

**Conservation Collier Land Acquisition Advisory Committee
Meeting of the LDC Donation Endowment Subcommittee**

Summary Minutes - Revised

August 9, 2016

North Collier Regional Park

15000 Livingston Road

Naples, FL 34109

Audio File Available Upon Request

<u>Subcommittee Members</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Public/Other Agency</u>
Tracey Dewrell (TD) chairman	Alex Sulecki (AS) Conservation Collier	none
Michael Seef (MS)	Melissa Hennig (MH) Conservation Collier	
Bill Poteet (BP)	Richard Henderlong (RH) Planning	
Patricia Sherry (PS) absent	Caroline Cilek (CC) Planning	

Items distributed before meeting:

1. June 28, 2016 Memorandum Summarizing Management Endowment LDC Review
2. AUIR Impact Fee Historical Land Values

Items presented at meeting:

1. TNC Stewardship Calculator
2. Conservation Collier Property Costs Spreadsheet

The meeting commenced at 11:00 a.m. Tracey Dewrell served as Chairman

1. Acceptance of Agenda: No formal motion made

2. Old Business:

- i. Review of Planning Commission comments on previous recommendation – AS reviewed a status Memo on the Land Development Code (LDC) Amendment previously provided to the Conservation Collier Land Acquisition Advisory Committee (CCLAAC) LDC Management Endowment Subcommittee on June 28, 2016, with attached Land Development Code Amendment Request and AUIR/Impact Fee Land Value Chart provided as backup, and suggested the following as a starting point for discussion:

ii.

For the Monetary Donation – Require an appraisal of the preserve area valued at post-development value. Payment would be 125% of appraised value.

For the Land and Endowment Donation – require a 3:1 donation ratio for land and \$36,500/acre for endowment.

The above suggestions consider Collier County Planning Commission (CCPC) recommendations which are: 1) base all fees on value of onsite preserve post development value. 2) Require an appraisal of onsite preserve. 3) Consider a land donation ratio of greater than 1 to 1, such as 1 to 3. They additionally asked staff to consider discounts within the target areas and consider a better incentive to retain onsite preserve areas in urban areas.

AS noted the AUIR values for park lands, and the existing monetary donation rule are both close to \$200,000/acre. The existing per acre value for monetary donations (\$186,107) is already close to where the CCPC would like it to be.

AS noted that The Nature Conservancy (TNC) has a new more finely tuned stewardship calculator than the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) one we had used before and she ran the management numbers through the new TNC calculator and got a very similar result. The \$558/ac for land management is still a good number.

iii. Discussion on a revised recommendation:

RH – Reminded members ~~that what~~ the CCPC wants to obtain parity for the gain a developer realizes ~~from~~ by off-siting their preserve.

BP – Would like to consider incentive discounts.

TD – Also wants to consider incentive discounts. He would like to consider adding to all existing preserves as a land donation option so there are more areas where donations can go. This may counter the effect of prices rising in multi-parcel projects from supply/demand forces.

TD - Noted that appraisals can be subjective so there would need to be some control of the appraisal process.

CC – Suggested we add the TNC derived numbers to the information package going to the CCPC and Board of County Commissioners (BCC).

There was discussion of the ratio concept, some in favor and others not. AS suggested a 3:1 ratio (using cost recommendations made previously by CCLAAC and DSAC); TD suggested a 10:1 ratio (based on the relationship of assessed value and market value and values between urban and rural areas).

AS - Noted that increasing the ratio will increase the management endowment necessary.

BP – Agreed that accepting parcels directly connected to the multi-parcel projects, as well as other CC lands, should be considered, with discounts for parcels inside multi-parcel projects.

TD - Agreed that use of discounts would be useful and suggested that we might consider accepting other donated lots outside boundaries and then selling or trading them to acquire more desirable lots.

AS - Advised that the ordinance does support the concept of selling or trading of properties.

AS – Questioned acquiring developable lots outside the Winchester Head project, as the boundary was developed based on acquiring parcels that were more than half wetlands.

RH – The value developers gain should be offset equally and discounts could guide them toward getting more “bang for the buck” . Staying within the boundaries and giving a greater discount would be more bang for the buck.

MH - Asked how a discount is applied to lands to be donated? TD – They would buy a percentage less of property. BP – If they had to buy \$200,000 worth of property, they would have to buy a percentage less.

CC – Asked members if it would be beneficial for staff to develop and walk them through a couple of examples? She noted that the parity concept was critical to the Planning Commission, so we should look for that primarily.

CC - Recommended developing a system that does not incentivize land donation over monetary donation, if the goal is to receive monetary donations.

BP - Still prefers having a land donation option, but it can be convoluted.

TD – If we get only funds, Conservation Collier can buy greenspace in the urban area, which is where it may be needed more.

TD - Noted that when development gets going, developers will send out mass mailings making offers that could increase the expectations of value for owners in multi-parcel projects.

There was discussion about whether the donation and discounts should be pegged to the **value** of the onsite preserve or to the **acreage size**, with a greater than 1:1 ratio. There was general discussion how pegging the value of the land donation to the appraised value of onsite preserves could potentially be abused; including potential for paying too much for property and/or resulting in less acreage donated and less per-acre management endowment money owed.

BP – Recommended requiring arms-length transactions, which would discourage fraud.

There was discussion around limiting the recommendation to monetary donations.

MH – Recommended the group make a land donation recommendation as well as a monetary donation recommendation.

CC – Said we can also ask DSAC if they would be OK with just a monetary recommendation, but we should still come up with a recommendation for land donation.

RH and CC ~~thought we should have~~ suggested a minimum value that would be accepted – like \$200,000 per acre – and use already-developed land management values of approximately \$558/acre. An incentive could favor a monetary donation if that is what is desired by the committee members.

RH suggested a scatter plot graph be developed to show the remaining parcels and acreages still available in the two multi-parcel projects, to determine how what is left for acquisition fits into a discount plan.

BP - Suggested another meeting for land donation recommendation.

TD - Cautions against too many contingencies. Simplicity is good.

For the next meeting, staff will prepare some examples of how a land donation scenario would work out considering ideas presented.

- iv. Develop Revised Recommendation – Members were not prepared to make a final recommendation on the ratio land donation option and decided to meet again for this specific purpose.

The meeting ended at 12:09 pm.

3. New Business: none

6 Set next meeting date and agenda: September 14th, 2016

7 Adjourn: Meeting adjourned at 12:06 p.m.