an issue but we needed to use a starting point.
- Currently, the ordinance requires 85% for land acquisition and 15% for land management. The way I’ve set this analysis up, we have to modify the number to 25% allocation for land management costs. Our land management projections are still fairly uncertain.
- Given the land acquisition cost of $75 million our projected contribution to land management is 27.5%.

Ms. Prosser asks how the land management percentage evolved from 15% to 27.5%.

Mr. Lorenz: 15% is the number from the ordinance. What I actually have done is calculated the expected land management costs, from 2004 to the year 2038. Those calculations dictate that we need 27.5%. Those numbers are not certain and can be modified.

Ms. Prosser: I certainly would like to know more about this within the next few months.

Mr. Carlson: My surprise was the $75 million cap. I can remember us saying that there will be ¼ mil tax and we think that will reflect in a $75 million cap. I remember it as being a projection and not a cap. Where did this come from?

Mr. Lorenz: From the county manager’s office and budget office, that is their understanding. We have asked the county attorney’s office to give us a reading. Perhaps now may be the time to have Mr. Petitt give us some information.

Mike Petitt, Assistant County Attorney: The answer is not finalized. The ballot question has been looked at but I am not prepared to give a final answer today. I should have an answer this week and I prefer to present it in writing.

Ms. Prosser states that her understanding was that there was never intent to cap this at $75 million, she agrees with Mr. Carlson. The ballot language was to bond $75 million and of course you would have to take more in for the debt service.

Mr. Carlson: I would tell you that the people that I deal with would consider it a great asset if the program did generate additional moneys. My constituents would be very disappointed if the program was capped.

Mr. Potect: At first, I thought it was $75 million until I reviewed an article from the Naples Daily News from November 2000. It basically says the Board of County Commissioners officially approved an ordinance for ¼ mil tax to purchase $75 million worth of green space. It doesn’t say more than $75 million; I think the general public has this type of conception. I’m not against spending more than $75 million, as the price of real estate goes up our projections of how much land
we could purchase is going down. I think we need to let the Board of County Commissioners know that this issue has been brought before us and that we need direction from them.

Mr. Lorenz: In terms of timing, I think it would be important to have direction from the Board of County Commissioners as we go into ranking our second cycle properties. We expect the ranking cycle to take place in November.

Brad Cornell, Collier County Audubon Society: I want to make it very clear on record that the Collier County Audubon Society strongly supported this ordinance. The only cap ever mentioned was the ¼ mil. The $75 million was all that we could guarantee. All we could conservatively assure was the $75 million. The bond is only one part of it; that is the only thing you have to go to the voters for. The Board of County Commissioners can, of their own volition, have ¼ mil. It occurs to me that we have focused on a lot of urban parcels. Those urban parcels require a lot of management money. I think there is a rural component and there are opportunities to purchase larger acres that are less expensive to manage.

Ms. Lawson: I have a question, in your understanding, are we required to spend a certain amount every year? For example, are we able to reserve some acquisition funds for an upcoming property?

Mr. Cornell: That is a legal question. I don’t think it requires you to spend every year. The process is set up to work every year. It certainly is beneficial to purchase the land up front, considering the property values.

Ms. Payton: If you look at Conservation Collier literature it clearly states ¼ mil for 10 years. The bond was there to jump start the program. The storm water fund may be projected to take money away from Conservation Collier. The Board of County Commissioners has made it a program that will come out of the current mileage rate. Something has to give. Another issue is if the Homestead Exemption is increased that’s less money that is coming into the county and they will look for other sources.

VI. Subcommittee meeting reports

Budget – Ellin is absent.

Outreach – Mr. Poteet reports that there was a discussion about mitigation and there will be a meeting immediately following this meeting.

Land Evaluation – Marco is absent.

Ordinance Policy – No meeting and none scheduled.

VII. Committee Member Comments

Ms. Prosser: Can we have an update on the Fleishman land issue.
Mr. Lorenz: I have no other information on the property north of the parkway.

Ms. Sulecki: A contractor has been selected to do that plan and the plan is not done yet.

Ms. Prosser: That’s the Fleishman property north of Golden Gate Parkway. The Board of County Commissioners has appointed a Blue Ribbon panel to evaluate the Fleishman property that is part of zoo and surrounding acres. We are looking at the issue of referendum that would be on the ballot this fall to have a mileage increase of .15 up to $40 million to purchase the Fleishman land that is south of Golden Gate Parkway. We will launch a campaign to notify the public. I want to make sure that members of this committee are up to date on Conservation Collier’s involvement in this issue. We recently received a memo that we had one more opportunity to amend the language of the ballot question.

Mr. Pettit: The July 15th date is a practical administrative not a legal bar.

Mr. Lorenz: Conservation Collier funding portion would be the value of the property of undeveloped property that contributes to conservation.

Mr. Carlson: Based on the minutes of last month’s meeting I think I read that there was a potential for well field in Unit 53. I would like to see a 20 year plan for where this county is planning on putting the well fields.

Mr. Delate: If I recall, the wells in question would be deep aquifer wells and would not affect the surface waters.

Mr. Carlson: Why put these wells in Unit 53, an area that we are trying to protect? Why not put them elsewhere? Why not put the wells along the canal right of way along the fairgrounds?

Ms. Sulecki: Those wells were going to be put along the roadway easement. I do not know why.

Ms. Lawson: I think I recall from the presentation that the storm water people were going to try to piggy back on our property that we had already acquired and they would ask for a small piece.

Ms. Sulecki: It also had to do with distance; they had to locate wells at specific distances apart. That might go a long way to answering your questions.

VIII. Public Comments

None

IX. Staff Comments
Ms. Sulecki: Lands Evaluation and Management had a meeting with 25 people attending and contributing comments on our development of the interim management plan and our final management plan. We are in the process now of drafting an interim management plan for the Visnich parcel.

Mr. Lorenz: Interim management plans need to be approved within 60 days of acquisition, according to the ordinance.

Ms. Prosser compliments staff again on an extraordinary job.

X. Adjournment

Ms. Lawson moves to adjourn. Mr. Delate seconds.

The motion to adjourn was passed 7-0 at 11:18 am.

The next CCLAAC meeting will be August 9th at 9:00 AM.

There being no further business for the good of the County of Collier, the meeting was adjourned by the order of the Chair at 1:18 AM.

Conservation Collier Land Acquisition Advisory Committee

Chairperson (Kathy Prosser)